

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1976 – 81

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 23rd September, 1980.

Pursuant to the adjournment the House of Assembly met at 12.20 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour E. E. ALLEYNE, LL.M., (Deputy Speaker); Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Hon. L. S. CRAIG, (Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment); Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Q.C., M.A., (Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Planning); Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, LL.B., (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. J. G. ODLE, B.Sc., (Chairman of Committees); Mr. M. C. C. WARD; Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN, Q.C., LL.B., (Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Trade, Tourism and Industry) (Leader of the House); Mr. V. L. JOHNSON, M.A.; Hon. L. R. TULL, M.A., (Minister of Education and Culture); Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW; Mr. L. L. SISNETT and Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, M.Sc., (Econ.).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday, 9th September, 1980 are before this House for confirmation.

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

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minutes are hereby confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am commanded to lay the National Housing Corporation (Pensionable Offices) Amendment Order, 1980. I would say this, Sir, that this greatly extends those offices at the National Housing Corporation which in future will be subject to full civil service pension arrangements.

Mr. GREAVES entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am also commanded to lay the Statements showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for 4 months ended 31st July, 1980.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to lay the Annual Report of the Barbados Industrial Development Corporation for the year 1978–79.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve of the vesting of land at Prescod Boulevard, St. Michael, in Mill Reef Co. Ltd.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$570,000 out of the Consolidated Fund and place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1980–81, Part II – Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1980–81, No. 7 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

I also beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$11,700 from the Consolidated Fund and place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1980–81, Part I – Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1980–81, No. 8 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

I also beg to give notice of a Bill to provide for the establishment of the office of Ombudsman, and on behalf of the Attorney General I beg to give notice of a Bill respecting inquiries to advise and to investigate.

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to provide for the establishment of the office of Ombudsman be now read a first time.

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

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

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill respecting inquiries to advise and to investigate be now read a first time.

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

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

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Attorney General I beg to give notice that the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 50 asked by the hon. member for St. Michael South is now ready. This Reply has attached to it a Schedule setting out the information required by the hon. member and copies are available from the Clerk of Parliament, and I will ask him to distribute them to hon. members.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move the suspension of Standing Orders 6, 16, 18, 20 and 42(5) for the remainder of today's sitting.

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

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker. I beg to move that Government Business be now taken and that Order No. 6 be the first Item.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Government Business is the instant Order of the Day. Item No. 6.
12.30 p.m.

Order Number Six was called — To move the passing of the Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order 1980.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Trade Unionism in Barbados, for many years followed a monolithic pattern. There was one basic Trade Union and there were various Associations, some of employers some of, as they then described themselves, Civil Servants and I believe others Sir, which occupied much smaller positions in the organisation of workers, than the main union.

The Civil Servants' Association which was one of these unions developed into the National Union of Public Workers and the same tendency which had led to the reduction of the monolithic situation of unionism, led also to some separation, even within the N.U.P.W. and in due course, the Barbados Union of Teachers and the Barbados Secondary Teachers Union were born. The Barbados Union of Teachers, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in particular, proved an extremely difficult union for those charged with responsibility, on behalf of the Government, for negotiating for the terms of conditions of service and salaries for teachers.

Broadly speaking Sir, it can be said that the Barbados Union of Teachers never came to any agreement with anybody, at any time, on any subject. This situation continued and exacerbated the relationships between the Government, the Ministry of Education, the Establishments Division of Government and the school teachers. When Hon. Members, on this Side came into office, we inherited these very bad relationships. We inherited a situation of particular teachers who had fallen foul during earlier Governments. Officials in the Ministry of Education carried over their attitudes of hostility and received in return, a good deal of hostility from the officials who had continued in office. So, we had such situations as sick outs, as to the quarrels down at the Westbury School, as the threat to difficulties which have been had with teachers, from time to time.

Led, I would quite freely confess Sir, by the spirited initiative of the Hon. Member for St. George South, the Hon. Minister of Education, this Government decided to give a new deal to the teaching service of this Island and we examined all the proposals for regrading of posts, upgrading of posts, changing of responsibilities which the two teachers' unions have submitted from time to time. It has taken us two instalments to come to agreement because there are a great number of outstanding points and indeed, Mr. Deputy Speaker although the Barbados Union of Teachers has accepted the regrading and has no quarrel with the new salaries, the Barbados Secondary Teachers' Union has accepted the salaries, but still has some very minor quarrel over the regrading, the principal one relating to the date from which arrears should be paid. But, we think that the officials of the

Establishments Division of Government and the Hon. Minister of Education personally, deserve very great congratulations for their success on achieving general agreement on conditions and terms of service, in teaching in Barbados and also, particularly, the Hon. Minister of Education deserves congratulations for his grasping immediately, the global nature of the problems which face education in Barbados and for dealing with them on a global basis.

The Ministry of Education has decided that it will expand greatly, the training of teachers and has so done, so that you will find a very substantial bunching of teachers in the newly trained grades. This reflects the work which has been done at Erdiston, in the last three years. The Hon. Minister, I believe, has a target date when he intends that all primary school teachers who are capable of being trained, will be trained.

Mr. TAITT entered the Honourable Chamber and took his seat.
12.40 p.m.

This effort has had its reward in the restoration of morale in the Teaching Industry. I do not think that it is fanciful to see that the difference between 13 Barbados Scholarships this year and no Barbados Scholarships in 1975 is the difference between an Educational System where morale is high, the Teachers are attempting to bring the best out of those school children and an Educational System in which morale was low and the Teachers were lukewarm and a theoretician was dancing fancy theories on top of his desk under duress of the Chief Educational Officer and others and getting nothing done for the Education of the children.

I do not believe that the children who were borned in 1958, I suppose, are that much less intelligent than the ones who were borned in 1963. I believe that it is a question of the determination of the Ministry of Education and the application of the best teaching principles to assist them. (ASIDES — How about the Lodge School?) The Lodge School tells you a lot about its Teachers and morale. I hear an asides about the Lodge School. The results of the Lodge School tells you a lot about the morale in the Teaching Service and its effects on the children. It is a member of the Opposition who is picking up this point, not the Government. I just want to make it quite clear.

The Order before the House, Sir, is the Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order is the first of the general passage of Salary Revision Orders which we are presenting today. It has to be applied to the other Orders because this is the regrading on which the other Orders are based. They have to be passed and indeed Gazetted in due course before we so deal with the Orders providing for the upgrading of wages.

There is a little technical history to that and certainly I can give hon. members the details. Previously, there were three separate grades of Headteacher. We have reduced the Grades to two. Teachers who teach in schools with more than 400 pupils will become Grade I Headteachers. Those with not more than 400 pupils will become Grade II. There is still in my opinion, Sir, going down the line some room for a new approach to Graduate Teachers. The Graduate Teacher arrangements were brought into force during the time when there were very few Graduate Teachers. Now we have a very large number of Teachers who are in training everyday. It may very well be that in the future you will have to have a cut-off point for Graduate Teachers who enter the Service after a given date. We may have to reduce the privileges available to them. That is a matter which has been canvassed with us by the Barbados Secondary Teachers' Union. There is still some room in the future for re-organisation.

Senior Teachers we now recognise their responsibilities and we have given them a very substantial upgrading now. They are being raised from Z.15-10 to Z.9-8. It is very hard to grasp them when you hear the archaicing mysteries of civil service coding being recited but basically we are raising of as last year the minimum pay from \$11,976 to \$14,856 and raising the maximum pay from \$14,376 to \$15,816 to combine with the increase in pay which I intend to introduce later in the House. They will get increases in emoluments of over 50%.

Qualified Teachers we have improved their scales at the bottom, if I remember correctly. They started at \$663 I think it was a month and they will now be upgraded to \$880 a month as of the old pay scales and we have arrived at a conversion arrangement. We have written what is called Special Conversion Tables. This means we will not bring four groups of Teachers up to one Grade salary, we will carry them up in pairs so that those who have been trained Teachers for three years will get more even now in the new scales than those who have just come out of Erdiston and I am glad to say that total and complete agreement has been reached with all of these points with the Union principally concerned which is the Barbados Union of Teachers.

I recommend this Order to the House, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to second it and reserve my right to speak.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, throughout my constituency there are a number of Teachers who heard the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister's speech that some Teachers will be eligible for approximately \$6,000 retroactive pay.

Many of them have asked me who are those Teachers and they would like to know the number of Teachers who are entitled to this big sum of money. I shall therefore be grateful if the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister will state to this House the number of Teachers in that category.

I do not think it is a colossal task for him to give that information. As I am fully aware that in dealing with this matter I have no doubt in my mind that the files are available and to clear the air publicly, I would be glad if he could give the necessary information. I do so with the full sense of responsibility in representing my constituents and I am appealing to him, if the information is not available now, that before this session ends today, this day's sitting, that he should seek to clear the air on this most important issue.
12.50 p.m.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am very happy with the increases which have been given to teachers, and I want to express my full support for this Resolution. For too long in this country teachers have been viewed as poor cousins in relation to their better off relatives in the main stream of the Public Service, and that has resulted in a situation in which there has been a flight of able people from the teaching service over the years. Notwithstanding that, I think we have all agreed that the teaching service has carried a large responsibility in this country and in particular at the Primary School level there were grave and gross anomalies. We had a situation existing whereby the headmaster of a primary school sometimes after thirty and forty years in the Public Service worked for far less than a graduate teacher 26 years old who had just come out of Cave Hill and who had no responsibility for managing a school plant and who had none of the experience of a man with 30 or 40 years. That was the sort of anomaly which obviously we could not continue to support, and I am very glad indeed, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that in this salaries revision we have done a reclassification and have corrected those gross and obvious anomalies which existed.

I hope that one result of this will be that the teaching service will continue to attract some of the most dedicated and finest minds in this country so that we can long look forward to a situation such as obtained this year when there will not be three or four or in some cases no Barbados Scholars but several reaching scholarship level and qualifying for the Blue Ribbon.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does any other hon. member wish to speak?

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member who raised a query is not in his place. We are trying to get the information for him, but we do

give the undertaking that this information will be available during the course of one of the other Orders relating to teachers, but we have sent for this specific information.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should like to thank the hon. member for the information he has given concerning the question which I asked.

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

RESOLUTION TO FIX THE EMOLUMENTS AND CONDITIONS OF SERVICE OF HEADTEACHERS, DEPUTY HEADTEACHERS AND THE VARIOUS CATEGORIES OF TEACHERS IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 7 stands in the name of the Hon. Prime Minister to move the passing of a Resolution to fix the emoluments and conditions of service of Headteachers, Deputy Headteachers and the various categories of Teachers in Secondary Schools with effect from 1st April, 1980.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is very similar to the previous Order. It is just that we need two Orders to deal with the particular subjects, because Headteachers and Secondary School Teachers do have separate areas where you make the Order. It will be noted in fact that we are now upgrading the salaries of all Headteachers of Secondary Schools. Previously those who taught in Fifth Form schools used to get less than those who taught in Sixth Form Schools. We are now upgrading them all and last year's rate would have been \$2,008 a month for each. Great difficulty has been found in getting people to work as Deputy Heads. We have upgraded the position of Deputy Head as well.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) ORDER, 1980

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 8 stands in the name of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) Order, 1980.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Order embodied the agreement which the Government has been able to reach with the National

Union of Public Workers which represents, as I am informed, over 7,000 workers in the public service. My statement which was made in the House on Friday outlined the general background to this Order, and really, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is very little to add to it.

There have been various difficulties on the way to reaching agreement, but I am glad to say that agreement with what I am informed is very much the majority union was reached on terms that are extremely favourable to public officers. I do not want to repeat myself, but it is the best salary increase civil servants have ever had. In 1976 civil servants had not had an increase for three years, the cost of living had risen 88 per cent in those three years — it is possible to argue it had risen more. I think at that time 100 per cent increases were being asked for by some Civil Service Unions, the negotiations went on and as early as June of that year the then Government made up its mind to impose a settlement on all unions representing Public Service Workers. I voted against it at the time in the House, Sir, on the grounds that every avenue of negotiation had not yet been fully explored.

On this occasion facing a cost of living increase that on an annual average basis, which is the basis produced by the previous Government in 1973, amounted to something like 24 per cent and even on a point to point basis amounted I believe to 34 per cent, and that only because of some eccentric mathematics relating to the choice of a base date, and as against these increases in the cost of living, the Government has offered an increase of at least 30 per cent to all persons embraced in what is called the key scale and associated grades. Indeed of the 6,000 people in the key scale more than 5,000 were offered an increase of 35 per cent which is the best increase negotiated in Barbados for anybody this year.

1.00 p.m.

We think that this is something to congratulate the Government about, not to abuse it, and I must say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that with all the goodwill which I have for the Barbados Workers' Union, with all the respect which I have for Mr. Walcott and indeed for the hon. member for St. Lucy and Mr. Trotman, with all the respect which I have for them — and I will tell you this, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they do not say much when Mr. Walcott is there but they are generally forces for moderation and good behaviour. You would be surprised, seeing the hon. member for St. Lucy in here, to see how humble and meek he is when he is sitting down behind Mr. Walcott negotiating; polite, pleasant, smiling, always in a receptive atmosphere, always ready with useful information and always willing to do business in a straightforward way, but if I had to deal with him and Mr. Trotman perhaps I would not have had certain

difficulties. Certainly poor Mr. Trotman is ready to agree with anything rather than have it said out loud that you got on the platform in *Gazettes* earlier this year and said there was nothing wrong with legislating the salaries in 1976. He has been trying to keep that as quiet as the hon. member for St. Lucy has been trying to get it publicised and I wish publicly to say that I did not mean the hon. member for St. Lucy when I said that an Assistant Secretary of the Union had said on a platform that there was nothing wrong with a previous Prime Minister legislating salaries in 1976. It was not that hon. member, it was Mr. E. LeRoy Trotman whom the hon. member for St. Lucy described to me as "Trottie". He said if it is "Trottie" that said it, why don't you put it on "Trottie".

It passes my comprehension how a negotiating team could sit down and negotiate with Cable and Wireless for 25% increases and refuse to agree with the Government for 38% increases, how they could negotiate with Da Costa for 35%, and indeed some at 32% increases but cannot agree with the Government for 38% increases. At one stage when we thought we were getting somewhere and Mr. Trotman was agreeing to let the Government submit its scale and the Union could comment on it, I was suddenly told by Mr. Walcott that I cannot tell the Union how to respond to an offer. It defeated all of us who were there, it defeated the Chief Establishments Officer, his Deputy, it defeated me and it defeated Mr. Trotman and the hon. member for St. Lucy as well, because they were as surprised to hear it knowing that this statement went right against the grain of previous negotiations with the Government, as I was. Indeed in the end of course it was done, they submitted a scale in the ordinary way but it was not a very realistic one. To have gone all the way with Mr. Walcott would have meant that a man at a certain point would have been given an increase and a man immediately above him would have been given so much less an increase that he would have been working for less money, and it was only when they straightened this out in the scales that this could have been dealt with, and I heard how the people at the top are getting so much more than the people at the bottom, that the percentage at the top was too much compared to the percentage at the bottom, and yet when the Barbados Workers' Union submitted a scale they had a wider spread between the people at the top and the people at the bottom than the Government's spread was, so all that I can really say was that the Barbados Workers' Union for whatever reasons of its own did not reach agreement with the Government.

This is September, Sir, this is not June like last time, you are dealing with people now who have passed the half year waiting for salary increases. The numbers involved who had not agreed compared to the numbers who had agreed were so small that I could do no more than say that the will of the minority cannot be allowed to prevail over the will of the overwhelming majority, and

on that basis this order and the order further down the Order paper come before the House. We hope to pay the salaries in October, Sir, and I am yet standing because I know that civil servants may take a long time to do things, but I know that when it comes to calculating seven months' backpay, the civil servants burn the lights at Government Headquarters, at the Ministry of Education and at the Treasury and other places till a very late hour indeed. If next week and the week after you see a lot of lights burning in the Treasury Building you will know that the back pay is being added up and the preparations being made to distribute it. It is going to be something like \$28 million coming out next month. The civil servants have held a lot of strain and I must say that I would like to congratulate all those in my office who have gone through these eight months of often bitter salary negotiation.

I have not said much about the National Union of Public Workers, Sir. It is not necessary to say a great deal except to pay some tribute to the good sense of its President and some of its Officers. There are however Officers of the National Union of Public Workers who should sit down and take careful stock of whether they have adopted the correct models to guide them in their approach to salary negotiations in Barbados.

I have seen one Officer go away on a course to Britain. Now I am a life long supporter of the British Labour Party and the Trade Union movement in Britain, but I cannot be insensitive in my contact with British people to the fact that there is a widespread belief that it is Union irresponsibility that has reduced Britain from being the richest country in Western Europe to being along with Italy the poorest, that the wild cat strikes, the destructive attitude of the British Trade Unions, the restrictive attitudes have made it impossible for Britain to pull itself up as other European countries, countries that have Communist Trade Unions, such as France and other French speaking countries, they have lifted themselves up because the attitude of the workers has been such as to understand certain economic imperatives.

Now the attitude of the workers in Barbados has in general also been such as to demonstrate clearly through their representatives that they understand the economic imperatives of life in our small country. In 1978 without the assistance of the Barbados Workers' Union and the National Union of Public Workers this country could not have recovered to make an economic miracle for a Third World country that is recognised the world over. If the workers' representatives had not pulled together and helped us to lift Barbados up we would not now be reading about ourselves in tones that no Caribbean country has ever been able to read about itself before. No West Indian has ever been able to sit down and open a newspaper and see the things said about his Island that you can open and see said about Barbados, and all of us,

the Unions, the Government, the people all deserve praise for this. If now we are going to get a Trade Unionist who thinks that perhaps he can compete with Frank Walcott, establish a power base within the Trade Union comparable to the power base of Mr. Walcott in the Barbados Workers' Union, and that his most effective way of doing that is to speak of making the Government crawl on its knees, we are in for just the beginning, the cloud no larger than a man's hand, of trouble on the union horizon, and I say to that young man, to Mr. Goddard, I say to him, if you aspire to be a Frank Walcott, try and learn what kind of man Frank Walcott is. Frank Walcott is not a noisy idiot, running about the street abusing people, negotiating through the newspapers. That is not Frank Walcott. Frank Walcott has participated in the building up of this country, over the past 30 years and acquired a certain sense of decency and responsibility in the press and established not just a Barbados reputation, but a world reputation.

1.10 p.m.

If, with the imminence of an Election, he feels free to allow a certain political prejudice which will do no harm, to influence his actions, that is a little slip from the grace, of which all of us can be guilty from time to time, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Frank Walcott has not prepared any military vehicle, has not spoken of lifting the sword, has not telephoned his friends in the newspapers every night — but he, himself says that he has no friends in the newspapers, so that particular course of action is ruled out — giving them a misleading picture of what is going on at negotiations. He has not prejudiced.

I must say, Sir, that the General Secretary of the National Union of Public Workers seriously prejudiced, at more than one point, the smooth progress of the negotiations, by interviews which he gave to the press. Sorry, Sir, am I breaking Standing Order 28, Sir?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is precisely what I was exercising in my mind.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am sorry, Sir. I am not intending to abuse anybody, or reflect on their conduct, Sir. I come to praise Caesar on this occasion, Sir, not to bury him and I withdraw any references which are in breach of the Standing Orders.

But, it is still important for us to remember, that, in Barbados, we get wage and salary increases of 20%, 25%, 30%, 35%, 38% and in Britain, you cannot get into double figures. Britain which has an inflation rate, now reduced, running at something like 16½%. This

year, Barbados which has an inflation rate of nine percent, .2 over percent last month, .4 over percent month before, we get increases up there because the Government and the employers alike understand that we are not dealing only with the cost of living, we are dealing with making everybody richer.

I cannot guarantee that corned beef will ever again cost \$1.60, Sir, I cannot guarantee that, even the price which the Hon. Member for St. Michael South West had rice in 1975, which is more than it is now, I cannot guarantee that we will never go above that. But, I can guarantee that the Government will take, as one of its objectives, and one of its major objectives, to do everything it can to build a strong economy, so that we can put money into people's pockets to buy goods at the increased price. That is what I will guarantee to try to do.

When the people abroad, the people in Uruguay and Panama River, they do not listen to the Hon. Member for St. Michael South West when they are grinding out the corned beef and whatever else goes into the corned beef tin up the river, nothing which the Hon. Member for St. Michael South West says is going to change the price. So, in Barbados, we cannot look at controlling prices through controlling the farm gate, or the factory door price of the great majority of the things which we eat.

We have to look at creating levels of prosperity in the Island which will enable us to cope with inflation and that is clearly what we have done and what we are doing. Mr. Deputy Speaker, last year, Barbadians' private consumption expenditure exceeded \$800,000,000.00, but this year, it is going to exceed one billion dollars, more than 25% increase. The cost of living has not gone up 25%. That increase is reflected in one year of the increase in the standard of living of Barbadians. It is not just that they are paying more for the same things, they are buying more things and that is a straightforward, mathematical calculation which cannot be gainsay and this was our object in dealing with the Public Service salaries.

I believe that it is an open secret, Sir, that really the Government had reached very, very near to the end of its patience, at the end of August, 1980, in respect of the salary negotiations. We had already then established the points beyonds which we were not going which is 38.3% at the bottom, \$500.00 a month for full-time paid officers and 22½% at the top.

That was established indeed, perhaps in June, or July. I mean, it is that long, that we have been sticking on that and when we reached a structure, at the end of August, which seemed to express, contain the maximum that the Government could afford to pay, we were very, very hesitant about going beyond that point.

But, just a fortnight ago, Sir, you may have seen it reflected in newspaper comments, I decided to take everything into account, even what Mr. Walcott had said about the workers should get interest on the arrears of pay. A calculation of what the Government had saved by not paying out the salaries month by month, was made, an examination of the Government's financial position which has been, by no means unreasonable in this Financial Year, Sir, an examination of the Balance of Payments which is holding up extremely well, I brought the Daily Sheet to the Honourable House, Sir, for yesterday I think, as we had something like, the Central Bank's own assets Sir, are \$128.7 million and their privately held assets, assets of Government and others. In addition to that, we examined the Balance of Payments, I discussed this matter with my Advisers, I said that the Government is not in the business of making a profit at the expense of civil servants. At that stage, if we had wanted to legislate, everything was ready Sir, and a fortnight before last Friday, it could have been done at that stage, had we wanted. But, I said to my colleagues, the Hon. Member for Christ Church West was always of that mind, I said that I thought that the Government's position would allow some improvement in the structure of the offer and it should be made.

1.20 p.m.

I said I do not know. I cannot give you any guarantee that they will agree even to this but I would prefer even to make it because I think that the civil servants should get the extra few millions. It is there and it is possible to pay. My colleagues in the Cabinet will all remember that occasion. The additional offer was made and after further negotiations the additional offer was basically accepted by all Unions which were ever going to accept any meaningful offer whatsoever.

I just want to say this to reassure the public. I think a lot of Barbadians get very nervous when they read of the possibility of industrial disputes. This is one of the things that I am asking the Secretary of the National Union of Public Workers to take careful thought of himself.

I daresay that it is possible that the National Union of Public Workers can afford to pay strike pay to people who would lose \$1,200 a month in salaries if they went on strike because I hope that everybody in Barbados does understand that one of the concomitants of any strike is that they do not get pay. I sometimes wonder if in the middle of it all if this was properly and fully understood. As I said, I have no doubt that all of this existed. The Union was prepared for that, that its funds will stand the strike for monthly paid employees as well as weekly paid employees and that if it had an industrial dispute to enforce it.

I have no doubt that would all have been done but I equally want the Union to understand that there should have been no doubt that the Government is not going to flinch in the face of threats. Let that be understood quite clearly. Nobody elected Tom Adams to crawl on his knees to Joseph Goddard. Of that I am sure, perhaps I should not have called the name. Nobody has elected any of us in here to crawl on their knees to anybody and the Government was not contemplating crawling. It did not arise with the Union concerned for a couple of years and I very sincerely hope that the responsibility which the President and other members have shown — I excuse the Treasurer as he really does not have sense enough to assure responsibility or irresponsibility — will be shared by all officials of that Union with whom the Government has to deal.

I do not know, Sir, how far hon. members have read the Order now before the House. It would be tedious to go through it line by line but I would say this. The Order itself embodies a number of regradings that have been negotiated over the past year, and are awaiting insertions in due course. These are regradings relating to Legal Officers. I think there may be others in other points. Really, there are so detailed in the Order that if hon. members have questions to ask, I will search out the information but if this is not understood, it may seem that that there may be some anomalies because when you compare it with the old Order you will see people in different positions here and there.

The Order is a General Order and it is an entirely new salary scale for all public officers but the work of improving the terms and conditions of service to public officers is a never ending one. As I have said on another occasion, the Government feels that there are still many positions in Government, mainly at the top and at the bottom that require further examination.

Many of the fixed point scales and certainly the professional scales are unrealistic in the conditions of 1980. Many of them are. Even Institutions of Government outside the Civil Service have salaries in terms much better than persons carrying greater responsibility within the Civil Service and at the bottom, Sir, I have had to say that it is virtually impossible for me to understand how a man driving heavy duty equipment for the Government, has been working for \$135 a week when working in the Construction Firms he would be getting a minimum of \$300 a week. This was raised at one point. I remember, Mr. Frank Walcott telling me he should get \$192 a week, but when the Union's final proposal came in Mr. Frank Walcott had raised it to \$233 but even \$233 might not be enough.

We are not ruling out some of those salaries that the Barbados Workers' Union have asked to have increased. We are not ruling them out but we will do them as a regrading exercise. The greatest theoretical point of difficulty during the negotiations was the refusal of the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union to enter into any talks at that stage about regrading. He said they must get the new salaries in the way he said they must get them. Now, Sir, negotiations are not carried in that way. Frank Walcott says they are to get their new salaries one way and I say it is better to give them in another way and we should negotiate on that basis. The end product may be that they will get the new salaries, those whose positions of responsibility justify it. They might not get the whole; we might strike a balance, those whose positions justify it.

I am not saying that there is going to be a re-opening of the negotiations and as far as I believe a man who wants to get \$220 a week, he wants to get it. He does not want to get it the way the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union says he must get it or the way the Prime Minister says he must get it. He wants to get it and it will be our aim to examine the case for some of these increases.

We have already agreed to regrade a number of position at the behest of the National Union of Public Workers and I hope that at the end of this year some element of the regrading and re-classification exercise will be concluded. Mr. Deputy Speaker, it has been a long hard grind to get this Agreement but it has been worth it.

In the Manifesto of the General Elections of 1976 the Barbados Labour Party promised that it would negotiate for as long as was necessary to achieve agreements with Unions. We think that we have negotiated as long as necessary to achieve agreements in this case. At the last salary negotiations we agreed on increases which put the lower paid workers right in front of the cost-of-living. We now think that we have agreed to increases which enable them to catch up in the years that the locust ate between 1973 and 1976 and I am not calling the hon. member for St. John a Governmental locust, Sir. I am referring in more categorical and metaphorical terms when I speak of locust but the locusts of mismanagement ate away at the standard of living of the people of this country. We believe that we have comfortably restored that standard of living and have given ourselves a lift, the Civil Servants as well as everybody else.

I recommend the Agreement to the House and I beg to move that the Resolution embodied do now pass.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that.
1.30 p.m.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, hon. members would expect that I would enter into this debate since as it is expected, I represent one of the Unions which was negotiating with the Government for an increase in the wages and conditions of employment of at least the employees who are covered in this Civil Establishment Order. It is interesting to note at the outset, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Prime Minister has had his say on Friday in a ministerial statement to this House. Of course he has had the benefit of air play on C.B.C. all over the weekend and as recently as last night, but up to this point in time hon. members of this Chamber have not been given a copy of the Statement by the Prime Minister. But that is just a comment by the way.

Let me say that the Barbados Workers' Union has been taken to task in the public comments which the Prime Minister has made on these negotiations. The Union recognises that in any situation that it enters into that the view which it takes whether it is dealing with private employers or with public employers 100% of the times clashes with the view of the body with which it is negotiating. Never will you find a situation where the Barbados Workers' Union will submit proposals which employers will immediately jump and say we agree, not that the proposals which are submitted by the Barbados Workers' Union are unreasonable, but the mere fact of submitting proposals on any particular condition or on raises of salary, the employers tend to take the view that they have to inch or pinch off a little bit.

Now coming to these particular negotiations the Barbados Workers' Union submitted proposals to the Government and negotiations started on 17th April, 1980. Our proposals were based on an increase of 45 per cent for persons earning up to \$749 per month. Secondly for persons earning between \$750 per month and \$1,499 per month we were asking for an increase of 35 per cent and for persons earning \$1,500 a month and over we were asking for an increase of 25 per cent. Let me say that the Barbados Workers' Union considered that these proposals were reasonable and indeed were justified in the light of everything that was happening or had happened in Barbados in the past, the whole question for example of the 1978 situation where immediately after the negotiations were concluded with the Barbados Workers' Union and the other Unions in the Public Service, one found a situation where the Prime Minister came to Parliament with increases for himself, Ministers and Parliamentarians in the range of 50 per cent, 60 per cent and in some instances 80 per cent.

We, as I said, considered that our proposals were reasonable and I would want to say that when proposals are submitted by the Barbados Workers' Union, the cost of living is not the only factor which is taken into consideration; it is one of many factors which necessarily make up the argument for presenting a case on any

particular set of proposals, so that for the Prime Minister to base his argument only on an increase in the cost of living is something with which I would want, from practical experience of the Barbados Workers' Union to take issue, and indeed I would say that there are thousands of people in Barbados who will appreciate the point that the cost of living has risen much more than the Prime Minister would have believed. But that is a matter which I am sure will be dealt with in more detail later on.

After some delay on our proposals we were able to get a meeting and at the first meeting the Government through the Chief Establishments Officer made an offer of 20 per cent in the first year and 2½ per cent in the second year for everybody. Now we immediately rejected that proposal because we could not understand the kind of logic the situation where a Government could think in terms of offering the person at the bottom of the scale, let us say, if the person was earning \$84.80 per week an increase of \$16.80, and a person at the top of the scale or top of the salary level in the Government who would let us say be earning \$3,000 per month a similar percentage increase which would net that person about \$600 per month. We said that was negligible and we certainly could not accept that style of negotiation and we rejected that proposal out of hand.

The Prime Minister talked about the Barbados Workers' Union being intransigent, we would not bend. How could one bend in a situation where that kind of nonsense for a proposal was coming forward? We considered that proposal had no merit in it and that the proposal would further have created the kind of gap that we were seeking to narrow in the Public Service, and indeed I would want to say that one of the bases for negotiation which the Barbados Workers' Union conducts in this country is to reduce the gap between the persons who are earning high incomes and indeed the persons at the lower level. I want to say that I have heard the Deputy Prime Minister on this on more than one occasion and I have heard the Prime Minister stating that through negotiations and presumably through the efforts of the Barbados Workers' Union, the distance between the income earners at the top and those at the bottom was too narrow and indeed I think the Government did say that as a matter of policy by one of its spokesmen they would seek to redress this particular situation to make sure that what they call the proper relativities were maintained. That seems to be the policy of the Government, to make sure that persons at the top get the biggest bit of any particular situation.

At the next meeting which was held between the Government and the Barbados Workers' Union the Government decided to consolidate their offer of 20 per cent in the first year and 2½ per cent in the second year into a one time offer of 22½ per cent for all workers em-

ployed in the public sector. Again that was rejected by the Barbados Workers' Union. We had a number of meetings and then a hiatus developed, and at the next meeting the Government made an offer where we felt we could then begin to enter into some kind of meaningful negotiation. Indeed on the 7th August the Barbados Workers' Union modified its position, and as I said the Prime Minister would have the public to believe that we were intransigent, we were not bending, we were not prepared to negotiate, but on 7th August the Barbados Workers' Union modified its position on the following basis: 40 per cent for the key scale and its equivalent within the Z scale, 35 per cent in the Z scale, that is from Z - 17 up and 25 per cent in the Z scale from Z-4 up. That was the modified position of the Barbados Workers' Union. Indeed an extract from the letter which was sent to the Chief Establishments Officer states at paragraph 2 as follows:—

"The Union cannot accept a model which persists in widening the disparities between the persons who already are the most favoured in the economy and those who are wage earners and consumers mainly. This position is completely unacceptable to the Barbados Workers' Union and I must inform you accordingly."

This letter was signed by the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union.
1.40 p.m.

Now I think it is important for us to realise that the Barbados Workers' Union had been looking at the entire public service and the relationships between the whole set of people there, and we had been expressing our dissatisfaction with the kind of situation which we saw operating.

Now we come into the situation where the Prime Minister himself took over the negotiations, and if I recall, I think we had about two or three meetings with him, but I want to skip all those details, skip for example the abuse which he heaped on the National Union of Public Workers in our presence, accusing them of being political — and of course we are aware of the fact that the Barbados Workers' Union was also being abused in front of the National Union of Public Workers to the extent that they were being political — but I am not going to go into all of that, all the bad talking which was done by the Prime Minister about the National Union of Public Workers. I do not have to say that he called any person present or otherwise of the NUPW any names, I do not have to say that, I think that the delegation from the NUPW will be quite aware of that, so I am not going into that.

But we reached the point, Mr. Deputy Speaker, where on the 15th September at 3.30 p.m. the Barbados Workers' Union received a letter from the Chief Establishments Officer stating that to grant the kind of increases

which the Barbados Workers' Union were seeking would ruin the economy, and they made one or two gestures, I would have to call them, in terms of adjustments, no significant adjustments, and asked the Barbados Workers' Union for a reply by 12.00 mid-day on the 17th. Again we took objection to this, because we felt that there was not enough time given to us, certainly if we were going to modify our position to do so, because we have procedures laid down in the Union for discussing wages and, generally speaking, negotiations.

We replied on Thursday, 18th September with again further modifications to our position, but I just want to refer to a letter which we had again to write to the Chief Establishments Officer on these negotiations on the 9th September. I think it is very important in the sequence and I missed it slightly, and it was when the second meeting which was set up was cancelled at the very last minute, and the Union wrote to the Chief Establishments Officer in the following vein:

"The Union is disappointed at the delay in these negotiations, and in addition, the last minute notice of postponement of meetings. The Union appreciates that there are times when meetings will be postponed, but cannot accept a one-hour notice of postponement of important meetings when large delegations are involved.

I must inform you that the Union once more is disappointed at the treatment Government is giving to these proposals and is satisfied that there is little seriousness about reaching an agreement on these matters.

The Union could not imagine that the proposals which for practical purposes are unaltered are submitted for serious consideration. The Union reiterates its statement submitted to you in a letter of 7th August that the position set out in your last proposal is completely unacceptable."

So that we were in a situation where the much talked about change of position by the Government in these negotiations was really insignificant, and as I said, we could not accept them.

Well, we reached a point where as I said we submitted another modified position on Thursday, 18th September, which we thought would have measured up to the requirements of the Government in terms of trying to reach an agreement, because we really, honestly and sincerely were hoping to reach an agreement with the Government on these matters. Our proposals however had differed with the Government's in a number of areas, and contrary to the impression the Prime Minister has given out again about 38.3% at the bottom, and there is a category, Z.30, where 38.3% applies, but in most of the other categories

and for example, the key scale workers, there is nobody in the key scale who is being offered or who will get the 38.3%, and I hope that those persons who work in the key scale will be aware of this and will not be looking to get 38.3% increase because Category I the Government is now offering 36.7%, Category II, 35.4% increase, Category III a 35.2% increase, Category IV, a 35.1% increase and it goes right down to where let us say in Category XII you find that the Government is offering a 32.1%, so whereas one might get the impression about workers at the bottom and where we normally recognise key scale workers as workers at the bottom, that the workers in this category are not getting a 38.3% increase. So anybody who has got that impression that they are getting a 38.3% increase could as well wipe that out of their minds, the Prime Minister has once more, I think pulled off one of his tricks, but we are not going to allow that to go by the board because I think we can point this out to the people, and certainly when people come to get their back pay or to get their new wages as the case may be, they will then see what this is all about.

When we in the Barbados Workers' Union take a stand we take a stand on a very important matter of principle. My colleagues have asked me to repeat this point which I am making that whereas the Prime Minister has led workers in the public service and the population of Barbados to believe that those workers who are normally considered to be at the bottom of the scale are going to get a 38.3% I say that that is a lie, that is not so, that is a lie. Workers in the Categories I to XII and in Category XIII who are normally considered by any reasonable person to be at the bottom of the grade scale are not getting this 38.3% increase that the Prime Minister is talking about.

The Prime Minister talked just now about regrading. He said that the greatest problem in negotiations was the refusal of the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union to enter into discussions on the question of regrading. Now, how can we be in a situation where we are negotiating increases to be at the second last meeting with the Prime Minister talking in terms of regrading? We said very clearly that at the present moment we are not allowing any red herring, blue herring or black herring to be drawn across the trail, we are at the present moment dealing with wages and we are going to be dealing with wages. If regrading is going to take place, as indeed we believe and we have stated this, that certain categories of workers needed to be regraded.

1.50 p.m.

Indeed, we even suggested that there was need for a whole scale of regrading in the Public Service, but that was not the time for it, not on the eve, or when negotiations had reached a point where you were trying to reach an agreement, do not worry to bring that in. So that, the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister was merely, as far as we are con-

cerned, throwing a red herring across the trail. So, it was a diversionary tactic which was employed by the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister which was being held out and we were not falling for that because we have been in that business, negotiating and we recognise very clearly when to separate the wood from the trees, as far as, issues are concerned and so, that is basically our position.

Now, I said, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I think I can make it very clear and I believe that the public knows this very well, that the Barbados Workers' Union has not agreed to the increases which are being legislated here today. They are being legislated by the Government of Barbados, 1980, the Barbados Labour Party Government is legislating salaries for public servants.

They refused to sit down with us, even after we submitted a modified position on Thursday, 18th September. What did we get? We got a letter the following morning, the 19th from the Chief Establishments Officer, I doubt that any time would have been had to look at our proposal, but the letter says:

"The Government accepts"

on paragraph four:

"that the salaries and wages of the Public Service are first charged on its Current Account. The Government also agrees that the public, at all times, is presently concerned with a satisfied and efficient Public Service."

All of these are points made in the letter:

"The Government is also certain that the public will look with disfavour on the attempt by any Government to saddle it with a salaries' bill which will have adverse effects on the economy.

On the basis of the foregoing and the fact that Government considers that its final offer is adequate, I have been directed to inform you, that Government very much regrets that it appears this matter cannot be settled to our mutual satisfaction and consequently, initial steps will be taken today, to obtain parliamentary approval of the salaries, wages increases which accompany my letter No. 6261 of 1980/0915."

It seems very clearly to us and certainly, to this Side, that the Government always intended to legislate a settlement in this particular area because as I said, it would seem as if very little consideration were given to the final position which was put to the Government by the Barbados Workers' Union, in its letter of 13th September.

Now, I said that we have to speak from this Side, without the benefit of the Ministerial Statement which was made by the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister on Friday. Of course, this is not the first time that this has been done by the same Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, but I made some careful notes of what he had to say, on this occasion.

I want to make this very basic and important point very clear, that is, that the National Union of Public Workers does not negotiate for the Barbados Workers Union, can never negotiate for the Barbados Workers Union. The Barbados Workers' Union and the National Union of Public Workers never negotiated jointly, on any issue, never did we enter into any arrangement for joint negotiations. (ASIDES). That is beside the point whether it is a TUC, or not.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, Please.

Mr. GREAVES: Do not antagonise me, Please. Yes Mr. Deputy Speaker, I just want to say that we did not proceed on any joint basis, we never entered any kind of arrangement, as far as, these negotiations were concerned. So that, what is very clear in this issue is that the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister adopted a policy which we might call probably, divide and rule, but that policy does not last long. You know, there is an old saying, "time is longer than twine". You only wait.

The Rt. Hon. Prime Minister said in his Statement, that the National Union of Public Workers represents the majority of people in the Public Service, as against the few hundred who are members of the Barbados Workers' Union. I would like to set the record straight on this point and to give some general indication for the benefit of the Honourable House, for the benefit of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister and for the benefit of the public, some of the areas in the Public Service where the Barbados Workers' Union has not only membership, but substantial membership. The Ministry of Communications and Works, the Waterworks, I have separated the two; in the Customs, Customs Guards; Child Care Board employees; Sanitation workers, postmen and certain other categories of postal workers.

Certain remarks made by the Hon. Member for St. Lucy and the Hon. Member for St. Joseph were ordered to be expunged from the Record by His Honour, the Deputy Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If you can continue with the Resolution, I think that we can get on.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the Hon. Member obviously has not concluded his speech, but the time is 2.00 o'clock and in view of the fact that it is not only the Hon. Members concerned, but there are

others who are involved in the administration, who have been working very hard since we started, I beg to move, Sir, that this Sitting be now suspended until 3.00 p.m.

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

The question that the Sitting be suspended until 3.00 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER accordingly suspended the Sitting at 2.00 p.m.
2.00 p.m.

On Resumption -

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This Sitting is now resumed.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Question Time be now taken. I understand that a question is to be asked by the hon. member for St. Michael South for five minutes or such time as is necessary.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now Question Time. The hon. member for St. Michael South his Question.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the question I am asking is Question No. 50 relating to incidences of particular crime.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the information sought by the hon. member along with the statistics for the three preceding years is being made available now in tabular form for circulation to all hon. members. In fact, it has actually been circulated already.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Supplementary Question No. 1. In view of the fact that there is a very high incident of crime relating to house breaking and other crimes as well, will the Minister indicate what specific steps he is taking to ensure that the people of this country are protected from what is obviously a crime wave as far as certain aspects of time is concerned.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can take the opportunity to express to the hon. member my regret that during his absence on public business he suffered a burglary himself and obviously I can assure him the Police have been doing all in their power in order to ensure that any loss or any person who has perpetrated the crime will be brought before the Court and I think the hon. member as well for St. Michael North Central earlier this year suffered this same problem.

Sir, as the figures which I have given to hon. members have shown, I do not accept that there is any large

crime wave in Barbados. The figures show that in 1975 all crimes were 7,001. It fell in 1976 to 6,134. It was 6,461 in 1977. It fell dramatically in 1978 to 5,868. It increased in 1979 over 1978 to 6,501 and the figures for the first seven months of the year on average would show that if that trend continues it will not exceed the figure for crime in 1975 and indeed the 1980 figures will be no worse than the figures in 1979.

The figures will show that in certain categories of crime there have been some increase, robbery being one, but there is no significant increase, significant in terms of numbers, in the area of house-breaking. However, for instance in 1975 there were 610 house breakings. This was reduced to 413 in 1976. It was 544 in 1977, it was 505 in 1978 last year 571 and the first seven months of the year, 447.

In keeping however with the Government's policy to ensure that crime is maintained at a minimum in this Island we have taken various positive steps to deal with the problem. The Police Force since 1969 has been calling for an increase in the establishment of the Police Force. As hon. members will recall, it has been increased to a figure of 141 additional posts.

We have also taken away from the Police the duty of writ-serving which has meant that 54 more Police are available for purely police duties. We have also removed from the Police, the duty of immigration which has released a further 45 Policemen for police duties. We are in the process of considering removing from the Police responsibility for licensing and we are also taking away some other police duties which we hope will go to other Ministries or be looked after by civilian personnel.

In addition, we have looked at the area of training in the Police Force which has suffered considerably over the years and this year in particular we have made 12 additional places available for training in special areas like in crime detection and investigation in the Police Force.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it will take sometime to train the additional 141 persons but this year we have been putting in special courses at the Regional Police Training Centre for Barbadian recruits and the hon. member will notice that there was a graduation ceremony held about two weeks ago at which only Barbadian Policemen passed out at that parade and we hope to phase in the additional posts in less than two years given the accent of additional training for the Police.

In addition, Sir, we have for the first time this year brought in Walkie-Talkie equipment for the Police and it is recognised that over a period of three years, this year being the first year, we would have equipped one-third of the Force, which is what has been asked for, with full walkie-talkie equipment.

In addition, Sir, we have increased the amount of vehicles available to Policemen. Now, we have assigned over the last two months 30 Special Constables on special duty dealing with house breaking and snatching from persons, 30 Special Constables who have been assigned to the areas in which we have detected any such weakness and who are doing nothing other than this duty.

Obviously hon. members would not like me to tell them the areas. I cannot (ASIDES). Some are in St. James. I can assure the hon. member that we have assigned some in various areas in St. James and I can assure the hon. member in terms of location of some of those crimes. A serious problem we have is particularly in the establishment of Hotels, that Hotels have been built without any regards to security and for instance there was recently at one place of entertainment within 20 minutes of the Police leaving the premises someone had had his bag snatched and held up at gun point. Now the Police was down there all the time but at that establishment there is neither proper lighting nor is there adequate security being provided for looking after the premises and whereas we recognise that to protect individuals we have a general duty, I think that I must tell the commercial establishments to do something more for the security on their premises.

3.10 p.m.

We could not, Mr. Deputy Speaker, pay the cost of having policemen stationed at all of these places; it would be too heavy a burden on the general taxpayer. I believe at the end of this year the ratio of police population would be something in the region of 1:240 persons. That is one of the lowest ratios in the world. In the United Kingdom the ratio is 1:400, and it is the aim of the Government over the five year period to bring the ratio to 1:200 persons.

The hon. member would wish to know that I have had the benefit of an investigation into the whole structure and administration of the Police Force done by a senior officer from Bramshill Police Training College. That report is being studied by my department, and we have started steps to give effect to the recommendations which have been accepted by the Commissioner of Police. Parts of the report are of interest to the Police Service Association and I will have to consult with them on that part of the report that may affect their welfare; but it is a very comprehensive report.

Finally I assure the hon. member that in regard to local training, for the first time since the 1940s or the early 1950s we have started at the Regional Police Training Centre a programme for refresher courses, criminal investigation, security including V.I.P. security and anti-terrorists training, and refresher courses for sergeants at all levels. We are hoping to run two such courses a year.

I have had the benefit of Mr. Baugh, a special police adviser who is re-organising the training methods in the Force, and shortly there will be two additional officers made available to me from the United Kingdom for this particular assignment. Only today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was in a meeting with the special adviser from the United Kingdom Police Services who has been dealing with the new Regional Police Training College. He is getting the brief ready for that and upgraded premises for Police Headquarters, an additional Police Station in Wildey with modern and up to date equipment, a forensic laboratory as well as a public mortuary.

I think the hon. member may be assured that not for a long time in the history of this country has so much detailed planning and thought been going into a proper re-organisation of the Police Force to ensure that we continue to contain crime both on the streets and in the home, and although I do not like to see crime anywhere, our statistics compare more than favourably with the increase in crime in other jurisdictions. It has been in the region of 20 per cent in Bermuda, and it has been in the region of 48 per cent in the Virgin Islands. Bermuda has an unemployment figure of 1.5 per cent of its population with a higher standard of living and I am told that in the United Kingdom and certainly in Hong Kong this year there has been a trend of increase in certain crimes, house-breaking being one, drugs being the other, and although I do not relish any increase no matter how significant either percentage-wise or in terms of numbers, because, Mr. Deputy Speaker, 20 per cent on 49 on 74 may sound a high figure, for instance but it is only 74 of those offences during the period of a year, and I wish therefore to say that I hope the police will do their best to continue to control any areas in which there is any sign of the slightest increase percentage-wise or in terms of figures on any of the crime figures. I think the country ought to recognise that during the period 1976-1980 instead of there being escalating crime there has been a graph which has shown a dramatic increase at times with a slight increase from time to time but never up to the peak year of 1975.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, not being myself satisfied that the methodology for reporting provides an adequate base for the conclusions reached by the Hon. Minister, would the Minister state whether he is satisfied with the method used for the reporting of crime which results in these statistics which are now before us is acceptable to him?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish to assure the hon. member that the methods for reporting crime in Barbados are no different from what the methods were for the period 1971-76. Indeed there has been improvement to the extent that we now only deal with true reports and we check out all reports to see which are true and which are untrue reports, and we

check these reports as much as we can. In criminology the hon. member knows, I believe, that there is always a grey area of unreported crime. For instance any citizen who goes down the road at 50 miles an hour and is not caught by the police in the speed trap is probably creating a criminal offence, and I do not know of any police force in the world which has a record of these grey areas and all police statistics are collected on the basis and the assumption that there will be a grey area of crime, and therefore the methods used in collecting police statistics here are the same as have been used in Canada and the United Kingdom, and they are no different in that respect, and therefore that is what I had come to recognise when I spent some years working in Scotland Yard in the Metropolitan Police Division and dealt with their statistics. I spent some months at that division and I used to reside with the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister and the methods were no different when I was known as Forde of the Yard from what they are today.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I now begin to understand why Adams of the Yard did not wish to take the advice of Forde of the Yard.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would be able and is willing to tell us to what extent overseas directed crime, organised crime as it is usually more popularly known, has been on the increase in Barbados. The statistics as it is now distributed has a category of all other crimes and offences. It has been popularly put abroad that there has been a substantial increase in overseas directed organised crime in Barbados. I wonder if the Minister is in a position to enlighten the House on this matter.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the only area in which we have found any signs of overseas involvement in crime or attempts at crime has been in the area of Mr. Sydney Alleyne's attempted crime against Barbados which hopefully did not reach here and in the area of Space Research Corporation which hopefully did not reach here either. I think it ended with Antigua. Other than that in the area of drugs there is obviously an increase in the incidence of drug offences occurring, and over the last four years that I have had responsibility for the subject our policemen have been working closely with police forces of other countries in particular the police forces of Canada, the United States, Columbia and Peru and the Caribbean countries, Jamaica in particular, in order to stop the trafficking in drugs through the Caribbean. You would have noticed I think a few days ago a release showing the success in nipping in the bud at the airport the trafficking in marijuana. I can assure the hon. member that it is my intention to recommend to Government very substantial increases in the penalty for drug trafficking.

3.20 p.m.

They will be substantial and I hope I will have the support of all sides of the House and I will not hear that we are bringing repressive legislation, but at the same time I hope we will bring a programme of education for drug trafficking. This is the area that has caused me some concern, and we are hoping as well in the next financial year to include provision for Police Dogs which we will use at the airport and the sea port for the detection of any drugs that may be coming in here.

I am still happy to say that the drugs have not been in the hard area, they have been mostly restricted to marijuana, and that most of the traffic seems to pass through Barbados to other destinations beyond Barbados.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am grateful to the Minister for the statistics which he has given us and the words of sympathy he expressed in my own personal situation, although that was not the origin of this question and I am not now dealing with that particular problem, but I would like the Minister to take note of the fact that in the areas of robbery, burglary and house breaking in particular the statistics do show some cause for concern. Whatever gloss you may put on 1975 or any other year there is a growing cause for concern, and I would like to ask the Minister specifically in relation to this whether he has deployed personnel for the prevention and the solution in respect of these crimes. I am not speaking now necessarily of policemen on the beat, but specifically in terms of the personnel for attempting to solve these crimes, whether personnel have been allocated to the various areas. In this regard, whether these persons have been substantially allocated into what have been described as the tourist areas around the south coast or whether other areas in this country have been provided with the personnel. Let us say there might be a case in St. Thomas where an old pensioner might have had some burglary or some loss of property and how these personnel are distributed. I wonder if the Minister could give us some information on this particular one.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: If I may answer the hon. member, Sir, let me repeat what I said, that any increase either in terms of numbers or percentage wise on any year is a cause of concern to the Police Force and myself, and particularly to the Police Force which has the duty to look after keeping down crime. If I take burglary, for instance, Sir, in 1979 year, that we have had a full year, there were 33 cases of burglary as compared with 39 in 1978, 70 in 1977, 43 in 1976, 54 in 1975, and up to July this year there had been 26. I have not got the statistics right up to September, I regret to say I have not got those available, and I think that shows some evidence that during the years

of which the hon. member has spoken the Police Force has been concentrating on this type of crime.

In terms of robbery, in 1979 it was 74 but in 1978 it was 54, and for the year it is 79, in 1975 it was 32, but if I look at house breaking, in none of the years to which the hon. member has referred have the statistics for house breaking shown any particular significant increase in crime, but house breaking is the sort of crime that even if there were two cases the Police Force would be very concerned about them, and it is the area in which we try to concentrate our maximum detective capabilities, and that is what we have been doing.

I regret to say that I cannot give instruction to the deployment of the Force. Under the Police Act, according to the law of Barbados, no Minister can give instruction as to how the Force should be deployed, and that is only but right, but the Commissioner has the overall responsibility to ensure that he carries out the law, and I have been assured by him that he has been deploying the Force in those areas in which there has been any increase in the incidence of crime particularly the three crimes which the hon. member has highlighted.

The hon. member will be pleased to note that between 1976 and 1980 the incidence of manslaughter has decreased to this year there has not been one case of manslaughter, and the hon. member will be pleased to note as well that the amount of murders created in Barbados has remained steady over 90 years in Barbados. As a matter of fact, between the year 1883 and to date there have only been 59 executions of people for murder in this country, and that is quite a statistic.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was somewhat taken aback by the replies of the Hon. Attorney General just now relative to house breaking. In 1975 the record shows that there were 610 crimes relating to house breaking in Barbados, the present statistics available to the House indicate that for the period January to July, 1980 there were 447 house breakings in this country. Will the Minister admit that if this trend continues there will be a significant increase, and furthermore, will the Minister admit that at this point in time if you were to make a comparison that there is not even at this half year or seven month period there has not been a significant increase in house breaking?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The hon. member's question is based on an assumption without taking the other assumptions. Our statistics show that there are some periods of the year where particular offences do occur, and usually in the tourist season, and in the

tourist season in the early part of the year you get the bulk of house breaking, burglary and robbery offences, because obviously there are many more people in Barbados at that time than at any other time. For instance, on the statistics reaching me for two days ago the incidence of house breaking was something like two in the whole island over the 24 hours that had preceded that day. I do not know if the Prime Minister has the day to day police statistics, because we make this available. The Press, for the first time since I have been in power, have had the day to day police statistics. We do not only ask them to publish positive things, they can look at the negative as well, and I welcome the Press being able to see what is happening in the statistics.

Let me assure the hon. member that I would hate to think that his assumption was correct by the end of the year, and indeed maximum effort is being placed by the police on trying to keep down the incidence of house breaking, but I repeat that no year between 1969 and 1979 has there been an increase in house breaking offences to go beyond the figure of 610 for 1975. So that if one is analysing the crime trend in Barbados between 1976 and 1980 it is not a fair assumption for anybody to assume that there has been a tremendous crime rate in Barbados.

3.30 p.m.

The figures do not show it. No matter what Hon. Members may think, the figures do not show that.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I just want to enquire of the Hon. Minister, if the figures, as published here, relate to all cases, or only to cases where a conviction has been secured.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The figures relate to all cases reported by the police which have been checked out by the police and proved to be true cases. In fact, in a couple of weeks' time, I hope to lay, in this Honourable House, the Annual Report of the Commissioner of Police for 1978 and 1979, so that those figures could be available. I would welcome sending to Hon. Members of the Opposition the daily Crime Sheet, I have no objection to it Sir, they can have the daily Crime Sheet. The press gets it, but I would appeal to all persons who speak on public platforms, on the question of crime, to emphasise to the public, that they have a duty to provide the police with information, they have a duty to themselves, as well, to make their premises secure and they have a duty to minimise the incidents of crime, Sir.

Mr. TAITT stood.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Rt. Hon. Prime Minister.

Mr. TAITT: Does that mean that the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister is to sit down?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, no.

Mr. TAITT: I beg your pardon, Sir.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: This is a supplementary Sir. Would the Hon. Member agree that the alleged crime wave in Barbados is really a matter of impression, rather than truth and will he do all he can, to ensure that fact is made more widely known, that Barbados is still an extremely law abiding country by world standards and that the Royal Barbados Police Force has done an excellent job, in the last twelve months, controlling all the elements which have been striving to drag our country down?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I could not agree with the Rt. Hon. Member more. Indeed, I have had to commend the efforts of the Police Force for the effort which they have been making, despite some of the problems which they have been confronting. Let me say that I have taken every opportunity, wherever possible, to appeal for public co-operation with the police and to deal with any incidents, in which the police themselves may have been in problems, and to ensure that we keep Barbados stable and relatively crime free because we need those conditions, if the undoubted improvements which have occurred in Barbados, during the last four years should continue.

Mr. TAITT: This is a supplementary, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Will the Hon. Member agree that the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister and his Cabinet have difficulty reconciling their position with the position taken by the Commissioner of Police himself, who only recently indicated that he, the Commissioner, is concerned about the sudden and wide ranging increase in crime in this country and does the Hon. Minister agree that attempts by the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister and Cabinet to whitewash and cover crime in Barbados, is a disservice to the community and this country?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is not a proper supplementary.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Just let me say one thing. In the normal course of events, Question Time would have finished after half hour.

If the Hon. Leader of the Honourable House wishes to.....

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that Question Time be extended for three minutes, so that the Hon. Member can ask his question.

Mr. SANDIFORD: My final supplementary. Mr. Deputy Speaker, would the Hon. Minister agree that in spite of all the window dressing, the level of insecurity among ordinary citizens, small businessmen, big businessmen and visitors alike to this country, has increased and is increasing and that citizens have been driven to buy all types of expensive types of security equipment and other devices to keep these elements at bay?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is also not a proper supplementary according to the Standing Orders.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I accept your ruling, but I would have welcomed answering the Hon. Member and asking the Hon. Member to tell.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The members of his Party.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: not to preach certain things on the platform.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Question Time is now up.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: I beg to move Sir, that Government Business be now resumed, Sir. The Hon. Member for St. Lucy was speaking at the time of the Suspension.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now time for Government Business.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, you would recall that when the Honourable House was adjourned for lunch that I was answering the point, a nonsense point, of course, which was made by the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister about the Barbados Workers' Union only representing a few hundred workers and I had not reached the end of my list. Just for the purpose of refreshing the minds of Hon. Members, I would want to go through that again and I indicated before, as I was indicating, that the Union represents a wide range of workers in the Public Sector and these include postmen, Sanitation workers, Child Care Board employees, Customs Guards, workers at the Hope Dairy Farm and that is where we ran into trouble with the former Hon. Minister of Agriculture — I would not go over that now because he knows very well — workers at the Waterworks Department, workers at the pipe track Division. At this point, I would just like to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that about 400 workers at the Waterworks Department in the pipe track Division have been served, have been given some indication, that they will be

without jobs shortly and indeed, some of them, as recently as, last Friday when the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister was making his Ministerial Statement in here, received letters telling them that they would no longer be employed at the Waterworks Department. (*Asides*).

We also represent workers at the Ministry of Communications and Works, the Ministry of Agriculture including market keepers, workers in the Ministry of Health, maids, cooks, *et cetera* at all the District Hospitals and polyclinics, the Mental Hospital, some nurses there belong to the Barbados Workers' Union, workers at the National Housing Corporation, workers at the Industrial Development Corporation, workers at the Parks and Beaches Commission and I could go on, and on and on. But, I mentioned those to give some general indication about the spread of the membership of the Barbados Workers' Union. So that, the membership is significant. So that, when the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister therefore, gets up and tries to create an impression that the Barbados Workers' Union does not represent a significant number of workers in the Government Service, then, I think that that would throw that particular point through the window.

Now, it is clear, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, when he was talking last Friday in the Statement which he made has not, in truth and in fact — he talks about impression and truth and what have you — has created a certain impression in the public's minds. But, as I said, time will show very clearly, what the real truth of the matter is.

I have attempted and I am sure that I have succeeded in bringing some particular truth to this situation. In truth and in fact, what the situation really is, is that 38.3% at the bottom, excludes a considerable number of workers and indeed, applies only to workers in Z30, I think it is. That is the only one.

Now, he said both on Friday and today, that is, the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, that this has been the largest increase ever negotiated for workers in the Public Sector. Now, I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that one has always to listen very carefully and understand very carefully, what the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister says, when he speaks. 3.40 p.m.

Now I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that one has always to listen very carefully and understand very carefully what the Prime Minister says when he speaks. At least my friend and colleague, the member for St. Michael South West, always warns me about this, be very careful when you attempt to even speak after the Prime Minister or attempt to contradict him and I do

not intend to contradict him on this particular point. But I think that it has, however, to be made very clear that he said that it was the largest increase ever negotiated.

Now in 1976, the Barbados Workers' Union did not agree with whatever increases were given and they were legislated on that particular occasion. In 1980 the Barbados Workers' Union has not agreed with the increases which we are now at this point in time legislating but whereas in 1976 just for a matter of record, the increase which was received, notice I did not say negotiated because negotiations were not completed, the increases which were received by workers at the bottom in the public sector, was 35% in the first year and 15% in the second year and one can very well remember the same Prime Minister, the present Prime Minister in 1977 said that the Unions had bamboozled the former Prime Minister by putting him into a position where he had to give the kind of increases which he did not feel at that point in time the Government should pay or was able to pay. Now I think that we have to be very clear about this particular point.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of elucidation. It is as much a point of order because he is misleading the House. I did say that the 1976 increase covered three years because it covered from 1973 to 1976. The 1980 increase covers only two years and if the hon. member cares to divide, he can in fact get the whole arithmetic of what they actually got divided by three in 1976 by what they are actually getting divided by two in 1980 and he will find that it comes out to more per month.

Mr. GREAVES: I will tell him that is no point.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. The hon. member for St. Lucy must not attempt to take over the responsibility of the Chair. It is for the Chair to say whether a point of order is proper or not.

Mr. GREAVES: Now if I may go on. The Prime Minister here today said that in 1978 and I quote "With the help of the Trade Unions, Barbados was able to pull through." Of course and it is very strange that the kind of stances and the positions which the Prime Minister takes from time to time when it suits him he attacks, maligns and he does all sorts of things to persons who cannot necessarily agree with any particular point of view which he is expressing at anytime and I would want to say that the Barbados Workers' Union is not interested in any lip service from the Prime Minister because the kind of gratuitous statements which sometimes come from the mouth of the Prime Minister one knows often how to take them because when he finds himself in a difficult position he always tries to butter-up and white-wash the particular situation.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the whole process of collective bargaining which the Prime Minister himself has said in 1976 that he holds dear to his heart which he claims today that their Manifesto speaks so much about this whole question of collective bargaining, is being violated by the same Prime Minister who had uttered such words.

Now he attempted to draw a relationship between the activities of Trade Unions in Great Britain and the activities of Trade Unions here in Barbados. I am concerned with the Barbados Workers' Union because this is the Organisation with which I am associated and he said that Unions have not been able to negotiate wage increases in Britain in excess of 8% and 9% and that kind of area. What he does not know, or indeed what he omits to say is that in Britain Unions do not negotiate terminal contracts or terminal agreements, to use the appropriate term in the British situation.

In Barbados we negotiate agreements for specific periods. Up to 1974 we used to negotiate agreements on a three-year basis. Since 1974 we have negotiated agreements on two-year periods, 1974-1976, 1978-1980, on a two-year basis. The fact of the matter is that to day, this 1980, we are negotiating a two-year agreement. It is for a period so to make that kind of comparison between Britain in which in Britain they do not negotiate agreements on that basis is wrong. Now the Prime Minister will know that in Britain, that they have increases sometimes twice a year. It cannot be compared so I do not want the Prime Minister to give the wrong impression. I do not want to say misleading the House because it would be unparliamentary to say that he is misleading the House but the fact of the matter is that these things need to be made quite clear.

I want, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to go to some of the other factors which have emerged in these discussions.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order. What the hon. member is saying is very important to the people of Barbados and I would like to hear what he is saying. I draw your attention to Standing Order No. 33. Hon. members on the opposite side, in my opinion, Sir, and with great respect to the Chair, Sir, are not abiding by Standing Order 33.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the other point which has been raised in the Prime Minister's presentation today and in his Parliamentary statement on Friday made mention of what he calls considerable tax concessions which were given or which had been given to workers in the public sector and in other areas.

I think one must understand very clearly what one is dealing with. I think it is fairly clear now that what the Prime Minister led people to believe that the workers at the bottom, throughout Barbados would have benefitted considerably from the tax concessions which he offered in his last Budget speech, one would now be in a position to know that when the Opposition pointed out that these concessions were not that considerable, one would very clearly understand now what really is the truth of the matter.

I think it is fairly clear that persons who can be considered to be workers at the bottom, invariably do not pay any particular large amount of income tax so in truth and in fact the tax concessions which were given in the last budget speech complied more and indeed were more beneficial to workers in the top brackets.

3.50 p.m.

I think that this point comes home very clearly when the Prime Minister himself admitted that a number of persons in that area working for \$3,000 or so per month would be benefitting to the extent of, I think he said, \$4,000 per year as a result of this. So that the Barbados Workers' Union in putting forward proposals and in attempting to negotiate an agreement which spreads over such a wide area would have to pay very careful attention to this particular matter. I would want at this point to just say that a group of workers whom we represent and most of whom fall into this particular category are the teachers at the Barbados Community College, so when he gives the workers in that kind of bracket a 22½ per cent increase, along with the considerable benefits which they would be getting from tax concessions they would get much more benefits than persons who can be considered at the bottom rung of the ladder. So I think these positions have to be put very clearly, and you would therefore see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, why when the Barbados Workers' Union writes to the Chief Establishments Officer on 18th September in the following vein we were concerned when we said for example and I quote:—

"Workers in the Key Scale are employed under conditions of employment different from those in the established Service. Their mobility is not the same and the majority of them who enter the Service at any given point retire in that position. An increase in emoluments must therefore bear a different relationship for public employees who enter at the bottom and reach the top as a normal routine in the public service. Against this background the Executive Council is therefore unable to accept the final position which does not provide adequate reward for all sectors of the Public Service."

I think one must understand that particular point. It is interesting that the Prime Minister said that it was

only at the last moment that the Government side understood what the Union really meant by the position which it was put in. I did not believe it when I heard it and I do not believe it now because our position is very clear when we said 45 per cent for workers up to \$749 per month, 35 per cent for workers earning \$750 to \$1,499 per month and 25 per cent to workers over that, and our position has always been calculated on that basis, so I cannot understand what the Prime Minister or indeed anybody can say they did not understand until very late in the whole negotiations when this was the position of the Barbados Workers' Union.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is not to say that the position was just given by word of mouth, it was a position and each position which the Barbados Workers' Union modified was contained in a letter which was in very clear language and which could very easily be understood if indeed there was any attempt to understand the position which the Barbados Workers' Union was putting. I think that to try to gloss over or to try to give the impression that they did not know that was totally misleading.

I would just want to conclude, Mr. Deputy Speaker, by saying that a lot has been made of the cost of living. I said at the outset that the question of a proposal from a Trade Union and certainly from the Barbados Workers' Union does not rest only on the cost of living. There are other factors. For example, the ability to pay, to use the words of the Prime Minister, the Deputy Prime Minister and other people who have spoken on Government finances from time to time. There is no doubt in the minds of the public and in my mind that the Government is able to pay. Furthermore when one takes into consideration the modest increases which the Barbados Workers' Union is seeking, and furthermore when one takes into consideration the size of the increases which the Government proposes to vote for Parliamentarians including the Ministers and the Prime Minister moving the Prime Minister's salary up to \$99,000 a year, that kind of thing.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member is out of order in relation to that matter.

Mr. GREAVES: I am sorry, Sir, I was just making a comparison. But the ability to pay is a very important factor and we have also to take into consideration the kind of work which the person is doing. All these are factors which govern a proposal. If you just operate on the basis of a cost of living. What it will mean is that if for argument's sake we find ourselves in a position where the cost of living did not rise very much, let us say as in 1976 where it is said that the cost of living rose by 3 per cent or 4 per cent, if we were for argument's sake negotiating at that point in time when it was clear that the cost of living only rose by 3% to 4% are you telling

me that we should only be accepting a rise in the cost of living or an increase based on the rise in the cost of living of 3%? All we are saying is that to expect any worker to get a mere cost of living increase or somewhere near around the cost of living means that the workers will never be in a position to improve their positions. All you would be doing is just restoring the position and the worker would never be moving forward. That is not the concept of the Barbados Workers' Union. Indeed the Barbados Workers' Union all over the years has been pursuing a policy which is designed to improve the lot of the workers, to put more money in the workers' pocket to ensure that they enjoy a better quality of life, and I think it is very clear from the achievements which we have been able to bring about in this country that the Barbados Workers' Union has been able to make considerable improvement in this particular regard.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if we only used to present our proposals on cost of living, then I would say that we would be in a very difficult situation and workers would not be able to advance in the way they have advanced. Let me just mention one other point as far as the point made by the Prime Minister today is concerned. He mentioned Cable and Wireless, and he made one big thing about Cable & Wireless. I do not even want to start dealing with the salaries at Cable & Wireless, but certainly one must take into consideration the fact that the workers at Cable & Wireless got a 28% increase and workers were in the bracket of \$2,000. As a matter of fact, if you make a comparison between what is being offered by the Government and know the basis of the actual figures, you will see that the amounts are completely different. As a matter of fact, I think the Prime Minister did say there is no maid in the private sector who is working for \$500 a month. (*Asides*). Well the impression which was given was such. I am very glad to hear that the Prime Minister did not say that there is no maid in the private sector working for \$500 a month, because there are maids in the private sector who are working for well over \$500 a month. At Cable & Wireless the maids are at present working for \$533 a month and in 1981 will be going to \$539; so don't worry to talk about maids in the private enterprise not working for what a maid is working for in the public sector.

In addition to that, there are a whole number of other working conditions which they have that you do not have in the public service. If you use that as an example, some workers at Cable & Wireless get telephone allowances, chargeable allowances, washing allowances, they get uniform, bicycle allowance, overtime, call out allowances; all of these things are things which have to be added up in the total package, so there is no point in the Prime Minister expecting that he can come and give a particular view and nobody is here to refute that. What I am saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that people in Category I like maids and attendants; Category II —

general workers, including labourers, cleaners, labour gang, Police yard men, M.C.W. people, road menders, caretakers, attendants, lorry loaders, mason helpers, workshop cleaners, market attendants, porters and gardeners deserve a better increase, and I cannot say in here and vote to support the kind of increases which the Prime Minister is giving.

4.00 p.m.

I will be voting against this Resolution because it is our view that the position which was put by the Barbados Workers' Union is a very reasonable position. It was reasonable from the very beginning and we did not have to go and ask for 80% increase at the bottom and 75% increase at the top and that kind of nonsense, our proposal was a reasonable one from the very beginning. The Barbados Workers' Union has adopted a reasonable position in this, and if there is any intransigence, far from it being on the side of the Barbados Workers' Union I would say that we have modified our position on many occasions and we tried to reach an agreement, the intransigence I am submitting was on the part of the Government and we have a situation where the Prime Minister is eating his own words and is now legislating increases in this country, to which the Barbados Workers' Union is opposed and against which I will be voting.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member on many occasions during the course of his speech attempted to draw me into the debate. I think that there are a few points of which he has spoken to which replies are needed.

Firstly, I think that the facts in this matter should not be clouded in mystery, because the hon. member finds himself in a very difficult position here today, for he is not speaking as a delegate of the constituency of St. Lucy, he is speaking as the mouthpiece of the Barbados Workers' Union. It is a classic situation in which the hon. member is apt to find himself on certain occasions when his objectivity as a member of Parliament and the representative of a constituency conflicts with his position as a paid employee of the Barbados Workers' Union and therefore advocate for its members.

It is therefore our duty to let the facts hang out very clearly. He says that his organisation represents a large number of public workers. He delineated and set out the categories of workers that they represent in the Public Service, he did not give us of course the benefit of the numbers of workers in these categories so that we could find out whether it is one or two or three thousand as opposed to the other Unions. (Mr. GREAVES: Why does the Government recognise us then)? Well, the Government is a very tolerant Government and we have so much interest in unionism and even if there is a scintilla of evidence of such support in some categories of workers, in pursuance of our belief in trade unionism we do not call for any such thing as a poll.

The position is very clear, Sir. This Government is in a position as employer of having to deal with a number of Unions, and regretfully we have not on this occasion been able to get the support of all of the Unions to our propositions, but we know this, it is a fact that the Unions that represent a majority of the workers in the Public Service who are represented by Unions, that agreement has been reached with them. This is a completely different situation from 1976 in which we had an imposition by the party to which the hon. member belongs.

Let us deal with Categories I to XIII. I have here, and I am willing to circulate to the hon. members on the other side, the exact figures, because we have nothing to hide in this respect. Category I receives a 36.8% increase, Category II 35.4, Category III 35.3, Category IV 35.2, right down to Category XII which will receive a 32.1% increase. But what is significant in relation to these categories is that they bear a parallel relationship with the Z.30 scale right up to Z.22 who are represented by the National Union of Public Workers, and we have been able to reach agreement with the National Union of Public Workers in respect of comparable scales in Category I to Category XII.

The crux of this matter is that because of inter-Union rivalry and because the hon. member's organisation cannot, if it is to succeed in gaining back the members that it lost to the National Union of Public Workers, they cannot appear to be going along with the same position that is adopted by the National Union of Public Workers. That is his difficulty. He finds himself in another dilemma. As a trade unionist now he finds himself in a dilemma in which the rival organisation who hitherto did not have the members but took them away from him is now in a position, so he is bound to be in an opposing position.

Now, Sir, the Government recognises that periodically it is necessary in this society, like in any other society, to re-evaluate jobs and this category of workers consists of a number of people whose jobs are of the types that there are shortages in Barbados, and we hope to attract skills in this area. That is the reason why the Government's position is in respect of these categories, let us accept the present proposals as reasonable, we undertake to carry out a regrading proposal in respect of special categories. That was acceptable. As the Hon. Prime Minister and Minister of Finance said, in respect of some of these categories, particularly those who have skilled jobs which are in short supply, we are willing as an independent exercise to carry out a regrading as we have done with the teachers.

Now, Sir, faced with this Government's record in relation to regrading of the police, in relation to regrading of the teachers, in relation to the regrading of many other categories in the Public Service where we have kept to

our promise, where we have done better than any record under the Democratic Labour Party, if one were not purblind and had other reasons one would accept the good faith and the undertaking of the Government. But a certain organisation would find that impossible because their political position is such that they cannot appear to be going along with this Government, their trade union position is such that they cannot appear to be going along with their rival Union.

The hon. member told the House, I think, and the country that an explanation as to what is the difference between their proposals and our proposals, as I understand it, the percentages are in the single digit area. As a matter of fact the differences cannot amount even in the most extreme case to more than 3%.
4.10 p.m.

As a matter of fact, it is probably less than three percent. There are a few other heresies. The hon. member said that we have preached on this Side, on many occasions, that we are in favour of widening the differentials between top and bottom in the Public Service, in Barbados. I have repeatedly said in this Honourable House, that in the Public Service salaries' positions between top and bottom is one of the smallest, in any part of the world. I have repeatedly said that, but we have also pointed out, that in all countries of the world there are certain job categories which are vital to the economic development and performance of the economy, where now, in a small country, the market for the people is very large and unless competitive salaries are paid, it will mean that you will not be able to attract people to that category.

The hon. member talks about differentials. I am positive that differentials between highest and lowest, in the Barbados Workers' Union, is greater than highest and lowest paid Government employees. I am positive of that. As a matter of fact, when it comes to the question of pay, I saw the hon. member's Organisation advertise for a job between \$800.00 and \$1,000.00 a month ago. People in that category, get more money in the Government Service. The hon. member has one position when he is inside here, when he is with his employer, he has another. That is another example of what happens when you try to put forward a particular position when you, yourself know you cannot bear examination.

The position is this. There is no doubt about it. During the course of the time that this Government has been in power, Government workers in all categories have had a better deal, or generosity in payment, than at any time in the course of 15 years, when the Democratic Labour Party was in power. Of course, we have been fortunate, in that under our Administration, we have been able to improve the fundamental structure

of the economic and productive basis of the economy, in such a way, that we have been able to afford it and in pursuance of our own philosophy, if you contribute to improvement of the economy, you should share in it.

The Government has been able, in this Salaries' Revision to pay out an average of 35% over two years which divided by two gives you 17½%. The hon. member, in 1976, agreed to a Wage Settlement..... (ASIDES: Mr. GREAVES: I voted against it).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: You still ran for the Party. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am addressing the hon. member, in his capacity as representative for St. Lucy, a member of the Democratic Labour Party, legislated a settlement in 1976, over a three year period 1973 - 74, 1974 - 75, 1975 - 76, when there was an inflation rate... (ASIDES) of 88%, over that three year period, divided by three, you get the average rate.

The hon. member who was Hon. Minister of Trade, presided over Consumer in 1975 had an inflation rate of 40%.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The hon. member is misleading this Honourable House. The rate for inflation in Barbados can be had from publications put up by the Government itself. In 1976, it was no 40%, nor in 1975, nor in 1974, nor in 1972, nor in 1971 nor in 1970. It is about time that you put that to rest.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: In 1976, the Central Bank statistics showed (ASIDES: Mr. TAITT: Call the page number) page 75 of 1979. (ASIDES: Mr. TAITT: I know I am going to catch you all) before I sit down, I will have the Economic Report. It is in the Economic Report. I have done this exercise. The average rate of inflation in 1974 exceeded 40%. (ASIDES) The total rate of inflation, over a three year period was over 80%.

The hon. member cannot demonstrate that over the two year period 1978 - 1980, the rate of inflation was more than 35%. In short, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the point which I am making is that the hon. member's political party legislated a Wage Settlement, in a three year period, in which workers found themselves in a worse position than in 1973. Whereas, in that settlement, the workers have been able to make gain. The hon. member for St. Lucy has accepted that because it is the duty of Trade Unions, not only to keep up with cost of living, but to make gains.

Now, we can see that that is why we were willing to make an offer at much better, than the cost

of living. Now, Sir, the hon. member himself had to concede that they make gains.

4.20 p.m.

Sir, the hon. member therefore was forced to concede that gains were made in these negotiations. He was forced to concede that but he said that he took other factors into consideration. We have to take other factors into consideration too. We have other factors to take into consideration and it is not only the hon. members category of workers that we have to consider. We have to consider the position in relation to the other Unions and we also have to consider the position in relation to the workers who are not represented by any Union at all.

As a Government, we have to take all of these things into consideration and what is more, we have to take into consideration the taxpayers of Barbados who in the last resort are the people who will be paying this bill. It is not any hon. member alone who is paying this bill. It is the taxpayers of Barbados who will be paying this bill and as I told the hon. member over there, and I tell that side all the time, we regard the responsibility of trustee-ship of the taxpayers' money as a very heavy, serious and weighty responsibility so we have to hold a balance. We have to hold a balance between all of these competing and conflicting interests and I believe that we did a very reasonable, fair and just job in the circumstances under which we were operating.

I am very sorry that it was impossible for us to reach Agreement with all of the Unions. I am very sorry that we were not able to reach this Agreement but I believe and I can detect it in the speech of the hon. member, in his tones, those plaintive tones which remind me so much of the speeches of which you are an advocate and of which the situation is against you but you have to make a show and because you have no facts to give, you have to rely upon the tone of your voice to give emotional appeal. This is the situation in which the hon. member finds himself in today.

I am advised that the precise figure in 1974 is 39.1%. I apologise to the hon. member for the error of being 8.8% out. It was 6% in 1976. I understand you were very low in 1976. The position is 39.1% for 1974 but the basic position is, Sir, that I do not think that even the hon. member for St. Lucy or any other hon. member can refute the fact that gains have been made but I would only close by saying that the Government will honour its undertaking in respect to those categories of workers, categories 1 to 12, in which there is a just case for regrading having regard to the skills that they have, the importance of that of their jobs, and the demands of their jobs.

We will honour our commitment and I am sure that the good faith that we have shown in relation to our

commitments to the Police, Teachers and others will also be in evidence in our regrading. That, Sir, is my contribution.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in some way I regret that my contribution follows the statement just made by the Hon. the Deputy Prime Minister. There are times, Sir, when the Deputy Prime Minister is not only lucid but logical. I regret today, Sir, was not one of those days. I am told that it has to do with the time of the day at which one catches him, Sir, and after lunch he is not normally as lucid and logical as before lunch.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That reference must be withdrawn.

Mr. TAITT: I withdraw it, Sir. Unhesitatingly I withdraw it, Sir.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, very recently in 1974 Henry Kissinger published a book called "The White House Years" and on page 55, I will go very slowly. (ASIDES). I see the hon. member for Christ Church East is indicating that this is not his favourite. He does not read that sort of thing. At page 55 he says, "History knows no resting places and no plateaux." I believe that the problem that we have today in the laying of the Report by the Rt. Hon. gentleman for St. Thomas and his subsequent marathon speech which has been repeated night after night on his Government station, I believe that the dilemma the hon. gentleman faces has to do with his dilemma on recognising that history knows no resting places and no plateaux.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would not beat around the bush. I believe that the hon. member having uttered many words when he was sitting on this side of this Honourable House, now that he sits on that side in that place, finds himself regularly in contradiction with himself. Now, Sir, knowing and hearing his words from time to time, I would not be surprised if he got up and said that he would rather be in contradiction with himself because the two persons concerned were so erudite that he likes contradicting himself. That might be the reason but, Sir, the fact remains that in this Honourable House on this Floor of the House when civil servant's salaries were being legislated, that hon. member, now the Prime Minister of Barbados, stood up in this House and gave the people of Barbados to understand that he would never countenance the legislating of any salaries for any civil servants at any time in Barbados. Now, (ASIDES) I do not wish the hon. member for Christ Church East to tell me on what assumption they were based on. This is a fact that the Barbados Labour Party likes to use rhetoric in place of....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please continue your speech on the subject.

Mr. TAITT: I am trying my best, with all respect to the Chair, to use rhetoric in place of trivial.
4.30 p.m.

This capacity of the Barbados Labour Party to use rhetoric instead of truth....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Continue with your speech on salaries.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I am trying my best to respect the Chair. (ASIDES) Yes, I do not want to say it about all of you, but since you insist, I am saying that the capacity of the Labour Party to use rhetoric instead of truth lands them in the dilemma in which they now find themselves today regularly, because one only has to take this Hansard and go through it and look at the words of the hon. member, the Rt. Honourable gentleman from St. Thomas, and one can see perfect contradictions. I have always said that English teachers in this country who recently got a piece of change too should make it required reading, this Hansard, so that they can see how logic is not arrived at, how truth is twisted, how argument is used to prove one thing and then the same argument is used to prove the opposite, and invariably if such teachers would use such a document they will find that 99 percent of the times when there has been a perfect contradiction, the speaker on each occasion has been the hon. member for St. Thomas.

Now, Sir, Parliamentary procedure does not permit me to call him a liar.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No! You will not say that.

Mr. TAITT: I withdraw that, Sir. I wish I could though. I came in here and found the hon. member for St. Thomas and I am not ashamed to say that he has taught me how to twist a word here and there; he is a master at twisting words. And so, Sir, we find him in 1976 berating the Government and stating categorically in this Hansard — it can be found on pages 6725 and he goes on with intermittent interruptions up to page 6734. It goes even further than that. Mr. Deputy Speaker, it was a marathon speech and I do not intend to read all of it in this Honourable Chamber, but I do not know if I will not read all of it on the political platforms when the times come. (A VOICE: Nobody would listen) Nobody would listen? That is what you hope. They will hear about you. I am sorry, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Hear the comfortable words of the Leader of the Opposition.

"Our manifesto...."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Which page?

Mr. TAITT: Page 6726. "Our manifesto will contain statements which will show that we have given thought to the problem of reducing the generosity of members for themselves in the matter of pension schemes; reducing the profligacy (that word is not the correct word, Sir) with which Ministries and the concomitant high salaries have been shared out; accepting the argument of the hon. member for St. Michael North East, and reducing, if not abolishing, the post of Parliamentary Secretary."

He was speaking on the salaries for civil servants which were legislated and I am trying to show..... I am reading from that debate. I realise that he was not speaking strictly on the matter, but I have to quote him to make my point. He went on to say: "You will have to wait for the details. I stand by the statement which has been made and except in a purely technical sense, any government coming from this side, after a General Election or otherwise, will be standing on that principle. We are going to do away altogether with members sitting down and saying....."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member must be able to find passages which relate to the question of the General Order.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I take your point. This debate all has to do with Mr. Adams' statement on the civil service salaries and I am going on to make the point. He went on to say in the same debate — you see, after having made all that because it is relevant here, Sir, the point I am making here is that civil servants in Barbados are being given to understand that they have been given some largesse by the Prime Minister who could not wait. He did not wish them to wait for the negotiations to be completed. He went on to say at page 6732: "Civil servants are taxpayers, civil servants are also people, civil servants now have the right to be represented in unions and to engage in collective bargaining with their employer, who is the Government of Barbados." Then he goes on, Sir.

"I hear that there is an agreement between the Prime Minister and the bulk of the taxpayers. An agreement to do what? An agreement to keep down the civil servants? I do not know whether the Prime Minister is serious when he thinks that the bulk of the taxpayers can be mobilised to say that it is correct to impose solutions without making more serious efforts at collective bargaining. I do not believe that 18 meetings is the maximum number ever held between representatives of a Government and representatives of the Public Servants of this Island before agreement was reached. That is a straightforward matter of fact upon which I have little information, and upon which the Prime Minister has all.

But I do not believe that 18 is an unusual number of meetings in wage negotiations. It may be high, but I do not believe it is unprecedented. (A VOICE: You are a preacher?) I am an honest preacher if I am a preacher, not like.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please! Please continue your speech.

Mr. TAITT: I know this is hurting. Bradshaw, you call me a mascot?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Michael South West must not refer to another hon. member by his name.

Mr. TAITT: You! You have got to be joking. I apologise, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I am very sorry.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Continue with the speech.

Mr. TAITT: I know that you do not wish to hear this, but, Sir, on page 6733 the same hon. gentleman, and I quote him again: "The people of Barbados look forward to collective negotiations and collective bargaining."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, look, I am accustomed to the rough of it and it does not...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. member please address the Chair and continue with the speech? Hon. members on the Government side, please remain silent. Order, please! Order on the Government benches please! Please continue!

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am sure you will agree that if there is a pig in a hole you cannot stand up in a shirt and tie and try to get it out; you have to go down in the gutter to get it out.

Now, Sir, he comes in here and he attempts to legislate salaries and he has the unmitigating gall to attempt to justify the position he has taken today on the basis of their having been different sets of circumstances and different sets of assumptions to be made. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the position is very straightforward. When in 1976 a man called O'Brien Trotman.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member is out of order. You cannot refer to a member of the Other Place, nor can you refer to a person unless you have given prior notice.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I thought I had given prior notice that I intended to call the hon. member's name.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: A document was passed up to me which document in my opinion is not in conformity with the Standing Orders.

Mr. TAITT: As Your Honour wishes. The man who was in charge of selling out the workers in the National Union of Public Workers at the time who subsequently got a position from the Prime Minister, the man who led the National Union of Public Workers.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please! That remark must be withdrawn. The hon. member must withdraw those words. It is only one such person who could fit that description and you must withdraw the remark.
4.40 p.m.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I withdraw the remarks.

Mr. WARD: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the hon. member for St. Michael South West would.....there is another hon. member on a point of order.

Mr. WARD: The hon. member spoke of someone who had sold out the workers. Who was the co-partner in this sell out?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. I have already ruled that those words should be withdrawn. Please continue with your speech.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in 1976 the situation was indeed different. We had a situation where persons in this country who were members of a Union were led to believe that the then Opposition would fight in their cause. It was only some time later that they understood that the Opposition was fighting the Opposition's cause.

The fact remains, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that now in 1980 for whatever reason — and the reason does not escape people in Barbados who can think — for whenever reason the Prime Minister feels that he had to get the negotiations finished by a particular time so that he could get his schedule for whatever it is he has to do or wishes to do and as a result he felt that he wanted the salaries paid in October, because if the salaries are paid subsequently they might not fit in with his schedule. For those reasons he comes into this Hon. House and, going back on his word, he legislates salaries.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on principle if it was wrong in 1976 it has to be wrong in 1980, and if the hon. gentleman found that legislating salaries was unacceptable in 1976, no amount of special pleading by him or any of

the other hon. members over there can make it right in 1980. I have reason to feel that the negotiations between the Barbados Workers' Union and the Government, on the basis of what I have heard here today from the hon. member for St. Lucy and on the basis of what the Prime Minister himself has said, I have reason to believe that agreement was far off. If in fact the difference between agreement was what the Prime Minister had said and what he has led us to believe, then that is all the more reason why he should have stuck to the principle which he himself enunciated in this Hon. House and should have gone down the road to negotiations.

It has been known in other places, if in fact he feels so strongly that some money had to be paid, there is nothing that precludes the Prime Minister from having made what can be described as an interim payment. If he felt so strongly about the necessity of getting money into the hands of the people, he could have done that and at the same time maintain a principle of collective bargaining.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is not only the Civil Servants, whenever in this country you reach the stage where people come to be able to look at a Trade Union as something which can only be used sometimes, when we reach the stage in this country where people have lost faith in the concept of collective bargaining, the same very stability which the Prime Minister gratuitously referred to today will turn into what he sees as the hand of trouble on the horizons of the Trade Union Movement in Barbados. No one who read what he had to say in 1976, who is a serious student of Trade Union matters or indeed of the question of living in a society of small size, could seriously question the principle which was adumbrated for collective bargaining is something which should have happened. Let no one say that if I participated in something in 1976 that I do not have the right in 1980 to look back on it and question its validity in the light of what has been said about it, therefore if it has been enlightened by the same hon. gentleman on this side speaking at length and at great pain, how could the same gentleman and his Government come subsequently and reverse the same principle? No amount of assumptions, no amount of proof of how close, how different the situation is, will destroy the principle which has been set up and established.

When we hear in Guyana that the Government has imposed a settlement, all of us in Barbados cry foul and all of us in Barbados say how difficult and how unreasonable it must be to exist in Guyana. If we hear as we hear in Poland that to join a free Trade Union was not the right of the individual and that the people in Poland had to close down the country and go on a rampage in order to justify and to preserve the principle of joining a free Trade Union, we in Barbados say smugly how that is really unfortunate. It is only one step when Governments take it upon themselves as a matter of

course to legislate agreements where the Governments say that they allow collective bargaining and they allow the Union to function.

It is said by the same Prime Minister today that the Unions have played a significant role in making Barbados what it is. What lip service are we paying? How can we take him seriously? How can I accept his word as coming from a scholar and a gentleman when he says that now soon after having imposed a settlement which I contend in the light of what we have seen and heard was not absolutely necessary?

And as for the question of the economy, I sympathise with the Hon. Leader of the House, because the lie about the economic position has been told so often by the Labour Party, it has been told so often that they have come to accept it as truth. Even on Sunday night, when they had their first meeting in 18 months, the hon. members in their political effusions indicated that the cost of living was 40% in 1975. The Prime Minister can tell you all that if you do not read the economic reports that you merely have to call the Central Bank for the statistics and they will tell you that is not true. We thought we had laid that to rest. (Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: What was it?) You get up and tell the people the truth.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: On a point of order, Sir. I have the Barbados Economic Report 1978 presented to the Legislature by the Minister of Finance and Planning. It says the precise figure on their calculation is 38.9. I again apologise to the hon. member, for it is not 31.9, it is 38.9 for 1974, 20.3 for 1975 and for 1976 it is 5%.

Mr. TAITT: Yes, and you will find that if you go back and look at the statements that have been made by Labour Party spokesmen perennially, continuously, and I can think of at least six different members who have stated categorically in front of persons, large and small groups, that the rate of inflation in 1975 was 40%. It is on record, they have said it, and even the Prime Minister himself recently in his statement in Leeds, according to that which was put out by the Government Information Service, who had the same information repeated and repeated and repeated, because like how Goebels did in Germany, when you tell a big lie long enough the people believe it and the liar comes to believe it himself.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. I am hearing about Goebels, but I gather that the hon. member mistakenly believes that hon. members on this said say that the year of the record inflation in the Commonwealth was 1975 and not 1974. He is wrong on that, Sir, just wrong. All of us know it is 1974 and say it is 1974, but I gather that he is angry because we say it is 40% instead of saying it is 39.1. If the hon. member wants me, I will write a statement saying that when Mr.

Branford Taitt was Minister of Trade inflation did not reach 40%, it only reached 39%.

Mr. TAITT: Oh, no, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in spite of the fact that he is abusing the privileges of a point of order. I do not want that, what I wish him to do is to write a statement in the same vein saying that when the same Mr. Branford Taitt was Minister of Trade that the inflation rate came down to 2% and that it was 3.9% in 1976, and when he took up the Government in 1976 the inflation rate was 2% and stop the nonsense of going around giving the impression that something his Government has done has helped to hold the inflation rate down.

4.50 p.m.

When he took up the Government in 1976, that the inflation rate was two percent and stop the nonsense of going around, giving the impression that something his Government has done, has helped to bring the inflation rate down. It is a perpetual lie which has been circulated by the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister over and over again and it is time that it be laid to rest because the journalists are picking it up, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We brought it down to two percent and.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Hon. Member's time has expired.

Mr. TAITT:.....that is where the management was, the management of the economy from then, to two percent in 1976. That is what I would like the Hon. Member to write the population of Barbados, write and say, "I have sinned against you, I have lied to you".....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Mr. TAITT: "I have told you this, and I wish you to accept my apology".

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Hon. Member must withdraw that statement.

Mr. TAITT: I withdraw the last part of that statement, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does any other Hon. Member wish to speak on this Resolution? (*Asides*)

Mr. SANDIFORD: I am up, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I wish to make just a brief intervention on this particular matter which is before the Honourable House. The first point which I wish to make is that Government is one of the largest employers in this country and along with the other employers in the country, from time to time, they have to meet demands from their employees for an increase in salaries and wages. That increase, the demand for the increase, arises from a requirement to

meet the increase in the cost of living, as well as, a quite natural and human desire to increase their living standards and this Government of the Barbados Labour Party is no different from previous Governments, such as the Democratic Labour Party, which has held the reins of Government in this country.

Now, I have indicated that people need an increase in order to cope with increased cost of living. Now, what is the position since 1976? We have had some information and statistics bandied around. I am not going by any Economic Report, I am not going by that particular document. It is a document which tends to show all of the signs of hurried preparation and a certain, shall I say, half baked state of statistics because of the nature and circumstances under which the document might have been produced. I prefer to go by the Central Bank and the position is, and I speak quite fearlessly and I quote from the statistics as I see them, that in 1974, — if I could find that information — the annual average index of retail prices, in other words, the general level of retail prices rose by some 38.9% in 1974. (*Asides*).

Now, I believe that if there were a 40%, I do not know what the figure is, I do not recall what is in the Economic Report. I am not quarrelling with the Economic Report, I am saying, like my colleague, the Hon. Member for St. Michael South West, that there was no 40% increase in retail prices, any time, in this country when the Democratic Labour Party was in power. Contrary to what has been said, from the Government benches.....

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to make it clear that I did say 40%. I undertook to check it, having checked, we had one document which said 39.1%, I went for the Economic Report and I subsequently made the statement clear 38.9% and the Hon. Member now agrees with me that it is 38.9%.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I am disagreeing with the 40% which you mentioned, that is what I am disagreeing with and in Britain, if there is a jump of two points in the Index of retail prices, this is cause for considerable alarm in that country. So, the difference of 38.9% and when you mention 40%, that is a considerable difference. Whatever the figure was, to us it was unacceptably high, no one on our Side, wants to see that particular figure.

That was an international situation. For the first time, this country was faced with a problem of inflation, it was faced with a problem of increase in the prices of oil. It is a well-documented situation which the country had to deal with. But, that was 1974. What has been the Record since that time? The figure dropped dramatically in 1975, from 38.9% to 20.3%, (*ASIDES*) and another dramatic drop in 1976, when it dropped to something like five percent, or 3.9%, depending on how you look at the

statistics, so that was a graph which was coming down and then, what happened when this great combination took over? From 3.9%, or five percent in 1976 to rise in 1977 to 8.3% and then in 1978, a further rise up to 9.5%. I do not have the figures to hand here now for 1979..... (*ASIDE: 13.1*) 13.1% in 1979..... and in 1980, they quote the months of January to July, that was for crime though, I do not know, the Hon. Minister would have the computer print-out to tell us now what it is in this particular.....

But, the point is that it is that inexorable rise in the cost of living which has led to the insistent demands by the workers in this country in the Public Service, in the private Sector and elsewhere, which has led to this demand, by the workers, for substantial increase in salary.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Are you disagreeing that it is the cost of living which led to the demand for increase in wages?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the Hon. Member please address the Chair.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I do not understand, the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister seems to be worried that I have said that.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No Hon. Member on that Side has said anything, certainly nothing which the Chair hears.

Mr. SANDIFORD: What I would say, at this stage Sir, is that the country needs some kind of unifying philosophy, some type of ideology which can put an end to these major divisions which come about in the society, whenever we have to discuss fundamental matters. (*CHEERS*) There is need for some unifying ideology.

I regret to say, you can cheer me one time and you can hiss on another occasion because I am saying that it appears that the method and approaches of the Government, on these matters, tend not to unify, but tend to divide the country further.
5.00 p.m.

What has happened in these negotiations, Mr. Deputy Speaker? I have heard from my colleague the member for St. Lucy and he has said, I was not there, but he has said that there was personal abuse against Unions and against individual representatives of Unions.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. Please continue with your speech.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Some reports which I understand are well founded indicate that at one stage the Prime

Minister had stopped speaking to some of the Unions. He was fed up with that — some report. I do not know. The Reports indicate that some other Minister took over negotiations at the end of the meeting. I cannot vouch for that but I understand that that is part of the story concerning this, at the end. I do not know but what I am saying is that we have reached a very sad state in this country.

If we can by-pass the Chief Government Negotiator — again, this is part of the sad thing concerning this whole argument, that the negotiations were snatched out of the hands of the Chief Government Negotiator and it is taken over by the political bosses in this country. I cannot vouch for that but I do not know if there are showing some type of respect. What type of respect are they showing for the civil servants in the country if that type of situation actually took place?

I am saying that for stability and for further progress in this country that situation is certainly not the type of atmosphere, not the type of environment with which we should conduct negotiations in this country. Now, what is the present position? The Government by means of its political sleight-of-hand.....

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: That does impute some impropriety. If he said political astuteness, that is different but not sleight-of-hand. We are not card players over here.

Mr. SANDIFORD: That is not so. There are a lot of them over there.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. Please continue with your speech. He has not ascribed the sleight-of-hand to any particular member.

Mr. SANDIFORD: If you ask me to withdraw sleight-of-hand I would say legerdemain.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please continue with your speech.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Alright, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We have the National Union of Public Workers which represent the larger set of workers in the public service. I do not know how many they represent probably about 5,000, 6,000, or 7,000. (*Asides*). I was complimenting. When I said sleight-of-hand it was not meant to be any disjointed statement. I was saying that you were able to get that particular Union in spite of the abuse on the Union, in spite of all of that you were able to get that, in spite of all the invectives and in spite of the fact that you have said today that your positions have been frozen since July, you were somehow or another able to get them to shout with a definite "Aye" to a settlement on that particular day sometime last week.

Now when you have got the Teachers' Union agreeing on that basis (*Asides*). I do not know about the Barbados Union of Teachers. My understanding is that they were negotiating on the basis of regrading. I do not know about salaries, in terms of these new salaries. I thought they were talking about regrading. I do not know what proposals were submitted or if they submitted any proposals for increases. There was talk about regrading first of all, something which had been promised arising out of the last salary negotiations.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. L. R. TULL: On a point of order. The regrading exercise was promised by the Democratic Labour Party in 1970. There were two wage settlements since then and they never took up the issue of regrading and the other point that the hon. member raised and which is strictly for the record is that the Barbados Union of Teachers said they agreed to Government proposals for increases.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I do not have that information. You may have it. Alright then, you got agreement from the National Union of Public Workers and you are saying on the Floor of the House that you got agreement from the Barbados Union of Teachers for their salaries as well. The Barbados Union of Teachers, I believe, is the second largest Union representing public workers in the public sector so you have number one and two as far as the public sector is concerned to say that they have agreed.

I take the indication and the information that they have agreed but you cannot get away from the fact that the negotiations cannot in any sense be said to have been completed because there was no full agreement from the Barbados Workers' Union which also has a substantial interest in these matters from the top representing the Royal Barbados Police Force and I am saying that in circumstances such as these where the difference between Unions may not be that great, or you have not settled, that it was a requirement on the part of the Government to sit down and talk some more on this question of salaries to see if an agreement could be arrived at, especially in due of the position that you adopted on a previous occasion because we have got to ask ourselves this fundamental question, how are salary negotiations, the wages and salaries of workers in this country to be determined? Are they to be determined by 24 members in the House of Assembly coming in whenever the Government of the day, acting from whatever information or for whatever motives it feels like acting, should those wages and salaries be settled on that basis, or should that principle which has been enshrined in the World International Labour Organisation or any other bodies which considers this whole question of the relationship between workers and the employers, this principle of collective bargaining.

Ought not every effort be expired and every avenue be followed in order to ensure that a settlement be agreeable on all sides? This calls for patience.

If you start your bargaining position at a ridiculously low position or a ridiculously low figure like 20% across the board, if you put forward that as a bargaining position, you want to draw out negotiations by a deliberate industrial policy to test the nerves. It becomes a war of nerves and that is what it was in this country. I can see the death hands, the death hands at play in this country. There is some mastermind at work in this country.

What I say is and I quote a Latin tag for this, *quod tangit omnes omnibus approbatur* — which means "that which touches all should be approved by all."
5.10 p.m.

And in this particular matter agreement with one Union does not mean that you should shut the door to all of the other Unions and shut them out and then tell them this is the end of the game, we have closed shop, we have frozen everything, this is it, take it or leave it. I am not saying that this particular settlement I am going to vote against, but I am saying that I am voting for this particular settlement because it is a step. I do not have to look around to make my position clear. I am examining the particular position and I am saying that this particular settlement especially in view of the position taken by the representatives of the largest union in the Public Service, that this is a step along the road, but it is unsatisfactory from the point of view that the Government has used political clout to shut and ban up the door of negotiations which should have been left open, especially a Government that castigated the previous administration for legislating salaries, and that is exactly what you have done in this particular case, a classic example of the principle of divide and rule. That is what has happened in this particular case, divide and rule; but that is an ongoing battle not only one will play; more than one will play that particular battle, I am sure.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what I am concerned about is that in this particular salaries increase as well as the re-grading they have created a large number of massive anomalies, and somebody has mentioned the nurses. (Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: They are under consideration.) They are under consideration? You had better get up and say that very loudly because there are trained nurses in this country who work very hard under very trying conditions and they are seeing persons with whom they might have had a close relationship as far as salaries are concerned and they see themselves left behind in spite of the fact that they give valiant service to persons in this country. There are persons like the police. This settlement, in spite of all the talk is not satisfactory to the vast range of persons and officers in the Royal Barbados

Police Force because they are interested in these problems as well. There is also the problem about watchmen vis-a-vis groundsmen, a whole host of anomalies in which you have persons who have to expose themselves to the rigours and dangers of the night and whatever goes under those dark times, and you find that they, somehow or other have not been given the type of consideration which they should be given, and I draw this matter to the attention of the Government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe I must be coming to the end of my address, and I will make the point again that I consider that this Government has been remiss, that it has been in error in not trying to reach agreement and in not talking further with the Unions involved. (Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Which Unions?) All except the National Union of Public Workers, because you announced a settlement even before you received a letter from the National Union of Public Workers, you were saying that the matter was agreed. That is my position.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there has been a great deal of heat generated on this question of the proposed salaries for public servants, and I believe, Sir, that we need, as the hon. member for St. Michael South said, to find a formula which will spare us the pain that we pass through whenever we have to think in terms of increases for members of the Public Service and the rest of the community generally. But he cannot be heard to call, as he said, for a unification in ideology when it comes to the question of dealing with these kinds of major issues, because the Barbados Labour Party's position is that Public Servants like all other persons who work in this country deserve an honest and reasonable pay for their efforts.

The hon. member for St. Michael South can certainly not be guilty of having forgotten what the position of his party was on those occasions when they had to deal with the matter of increased salaries for the Public Service. In 1974, the year which seems to be the year of reference, the Governor of the Central Bank made a general plea with the Public Service and everybody else for that matter. It is on page 6 of the Central Bank of Barbados' Report and Financial Statement of Accounts for the period ended December 31, 1974, and the Governor of the Central Bank made a public call to the Trade Unions to exercise restraint in their wage demands so as to curb the upward spiral of prices. At that time, Sir, we were dealing with wage settlements that were somewhere in the area of perhaps 10% per annum and at that time under the policies of the then Government a general call was made for restraint to the Trade Unions; I believe the term that was employed was "to hold strain". People were advised at that time to hold strain when they were calling for about a 10% increase in their wages.

In 1980 when wage demands are touching 45% and 41% we can hear them coming in here complaining and

saying that the Barbados Labour Party Government is bullying or using unfair mechanisms to effect settlements, and I believe, Sir, that if the hon. member for St. Michael South wants unification in terms of ideology when it comes to these matters, he has to be consistent because he would recognise that at that time the Government was under severe pressure, 1974, as a consequence of whatever, mismanagement, they said oil prices were responsible, but I am saying here that even with oil prices generally three times higher in 1980 than they were in 1974, the inflation rate in Barbados is only 9% in 1980, and at that time the figure was 38.9 per cent as put out by the same document to which I have just referred. People living in Barbados, public servants and all others were asking for these kinds of settlements, and you must bear in mind that the standard of negotiations has changed. At that time settlements were reached in two tiers and usually if the overall settlement was 15%, the settlement used to be 5% and 10% or 10% and 5%, but in 1980 whatever figure is agreed at, it is paid from the date that the settlement becomes effective.

5.20 p.m.

So in a real sense the public servants are infinitely better off because of that particular device. They are getting the whole quantum of the settlement at one time dating back from the date of the original contract. In those days, 1974, under the Democratic Labour Party they used to have two-tier settlements, and even with two-tier settlements when the Government was asked to absorb a smaller portion of the settlement in the first year than in the second year they were begging to hold strain, and now today we have them coming in here making noise about the fact that they say that the Barbados Labour Party Government is unreasonable in asking Unions to exercise reasonable restraint, and when we are talking about reasonable restraint we are meaning that Union demands have to be based upon the actual situation prevailing in the economy at that given time.

In 1974, the year when the Central Bank Governor was calling for holding strain, the cost of living in Barbados was 39% and workers were settling at 10%. I do not have the exact figure, but I believe it would be somewhere in that general area, but they were asked to hold strain in a wage settlement that was almost 30% out of line with the existing cost of living situation. Today they are getting a wage settlement that is 31% ahead of what the figures were in 1974 in terms of percentage comparison, and they are complaining. I do not think the workers are complaining, because I am certain that the workers are satisfied with the arrangements that have been reached, but members of Parliament of the Opposition side for political reasons are coming in here making noises that really do not make sense when you think of it in terms of strict analysis.

The hon. member for St. Michael South West was very unhappy to hear that the inflation rate was 39%, because he was largely responsible for trade and industry at that time. I am sure he is going to be even more unhappy to learn that during that time food items and beverages were mainly responsible for the rise in the retail index in 1974. Food and beverages led the path registering an increase of 44% over the previous years and that, Sir, can be found on page 49 of the same Central Bank Statistics. Food and beverages in 1974 increased 44% at a time when he was using stringent price control, prices still managed to rise 44%. In 1973 it was 17.8, 1972 16.6, so that with this brilliant price control strategy employed by the member for St. Michael South West food prices led all inflationary increases in the economy. Food prices were up front, 44%, followed closely by household furnishings, another area for which he would have been responsible, with a stiff 62.5% increase. Branford Taitt, the brilliant economist or whatever he is — I am sorry, the hon. member for St. Michael South West who shall remain nameless — I am sure he does not want us to tell people who he is, not now, because he does not want to hear these prices. He is complaining that it is not 40, it is only 39.1.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The hon. member is reading statistics and misleading this Hon. House. He is merely calling out numbers, he does not understand the relationship of the statistics apparently and he is giving the wrong impression to this Hon. House. If he wishes me to explain how the statistics should be read I would be happy to do it at any point, but he is misleading the House in reading it the way he is reading it.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am reading for him the change in retail price index and it is on page 49 of this book. He can read it however he wants to, like how he reads the lessons at St. Leonard's. I am reading it the way it is written here. I can't help it, if he does not want me to read it the way it sounds, it does not sound good, it is an awful report, it does not make him look good at all, he and his price controls.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please identify the document you are reading.

Mr. JOHNSON: I have already identified it, Sir, the Central Bank of Barbados Report and Financial Statement of Accounts for the year ended 31st December, 1974, Vol. I, B.1000/3. Now, Sir, page 49. The hon. member who is making noises and complaining that it is not really 40, it is only 39.8%, does not really want to hear these things. (Mr. TAITT: No, Sir, that is not what I complained of. Will you give way?) No, I am not giving way. Even though he had price controls he was not able to keep food prices under control, and I am saying further that people were asked to pay these prices at a time

when they were receiving wages that were for the most part substantially behind the rate of increase in the cost of living. In other words, people were settling at that time and they were worse off in real terms by about almost 30%. Now we are reaching a settlement that will give the public servants of Barbados a substantial improvement in real terms, in other words, they are going to have discretionary income left when they have finished dealing with all the thing they have to buy. This is an important fact that you have to bear in mind.

You will remember, Sir, that in 1974 situations were so bad that not only did they call for restraint and bullied the Unions into keeping quiet, but they had to bring a mid-term budget in order to raise revenue to deal with the inflationary situation. They had to call a special mid-term budget for the purpose of raising emergency funds to deal with their mismanagement, and now they are talking about the patient dying but it was not a 45 bullet it was really a 32 bullet. It does not make any difference what calibre the bullet was, he is dead. It was not a 45 bullet that killed him, it was a 44, but he is dead and buried. (Mr. TAITT: Do you mean Pele?)

I mentioned, Sir, that in the final analysis we in Barbados have to come to the realisation that wage negotiations have to be done within the context of the ability of the country to finance those agreements. The economy has been doing reasonably well and Unions are going to be tempted because of that relative prosperity to make demands that will make their workers' position better, but we have to bear in mind that a reasonable approach has always to be taken in order not to destroy all the gains that we have been able to make in the short period of time that we have been controlling things in Barbados.

In Dominica, Sir, Unions put an awful lot of pressure on the Government and forced it to do things which perhaps it would not have done in the absence of that kind of pressure. We have just seen a change of Government in Dominica in circumstances that are not at all harbingers of anything that is good, and public servants in Barbados and workers generally — I should not say the workers, the Union negotiators, the ones who go to the bargaining table — have to be very certain that a position of reckless intransigence does not prevail over reason and good sense.

5.30 p.m.

On a bargaining table, you are in adversary positions and sometimes, both parties may give rise, or give vent to feelings which are not always diplomatically expressed. Invective prevails and you have people calling names, threatening military action and making people crawl, but that is not the central purpose of a union negotiation. The central purpose of a union negotiation is to effect

agreement and it is difficult to effect agreement when people are thinking in terms of making one another crawl, in that kind of situation. We ought to search diligently for areas of compromise, to make certain that the people we represent are satisfied with the kind of agreement which we reached and that we leave a residue to build back up, so that when the next negotiation comes around, there will be money there, over which we can negotiate.

I would like to commend all those persons who have assisted in finding a reasonable settlement to these negotiations just concluded. The Barbados Workers' Union is generally a union of reasonably good sense, we have been able to reach agreements at the Barbados Marketing Corporation for three years running without any difficulty and I would like to think that, on this occasion as well, that good sense would prevail and that the Union will recognise that if the bigger people have settled up front, they who represent just a fraction of those numbers who are represented by the other two Unions, should follow their lead and gracefully accept the proposals which are not, by any means, or any standards, disgraceful.

I believe Sir and it has been said over and over again, that these settlements are the best settlements which the Public Service has reached in the history of Barbados. That Sir, is a commentary, one to the negotiating skills perhaps, of the Unions involved, but at the same time, to the willingness of the Government to compromise in areas where no dishonour is left.

I would like to suggest, that in the interest of industrial stability, that the Union representatives who negotiated for the Barbados Workers' Union accept this, as a reasonable and sensible settlement, so that industrial tranquility can prevail and so that the people of Barbados can get on to something else which is more significant than squabbling over matters, which really do not deserve as much squabbling as has gone on, in the past few months.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, what has this debate been about? Evidently, the Hon. Member for St. Michael South West is very stunned by the fact that his management of the inflation portfolio for five years was so unsuccessful in the Caribbean and possibly in the Commonwealth and therefore, the Hon. Member has resorted to what is known as nit-picking, to a degree that I have never heard in this Honourable House before.

I do not know, that on one occasion when the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition told a fellow Hon. Member of his Party that he had failed the Bar Exam 13 times, the fellow Hon. Member got up and said, "you are a liar, you are a liar, I only failed it 12". I do know that James Arundel Haynes, known as "Slims" Haynes, when the

Advocate newspaper said that he had 39 convictions for dangerous driving of vehicles proposed to engage Counsel to sue the Advocate for libel on the grounds that he only had 37 convictions. So, the Hon. Member, having seized upon the fact that we, on this Side, make little distinction between the blows which a consumer gets when inflation is 38.9% and the blows which he gets when inflation is 40%, described the events of 1974, as 40% inflation.

The Hon. Member for St. Michael South, with that penchant for defending the indefensible.....

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of elucidation. The Hon. Member has completely misunderstood the purpose of the purport of my intervention. The point which was being made is that errors continue to be made about the year 1975. Those errors are made in the context of 1975 being a bumper year economically, in Barbados and yet, it is said that inflation was 40%.

The other point which was made, which the Hon. Member is misunderstanding, is that the economic management was seen, when suddenly, in the entire world, there was an unprecedented spate of inflationary rises which had never been seen in the world economy as it is known and yet, from that time, until the Hon. Member took up the Government as Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, we had managed, through the genius of the Party which was in power and the Hon. Ministers responsible for the economic Ministries as he put it, in particular, they had brought that inflation rate from 38.9% to 2%. That is the point.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The Hon. Member now is not reducing himself from the sublime to the ridiculous, he is reducing himself from the ridiculous to the ignorant, the salaries' revision to be discussed solely in terms of the cost of living, but the Hon. Member for St. Lucy really said the last word on that. If the cost of living goes up 7%, or 8%, it does not mean that you are only going to offer people 10%, if the Government can afford to pay more and I do not believe that it should be seen entirely in that context. But, so much has been said about it and when even somebody as rational and as sane, as the hon. Member for St. Michael South can spend 22 minutes talking about the cost of living and only eight minutes making a very cogent contribution to this debate — he is the only Hon. Member who has actually mentioned the National Union of Public Workers and its Agreement — you realise how ridiculous some of the debate has been. The fact is that 1972 showed a considerable inflation rate in Barbados compared with the past, I think that it was something like eight percent, 1973 showed a real surge in response to inflation, in the rest of the world. 1974 inflation, in the rest of the world, in the United States, it rose to a virtual unprecedented height of 10.9%, in the United Kingdom, 16%, in Canada 10.9%, in

Trinidad and Tobago 21.9%, in Jamaica 24.4%, in Guyana 17.3% and in Barbados 38.9%. Therefore, there was something which the managers were doing in Guyana and Jamaica — and take Guyana and Jamaica, just take those two, no more — that the managers in Barbados were not doing because the Hon. gentleman in the seat as the Hon. Member for St. Michael South West, contrived to let prices rise twice as far in Barbados, as in Guyana.

The next year, when prices in Guyana rose 8%, the Hon. Member for St. Michael South West contrived to let prices rise 20%. He seems very proud of the fact that inflation was only 20% in Barbados in 1975. In the United States, it was 9.1%. The following year, inflation in the United States, as in Barbados, was between 5% and 6% — 5.8% and what we have always done, when comparing the record on inflation of the two Governments is to point out, that we have had some extremely high rates of inflation to contend with, in our partners overseas. The highest rate of inflation ever known in the United States, except in 1864, when there were shortages due to the blockade in the middle of the Civil War. When, in the face of an inflation rate of 13% in the United States, 17% in the United Kingdom, 17% in Trinidad, 20% in Jamaica, in Barbados, it was only 13%.

5.40 p.m.

The biggest year for inflation has actually been 1979. That was when national pressures outside Barbados were greatest and we controlled prices in Barbados well enough to keep our inflation rate at roughly the same as that of our trading partners.

In 1976 the two hon. members, the hon. member for St. Michael South West and the hon. member for St. Joseph tried to keep, dividing the year between them, the inflation rate a little below or roughly what it was actually outside but in 1974 and 1975 the hon. member for St. Michael South West consistently allowed the prices in Barbados to run at double what they were running outside of Barbados.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order. The hon. member is definitely misleading this Honourable House. If the hon. member should examine the details he would be able to say that the vast bulk of that inflation which showed up was due to the sudden rise in oil prices. I have not bothered about that. The hon. member can look and see for himself. To talk about prices, let him say what the actual prices of food were. Do not let us come here contriving to raise prices. Everybody in Barbados knows what was happening then and what was done.

It was the first time that the oil prices of 1973 and the financial prices hit the entire World and also, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the hon. member would pay attention at all to all of the truth he would say that that was also

the year when the monetary situation in Barbados was changed dramatically.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member is scratching and digging and doing his best to make what is an unmakeable case. The oil prices affected Guyana too. Guyana imports more oil than Barbados. Why is it that in Jamaica which imports many times more oil than Barbados and Guyana which imports more oil than Barbados, they can still keep their price increases running at half of what the hon. member has had. Everybody had to pay more for their oil in 1973 and in 1979 we have not driven down the West Coast to talk a lot of crap that big people have lights burning but in the poor people houses no lights are burning.

The oil bill of last year was more than the whole annual bill for 1973. The increase that we had to pay was more than the whole amount of which the hon. member is speaking and we do not import very much more oil and the imports are not expanding in any great detail in Barbados and indeed even with the domestic position now, conservation measures are keeping down the consumption of oil in Barbados.

There was an oil crisis in 1973 and there is an oil crisis in 1979 and 1980. I was very alarmed when I looked at the Central Bank's Foreign Reserve figures week before last to see a sudden drop of \$8 million. What is it? Foreign currency sold to the Royal Bank of Canada to pay Mobil Oil Barbados for oil imports.

The hon. member is talking about the situation when oil went from \$2 to \$8 a barrel and then eventually to \$14. Oil is \$32 a barrel now and with oil \$32 a barrel we are still holding inflation to a third in the worst year. The year 1979 was the worst year for inflation known to mankind and we are still holding inflation at a third of what he was able to hold it at.

I know it has been painful, that the hon. member has had to defend himself. His particular credibility as a politician itself not only depends on his rhetoric and his command of meaningless words that flow out of the back of an empty head. His credibility as a politician depends on his own belief in himself and if he knew something about Economics and he knew something about running the Ministry of Trade — he knew nothing — he presided over record inflation and record unemployment and he will hear that night in and night out on the platform during his forthcoming contest in the General Election and he will have to prepare better answers for it than he has been able to prepare here this afternoon.

I did not want this to be a debate on inflation. I can hardly believe that hon. members opposite who have the worst record in Caricom for dealing with inflation and price increases would actually come to the House of

Assembly to make that an issue, to stand up in front of us who have all the facts and try to pull the wool over the eyes of whom? Whose eyes are you trying to insult? I do not mean you, Sir, I am asking the hon. member on the other side who has spoken. Treat the people of Barbados like adults, not children. Try something else.

Now I really much regret that the hon. member for St. Michael South lent himself to this. At least the hon. member for St. Lucy did not invent a case on inflation to support his speech. The hon. member for St. Lucy really said so and that it is difficult to reply to it. He did make one glaring — I cannot say malicious report — but he did make one statement which is so mischievous that it deserves some considerable refutation. He said that there were over 500 lay-offs at the Waterworks. We cannot use words like liar in here, Sir. Now that statement contains all kinds of connotations (*Asides*). I beg his pardon. He did not say "they were". He said "there will be."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. Please continue.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am letting the hon. member line himself up against the walls of the firing squad, Sir. I remember when Admiral Bings was executed and he insisted that since he was the Senior Officer present on his own ship that he and only he could give the order to fire and he told the firing squad "Ready, fire" and that is what the hon. member is doing. He has actually told the firing squad to shoot him down because he is now giving me more details. He said that they have letters. If he knows they have letters he should know what is in the letters.

The Waterworks Department is being disbanded. We have passed an Act through the House establishing the new Water Authority. People who now work for the Waterworks will go to work for the Water Authority so before they go to work for the Water Authority they have to get letters saying that they are no longer working for the Waterworks. Can you believe that hon. members can be so wicked as to come into the House and try to make the public and the House believe that people are being fired?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Having said all of that the reference to wickedness must be withdrawn.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg your pardon, Sir. The hon. member for St. Lucy is not wicked, he is not vicious and he is not a liar and I withdraw all of those words that I have used or implied, Sir.
5.50 p.m.

His speech, Sir, really was, and indeed that of the hon. member for St. Michael South West, Othello without the Moor, Hamlet without the Prince, Henry V without the

King. You know you could listen in here and believe if he did not hear the speech of the hon. member for St. Michael South that we were legislating salaries as they were legislated in 1976. You could believe it. Not one of the hon. members at that stage said anything about agreement on salaries having been reached with the National Union of Public Workers or the Barbados Secondary Teachers' Union. A specific question to the Barbados Union of Teachers this morning orally elicited the fact that there is no objection, that they did not reply because they did not think they were called on to reply; the police have replied saying that they accept the salaries but would like a review of the bottom positions of constables. This is in fact what happened, and a whole debate was built up as if this was the 1976 situation all over again.

Now the National Union of Public Workers represents thousands something like 7,000 people. I am informed, I do not know how accurately that the Barbados Workers' Union represents hundreds, not thousands. I would not embarrass the hon. member by telling him what members of the staff of the Establishments Division of Government have said are the actual number of persons whose salaries are being checked off every week for union payments to the Barbados Workers' Union. Must I hold up that agreement for 7,000 people because of a few — I have not used the word "few" yet, he used it he said a few hundred — because a few hundred have an argument? If that argument was well based, Sir, really I would have....(Mr. TAITT: Thirteen hundred.) You may have that if you count the Housing Authority, the I.D.C. and the things not covered by this agreement, but if you want to count public servants, you are not going to reach 1,000; let me tell you that. You will find it, very hard to reach 700 if you want to count civil servants.

Now we have heard all about the Key Scale, how the Key Scale must get the same increase. You heard how 38.3% is misleading. Now I am going to remind the hon. member of something. In 1978 we reached an agreement on the basis of 20% at the bottom and 10% at the top. Now I have never heard the hon. member accuse me of misleading the public because in fact we paid at the bottom 21.2%. It was called a 20% settlement, but the bottom actually got 21.2%. We are dealing now in 1 per cent and 0.9 of 1 per cent and 0.4 of a per cent, things that translate in a salary of \$1,000 a month to \$3.00 out of the thousand. That is what we seem to be arguing about. This business as alleged by the hon. member that you must give the whole key scale the same amount, but in 1978 categories I and XIII of the Key Scale — I am speaking from memory — got 21.2%, and category XII, the Electricians at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital got something like 14%, and the reason why the Government could not accept the good faith of the Union in respect of these negotiations was that contrary to all previous

practice the Union refused to submit a graded scale such as it has been doing whenever there is a variable increase at the top or bottom. That is the reason why I do not believe the Barbados Workers' Union really wished to come to an agreement, and while the scales at the level of the electrician at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, category XII, the Head Butler at Government House, Category XI, may only have included 30 people, what the Barbados Workers' Union was asking for at those levels covered hundreds of people working as senior clerks and similar positions, working even as policemen, hundreds, perhaps thousands of people and the 4% or 5%, I think the hon. member said that in the negotiations they asked for 6% more, would have involved the Government in additional wages that would have run into \$10 million rather than the \$2 million or \$3 million that was possible to be found at the last moment, and in those conditions you could not believe that the people you are talking to are serious people. The hon. member for St. Lucy is aware of the very point in the negotiations where unreason came through the door and sat down between Mr. Walcott and Mr. Trotman and himself, because there was a point in the negotiations, and I say this without any fear of the contradiction which will no doubt be imposed on Mr. Trotman by his counsel and his General Secretary, there was a point in the negotiations where Leroy Trotman, Assistant Secretary of the Union was ready to agree with the Government on the scale of proposals in such a way as we could have come to terms. I say that without any question of contradiction. (*Asides*) The hon. member for St. Lucy was deferential not only to the General Secretary, but also to the Prime Minister. Indeed sometimes I think he was deferential to the Establishments Officer as well, but in here it is a different story altogether. The Union's final position bore no relation to reality, and there is a well known expression among card players, raising the ante, raising the stakes, and you know you don't say 'well boys, it was \$50 until now, but now it is \$1,000'; you don't do it that way, and this is what the Barbados Workers' Union did, and you cannot negotiate with a Union which decides to change the rules in the middle of the game.

Now the speech of the hon. member for St. Michael South was not one with which the Government should quarrel. I will just correct him when he says it was a personal abuse when I was speaking of some Unions. It is a rare, what the hon. member for St. Michael South West would call, twist when you use a mutual and trusted friend as a means through which delicate negotiations can be conducted to hear it described that you had to call in some other Minister because you were not speaking. I have paid tribute to Senator Nigel Barrow, and I do not think that any apology is necessary, nor do I even have to hedge when I say that Senator Barrow was able to assist very greatly in the negotiations to keep in touch with all parties to establish positions which subsequently proved to be to the satisfaction of all sides, and I think

that we all owe him as indeed I owe a great deal to Senator Don Blackman the Minister of Labour whose advice in respect of the behaviour of the Barbados Workers' Union was very significant and turned out to be a very correct assessment, and there are others whom I would not name because their role perhaps was a little more under cover than that of the Cabinet Ministers concerned.

But, Sir, I do not know what hon. members want me to do. I really enjoyed when the hon. member for St. Michael South West read my speech. I always like the idea of sitting down and realising in the few short years that I have been in public life not only the speeches I have made as Prime Minister but which I made as Leader of the Opposition have proved of some assistance and have proved instructive to hon. members on the other side. I thought the only hon. member whose intellectual breadth was such as to be able to extract the maximum from them was the hon. member for St. Michael South.
6.00 p.m.

The very bad job which the hon. member for St. Michael South West made of selecting the extracts and reading them out in the House has not persuaded me that he yet has the same friend but it is at least an ambitious step in the right direction as he seeks to enter into the ranks of those who are not too important of themselves as to realise that they have something to learn from others. I really felt a modest glow of self-congratulation flowing through me when I heard how well I had put the case against hasty legislation of salaries in 1976. I gather that on that occasion there had been 18 meetings with all the Unions concerned, but those meetings had been concluded with some rancour in June. At this stage there were more than 18 meetings, they went on longer and they were persisted with until the great majority of public workers, the two biggest unions, because don't doubt the Barbados Union of Teachers has twice as many members as the BWU has in the public service, the two biggest Unions could agree with the Government on all outstanding points.

The hon. member for St. Michael South said that that which touches all should be approved by all. I am not going to seek to tell him that therefore he should not be in the House of Assembly because only 12 more people approved of him than approved of his opponent. All of us get in here by majority vote, and democracy consists of a state of affairs in which the minority accepts the will of the majority. It seems that this is a thesis which is alien to the Democratic Labour Party. Some political fledgling on a political platform in which he sought to involve the Barbados Labour Party in the disgraceful catalogue of vice that Space Research and its ramifications indeed, Sir, remarked that the Barbados Labour Party had borrowed the Government. I think that those words can also be attributed to Mr. LeRoy

Trotman, they lent the Government to the BLP. There are short term, medium and long term blows, and when LeRoy Trotman faces the other Sweet Boy LeRoy we will then see whose loan will be short, medium or long, and I have a feeling that the bank will be calling in Trottie a long time before they call in Sweet Boy, but all of this evidence that the Democratic Labour Party does not believe in majority rule has been well exemplified by what we have heard in here today.

The simple fact is that unprecedentedly the Government has been able to obtain the agreement of the great majority of public workers to a generous wage settlement that will lift all public workers towards the better life we hope for them, and I am asking the House to support that wage settlement here and now.

There were some figures asked for by the hon. member for St. Philip South which are a little bit complicated. There are in fact in primary schools 116 Head-teachers who will benefit from the regrading, in the newer secondary schools I think there are 12. In the primary schools there are 706 qualified teachers who will benefit, 145 senior teachers and a number of untrained teachers, including temporary ones, is 985. In the newer secondary schools there are 471 teachers, 37 special grade, 33 senior teachers, 239 qualified teachers who will benefit, 265 graduate teachers. He will find that there are something over 3,000 teachers in Barbados. Their back pay alone is going to be \$3 million, that is over and above the 51 million which was mentioned, that is their arrears of back pay not their current back pay, that is last year's back pay, so you are really dealing with a substantial number of workers in the country. I hope these details satisfy the hon. member.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it has been a long debate, we have more to go, and 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, the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Mr. BRADSHAW, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. ODLE, Mr. WARD, Mr. SISNETT, Dr. CHELTENHAM, Mr. SANDIFORD and Mr. WEEKES — 12.

Noes: Mr. GREAVES and Mr. TAITT — 2.

RESOLUTION RE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENTS (TEACHER) ORDER, 1980.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, this is the new salary for teachers. We had to pass the regrading first and

having passed that we can now pass the ordinary salary, and I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, not long ago I queried the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance about the number of teachers who will receive approximately \$6,000 back pay, and I would be very happy if he is now in a position to give me the number.
6.10 p.m.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The number Sir, according to my instructions and the calculation that the regrading of senior teachers will lead to is that this would be in the region of 170 senior teachers.

Mr. WEEKES: I must express my sincere thanks to the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister for giving me the information which I requested.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (PART-TIME OFFICERS)
ORDER 1980.

Order Number Ten was called — To move the passing of the Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Part-time Officers) Order 1980.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, there are a number of officers, the best known are the doctors and the chaplains. I must say Sir, that although agreement has been reached with the Union which represents this category of person, there is still some discord, especially in the hospital, on the matter of doctors although not specifically, the part-time doctors. But, I would want to take this opportunity to say that the new sessional rates which have been reached in respect of casualty attendants, at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and so on are going to be re-examined by the Government.

There has been a lot of awkwardness from time to time, at the Casualty of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I do not want to open a whole can of worms, as they call it, Sir, but I recently had an example of it, when my dear mother who is not a young lady, she would not wish me to say how old she is, fell and broke her arm. I had to wait several hours at the Q.E.H. Casualty before she could be admitted to a ward. I mention this example to show, that all of us probably have some kind of experience of the sort of time table which you may have to face at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. The Government is taking steps to improve the morale of the staff.

The part-time officers covered by this Bill are being given increases appropriate to their position in the general scale, we have recently reviewed payments to junior doctors and we hope, relieved some of the complaints. We will take another look at the whole situation and see how far we are in a position to improve these rates and how far improvement of the rates will improve morale to the point when the Casualty will operate on a better basis than formerly, but we are putting our trust Sir, in the capacity of the National Health Service, the first pilot scheme for which will come into operation quite shortly relieving pressures on the Casualty and therefore, taking away from that narrow, intensive point, the bottleneck which has beset it for so many years.

I really do not think that it is a political matter, it is an organisational matter which nobody has been able to handle in full and nobody will handle without some system of decentralising the work which is now concentrated at the Casualty.

I am sure that Hon. Members will have no quarrel with this Order before the Hon. House, Sir, and I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Order Number 11 was called — To move the passing of the Resolution to fix the rates of pay and conditions of service of unestablished staff and casual employees with effect from 1st April 1980.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, a good deal of what has been said on an earlier Resolution applies to this one and Hon. Members will forgive me if I take the opportunity of replying to some of the points which have been raised on this Order, rather than on the earlier Order.

The Hon. Member for St. Lucy spoke about maids and he spoke about maids at Cable and Wireless getting \$535.00. I think that it would only be fair if I pointed out that the Hon. Member is well aware that the maids in the Government Service have been placed on a scale and that, by the time of the next salaries' revision, that they will be getting more than the maids at Cable and Wireless, they will be getting \$546.00. He need not come in here and make a big thing about having negotiated a higher price for a maid outside the Government Service, than these maids in the Government Service.

I would also point out that the Proposals of the Barbados Workers' Union called for \$118.00 per week for a maid, I have them here opened in front of me and that is precisely what they called for. I mentioned these things, so that Hon. Members will have factual basis of

assessing some of the information sought to be conveyed by the Hon. Member.

The point made by the Hon. Member for St. Michael South, to the effect that watchmen and grounds-men have similar responsibilities, but different pay is also well taken, but this is really a matter of reclassification, this is not a matter of salary negotiation.

I thought of who he could mean when he spoke of nurses seeing other people on the same scale. It occurred to me that he could only mean teachers. I presume that he could mean teachers. He did not name them because he did not want to be accused of saying that teachers are getting too much. I admire the Hon. Member's prudence in seeking to put forward a dog in the manger case, I think that such a case is always to be treated with contempt and when certain Unions had a lot to say about the Permanent Secretaries' emoluments being increased, in more than the whole amount, than an artisan was getting, the increase which the Barbados Workers' Union was seeking for an electrician at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital was in fact, more than the maids were getting paid, more than the maids have been getting in the past. I mean, that is a mathematical consequence of some people getting higher salaries than others.

What could be pointed out, is that taxes bear very heavily on those at the top. There is a corollary of taxes at the bottom not being as beneficial to workers, as taxes at the top. The corollary is that increased salaries at the top are not as beneficial as, increased salaries at the bottom because the Government takes more of it away. But, even this point, which was made by the Hon. Member for St. Lucy, on an earlier occasion, is really a very negative point indeed.

6.20 p.m.

A person whose taxable income was anything like \$6,000 when the Democratic Labour Party left power, I believe was liable to pay something like — now, \$850 is more than 10% of his original salary — he was paying at a marginal tax rate of 20%. Now the tax rate rises up to \$10,000 taxable which is 20% and the first \$5,000 is taxable only at 10%.

In practical terms it is true that a maid who was getting \$84 a week is only saving \$4.00 in tax or something like that as a result of the latest tax advantage and perhaps 8% or 9% in the income tax at least as we found them in 1976 but the fact is that she is glad to have the few extra \$9 in her hand and I am yet to hear anybody, other than members of the Opposition, who are critical of getting more money when the week comes by means of income tax. Nobody except the members of the Opposition are complaining about it.

Nobody has telephoned me to tell me "Mr. Adams, I am very sorry but I do not think you should have re-

duced my income tax." Some have telephoned to talk about the Consumption Tax and it has been pointed out, that the price of bottled gas came down, the cost of appliances came down, refrigerators and stoves, that fruit juices came down, that kitchen utensils and saucepans came down and that the Consumption Tax did not rise on the things that the ordinary people buy. There was no Consumption Tax on food. When that has been pointed out some people have been able to see a little of the light through the dark skins of the wool that the hon. member for St. Michael South West and others were trying to pull over their eyes.

The truism which is a tax relief for workers at the bottom is less than the tax relief for workers at the top and it is really neither here nor there. All it means is that you recognise that you tax people at the top more than you tax people at the bottom. If the Democratic Labour Party is saying that income tax relief is wrong, I understand it is saying certain things about salaries of members of Parliament and they are going to go back to 1978. I want them to tell people that they are going to put the income tax rates back to where they were in 1978. If they are honest let them tell the people that. Tell the workers at the bottom whom you say got no benefit from tax relief that they will have to pay the same tax that they paid in 1976. Tell them that. If you name "man" tell them that. Go and tell Miss I. Gaskins who works for me who will be getting \$116 as from the 1st of April, go and tell her that she must go and pay the same tax as in 1976. Sir, the tax rates were applicable to working for \$116. If you name man go and say so.

You want to tell the people that they are getting no benefits from taxes. You go and be idiotic enough and tell them they got no benefit so we are going to put them back on. I do not mean you, Sir, you have more sense than that. I have never yet imagined that you could live in a country where a political Party could oppose the removal of a Sales Tax, oppose the reduction of Income Tax, look at people when the Consumption Taxes are reduced on virtually all household items to which they applied and tell them that they have been raised. I mean, to tell them that they are paying more for bottled gas and when \$6 has come off the drums? I could not believe that I could live in a country where that is a standard of opposition with which I have to deal.

Of course, Sir, Dr. Goggles did say what has been struck off from the records earlier in here today that if you tell a lie often enough, it is a big enough lie but to tell people that the Consumption Tax has gone up on everything is not a big lie. It is a foolish lie because you only have to tell them what the price of gas was before and what it was after, what the price of a fridge was and what it was after and what the price of a cup and saucer was before and what it is after and you go on.

You only have to tell people that when we came into power a maid earning \$25 a week could be called upon to pay income tax and now she has to earn \$90. It is only a few cents at \$25 and a few more at \$50 and a few dollars at \$90 but the fact is she does not have to pay it now. That is a fact. In any case the next Budget will produce a little more income tax relief. This is a pledge I am going to give from here. That is the pledge I will give. (*Asides*). A little more.

This Order, Sir, deals with the key scale of Established Staff and it only remains to say that in connection with the Unestablished Staff, the Casual Employees, that the re-classification which the Government intends to undertake it is not intended to result in general increases. Let there be no mistake about that. There is no intention of giving a different increase under the guise of re-classification but we will select all of the positions that have been represented to the Government as being in need of some improvement.

There are also in the key scale several positions which are no longer on the Government's Register. The Government does not have any Ship's Carpenters as far as I know. The Government does not have any able foremen as far as I know, these all work for the Port Authority now. I think there are too many casual workers in the Soil Conservation Scheme. It is time that some of them got permanent positions. The Soil Conservation Scheme is here to stay. There is no need for a Hollywood in St. Andrew. There is no need for people to be acting or to be having the threat of being laid-off at a week's notice as was done with 300 MCW employees in 1973.

We will look at all of those things and I believe that we may be able to iron out some of the anomalies of which the hon. member for St. Michael South spoke. The hon. member spoke so well and so feelingly that perhaps it might turn out that his true career might very well lie in that kind of negotiation or his approach to that sort of thing. He reveals the knowledge of these intricacies which with great respect to the teams of the Barbados Workers' Union, I must say seemed totally lacking in their approach to the matter. Of course there are only a few hundred members and they might not have seen the importance but there has been no change in the classification since 1966 and it is high time that if the Union will not make representations on behalf of their members that the Government will have to make examination on behalf of their members for them.

I know that the work is difficult, it is tricky, intricate and it is detailed and when you reach a certain point in life you just become a little impatient of details.
6.30 p.m.

Nonetheless I am sure that Trottie and Lyn and Lyn and Trottie have not yet got to that stage where

they are impatient of detail, and they may yet retrieve, and I am not meaning to be patronising, some of the confusion into which they have thrown themselves wilfully not wilfully on their part, into which they have been thrown by careful attention to the detail of terms of service of the Key Scale employees.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, what I have said in the period before and after lunch would apply equally to this Resolution which we have before us, and I do not intend to go over the grounds which have already been passed. I will quite naturally be voting against this Resolution when it is put to the vote, but I would just like to make one observation relative to a comment which was made by the Prime Minister on the tax concessions where he indicated that his maid or anybody for that matter in the lower wage scales is glad to have the extra \$9.00 or whatever it is that they got as a result of the tax concessions offered by him. You will recall that when the Deputy Prime Minister spoke he indicated that the difference between the Barbados Workers' Union and the Government on negotiations particularly for those workers in the Key Scale was not very much and that the Union could give in. There was not much we had disagreed over. If the Prime Minister could say that \$9.00 would make all this difference as indeed it is important that it does not make a difference to what a person at that level can certainly buy, but every amount is important, and when you look at the difference between the Barbados Workers' Union and the Government on these negotiations, you would see that the difference is not as significant as the Deputy Prime Minister or indeed as the Government has attempted to point out, because the differences in some areas in the Key Scale are in the region of \$7.00 per week, \$8.00 per week and in one instance \$9.00 per week. That is the kind of difference that we are talking about, and I would just want to repeat, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we should disabuse our minds of the suggestion which has been made over and over again that those workers at the bottom are getting a 38.3% increase. As a matter of fact, I want to say that under the Key Scale, workers in Category I would be getting 36.7%, Category II and I think we have a general idea of the workers who would fall into this area such as general workers, porters, gardeners, etc. would be getting an increase of 35.4%. In Category III Government is offering 35.2%, Category IV, 35.1%, Category V, 35.1%, Category VI, 35.2%, Category VII, 34.7%, Category VIII, 32.8%, Category IX, 32.6%, Category X, 35.2%, Category XI, 32.8%, Category XII, 32.1%, Category XIII, 35.7%; so that you see there is a difference between the position taken by the Barbados Workers' Union, a difference both in terms of percentage and in terms of actual money, and

as the Prime Minister has admitted, the extra money, no matter what it is, means something to the workers in these categories. It is for this reason that the Barbados Workers' Union will remain unswerving as far as the demands which it has made for workers in these categories, and our proposals rounded are in the region at one point of 38.9% going up to 40% and we still consider that this is a reasonable position taken by the Barbados Workers' Union.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have disagreed and will continue to disagree not only with the method but to the amount which the Government is now legislating for this category of workers, and I should just want to draw to you attention, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Addendum to this Resolution which in my humble opinion is misleading. I am not at all going to say in here again because it would be unparliamentary for me to say that it is deliberately misleading, but the fact of the matter is that it is misleading. The Addendum reads as follows:—

"This Resolution seeks to give effect to the settlement reached by the Government in negotiations with the workers' representatives regarding revised wages for the unestablished and casual employees of the Government."

The impression which is being created here in this Addendum is that an agreement was reached with all the unions who are representing these particular categories of workers, and I am saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this is not so, and indeed I would think that in all honesty and sincerity this Addendum should be changed so that it could reflect the true position. As I indicated, most of what I said in the debate earlier on will be applicable to this particular debate, and I have no other alternative, and without any hesitation, but to say that I will be voting against the effect of this particular Resolution.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, what I have to say will not be very long. I believe what I said earlier applies equally here except that it applies in a greater measure, because this category of worker is the category of worker which will be affected the most by the imposed settlement. The imposed settlement, I indicated earlier, I disagree with in principle, and if I disagree with it in principle and I disagree with the principle, I think it should be hypocritical and/or dishonest for me to vote for it. I therefore will not be voting for this Resolution. Many of the persons who live in the constituency which I have the honour to represent work precisely in these categories, and when the Prime Minister gets up and talks about \$9.00 and \$4.00, he is talking about ordinary little people who constitute the vast majority of my constituents.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is another fallacy which the Prime Minister in his facile manner, (ASIDES) No, I did not say fascist, I said facile, in his facile manner has suggested as he has done in the past, I would ignore the fact that earlier today he managed somehow to suggest once again that there is nothing but emptiness in my head, something contrary and different from what he has said on political platforms when I was out of the country. (Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: You have passed many tests.) Which you have not done. The hon. member today when he was talking about Prime Ministers and the Leader of the Opposition who said this and said that, he forgot it was the hon. Leader of the House, now the Leader of the Opposition, who said that he had given him five noughts at the Foundation, and he got up and said it was not true, it was four noughts. I believe that the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister drew that to our attention using other analogies because he knew that we would all immediately remember that his colleague, the Deputy Prime Minister had taken exception to being given an additional nought.

Sir, the Prime Minister spoke about his indirect taxation reducing the price of bottled gas. Now, Sir, the Prime Minister does not tell a deliberate lie.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: In this Honourable Chamber no hon. member tells lies.

Mr. TAITT: No member here would tell a deliberate lie; we know that. But, Sir, he does not even seem to know what bottled gas comes in. What did he call it? He didn't call it a cylinder. I think he said a can or something. Anyway, that is not important. The point I want to make is that if you examine just a few weeks before the consumption tax was imposed by the Minister of Finance, the price of bottled gas had moved to an unprecedented price in this country and the now Minister of Consumer Affairs threatened that he would bring it back down.
6.40 p.m.

What we have had is the price having gone up beyond what it should be, and the consumption tax bringing it back to what it would have been if there were proper price control on the item, but let us not get into that.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir. The hon. member does not now have access I hope to the submissions made by the merchants, otherwise he would know that the increase which was based on the

margin that he set when he was in power was refused. Smaller margins were insisted on and the consumption tax was reduced. The increase in the price of bottled gas, such as it is, owes everything to import costs of the commodity. We took off part of the consumption tax and we reduced the margin which he was giving the dealers.

Mr. TAITT: Whatever the hon. member says does not interfere with the point I am making. I do not have access to the information he has with the merchants, I do not wish to have that access. Earlier today the hon. member apparently was speaking at something connected with the merchants' operations in Barbados and he would have information about merchants which I could never have and would never want to have either. The point I am making is that it is wrong for him to get up in here and suggest that his indirect taxation has somehow reduced the price of bottled gas when everyone who has ever purchased a cylinder of bottled gas knows that without rhyme or reason the price of bottled gas went up just a few weeks before to a price which the Minister himself said was an exorbitant price, so I do not know what nonsense the Prime Minister is getting up in here talking.

He also tried to suggest that the Democratic Labour Party has been saying to the population of Barbados that it is against the reduction of personal income tax. I cannot recall at any time, and I doubt that the Prime Minister can recall, ever hearing anybody from this side say that they were against the reduction of income tax for any other person in Barbados, but it suits the Prime Minister now as he is coming here with these figures where we are talking about some very small money for some very small people to talk in terms of \$9 and \$6 and \$3 relief which he is giving to people in this country.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish to repeat a charge which I made before and which the hon. member for St. Michael West who is not now in his seat went on a political platform and sought to refute. I said that a 10 oz. bottle of Nescafe costs \$17.32, they have sought to say it is not true. They might be right in that particular today, because the last time I checked it it was not \$17.32, Sir, it was \$17.34, and I stand by that, and if the Prime Minister or the hon. member for St. Michael West would go into the supermarket and check they will find that a 10 oz. bottle of Nescafe costs \$17.34. Sir, when I look at this I do not believe that this Hon. House, whatever it does with this Resolution, wishes to pass a Resolution which deliberately or otherwise suggests that there has been agreement with the workers' representatives. If it were possible I would move an amendment to the Addendum of this Resolution so that the "workers' representatives" would be scratched out and the "National Union of Public Workers" would be inserted there, because according to what the Prime

Minister has told us he has reached an agreement with the National Union of Public Workers. As far as I am concerned the Barbados Union of Teachers would not be involved in this at all, is it straight between the National Union of Public Workers and the Barbados Workers' Union.

It is well known, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Barbados Workers' Union represents a vast proportion of the persons identified in the various categories which are embraced in the Schedules to this Resolution before the House. Do you mean to tell me that the Prime Minister could be so heartless, that the Government over there could be so without feeling for these ordinary people who bear the brunt of the difficulties in this country.....(Dr. CHELTENHAM: That is 1952 rhetoric, not 1980, nobody is listening to that, Sir). The hon. member for Christ Church East will discover in due time that if he had been as feeling as he should be about the poor people in Christ Church East that he would have retained his seat. He will discover that in due time, but Charlie Best will lick out his eyeballs. Charlie Best is not a violent man, Sir, he is only going to win the Seat. (Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: He is no man at all).

Sir, if the Prime Minister can get up and talk about \$5 and \$4 when he is considering giving income tax relief, he can give income tax relief for \$3 and \$4 and \$7 and get up and make a great speech lasting four hours about these small prices. He makes it seem as if these people had got a passport to Heaven with this relief of \$4 and \$6, and yet when it comes to negotiations, when he has an opportunity to give them \$3, \$4, \$8, \$9, the Prime Minister is so heartless apparently that he says the Union is unreasonable to ask for another \$4 for a poor woman who lives somewhere down in 2nd Avenue, Richmond Gap. Mr. Deputy Speaker, if anybody from that side takes the trouble to go and see how the people in Barbados are living, while the Government is saying that all the newspapers from all over the world are saying that there is a miracle going on in Barbados, and it is truly a miracle because I myself cannot understand how some of the poor people of this country manage to exist. It is truly a miracle. If some of them did not have a religion, a belief in Christianity or in some Higher Being, I believe that more of them would go mad, and some of them again find solace in the same kind of spirit, Sir, spiritual activity for which my friend, the Hon. Leader of the House, has always suggested one should fortify oneself when faced with a difficult situation. But these poor people have to go into supermarkets, and if you see them coming out with little baskets at the end of the week, do you realise that there are women who work in the Westbury Cemetery who get \$69 a week, Mr. Deputy Speaker? 6.50 p.m.

I am very glad to hear that the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister's maid is getting \$116.00. I would be interested

to know what her basket of goods looks like with that \$116.00 because I wish to say and I know that a large number of people in Barbados will confirm this, that going into the supermarkets in this country with \$300.00 when you walk out, you still cannot believe that that is all you got for the \$300.00. So that, when these people who are earning that small money are being fought for to get another five, six, seven or eight dollars a week, who is being intransigent? Do you believe that a feeling, thinking, humane Government would fight a Union on the difference between 35% and the 38% which they are claiming?

You know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not beginning to believe that taking these categories, as they have been outlined, that if, in fact, these people were going to be getting 38 point something percent, instead of 35% and 32%, I believe that we would have had a nearer acceptance, or that we would have been nearer to acceptance, but the truth is that the more we hear about this so-called Agreement, the more we are beginning to realise that the Barbados Workers' Union must stand up on its principle and battle for these down-trodden persons who cannot look to the Government for any assistance, or sustenance and indeed, can only look to the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister for more of his rhetoric which is calculated to give wrong impressions.

Time and time again, when the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister speaks, people listen to him and believe that they heard something which, on close examination, they discovered that he never said. His language is picturesque, his language is interesting, his language, because it does not come from an empty head is sometimes deliberately deceitful. (ASIDES) His language, Sir, he does not intend it to be deceitful.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, no, you just said that his language is deliberately deceitful, that must be withdrawn.

Mr. TAITT: With the greatest respect Sir, I withdraw the remark. What I intended is not that the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister himself, was deceitful, although I tell him that outside of here regularly, Sir. What I am suggesting is that the manner of language, the style of his language is such, to the unsuspecting person, that it is the person who is deceived Sir, it is not that the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister deceived them, the person deceives himself, after hearing the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister.

The Rt. Hon. Prime Minister has this capacity, he does not set out to deceive anybody, he has this capacity that all those who hear him deceive themselves, they mislead themselves into believing that the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister said something which he did not say. I treat everything which that Honourable gentleman says with the greatest reserve. I will not believe anything which he

tells me until I see it written down, even "good morning" not because I doubt that it is a good morning Sir, but because from practise and habit, one knows that the words which drop from the lips of the Hon. Member for St. Thomas are not words in the same vein as those which drop from the lips of say, the Hon. Member — I have to find an Hon. Member over there, Sir — the Hon. Member for St. James, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Can you come back to the Resolution, please.

Mr. TAITT: Yes, Sir. You know Sir, that I was believing that the 38.3% applied to a large number of people at the bottom, I was wobbling, Sir. I had difficulty understanding how the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister could be saying that the Union is intransigent myself having been a negotiator in the Union, Sir, I could not believe that this same Workers' Union, fortified by an improvement in the quality of its personnel, by an advancement of its Research Department, I could not understand how this same Workers' Union could be said by the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister to be intransigent and then, I heard the facts being slowly revealed, 38.3% at the bottom does not mean 38.3% at the bottom. (ASIDES). Z30 is getting 38.3%, all the others, all the people caught in this, the Key Scale people who we normally talk of as at the bottom, when you hear anybody say the broad masses of people in this country, they mean those kinds of people.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir, the Hon. Member would have to be guilty of some deceit if he suggests that it is unusual for Z30 to get a different increase from Category 1.

I challenge the Hon. Member to find any occasion when the two ever got the same increase because Z30 is a lower scale than Category 1 and attracts a bigger increase.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, he can challenge me until the cows come home. I am not a negotiator, I am a simple, ordinary person who tries to understand what he hears.

The Rt. Hon. Prime Minister makes a Statement, one has a right to believe that his Rt. Hon. Prime Minister is telling the truth.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, this is overdoing it. The scale goes from 38.3% at the bottom to 22.5% at the top. There is no compulsion for anybody, other than at the bottom to get 38.3%, or anybody, other than at the top, to get 22.5%. All scales are drawn on a descending percentage. All.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, he could talk, he could say how far it is going, he could preach like Peter an pray like Paul. Mr. Deputy Speaker, 90% of the people in my Constituency believe that the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister was giving 38.3% to the vast majority of people in Category 1 through whatever it is in here, they believe that, Mr. Deputy Speaker and I believe that in your Constituency, they believe that and his Constituency they believe it, throughout Barbados, they believe that. Now, he comes in here and he is getting up to tell me how, my dear, need I go through.....

SUSPENSION

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not want to interfere with the Hon. Member. I rise on a point of order.

The usual custom of procedure Sir, is that we have certain working periods, we have reached that working period now, Sir and I hate to interrupt the Hon. Member now that he is in his stride.

I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended until 8.00 p.m.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on that Suspension Proposal Sir, the Hon. Member knows that the Standing Orders have been suspended.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir. Are there not Rules of the Honourable House Sir, which say that there should be no debate on dilatory motions being suspended?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am trying to draw to the Hon. Member's attention that there has been no seconder.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to second it, Sir. (ASIDES).

Mr. TAITT: Sir, it is very significant.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. The question is that this Sitting be now suspended until 8.00 p.m.....

Mr. TAITT: I wish to speak on that matter. The Standing Orders have been suspended Sir and that is an ordinary motion put before this Honourable House.

Do not tell me about the Rules.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Standing Orders may have been suspended, but some sense of what is going on in this Honourable Chamber must take priority.

My ruling is that you ought not to be permitted to speak on the motion and that the motion should be put to the vote.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I respect your ruling Sir, and I bow to that ruling, bearing in mind Sir, that I was in the flight of my attack on the Government, when the Order was put.

The question that the Sitting be suspended until 8 p.m., was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

7.00 p.m.

On Resumption

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This Sitting is now resumed. When the Sitting was suspended the hon. member for St. Michael South West was speaking. He has another five minutes.

Mr. TAITT: Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was making the point that throughout the length and breadth of Barbados people accustomed as they are to accepting that the bottom or the broad masses usually include people who I see listed now in the Schedules to the Resolution which this Honourable House is now considering and I must say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that having myself been acquainted with the key scale, I myself have always come to believe and associated the key scale to persons of a certain category.

When we talk about people at the bottom we are not talking about persons who earn a \$1,000 a month and that sort of thing. We are talking about a relatively broad sector of the community. Within the Civil Service all the persons who are considered to be in the low pay category seemed, in my view, Sir, to fall into all the categories we now see attached to this Resolution.

Sir, we believe and indeed the people believe that the 38.3% at the bottom would apply to them but when the time comes and they receive the actual money they will continue as they have done before to judge the Government as being very slippery. They will judge the Government as being a Government which is insensitive and harsh and one which shows not as much humaneness as it ought to show to those persons who we consider to be at the bottom and I am fortified in my view, Sir, that with a little more patience and with an exhibition of what the Prime Minister when he was leading the Opposition has pointed out, that with a little more commitment and willingness which he had spoken about that we would be in here hearing about an Agreement rather than the legislating of wages and salaries for these workers.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, not all that one wishes to say can be said in the time allotted for discussion of a Resolution such as this but I am satisfied in my mind that throughout the length and breadth of this country this debate will continue and persons would come to judge the Government in terms which the Government would not like and it is my belief based on what I hear from day-to-day in all walks of life that that judgment will be expressed when the people go to the polls in December. I believe it is December, Sir. Is it December, 1980 that the Prime Minister will be calling an Election? Whenever he calls the Election we are satisfied that the people will go to the polls and express their disappointment in the manner in which the Government is able now to say the complete opposite. (ASIDES). December, you confirm that December is the date of the Election. The Deputy Prime Minister has confirmed that it is Christmas. I hope that the Prime Minister would remember that it was December 1961 that the people swept them out.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Mr. TAITT: December, 1961 the people of Barbados swept them out and if the Prime Minister is going to call the Election in December, well, we have to flush them out.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let me conclude by saying that I would find it impossible to support this Resolution and I am going to vote against it. I hope that I have been able to give some indication as to the large number of reasons why I find it impossible to support the Resolution.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I have sat and listened to the remarks and the discussions of the proceedings one question comes very much to my mind and that question is, what will be the future role of the Unions in Barbados? One should be aware of the fact, either weekly, monthly or however that these members of Unions pay their dues for a specific purpose that when the occasion does arise they will get the type of representation they expect to get and which they consider they are entitled to get and they also expect the people whom they elected to represent them to deliver the goods.

It seems that a serious pattern is being established in Barbados in relation to people employed by Government. That pattern is that whenever it suits the Government present, past or maybe the future ones, in these matters pertaining to the differences over wages and salaries, it is the prerogative of the Government to legislate. If that becomes a status pattern in Barbados, then it is only natural that members of the Unions representing the working class people may very well be asking themselves whether or not it is worthwhile to continue to subscribe to these Unions. What they could very well do is to sit back and every two or three years

expect the Government to come in and legislate what their wages and salaries should be.

One has to wonder if this is a good thing bearing in mind the great strides that workers in this country and workers all over the World have made particularly in this century if suddenly because of the intransigence of the Government those rights or those privileges, however you care to look at them, have been proved, as the result of great sacrifices, suddenly find themselves destroyed or undermined by a Government.

I cannot feel happy with the situation, either the present one, the past, or the future, if the future does arise. I feel that where we have come to expect negotiations between an employer and employee are something which underline the intrinsic value of the democracy, I feel every step should be taken at all times to ensure that negotiations do continue and that somewhere along the line people are able to give way.

What is also disturbing to me is when one looks at the courses taken by the different Unions who are representing the same group of people, that is people who receive their salaries and wages from the Government Treasury, one is disturbed and must be disturbed that there has been a failure between the Union to reach some understanding or compromise in the way in which they approach this serious and important matter of raising the salaries and wages for employees of Government. The fact that they have failed can only strengthen or encourage the Government to set out to behave in the way that it has behaved, and it should also be an incentive to future Governments to continue in this way if these Unions fail and in fullness of time to appreciate that they are representing a group of people who all draw their salaries from the Government Treasury.

I can only comment as an observer. If one listens carefully one would get good reasons either from the representatives of the Barbados Workers' Union or from the other Unions that this state of affairs has occurred in Barbados today but I seriously believe that any intelligent worker in this country must deprecate that this situation has arisen.

When one looks seriously at the question of what these increases mean to the people in this country I find it very difficult to appreciate that in terms of actual money which will be obtained by these people when you work out their percentages, when the tax deductions and National Insurance premiums are deducted, that the money which is going to go into their pockets will do much for them to meet the challenge brought about by the recent trend of increases in goods and services in this country.

8.10 p.m.

One may feel a bit sympathetic towards the Prime Minister that Barbados is not in a position to determine what should be the ex factory price of certain goods as they come into this country, but at the same time as a representative one has to be sympathetic to the workers to ensure that the actual take home money which they will get after the various deductions have been made will help them to meet the increased prices that have been becoming a constant feature of Barbadian life today. Sardines have jumped from 69 cents to 79 cents, milk has jumped up to 92 cents or 93 cents and you get these types of things which occur regularly in Barbados, and one expects especially for the individual at the bottom that some serious consideration be given to him when these negotiations take place and a final result is achieved.

There are people in Barbados who can boast that they can take themselves regularly to Puerto Rico or Miami and shop there and return home with their goods, so that the problems of having to buy in Barbados do not affect them as greatly as the individual at the bottom who cannot go to these places. I would have preferred that some amicable agreement or settlement would have been reached. Maybe the Government will have good reasons for advancing why they could not wait any longer, but when one reflects on the position taken by the party now in power in 1976, one would believe that they would be the last people in Barbados who would want to come into the House of Assembly and legislate on any matter pertaining to salaries and raises of Government employees. It seems they have flattered to deceive.

Sir, I have been deeply impressed by the figures given by the hon. member for St. Lucy, and I would have to admit that he is in a position to know better than I do as he is a representative of workers in this country and has been indulging in these affairs for a very long time, and in the absence of any serious rebuttal from the Government benches, one would have to agree that his contentions are the ones to follow and accept. If this is the case, one can see a lot of dissatisfaction among the working class people of this country when they actually receive the money as agreed upon in the very near future, because it will then shock them that in spite of the beautiful glad tidings which they had been made to believe had been coming, the actual money received in their hands will do very little in helping them to meet the challenges imposed by the cost of living in this country.

Like the hon. member on this side who spoke before me, I find it difficult to support this measure at this particular time, because of the way in which it has been arrived at, and I may repeat before I sit down that I think it is a bad augury for Barbados if we find ourselves in this situation where Government because of

its numerical strength will find it over and over again necessary to legislate salaries and wages for the people of this country; and I would like to suggest to my honourable colleague here who is also a member of the Barbados Workers' Union that it is high time that they take a serious look at themselves in the light of what is happening in Barbados when negotiations for wages and salaries between Government and the representatives of the workers in this country come to the fore.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would not like the speech of the hon. member to go down without some comment. As I understand the intention of the hon. member about the negotiations concerning the wages in the public service, his comment is that because the Government is an employer and probably the ultimate constitutional authority subject to Parliament in this country, there is no machinery which allows the processes of collective bargaining to take place properly, and although my friend has not put it in that direct manner, I would not like his implied statement to be taken as in any way signifying that this Government does not respect the process of collective bargaining. Indeed these negotiations were spun over several months to the extent where the unions themselves said that there was a necessity for an early resolution of the matters in issue. I think that an objective analysis of the negotiations would show that there has been a great measure of agreement between the Government and the Unions, all unions concerned, except in relation to certain limited categories of workers. There has been agreement between the Government and the National Union of Public Workers who represent over, I believe, 70% or more of the work force in the public service. There has been agreement between the Government and the Barbados Secondary Teachers' Union which represents a significant proportion of workers, and even those categories of workers who are not represented by unions because of existing legislation but by their association have reached almost a total 98% agreement with Government on all points. One cannot interminably spin out negotiations.

If the hon. member is suggesting that where two persons cannot meet and the Government is the ultimate employer so that the Government is not in a position to be an independent arbitrator and he wishes legislation passed to have a separate Arbitration Board, say so; but I understand that the workers do not agree with this. The Barbados Workers' Union does not agree with this approach to the matter of collective bargaining in this country. Either we are going to have the process where eventually you have to say well I can't pay or I can only pay \$X, we go to an arbitrator if you like or you are going to have it by statute; but if the Government came in here and legislated for compulsory arbitration of wages in the public sector, the next criticism we would have is that we are taking away the right of collective bargaining. (Asides). Let us see where we are going. There must be an

end to negotiations at some time and if you are saying there will never be a position where the Government cannot legislate, you are saying then that the Government will have over it the sword of Damocles that it must either give in to any request or get somebody else. My friend says he is not saying that. I want to know what is being said because I really cannot understand what he is saying he is not saying. I would invite the unions to listen very carefully to a part of the Prime Minister's speech which I think was very significant. I am referring to the speech made in here earlier today in which he said quite clearly that the union wanted a percentage overall for the Key Scales.

As far as the Government is concerned, it was not negotiating that percentage, but the Government was prepared to give serious consideration to a claim for reclassification of the Key Scale workers which may well result in the amount of money approximating to roughly what at present looks like the difference between the parties. That is what he said and I listened very carefully, and I believe that if the ultimate pie is what is going to be reached although there is a difference about methods, then obviously this cannot show a Government which is recalcitrant on any of the negotiations. Let us face the fact that there has been two significant things that have happened in the last four years here in relation to labouring sections.

8.20 p.m.

One has been a dramatic fall in unemployment from 22.5% down to 11%. We have more than halved the unemployment, and in the process another significant factor has occurred, we have done this where wages have risen and the real living standards of the population at large, including the working class, have improved. Those are documented facts, I do not mind how partisan the other side wants to be on this issue, and I suppose they have to be partisan in order to win an election, but any person who is going to take the trouble and care to analyse the economic facts of this country must admit that you have had in four years these two significant factors occurring in the economic and employment life of this country, and no amount of misrepresentation is going to change those facts, and I will drive it home, Sir, because you have to repeat it. There are very few countries in the world, including the United Kingdom, where you would have had a fall in unemployment together with the genuine transfer of resources for a real growth in the per capita income spread over a wider distribution sector.

And there is a third factor, Sir, that I have to emphasise, that has occurred. There has been a narrowing in the gap between those at the top and those at the bottom by a series of measures, including fiscal and taxation measures, as well as increase in wages. Let us face

facts, Sir, if you multiply on an annual basis before tax the top of the Civil Service and the bottom, it is a ratio of one to six. There is no other country in Latin America and the Caribbean that has such a low ratio. Let us face it. I hear all the arguments here that we are going to talk about, but in the public sector it is one to six in Barbados, it is one to thirteen in Cuba, and it is one to seventeen or nineteen in the Soviet Union. Let us face these facts, these are factors that people must bear in mind. Why misrepresent the country? What is happening? We have to get it over to people, even if we have to repeat it over a million times, that they have been better served by this Government in four years than they have been served by the Democratic Labour Party in 15, on any standard when you judge it.

The hon. member talked about the quality of life. There is no Bajan woman walking in the streets today who is not looking good in front and behind, let us face it, properly dressed, well groomed. Look at the quality of life. Do you want to hear about the quality of life for the very Casual Workers? It took this Government to fulfil its election Manifesto promise to give them four 'weeks' holiday after five years, a thing that had not been achieved in the quality of live for leisure time. Do you want to hear about the quality of life? That is the quality of life for them in leisure time. We gave them three weeks after one year, which you did not achieve, we turned around and gave them four weeks after five years, and the only change made in the Holiday with Pay Act since 1951 was made when we made it in 1978 here on the floor of the House. We are going to give them more too, Sir, all I am appealing to them to do is to get on with the legislation and let us improve the quality of life in a little way. Let us improve the quality of life by dealing with the Bill that we have circulated to the Unions to deal with unfair dismissal. We have got the Bill ever since, it has been circulated to the Unions, it has been in the possession of the Unions for over a year and a half. There is a Charter of Rights set out in our Manifesto that we are anxious to legislate and we have waited patiently for the comments from the employers and the various workers' organisations on the necessary legislation. This is a fact, Sir.

If the Unions have objections to certain sections, tell us so and let us then sit down and solve them, but we cannot go on interminably saying that the Government is not interested in people at the bottom when we are moving towards legislation to improve their condition and we cannot get any people around a conference table to discuss the legislation. Had I been Minister of Labour I would have brought the legislation in here, I would have given a final time and I would bring it in here. We are very tolerant on these points. You cannot have people being unfairly dismissed and we cannot do anything about it. There may be one or two areas that the Union does not agree with, but the Government is prepared to

be persuaded on the Union's point of view. (ASIDE). It has nothing to do with Don Blackman, the legislation was prepared during the time that the hon. member for St. James was Minister. The legislation was circulated and we are waiting for it. I am only using this to rebut any suggestion that this Government does not want to negotiate with workers or anything of the sort, Sir.

I remember the time when the last Government legislated wages in here. I will say this for the hon. member for St. Lucy. He did not agree with them and he consistently got up in the back and he voted against it then, and the hon. member for St. Michael West. I do not know that my friend, the hon. member for St. Michael North Central on that occasion voted against his Government for legislating wages which were not as favourable as the wages on this occasion. The hon. member is only four years away from that, you know. I am glad to hear that he is convinced now. I wonder if in his Cabinet he told the right hon. member for St. John at the time "if you go down to the House with that piece of legislation, I resign"? (ASIDE) I am not going to ask Mr. Blackman, I know he was in here and that he vote AYE, that is what I know, Sir, so I am not really taking him seriously on this occasion, I am not taking him seriously at all. (ASIDES). When the matter went to the Senate, when the hon. member went to the Senate with the various Resolutions, he introduced them and he voted AYE too. I have to remind the members, it is only four years, you know.

Mr. TAITT: If the hon. member will give way, Sir, on a point of elucidation, the hon. member appears to be saying that I voted AYE in the Senate then and that I voted NO today; but he voted NO over here then and he voted AYE today, Sir. Is that what the hon. member is saying he understands to have happened with me, Sir?
8.30 p.m.

There was no agreement with any of the Unions at that time at all and as I understand it, we are implementing an Agreement with the National Union of Public Workers. There was no Agreement with any of them at all, Sir.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir, the hon. member says that we are legislating the Agreement between the National Union of Public Workers. Why then, does the Addendum on this Resolution say, "with the workers' representatives" Sir.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, the Hon. Member may give way to some points, Sir. I am glad to see, in the absence of the Rt. Hon. Member for St. John, that the Hon. Members are now getting a bit of spunk.

You know what Opposition has done for them, Sir, it has begun to make them feel like real men, that they can disagree with their Rt. Hon. Leader for the first time. Show your position clearly and yet still be in political life. When they used to be over here, each man, if you have an appointment, otherwise you are not in the Party any longer. At least they are learning to do that, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. Could we go back to the Resolution?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Yes, Sir. In my view, Sir, I think that the trend in wages in Barbados, in the future, will move towards the improvement of people at the bottom for the obvious reason that you have to keep a community in which disparity of salaries and wages are very great. But, I also want to make two points, Sir, which I think are critical to this debate and which we are losing sight of.

The first point is this, that the country can only pay more, if the country produces more and its real wealth improves. That is point one. It is a truism, but it is a point which we must never forget and let me say to the Public Sector particularly, as well as, to the Private Sector, that it is of great importance that each wage negotiations should be matched by an increase in productivity, if not equal to the certain percentages, certainly an increase in productivity and we want to see better management techniques, in order to bring out in the workers, the natural ability which they have.

The second point which I want to make as well, Sir, is that we must not believe, in our anxiety, to become a society of levellers, that you do not have to reward on the basis of meritocracy, people with ability and with special qualifications. Even today, in China, in the Soviet Union and in Cuba, it is recognised that you have to reward people with special skills and with special qualifications, and therefore, no matter how you want to be in George Alwell's 1984 and all that, you must recognise that you have to have some relationship between different occupations and different skills and you must be careful in the Public Sector in particular, that we are not squeezing out of the Public Sector, people who can bring an overall improvement in the management of the Public Sector. In this regard, I wish particularly, to take note of what is happening between the private and Public Sector, in relation to the remuneration of the professional classes, particularly, the lawyers. I do not want to stress the point at the moment, but the Public Sector must not lag behind, to the extent that it will get not the first rate, but only the second rate. The Public Sector must be able to attract particularly, people with the best ability and talent at the political level, as well as, all other levels of the life of this country.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as you are fully aware, Sir, I voted for the revised salary of public workers. I am indeed happy to hear from the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, who is also the Hon. Minister of Finance, that he has, under consideration, or that his policy is the regrading of certain employees in the lower bracket.

As you are aware Sir, I have those employees' interest at heart and therefore, I would like to know that an amicable settlement with the Barbados Workers' Union and the Government be made, as soon as possible. While it is true Sir, that we have voted for employers in the top bracket, the middle and those at the bottom, who in the true sense, are called Civil Servants, we have to think about those at the bottom of the ladder, and therefore, I can only suggest to the Government to continue negotiations with the officers of the Barbados Workers' Union and come to some reasonable agreement about those workers.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is those workers who can bring this Island to a standstill. I refer to workers who are employed at the Transport Board, I think about those workers who are employed in the Sanitation Department, I think about those workers who are responsible for keeping the trenches, or gutters clean.

8.40 p.m.

Those are the workers whom we have to depend on. While those in the other brackets may be satisfied with what we have done today, it is my duty to state to this Honourable House that we still have a colossal task to solve. I do not want for one moment to hear that those people in that bracket go on strike because they are indispensable to the functioning of any Government in any country.

It is regrettable that at the present time the Barbados Workers' Union and the Government have not seen eye-to-eye, but with good reasoning and some common-sense I am confident that the problem will be solved. Let us assume that those workers whom the Barbados Workers' Union is responsible for have to be upgraded. I feel that the Prime Minister is big enough to do something tangible for those people. In other words, let me put it my way. I feel that because we have come to an amiable agreement with certain sectors in the public service and we have all agreed or the majority have agreed to the increases which they will get, if the Prime Minister had to go out of his way in trying to satisfy those workers in the lower bracket by giving a bigger percentage, I feel that he would have done an excellent job.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, those workers in the lower bracket have to send their children to school and therefore you can understand in this age when the Minister of Education in no uncertain terms has indicated to this House that his policy is to bring all children on the same

level. Those parents have to think about bus fares. They have to think about lunch and they have to think about the deportment of their children at the various schools.

Fortunately for us and I am very happy to know that there is no discrimination in this country when it comes to education. Regardless of your background, if you have the ability to learn, once you can comprehend certain things you are given the same opportunity as the Governor General's child of this Island. But, Sir, with all of those things you have to think about the workers in the lower bracket who have to pull their pockets to keep their children there when they are given the opportunity to go to some of the leading schools in this Island, namely, Queen's College, Harrison's College and others.

Now this is the time when it is going to prove to the inhabitants of this country the policy of the present Government. I can only suggest to the Prime Minister to go back to the bargaining table with the Barbados Workers' Union who represents the people in that category and try to reason and settle this most ticklish issue.

I want here to remind the hon. members of this House of a Biblical quotation and it is this, "come let us reason together saith the Lord." To come here and to legislate for people in certain categories and to leave people at the bottom of the ladder without full discussions and reasoning with the Barbados Workers' Union can only cause confusion and chaos in this Island.

8.50 p.m.

I have no doubt that the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister with his reasoning and his ability will do everything possible to alleviate what I call a clash and confusion in this country. He has already told us that he is considering regrading certain categories of workers. I can only accept his statement as a fact and with authenticity, and I have no doubt whatsoever having made that statement in this House that he is going to do everything possible to settle this matter. When we consider those people in the lower bracket, we have got to realise that you or I cannot do the manual work which they are expected to do daily, and therefore it makes sense, good reasoning and sound judgment to try and do everything possible to upgrade those people in these categories. Failing to do so we would not be representing the interests of the masses of the country, and it is the masses of this country which have caused people like you and I, Sir, to become members of this House. Let us therefore represent them and do our utmost in some way or other to satisfy them. Failing to do so, I am sure Sir, that we must pay the indemnity.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:—

AYES: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS; Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN; Hon. L. S. CRAIG; Hon. H. deB. FORDE; Hon. L. R. TULL; Hon. C. L. BOLDEN; Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW; Dr. CHELTENHAM; Mr. SISNETT; Mr. WARD; Mr. JOHNSON — 12.

NOES: Mr. TAITT; Mr. GREAVES and Dr. CADDLE — 3.

ABSTENTION: Mr. SANDIFORD — 1.

RESOLUTION TO FIX THE EMOLUMENTS AND
CONDITIONS OF SERVICE OF HEADTEACHERS,
DEPUTY HEADTEACHERS AND THE VARIOUS
CATEGORIES OF TEACHERS IN
SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 12 stands in the name of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister to move the passing of a Resolution to fix the emoluments and conditions of service of Headteachers, Deputy Headteachers and the various categories of Teachers in Secondary Schools with effect from 1st April, 1980.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Barbados Secondary Teachers' Union has agreed with the salaries. I do not know if this will attract an adverse vote from hon. members opposite but they are welcome to divide the House against people's money. I do not mind.

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.

RESOLUTION TO FIX THE RATES OF SALARY AND
ALLOWANCES APPLICABLE TO THE POST OF
PERSONAL ASSISTANT TO THE PRIME MIN-
ISTER, PRESS SECRETARY AND EXECU-
TIVE PERSONAL SECRETARY

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 13 stands in the name of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister to move the passing of a Resolution to fix the rates of salary and allowances applicable to the posts of Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister, Press Secretary and Executive Personal Secretary with effect from 1st April, 1980.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister, the Press Secretary and the Executive Personal Secretary so far as I know have no objections to the new rates.

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.

RESOLUTION TO FIX THE EMOLUMENTS OF
THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 14 stands in the name of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister to move the passing of a Resolution to fix the emoluments of the Governor-General with effect from 1st April, 1980.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the new emoluments for the Governor General have been calculated in accordance with the general principles agreed for public workers.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that.
9.00 p.m.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on numerous occasions I have come in direct contact with the present Governor General of this country, and I want to state here in this Hon. House that I have been very impressed with the manner in which he performs his duties. I want to let this Hon. House know that I consider him as a model for others who are attorneys-at-law to emulate. He is not a snobbish person, he is a man of the people, he is a big man. Only a few days ago he had the opportunity of visiting someone in the parish of St. Philip who attained the age of 100 years and he spent approximately one and a half hours there. Well, you would expect me to be there also, and I was so impressed with his humility, sincerity, honesty of purpose and everything that is good, that I am wondering if Barbados could produce a son of the soil who could perform such duties as he is doing at present. Therefore, when I noticed, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that his allowances will be included in the computing of his pension, I wanted to say how happy I am about that, full stop, but I am going on to say this here now, that while I have appreciated the generosity of the goodwill of the Government in dealing with him, and I appreciate it very much, and I am happy about it, I want to say this, that there is something radically wrong with the computing of legislators' pensions.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member will have a chance to make that point in relation to the Resolution.....

Mr. WEEKES: But we are dealing, Sir, with the allowances of the Governor General which will be included, together with his salary in computing his pension. Consequently I do not think, Sir, subject to

your ruling, that I am treading on the wrong ground, but on the other hand if you....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Proceed.

Mr. WEEKES: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I want to say, Sir, that there is something radically wrong with computing the pensions for legislators who have rendered inestimable service to this country, and I say this with no apology to any person in this Hon. House. If by chance I appear to be insular, parochial or sentimental in my approach, I have no doubt that you are prepared with your training as a barrister to give me a hearing.

What I am saying is this, that I anticipated that the Government would have brought down legislation dealing with pensions for legislators who have to face the electorate of this country and who have to go in the various other streets and implore people to vote for them so as to carry on the work of the Government. The time has come, and I am going to speak quite forcibly, that something should be done for legislators who have to retire and pensions must be computed on the salaries which they received long time ago. I am not comparing legislators with the Governor General, but I am just drawing the matter to the attention of the Government.

9.10 p.m.

It is a fact Sir, that you have certain Legislators who have served in the past and they have paid the extreme penalty for rendering service to the community. Let us therefore, have a new look at the Pension Act for Legislators. While it is true, Sir, that I may be involved in that exercise, I want to say this, to both Sides of the Honourable House, that we need a new Pension Act and it is a waste of time for any person to try to convince me that it takes one hundred years to bring in a new Pension Act for Legislators.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is a fact that when you are in here and you represent the people, you are given all the respect by your constituents and the public in general, but I want to say this, that when you leave here and you have not got anything to hold on to financially, those very people are going to consider you as they consider the ordinary man on the street. They are not going to sympathise with you, there is no honour for you, all they are going to do would be to laugh at you, if your position deteriorates.

I am giving a warning, we do not have all lawyers and doctors in here, we have laymen. The time has come when we are thinking about others. Regardless of what the public may think, let us think too, about people who have rendered yeomen service to this country and do not let us come to the conclusion, oh, it takes time to deal with this Act because it has not taken time to come in

and to say that this and that should be done. I realise with my years' experience, that the only thing which a Government cannot do is to put breath in a man as therefore, if by chance, any person, or any Hon. Member of this Honourable House, might come to the conclusion that I am trying to make out a case, I want to warn them, that the time will come, when they will see that I am on the right course. How can you compute a man's pension, or Legislator's pension, on say, the salary which he received five years ago, when there have been so many changes in this country?

We have got to realise that, in introducing legislation, you are not introducing it because someone belongs to your Party, but you have got to introduce legislation for all Legislators. I hope that the time will come soon, before I leave this Honourable House, when I will be able to agree with the present Government in improving, revising and I may go so far as to say, to scrap the present Pension Act and bring in a new one in this Honourable House of Assembly.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I thank you very much.

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

Order Number 15 was called – To move the passing of the Resolution to approve the Senate and House of Assembly (Remuneration and Allowances of Members) Order.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, first of all, I am saying that there should be an immediate acceptance of the principle that Hon. Members of Parliament, as workers in public affairs, should automatically get an increase when other members of the Public Service get an increase.

I am quoting Sir, an extract from the House of Assembly Debates, Tuesday, 21st November, 1978, page 1582 and then the passage Sir, which is contained in the speech of the Hon. Member for St. Michael South goes on:

"The salaries of members have always been considered as a kind of political football, and I have never been among those who believe that you should discuss certain types of salaries and then other types of salaries and then you suddenly discover that the country is going through financial times and the Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries and members of Parliament must hold strain. I am advancing the view that the salaries of members of Parliament form but an infinitesimal amount of the total wages and salaries in the public service, and that to say that members of Parliament's refusal to take an increase will contribute signifi-

cantly to improvement in the economy is farcical, but politics being what it is, you will always get politics played on this particular matter."

The Hon. Member who was the principal speaker for the Opposition in 1978, also said at pages 1583 and 1584 that he had:

"made one specific proposal that there should be an immediate acceptance by the Government of the principle that members of Parliament, as workers in the area of public affairs should automatically get a pay increase when other public officers do. If that is done all this kicking around the political football would come to an end because whenever circumstances operate for an increase for an Assistant Secretary or Permanent Secretary, the same considerations would apply as far as the political head....."

"Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If the hon. member wants some assurance on that point, the Government can give it."

9.20 p.m.

We do intend that it will be done in the future and I have said so already in here that the Government intends to phase future salary increases for Parliamentarians with other Government officers. Nowhere in the debate has any member of the Democratic Labour Party contradicted that principle.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that and reserve my right to speak, Sir.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have spoken on previous occasions in dealing with increased salaries for legislators and I want to state here tonight that I do not intend to back down from the statement which I have made on other occasions.

Firstly, let me clear the air by stating that increased salaries for legislators have my wholehearted co-operation and support. It is possible and I know that you are very anxious to hear my reason. A few days or approximately two weeks ago I read an article in the *Nation* and in that article the writer feels that this House of Assembly is being dominated by Lawyers. What I did not notice is that he never said Doctors.

What I want to say is that if we do not want to pay a reasonable salary to legislators, the time will come very soon when we will have 24 legislators and if the number is increased, we will have 24 or more legislators as Doctors and Lawyers. Now if you are going to do something to attract not only professionals but others whom I am confident can make a contribution to the upliftment of the

masses and who will represent them well, you must realise that you have got to pay them a reasonable salary.

I am not ashamed to say that as a legislator today in this Honourable House, do you know what is my salary? The public can hear, approximately \$1,200 a month. I dare suppose a Senior Clerk in the Government will receive that salary. Can any person tell me that a legislator with this increase who will receive \$1,200 a month should not be given that?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let us face the realities of life. This is no political issue. When the cost-of-living goes up for one, it goes up for all and fortunately me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not placed in your position but I am sure that on the basis of what is paid in here, you would not have to defend it, but although I am on my way out I want to say this that if we as legislators under-rate ourselves, the public will do that also.

This is an age in which I am sure that you will agree with me, Sir, that a man's salary has a lot to do with his prestige and when you get as Senior Clerk in the Government coming to the conclusion that a legislator is paid \$1,200 a month, a backbencher, and that he receives more than that, it is a fact that he does not have the respect for you which he should have and therefore for any person to expect me to come in here, a poor man, who has been representing the people in Local and Central Government for nearly 40 years who will leave here as a pauper, I repeat a pauper, because it is the consensus of certain people that when you become a legislator, you become rich overnight.

9.30 p.m.

I want to say, Sir, that any person who cherishes such a thought is straying away from the truth. If a legislator comes in here and gets rich overnight, something is radically wrong with that legislator regardless of who he is, Minister, parliamentary secretary or whatever position he holds. If he had come in here for five years or ten years and held ministerial position or be a backbencher and then is a millionaire overnight, something would be radically wrong. I am not referring to certain eminent lawyers who are members of this House and who carry on a wide practice and maybe in some cases can be paid \$50,000, \$75,000 or \$100,000 for a case. You cannot watch those people, but I am speaking in general of members of the House of Assembly.

Now I must repeat what I said not long ago. Mr. Deputy Speaker, when you are a member of this House, you get the policemen to salute you, you get people to be addressing you and "yes, Sir" and "no, Sir" and you get all these niceties as a legislator, but as soon as the people kick you out and you are not in here, you are the same ordinary man to them on the street and therefore if

people resent a legislator being paid, it is a matter entirely for them. If you give yourself an increase and they are ready to kick you out, they are going to kick you out. If you do not give yourself an increase and they are ready to kick you out, they are also going to kick you out. Therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I take great pleasure, and my conscience tells me that as a member of this House I should, in supporting an increase for legislators, and I have no apology to make to any person who thinks that I should not support it. I have supported it in the past and I regained my seat in here, and because I am on my way out I am still going to support it, and I want you to know, Sir, that I have no regret in so doing. This Resolution has my support one hundred per cent.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I must say I also felt a little pride to note the care with which the Hon. Prime Minister has researched my speeches and that he can find comfort, support and solace not only in the elegance of the words, but also in the principles enunciated thereby. He quoted from one of the principles which I enunciated on that occasion and that principle is a very simple one: it was that the Ministers and other political public officers are in the business of public service, albeit public political service and they deal with the same range of matters as the non-political public service by and large, and just as the cost of living goes up for those non-political public officers, it also goes up for those who hold political office, and the principle is a simple one, that all those who are in public office whether political or non-political should be considered for an increase at the time when increases are being considered. That was the principle which I enunciated then and it is a principle which I stand by now.

Just as Martin Luther at that cathedral in Wittenberg said those immortal words "*ipse sto, here I stand*" when he wrote up his theses on the church door heralding the reformation, I say today also, here I stand, and I as my colleague has said will not be veering from that particular principle because it is a principle I believe in and I will be giving my support to this particular Resolution.

However it is a matter of concern to me that I enunciated not one principle on that occasion, but two principles, and that the Prime Minister should somehow or other have suddenly become purblind and forgotten or ignored the fact that I had enunciated a second major principle on that occasion, and I with your indulgence, Mr. Deputy Speaker, will refer to that second principle. It is a little later on in the speech which the Prime Minister quoted, page 1584 of the Debates of 21st November, 1978. I said on that occasion and I quote:

"I am calling Mr. Speaker, for the establishment of a Members' Remuneration and Allowances Review Tribunal which should sit on a continuing basis to

monitor the salaries and allowances of members. I am making that proposal, and that they should take into account the movement in the cost of living, in the retail price index and other considerations; and that this particular body should include some Government officials."

9.40 p.m.

"I am not telling the Government how to compose that body, but I think that as far as possible, however, it should include representatives from both major political parties, if you can get them, and members of the Remuneration and Allowances Review Tribunal which should be set up and from time to time recommend a correspondence between posts in the Public Service and parliamentary posts, and to set out the salaries and general allowances as they relate to performance as far as members are concerned."

I am making that constructive proposal. I made that proposal then and I am reiterating it on this particular occasion because I believe that there is need for such a body to consider this particular matter. I do not think that it is one which should merely be settled, however it is settled or however this has been settled, because we have a somewhat unsatisfactory history when it comes to the matter of dealing with the question of salaries for members. I need say no more about that, I wish to draw the attention of this Hon. House to an inaccuracy in the information that has been circulated to hon. members, because in the search for support in the Addendum to the Resolution there is reference to an undertaking given in the House by the Prime Minister on November 28, 1978 to the hon. member for St. Michael South as principal spokesman for the Opposition on that occasion. I believe that inaccuracy is repeated in two Addenda to two Resolutions before us, Sir, because the only contribution I recall I attempted to make on the 28th November was in respect of a failure on the part of this Hon. House to permit me on that occasion to speak on a matter on which I was entitled to speak, and I left this Chamber. So this is an inaccuracy in here and I hope that those who composed these matters would pay especial attention to these matters.

I saw another one, the member for St. Michael South West drew attention to what was an inaccuracy in the Addendum earlier on, when the Addendum referred to a settlement between the Government and a representative of the workers, which might give the impression that this was a settlement between the Government and the representatives of all the workers. We have got to be very careful that we pay especial concern to a truthful representation of the record, and I do hope that this particular error here in the Addendum would be corrected. It is a matter of grave concern to me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that while Parliament is making provision for.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If the hon. member will give way, Sir, in my speech I did say 21st November, and the date is the 21st November. I have what I was reading from written out and it is quite clear, and I do apologise to hon. members, because the date is wrong, the date is the 21st November. It is of course my speech which is misquoted rather than his.

Mr. SANDIFORD: It is a matter of grave concern to me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that while as a Parliament we may be making provision for ourselves, I see nothing before me at all concerning those members of the staff of Parliament who serve this House so faithful and so well and with dedication. This is a matter of concern to me, that when we are taking into account the whole Public Service and the political service.....

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: On a point of information. The hon. member should know that the members of staff are represented by the Barbados Workers' Union. The Barbados Workers' Union puts proposals to the relevant Committee, the relevant committee in accordance with the usual procedure has sent them to the Establishments Committee — not that we are bound by their advice — and the usual Advisers to the Debates Committee, and my understanding of the position is that we are now in a position to have the views of the Establishments Committee and then we will have our meeting at the earliest date with the Barbados Workers' Union.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I am deeply obliged to the Leader of the House for that point, I am not certain what it was a point of, but whatever the point was I know that.....

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The hon. member very kindly gave way.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Yes, you know I will always give way to you. It is also a matter of deep appreciation, of deep gratitude to learn that the Government pays so great attention to the views of the Barbados Workers' Union and to follow correct procedures. I would not have gathered that from the tone of other discussions and debate that have taken place hitherto, the way in which the Barbados Workers' Union and their positions have been ignored, or by-passed, or how they have been estopped, but we are glad to know that on this particular occasion the procedures are being followed.

In conclusion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would say that on this occasion I do not have to justify my position. My position is quite clear. I said it quite loudly in 1978, and I have said it and repeated it again. I believe, however, it is the Government which may have some explaining to do of its own position, and just as there has been a quotation from a speech of mine on the 21st November, 1978 I will also reciprocate and give

a quotation from the 1976 debates, the date I believe is the 22nd June, 1976, and the page is 6726.
9.50 pm.

The page 6726 and I quote:

"Our Manifesto will contain statements which will show that we have given thought to the problem of reducing the generosity of Members for themselves in the matter of Pension Schemes, reducing the profligacy with which Ministries and the concomitant high salaries have been shared out. Accepting the argument of the Hon. Member for St. Michael North East and reducing, if not abolishing the post of Parliamentary Secretary.

All of this will be found in due course and certainly, no Minister of Finance will be granted any increased salary at any time to any Minister. Ponder upon that and wait for the Manifesto itself. You must understand that no Barbados Labour Party Minister of Finance will be granted any increase in Ministerial or other salaries. Ponder the words carefully, Mr. Speaker. I do not have to say that they will get them in 1978, or that they will not get them in 1978. I do not even have to say that they will never get them.

I stand by the statement which has been made and except, in the purely technical sense, any Government coming from this Side"

This Side was that Side:

"after a General Election, or otherwise will be standing on that principle. We are going to do away altogether with Members sitting down and saying, I want this and finding themselves getting it."

I believe therefore, that it is the Government which will have to explain their present position in the light of statements enunciated then, by the then Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition, now Rt. Hon. Prime Minister and Minister of Finance.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is a little fable which is told about an animal observing the festivities for all the animals in the jungle and he was supposed to be high up in a tree, Sir and somebody looked up at him and said, why are you not participating in all the fun and thing which is going on down there. Sir? He said, "In the cool of the evening when certain things begin, I will be down."

Sir, as I join this debate, I really am waiting for the cool of the evening when the voting begins, then, I will really make my statement. The Rt. Hon. Prime

Minister, in introducing this Resolution, started off by reading the speech found in the Hansard of the Hon. Member for St. Michael South and he describes him, on that occasion, as the principal spokesman for the Opposition. What he means is the first spokesman on the Opposition and I wish to disabuse the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, the public and the Hon. Members on that Side, of the Honourable House, of the belief that when the Hon. Member for St. Michael South spoke on the question of salaries, that he was speaking with the Shadow portfolio enunciating the position of the Democratic Labour Party. He was not the principal spokesman on salaries, he happened to be the first person who spoke and if there is any.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir. Order 30...(ASIDES) of the Rules of the Honourable House makes it quite clear that the Hon. Minister who moves a Government Order, or the Hon. Member of the Opposition speaking first, on behalf of the Opposition are recognised as the principal spokesmen on their respective Sides. They have no limit to their speeches, they have special privileges and the Hon. Member is not in a position to contradict the Rules of the Honourable House.

If a man speaks first, on behalf of the Opposition, in an unlimited speech and is not contradicted, there is no construction of parliamentary practice, or procedure, anywhere in the world which does not make him the principal spokesman.

Mr. TAITT: The Rt. Hon. Prime Minister is not known for his capacity to interpret Law. Do not let him come in here and get up and read a Rule and tell me that he interprets it and therefore, it is interpreted. He, himself, reading out the same Rule says, "on behalf of the Opposition". Mr. Deputy Speaker, I invite you to look at the words, "on behalf of the Opposition". Do not come in here with that foolishness which you can put to the people outside. I do not buy that. I am saying that on the occasion when the Hon. Member for St. Michael South spoke on salaries, he was not speaking for the Opposition, he spoke for himself, as he speaks for himself today. He does not speak for me, nor the Opposition on this question.

Furthermore, there is no doubt — he said that, and I am going to quote — he said that he was not contradicted. I am going to quote from the same document which he quoted from at page 1598, I was speaking Sir and I said:

"Mr. Speaker, the case of the Democratic Labour Party on this question has been eminently put, especially by my two colleagues who spoke just before me."

The two colleagues who spoke just before, as can be found in the document which I am looking at, were the Hon. Member for St. Lucy and the Hon. Member for St. Michael South Central. So, let there be no record going forth that the Hon. Member for St. Michael South spoke for the Opposition, on this issue.

If the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister cannot find a peg on which to hang this abominable assault on the credibility of the people of Barbados, he can come only with what can be described as political chicanery and offer a speech by an Hon. Member.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Hon. Member must withdraw the remarks, "political chicanery".

Mr. TAITT: I withdraw the remarks. If the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister cannot find a peg on which to hang his capacity for misleading the people in this country with his words.....(ASIDES).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You must withdraw those remarks.

Mr. TAITT: I withdraw that, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please continue with your speech.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister cannot find a peg on which to hang an attempt...(ASIDES.) once again to have the people of Barbados accept a position that they believe it to be one thing, when it is something else, if the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister can only find a statement, or principle made by an Hon. Member who stated that he was taking a position on principle, of whom it is known that he has always had a position of principle, if the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister has to use that to justify this action which he is thrusting on the people of Barbados, he is indeed in a bad shape.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the Debate which the Hon. Member who just sat down read at page 6733 of Hansard, they have misquoted the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister because I do not believe that he said this. They have the Rt. Hon. Member, the then Hon. Member for St. Thomas speaking and Mr. Adams, in response to a situation of the then Rt. Hon. Prime Minister went on to say:

"That was a case which as the Prime Minister properly said"

I am quoting at page 6733:

"he was standing in a dispute resting to *alios acta*, a thing between other people".

He then went on to say:

"I will now give him another Latin maxim" and I am going to say, Sir, that I believe that the Reporters did

not understand and they quoted him wrong because they have him saying:

"nemo judex sua in causa".

That cannot be right, I believe that he said:

"nemo judex in causa sua".

and he went on to explain what he meant:

"no man shall be a judge in his own cause."

10.00 p.m.

Let me repeat it *nemo judex in causa sua* which means no man shall be a judge in his own cause. What the Prime Minister and his Government would be on trial for before the public of this community is the inconsistency and the duplicity which showed up in the position which he has taken on one occasion and the position which he took on another occasion and the very slim and flimsy basis on which he seeks to take that position.

He promised the people of Barbados, both from his position as Opposition Leader and subsequently from the Manifesto which he brought to the people of Barbados, that he would not bring Parliamentary salaries for legislation until the situation had been subjected to a permanent Review Commission. We saw.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Hon. Prime Minister is on his feet. He is on a point of order.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If he cares to read from the document which he is pretending to quote from he will discover.....

Mr. TAITT: I object to "pretending to quote", Sir.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: You have it in your hand? You are lying. You do not have the Manifesto in your hand.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Mr. TAITT: He said the document. He did not say the Manifesto. He cannot get up in here and use that sort of language. He said a document and I was quoting from a document.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the hon. member for St. Michael South West would permit me to ask the Prime Minister to withdraw the remarks there would be no problem.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am reminded, Sir, that Groyseur Marks said.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Have you withdrawn the remarks?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I withdraw the remarks. I said I was quoting from the document and this is the document. Groyseur Marks once went into a shop to give a friend a present and it was suggested to him to buy his friend a book and he replied, "why, he already has a book." Well the hon. member pretends to be quoting from the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party. I pointed out that he is not quoting from it and he said "I have it here in my hand". I have a document and I said I am quoting from a document.

Mr. TAITT: I never said that I have the document in my hand, Sir. I never said that I had the Barbados Labour Party Manifesto in my hand.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: He is not quoting from what he says he is quoting from. What he said in the Barbados Labour Party Manifesto is that no salaries will be raised until after a Review by an Independent Commission and no salaries were raised until after a review by an Independent Commission.

Mr. TAITT: The Prime Minister is perfectly right. He should go on treating the people of Barbados that way forever.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Come back to the.....

Mr. TAITT: I am on it, Sir. I am discussing the duplicity which appears to me. It consequently flows out of the debate concerning this issue. I am saying that he has a perfect right to continue giving the people of Barbados that kind of talk. I cannot say double talk but the kind of talk in which he now gets up and tries to give another interpretation of what any ordinary person reading his Manifesto would understand. It is typical of the Prime Minister's methodology. I am saying it over and over again because it needs to be stressed so that when people hear that hon. gentleman speak they would not go off with the first impression they get. He now by practise cannot help people receiving the wrong impressions when he speaks. (ASIDES). I do not want it from you and I do not want it from them and.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please stick to the Debate. Forget the asides.

Mr. TAITT: Yes, that is true. Mr. Deputy Speaker, so that there will not be any kind of hypocrisy, I am inviting the hon. member to put a Clause in this Bill saying that all of us who voted against it cannot get the money, if that would satisfy him, let him so do.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, do I have to put up with this. I would rather him not be sitting over here.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please continue with the debate. I will protect you from hon. members. The hon. member for St. James, please.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order. The hon. member for St. Michael South West is inviting the Government to put a Clause into the Bill stating that any member who votes against this Bill should not draw the money. As I understand it, he is in a position to move the amendment. He can move the amendment. I will support it with you.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please continue with your speech. Order please.

Mr. TAITT: The Hon. Prime Minister from sitting in his seat last Friday said he wondered if he should put it in and I shouted across and said put it in and the last time he said he would put it in and I invited him to put it in and he moved an amendment to change the pension situation so there is nothing to prevent him from doing it, and I want to make it clear.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. Please continue with your speech.

Mr. TAITT: I know it must upset you. I know it.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I know I am not drunk. I promise you I am not drunk.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. Will the hon. member for St. Michael West please continue with his speech.

Mr. TAITT: I am trying to, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. members on the Government benches please be silent. Please continue.

Mr. TAITT: I say it is wicked. It is deceitful.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will you please continue with your speech.

Mr. TAITT: I am continuing. I say it is wicked, deceitful and dishonest for people in the community to be led into thinking (a) when in fact it is (b). Sir, it is unfortunate that the hon. members on that side think that this contamination of....(Asides). A good one too. Is he a Lawyer? Brady boy, a good one too.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will you please continue with your speech.

Mr. TAITT: If, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it must be a case of heckling for heckling, if they want this to turn out into a political mass meeting, Sir, it is alright with me. They cannot heckle me in St. Michael North West.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. member for St. Michael South West please continue.....

Mr. TAITT: Yes, I am saying that the people in St. Michael South West whom I have the honour to represent I am saying that numbers of the people of St. Michael South West told me how dishonest this Government is. They told me this time and time again that they cannot believe a single, solitary word which they hear from the Prime Minister.

10.10 p.m.

The people in South West tell me regularly that when they look at the words coming out of the mouths of people on the front bench in this Honourable House they cannot believe that they are honourable members.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, I submit the hon. member is not entitled to take hearsay and by implication to be defamatory of the characters of other hon. members. The last three statements which he made are so defamatory, and I must ask for a ruling that they be withdrawn.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member must withdraw the remarks.

Mr. TAITT: I withdraw the remarks. The fact is that when this Resolution comes to the vote, I will express my position very eloquently by voting "no". I will vote "no" not because I do not believe....(Interruptions) You will have to protect me from this nonsense, Mr. Deputy Speaker. If I am to speak in this Honourable House, I am entitled to be heard in silence according to the Rules.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will ensure that you are heard in silence. Hon. members must permit the hon. member to be heard in silence. Order please! Please continue with your speech. (Asides)

Mr. TAITT: But I do not sleep with the women in them for them to keep a job.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. member please continue with his speech? Order, please! I must ask hon. members on the Government benches to desist from interrupting the hon. member's speech. Please continue.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the time comes for this Resolution to be voted on, I shall vote "no". In voting "no" on this Resolution I believe I will be expressing the views of the majority of persons in my

constituency. I would also be expressing my own view, and I believe I will be expressing the view of the Democratic Labour Party according to a Resolution passed by the Executive Council of that Party only Monday night. "The Party does not support the granting of increased salaries to parliamentarians and Ministers at this time." The Press release putting that out said in essence, the new Executive Council of the Democratic Labour Party at its first meeting held last night, September, 22, 1980 — I will make it a document of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is it a document?

Mr. TAITT: Yes, Sir. It is a document published by the Democratic Labour Party.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you reading from the document?

Mr. TAITT: Yes, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: And are you going to make it a document of the House?

Mr. TAITT: Yes, Sir. ".....September, 22, 1980 unanimously passed a Resolution expressing its unalterable opposition to the proposed increases or any increases in the remuneration and allowances of Ministers, Parliamentary Secretary and parliamentarians."

Sir, part of the reason for that is very simple. It seems that only in 1978, it seems like only yesteryear that we were in this Honourable Chamber debating Parliamentary salaries. It is not that persons in this Honourable House are not to be given emoluments of some kind. It is not that persons in this Honourable House are not to be given an opportunity to maintain their dignity. That is not the issue at all, Sir, because if that were the issue it could not be that hon. members on the back row on that side and some hon. members on this side could be judged in terms of the quantum as being their worth. It must be recognised therefore, Sir, that the issue of Parliamentary salaries is not necessarily related to the world of the persons who function as parliamentarians. If that were the case it could not be in the quantum.

The point therefore must be that parliamentarians get some other reward, primarily psychic reward by having been chosen by the people in their particular constituencies to come here and represent them. It cannot be denied or contested that persons who are elected members of Parliament in Barbados are raised to very high honour and if we are seen to be merely interested in making ourselves through being judges of our own cause comfortable while others in the society do not believe that they are comfortable, I am saying that precisely the dignity and quality which we have heard spoken about often in this House will disappear as per-

sons come to regard coming to the House of Assembly as nothing more than filling in an application and making application for a job.

Certain scurrilous remarks are being suggested by way of who earns what here. I do not believe that it is in keeping with my own concept of myself to deal with such matters on the floor of this House, but if the hon. member for St. Michael West wishes at any time to have a private preview of whatever emoluments I have got, am getting or will get from Berger B or elsewhere, I will let him see, and I will not even ask to be allowed to know what he is getting from the various and sundry public and quasi public institutions which pay him out of the taxpayers of this country. I am totally disinterested in knowing. The public will be interested in knowing in due course.

It is wrong for us to hide behind a concept relating to dignity while at the same time appearing to the public as if we are people who merely are grabbing at what we can get. The hon. member for Christ Church East made a speech in this Honourable House with which few persons will disagree. He suggested, if I recall correctly, that the whole question of parliamentary salaries should be dealt with in a particular way. No one can disagree with that, and I am putting it to you, Sir, that if the Hon. Prime Minister had indicated to all and sundry that he is removing the question of parliamentary remuneration once and for all outside the dictates of Parliament itself except in so far as reports coming in, that all of us would find ourselves in a position where we have to say "Thank God, that is being removed from the political arena at last"; but it cannot seem right to persons in this community that only last year, because although it was 1978, it seems as if it was only last year that we finally settled the matter, that just because the civil servants get a raise we appear to be getting another raise, and if the civil servants get another raise in two years the Parliamentarians according to the principle must get another raise, and if you follow that to its logical conclusion, it means that *ad infinitum* Parliamentarians will retain a sort of umbilical relationship with the civil servants, and the Prime Minister must know from his experience in the Ministry of Finance that there are times when you may have to give the civil servants because you have to give the civil servants or because you have to meet the Unions, but you cannot necessarily give parliamentarians. Let us be realistic. In the context of how we live compared with how the vast majority of people in this community live, we do not have to get a raise each time the others get a raise. Let everyone assume, as it is their wont to do, that one is not joining or appearing to be joining in conformity, the usual thing is to be disparaging. I wish this Honourable House to know that my affairs are open for scrutiny at any time, and I am suggesting that the point I am putting to this Honourable House bears no relationship to the individual work of the

various people in this House. I would not wish my colleague from St. Philip South or my friend the hon. member for Christ Church East or indeed the hon. member for St. Michael North East to believe that what I am saying is that they are not worth \$2,400. That is not what I am saying. I am saying that the methodology is wrong; I am saying that as Parliamentarians we ought not to put ourselves constantly in the position where we are judged by the public even in terms that may not necessarily be true.

10.20 p.m.

For those reasons, and because I hold my convictions equally as strong as my colleagues on this side who hold opposite views, and as those who hold views over there, Sir, I am saying that here too I take my stand.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I could not let this debate pass without making a contribution in an area which I think is of considerable importance to the entire nation. In 1978 when the debate on parliamentary salaries took place I made a contribution on that occasion and stated very clearly the position as I saw it, and as my colleague for St. Michael South West stated, the position as was taken by the Democratic Labour Party on this issue was stated by myself and the member for St. Michael South Central. On this occasion I find myself in a position where again I have not only to state my position on this matter, but I also have to reiterate the position of the Democratic Labour Party on this particular matter.

The first point I would like to make is that we are particularly concerned, and certainly I am particularly concerned, with the indecent haste with which the Prime Minister has hustled these salaries down to the House of Assembly. There can be no justification, and I have not yet heard any reasonable justification for our discussing here tonight the increase in salaries for the parliamentarians and for Senators, who are also parliamentarians, Ministers, Prime Minister and everybody.

I think that it is a very serious situation which we find ourselves in when there appears to be this mad scramble, to use the words of a member of Parliament from time to time, to put a piece of change in the pockets of parliamentarians, I think that this is bad and I think that one has to be very concerned with the whole question of the leadership in this particular area, and on this occasion in spite of the way in which the Prime Minister has attempted to justify these proposals, I am saying that the decision which the Cabinet, which is Government, has taken on this particular matter lacks any kind of leadership and certainly demonstrates contempt for the people of Barbados.

It would be interesting to have an over view of the entire salaries profile of members of Parliament.

Unfortunately, because of the way in which the legislation is being discussed I cannot, let us say, give an over view of the salaries of the Prime Minister, the Deputy Prime Minister or other Ministers, but certainly we will look at this as time goes by, but I can certainly say it in relation to members of Parliament, and I would like to say that we have a situation where a member of Parliament in a four year period — because this Session started on the 2nd September but it was opened around the 14th October — but elections were held in September 1976, so that we have just gone past, as it were, four years, but we have what I would describe as the ridiculous situation where the salaries plus allowances of members of Parliament being increased by over 100%. As a matter of fact, I think the figure is 104%, but it is more than this if one were to compute the real value of an entertainment allowance, travelling allowance or duty allowance, as the case may be, and try to project....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir, if the hon. member would help me. I am not aware of the period over which these salaries were increased over 100%, and I would be glad if he would help me. Does he mean the total bill has increased by over 100% or the salaries of all members have increased, and if there are any other members besides the Leader of the Opposition who, as far as I know, is the only person whose salary has increased over 100%? I would be glad if he could say, Sir.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am dealing with the total emoluments of members of Parliament. In 1976 a member of Parliament was getting a basic of \$7,200 per annum, in 1980 it is proposed that he goes to \$14,760 per annum. The Prime Minister is or was a mathematician, I believe he can calculate and he should therefore know that that would come to over 100% (ASIDE). As I said, if one were to make a computation of the allowances one would find that it would even be more, because to get allowances which are tax free, and to get it at that particular point, you could do some calculations and certainly you will see that you will have to be earning income in excess of what we are talking about in order to reach that particular point, but the overall fact of the matter is that we have the situation where our salaries have been increased over a four year period by over 100%, and I really think it is a ridiculous situation.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. We are speaking about a seven year period, not a four year period. He is comparing salaries that were fixed in 1973 with salaries that are proposed in 1980. Let him tell us about the cost of living at that time, and so on and so forth.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not want to be contentious on this particular point other than to state what is a fact, but also you would have to bear in

mind that even taking the reference point from 1976, because a number of people who are here now cannot talk of before 1976. The member for Christ Church North Central, the member for St. Michael North East, the member for St. Michael South East, the member for Christ Church East, the member for St. Michael West, you yourself, Mr. Deputy Speaker, were never members before 1976.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir. Is the hon. member therefore saying that if a public officer becomes a public officer a week before a salary revision he should not get the revision because he was not there when the salary was first fixed?

1030 p.m.

Mr. GREAVES: That is totally illogical and indeed irrelevant, because as I am saying, I am looking at what the salary was in 1976 when this Honourable House came into being. In 1976, the salary of an Hon. Member of Parliament was \$7,200.00 per annum. In 1980, the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister is now proposing that that salary be raised to \$14,760.00 per annum, which is over 100%, that is what I am saying and take the Speaker of Parliament. In 1976, the Speaker's basic salary was \$13,200.00 per annum and today, it is today proposed that this be raised to \$38,808.00 per annum. This the kind of thing that we are talking about. The Chairman of Committees, whose basic salary in 1976, was \$9,600.00 per annum, there is now a proposal to raise that to \$25,836.00 per annum, (ASIDES) and we can go down to the allowance for the Speaker and the other Hon. Members. Entertainment Allowance in 1976 was \$1,800, today, it is being proposed that he gets an Entertainment Allowance of \$7,200.00 per annum.

In 1976, from what I can see, there was no Travelling Allowance for the Speaker. We are proposing now that he gets a travelling allowance of \$7,800.00 per annum. That is what the Government is proposing. (ASIDES). I can go on and on, but the fact of the matter is that it seems to me, to be some very serious irregularity in this matter and I do not see how I could, in all sincerity, support this Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Hon. Member is obviously reflecting on the character of the Government Members to suggest that there is an irregularity, Sir. Sir, "irregularity" in the context used, I suggest is unparliamentary.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I did not interpret "irregularity" to mean anything which would be unparliamentary.

Mr. GREAVES: Not only do I consider it to be irregular, I consider that it is wrong, it is wrong and I therefore, as I have said at the beginning will not be able to support this Resolution. As the Hon. Member for St. Michael South West has stated, the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister is free and we are inviting the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister and the Government to introduce the Legislation as indeed, he threatened to do so in 1978, when this was done, when we took a position against it. He can do it now, we are inviting him to do it, to make the necessary legislative arrangements that any Hon. Member who votes against this Resolution, that he could pass the necessary Legislation to ensure that we do not get the increases which are being granted under this. We cannot support this and we are inviting the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister to bring down the necessary Legislation to take care of that. It is as simple as that.

I, certainly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, will not be able to support this Resolution.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is that this Resolution.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sorry Sir, I feel that.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I must, in reply, just deal with a few very small points. First of all....(ASIDES)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: the speech of the Hon. Member for St. Michael South. He did make two proposals in 1978. The reason why his second could not be dealt with, was that there was a very bitter atmosphere at that time, Hon. Members refused to serve on the Select Committee, including the same Hon. Member, and it would not therefore, have been politic to set up any Members' Remuneration and Allowances Review Tribunal. Just then, as I proposed, what he proposed, in relation to a link with the Civil Service, I think that I can tentatively accept the concept, if Hon. Members of the Opposition are willing to co-operate in a permanent Members' Allowance and Review Tribunal and I will tell you why I think that this is important. In these increases which are now before the Honourable House, we have taken for the Hon. Ministers, a little less in taxable and pensionable emoluments in percentage terms, than Senior Civil Servants of Government. At the moment, Hon. Ministers get \$300.00 per month more in their taxable and pensionable emoluments, than the top grade of Permanent Secretary. The new salaries will only be \$230.00 per month more because Civil

Servants' Housing Allowances have been increased by a wider margin than the Hon. Ministers' salaries. Hon. Ministers do not get a Housing Allowance.

Now, that is a significant point to me. It may very well be that some Tribunal is needed to examine the rationale for a top Civil Servant getting a Housing Allowance, but not an Hon. Minister. It may very well be, that if a regrading takes place and a top Civil Servant, or a few top Civil Servants are regraded at levels higher than Hon. Ministers, that there might be some inconvenience. I can imagine that there are ways of dealing with it. It may be to some inconvenience and \$230.00 a month, God knows Sir, is not an excessive amount to take for the difference between an Hon. Minister and Permanent Secretary.

Now, Sir, Hon. Members opposite, some may vote against all the amounts. I do not believe that the public wants an Hon. Minister to be working for \$316.00 a month less, than his Permanent Secretary, if he has a Grade B Permanent Secretary, or \$513.00 less than a Permanent Secretary, in the case of the Hon. Minister of External Affairs. I do not believe that the public wants that. He can vote against it because it may seem to have political clout in it, but nobody can make me believe that if you put it to a group of people, be assured Sir, that if you ask eight people whether we should get an increase, they will all say, no no, we should not get it and if you ask eight people whether we should get paid at all, you will find that four will say that we should not get any money at all, that we should work for free.

So, you can be sure of that. Hon. Members' salaries are unpopular, but Government has made an honest attempt to cease making a political football of Hon. Members' salaries and the Hon. Member for St. Michael South West may be sincere, but he is wrong, when he says that there is not a case for increases of Parliamentarians, certainly of Hon. Ministers, alongside Civil Servants. Hon. Ministers are full-time officials of Government working and nothing else, just as Civil Servants are full-time officials of Governments, and it is intolerable and will not be tolerated by this Government, that you have to go through the same charade of Government putting forward salary proposals, Opposition voting against salary proposals, all but one or two dedicated individuals in the Opposition who from time to time, support the salary proposals because they know that they are right and I include the Hon. Member for St. Michael South in this class and modesty forbids me to mention another one who can also be included in this class, to some extent.

But, it is nonsense that we degrade ourselves that we make hypocrites of ourselves, by going on time after

time, with this foolishness. The proposal of the Hon. Member for St. Michael South that everything is linked together and moves automatically is one which, if accepted by Hon. Members, would go a great distance towards removing the football aspect of Hon. Members' salaries and that is all that we have done.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let me tell you, there is great temptation to take a cowardly line in a lot of things.
10.40 p.m.

If members think it was an easy way and a hard way for the Cabinet to look at this, they cannot honestly believe that the easy way is to carry out the pledge of 1978. They cannot honestly believe that. If hon. members on the other side were in and they had it to deal with I daresay that they would have had no increase but they would have made up for it when they got in afterwards. Well, we do not wish to be such hypocrites and there is some evidence of that view because bearing in mind what the Leader of the Opposition said about salary increases for Parliamentarians just before the 1976 Election they would have made up for it afterwards. We are trying to steer a decent course in this matter, the Judges, the Governor-General, the Permanent Secretaries, the Ministers, the whole lot that go along together.

Now the reason why Mr. Speaker, and the Leader of the Opposition, I was mistaken in saying only the Leader of the Opposition have been given slightly greater increases than others is because the Government is consciously seeking to regrade those two positions. I have privately communicated this to the Leader of the Opposition and he will be aware of it. We cannot do it all one time. (*Asides*). I am not speaking of any confidential communication between the Leader of the Opposition and myself. You may not be able to do it all one time and indeed this is an area where there can be an input from an all Party Committee.

The question of the backbenchers. There is one school of thought that a man should be elected to Parliament and he should know what his salary is for the five years. We really do not accept that. Backbenchers must get an increase just like anybody else. I do not believe that it is correct that if you take the backbenchers' total emoluments you would find that they have been increased by 100% and hon. members will recall that the value of the tax-free allowance is reduced everytime there is a tax concession. The value of the tax-free allowance to a Minister has to be *de facto* reduced by the fact that they will take \$8,000 less income to earn one of those allowances under the new rates.

When you look at that if the hon. member for St. Lucy could realise that if he had calculated it out to the

end he might find that the real value of the allowance is now less than it was when we came into power because when we came into power presumably to earn allowances on top of salaries at a certain level you had to earn \$70,000 a year. You may find that you have to earn \$62,000 now to get the same allowance so the hon. member will find that mathematics will bring down his case not put it up.

In any case, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the cost-of-living has risen something like 120% since the members' salaries were fixed in 1973. I do not believe that anybody should complain if one or two members have an increase near to 100%. We are a long way from 1973, a long long way from there. The Cabinet is managing big business and I am conscious I am using an analogy used by the Leader of the Opposition some time in the past. We are running a \$500 million business over here on this side, a bigger business than any business we have had and I do not believe that it is unreasonable to ask that Ministers get \$4,000 a month for the responsibilities which they have to carry out.

When the Minister of Trade is telephoned by the Bank Manager to ask him if the BMC could have an overdraft, under the present conditions the Bank Manager is working for \$110,000, \$9,000 a month and the Minister is working for \$3,300. That might seem right. That might seem a good idea but I personally believe that my Ministers must be able to look fair and square into the faces of the people they have to deal with in their day-to-day affairs. I personally think very strongly that we must not be always looking up under ourselves and trying to drag down people who have shown a certain dedication and sincerity in Government because apart from one or two bad eggs, they do not smell too good when you break them, Sir, apart from a few of those, over the whole history of Ministerial Government in Barbados we have not had a wicked set of Ministers, over the whole history of Ministerial Government and it is time that we recognise that in a small country it is better served by dedicated Ministers properly paid so that they do not have to be hustling or stealing to keep themselves afloat to keep debt from the door and so on. It does not reflect well on Barbados when a former Minister of Government or a Minister of Government has to be facing the Writ-Server and skipping hither and dither, in and out of the Courts.

The hon. member for St. Philip South, the Allowances and Remuneration Committee, as has been suggested by the hon. member for St. Michael South is just a forum dealing with that. We have reduced member's pension entitlement in that regard. It may very well be that we should improve a member's pension entitlement in other regards. It may very well be.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I regret that there are hon. members whom the exigencies of politics will compel

them to vote in what I very sincerely think is the wrong way on this Bill. They are missing a great chance to protect themselves if they are ever returned to Government as well as members of the Government who have been given the responsibility at the present time.

I very much regret that they will feel that there is some electoral advantage to be gained from voting against the salaries. I can only say that I hope that careful notice has been taken. If there is anybody in Barbados who does not feel that a salary of \$230 more than that of a Senior Civil Servant is a proper salary for a Minister, that person does not deserve a good Government. That is all I would say.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that.
10.50 p.m.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS; Hon. H. B. St. JOHN; Hon. L. S. CRAIG; Hon. H. deB. FORDE; Hon. C. L. BOLDEN; Mr. WARD; Mr. SISNETT; Mr. BRADSHAW; Dr. CHELTENHAM; Mr. JOHNSON; Mr. ODLE and Mr. SANDIFORD – 12.

Noes: Dr. CADDLE, Mr. GREAVES and Mr. TAITT – 3.

THE MINISTERS AND PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES (REMUNERATION AND ALLOWANCES) ORDER, 1980

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 16 stands in the name of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries (Remuneration and Allowances) Order, 1980.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, 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, the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS; Hon. H. B. St. JOHN; Hon. L. S. CRAIG; Hon. H. deB. FORDE; Hon. C. L. BOLDEN; Mr. WARD; Mr. SISNETT; Mr. BRADSHAW; Dr. CHELTENHAM; Mr. JOHNSON; Mr. ODLE and Mr. SANDIFORD – 12.

Noes: Dr. CADDLE, Mr. GREAVES and Mr. TAITT
— 3.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this House be suspended until Friday, 26th September, 1980 at 10 a.m.

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

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, looking at the Order Paper as it appears before us and looking at the amount of business which we have completed, I really would be grateful to the Leader of the House if he could explain the necessity for returning on Friday and hence a suspension. Obviously if there is a return on Friday, it would have to be a suspension; but if he could indicate what business we are likely to be doing, it would assist us in the reorganising of our respective businesses and the business of this Honourable House. I really am seeking information from the Hon. Leader.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: There are three Bills of great importance on the Order Paper, all of which were given notice of before the recess in August to hon. members that the Government regards as matter of urgency. The

Bills relating to acquisition of plantation houseslots by tenants of plantation spots and to the Urban tenancies both of which are part of the programme of Government and are the subject of international commitment by Government we would like to get started. Notice of these Bills was given before the recess. In addition we have a Bill dealing with the correct definition of the Commonwealth of which notice was given, and we have applications for membership to the Commonwealth, and we should have that Bill in accordance with the Commonwealth Law Ministers' Conference tidied up so that we will get that out of the way. These are very important Bills and we expect that there may be some debate, and that is why we have to come back.

We also have two Bills of great importance which have been recommended to us for a long period of time dealing with the subject matter of a question today, and we would like to give notice in respect of that too.

The question that the Sitting be now suspended until Friday, 26th September, 1980, at 10 o'clock, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.
11.00 p.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting is now resumed.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS (RESUMED)

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 4, under Government Business be the instant Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 4.

TENANTRIES FREEHOLD PURCHASE ACT, 1980

Order No. 4 was called - To move the Second Reading of a Bill to provide a right for tenants of lots in certain tenancies to purchase the freehold in those lots; to alter section 16 of the Constitution to assure the constitutionality of that right; and to provide for matters related or incidental thereto.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, the legislation which seeks to have Parliamentary approval this morning, has a long and interesting history. In 1976 when the present administration assumed the duties of governing the country, one of its Manifesto pledges, Sir, was to make sure that the rights of the plantation tenants to live on the plantations be secured and to be given that opportunity to purchase the lots on which they were living for a considerable time. The Ministry of Housing, Mr. Speaker, its duty is not only to build houses, basically it is to upgrade the standard of housing in Barbados and to provide for those persons a better standard of living by way of housing.

I think, Sir, one would have to look at this legislation in the light that it has rather far-reaching ramifications. It has, Mr. Speaker, after so many years of hard-work, toil and sweat, bruises and tears, all from the days of slavery, Sir, when our forefathers worked so hard and received so little. Until this very day persons living on plantation tenancies still do not have that right to purchase the lot of land.

I think it is the wish, Mr. Speaker, of every Barbadian to know that he has his little home which is his little castle, but there are some areas where people are unable to upgrade their standard of living by having proper roads, water and lights, to be able to put that foundation on the land which so many of us refer to as the ground-sill knowing that it is theirs forever and knowing that when that stone is affixed to the chattel that the piece of land on which they live they can safely say it is going to be theirs forever unless they so desire to sell it, Sir.

I think the architects, people like Prescod, O'Neil and Wickham, and even if you examine Busta, the runaway slave who ran to Vineyard to a Mr. Allen, this was the beginning of the social pattern, the turn towards this present century, Sir.

In 1980, the Government therefore set about to guarantee that after so many years of work on the plantation that the very last nail be removed once and for all and to give the Barbadian that real true feeling and true sense of independence. It is with this in mind, Mr. Speaker, that we seek this passage through Parliament. An examination of housing, Mr. Speaker, away back in 1937 which prompted along with other social problems the disturbances during that year, which brought out reports such as the Dean Report, a Committee set up by Sir Grantley Bush to report on the social problems of the Moine Report, Sir, all of these along and with these pressing problems we have lived with over the years.

There is nothing more depressing and disturbing than to have that feeling that when you go to your home on evenings after work, there is some possibility that your landlord can have you evicted and over the years there have been certain bits of legislation brought about to secure and to protect that aspect but we today, Sir, would like to go a step further.

In some areas, Sir, on the plantations it is very, very difficult because of the terrain, for example, to be able to provide roads, water and light so that people would be able to have their water borned system and the Government has demonstrated this, Mr. Speaker, so far in two years. We have demonstrated this by resiting a number of houses from out of the area known as Spring Head in St. James. I think this may be by co-incidence that I happen to be the representative of St. James. It was a very long time, since 1966, a Resolution which I brought into the House at that time to have roads, water and light carried to the people. One can appreciate that to have done that it would have been exceedingly costly so the Government set out to demonstrate that where it is difficult to have such amenities carried to the people, it is best to bring the people to these amenities, Sir.

10.20 a.m.

A team led by a sociologist, Mr. Speaker, from the Housing Planning Unit of the Ministry of Housing set about on its task to seek out and to search out the problems which the tenants living on the plantations had. They held talks with the plantation managers, we have held meetings with the Sugar Producers' Association who are supposed to be the umbrella of the plantations. A team of investigators is still continuing its work on these tenancies. I drew that to the attention of the House so that no one would feel that it is something which the government is thrusting upon the owners of the plantations in a dogmatic manner, and I am happy to report to the House that we have had the fullest cooperation of the plantation managers in this area. They have been rather cooperative; they walk the areas with the investigators and they have even taken it upon themselves to show the rent book in some cases to the sociologist.

When one examines, Mr. Speaker, those social problems and one can have the fullest cooperation of the owners of the land, then I am satisfied that the Government is on the right track both with an owner and tenant who have been able to see eye to eye with the Government.

There are areas, Mr. Speaker, where the Government may have to bring people from one area into another area because of what is referred to as a dying village, one where you may have people at the age of 70 years, and the young, the grands and the children have all left the home and sought their fortunes maybe in other areas because of the depressed areas in which they live. Then there are other tenancies where the young and the old still live together and it is that type of tenancy, as long as it is possible where you can have the infrastructure taken in, that the Government would obviously keep.

The Government, Mr. Speaker, set about to demonstrate in no uncertain terms how this could be done. There are plantations owned by the Government and we have already put into these areas roads, water and light so as to make it possible for the persons to buy the house spots. There are other areas, however, where the land is not yet developed, but the Government obviously when these spots are sold by the plantations to the tenants over a period of time, and I sincerely hope relatively soon, would be in a position to start to put in the necessary infrastructure. We are trying to make this exercise to the purchaser, Mr. Speaker, as cheap as possible and in the meantime with no difficulties to the owner of the plantation as if to say that you are taking his lands away from him.

We have worked this out very carefully, Sir, and as we examine the clauses of the Bill when we come to debate them, one would notice that a house spot on the plantation tenancies where there is no infrastructure yet would cost not less than \$300, and not only is the Government setting out to make sure that the tenants own the land, but in areas where it is possible for financial help, the Government is prepared to make available that sum or sums of money to the tenant for the purpose of purchasing the land. We have looked, Mr. Speaker, at every conceivable aspect of this Bill. The Officers in the Ministry have examined the sociological problems and we are satisfied that it is a step in the right direction, and that we can safely consider this as a revolutionary piece of legislation.

There is another area, however, in the development of other tenancies outside of the plantations. For such tenancies development the Government would be working out a formula whereby the improved tenancies apart from the plantation tenancies can be owned also by the tenants. If you examine, for example, let us say,

Hanschell Land, just to take a tenantry, one would recognise, Mr. Speaker that nearly all the people living in that area find it difficult to have waterborne systems just because they do not own the land, and the whole structure of the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Bill is primarily to guarantee that there is a stake in the land for those people who served so well over the years.
10.30 a.m.

There are, I have no doubt, Sir, a number of legal implications with which the legal luminaries will deal during the passage of this Bill, and since it has always been my approach when I have legislation to introduce to make a relatively short introduction, I will do so on this occasion as well so as to hear what comments other members of Parliament would have to make. I think the principle of the Bill I have tried to put across, and as I have said earlier, the whole idea behind the Bill in keeping with the party's Manifesto pledge, is to provide those persons who worked so hard over so many years the right to purchase the spot on which they now live.

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

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, in rising to second the second reading of this most important piece of social legislation, I should like to thank all those who have finally brought it to the floor of the House. The hon. member who moved the second reading spoke of the year 1980; indeed, this matter has been in train since September 5, 1976.

It is always difficult when revolutionary concepts have to be carried through within a non-revolutionary framework. The idea that persons who have been residents of the plantation tenancies for a long time have special rights, special social privileges arising from the history of slavery and deprivation which have over-riden property rights, has evidently been a very difficult idea for many persons not immediately connected with the particular issue to grasp. The strange thing is that the property owners themselves have not only made no complaint but they joined hand in hand with the Government, as the Minister of Housing has said, in welcoming this opportunity to make some redress, to grasp a new break in life and to lift the rural residents, particularly the plantation tenant, out of the depressed situation which is reflected in so much of our national life.

This Bill has been very dear to my heart, Mr. Speaker. I represent a rural constituency with 20 plantations. It is one of the two or three most agricultural constituencies in Barbados — St. Philip North, I am told, is the most agricultural, I should not think that St. James, St. George and St. John can be far behind

— and we have had some problems in dealing with the application of the simple concept that plantation tenants must be given an option to own the land on which they and their ancestors have lived for generations, the plantation tenants indeed in many cases do not know how many generations. I doubt that the Adamses of Vauxhall, Christ Church from whom I am sprung know that they had no name until 1837. They were known as Samuel, Thomas, Deborah or whatever, and they were given the name Adams because the descendants of Thomas Adams of Adams Castle who had by then become absentee landlords and had gone back to England for many years before still owned the tenantry, and that the basis of their surnames was ownership, but they do know that agricultural work has traditionally been the least regarded occupation in our country. They do know that to live in a plantation tenantry is to live in the least desirable part of Barbados, and it is to deal with the social as much as the physical problems outlined by the Minister of Housing that our party conceived this revolutionary initiative and is taking steps to bring it into operation.

We have had special concepts to deal with. There was debate that stretched over two years on how to price the lots in the tenancies. The first formula that it should be based on the rent was after long discussion described as unfair because there are some tenancies where by one device or another, some devices legal and other devices illegal, the plantations have managed to raise the rents. There are other tenancies in which the plantations have not wished to raise the rents so that the rents remain at the level of a few cents per week, and it was considered that the application of a rent formula would create anomalies that were undesirable. Eventually the concept that we should decide on a fixed price per square foot or square metre — 10 cents per square foot roughly speaking, one dollar per square metre in the Bill — was accepted.

The Government has also taken a decision in principle that since you are fixing the price and the landlord is bound to sell at that price, the Government would have to take some steps to ease burdens on both the landlord and the tenant, both the vendor and the purchaser, in respect of legal costs and surveying fees. The decision which is in the process of being worked out will eventually mean that surveying costs which are normally allowed for in the purchase price will be subsidised by the Government so as to make sure that the people do not just get title, they don't just get a sale but they will get a plot as well. Even in the matter of the sale and the conveyance it has been an absolutely cardinal point of Government policy that the form of transfer should be as simple as possible, and we have accordingly introduced in the Fourth Schedule perhaps the simplest conveyance ever known to Barbados which

even the tenants themselves will be able to fill out if they feel like, and I will say this, I said all along that no lawyer is to get more than \$50 for conveying a piece of land to a plantation tenant, and I am glad to say that the Attorney General, who will be able to fix the fees, considers that \$50 may even within the framework of the Act be actually too much, but I cannot anticipate what fees will be fixed in due course.

10.40 a.m.

I can add nothing to the social aspect of the matter. The speech of the Hon. Minister of Housing and articles in the Advocate newspaper, which I may reveal, are prepared by Officials of the Ministry of Housing, I think explain all that can possibly be explained about the need for social and physical development of the tenancies.

We have had to ride through certain Town Planning concepts. It is all very well for the Town Planners to say that you cannot convey a piece of land, unless it is 2,400 sq. feet, or unless it has certain services, but that would only mean that you either put on landlords, a burden of great expense which would inevitably be transferred to the tenants, or that tenants, in these longest settled parts of Barbados would never get to own the land — under the present Town Planning Regulations — on which their houses stand. We are therefore, exempting this Act from the operation of the Town Planning Act altogether, although the Town Planner still has power, on the representation of the landlord, or other persons, to exclude a particular tenantry from the operation of the Act, in which case, the tenants would have to be resettled on land which they can develop and buy.

But, apart from these social points, I think that something must be said about the Constitutional points. In this country Sir, during the last four years, we have seen opposition to the absolute end, we have seen opposition to a Bill seeking to improve integrity in public life. We have seen opposition to a Bill seeking to put down the possibility of corruption in public life. We now have a Bill which, in my foolish way Sir, I would really have thought, it was almost impossible to oppose, if property owners themselves, the plantations are in support of the Bill, its provisions, its pricing formula and its purposes, I would really have thought that it would be difficult, in Barbados, to find any means of trying to drag the Government down over this Bill. Yet, we have the Hon. Member for St. Michael South West twisting the words of the Bill to suit his own purpose and I use that phrase deliberately because I observe that on the front page of the Advocate newspaper, an irrelevant comment by him, as to how competent I am at twisting words and I sincerely hope that the reporter, responsible for that will note that I say that the Hon. Member for St. Michael South West twisted the words of the Section dealing with the Constitution in this Bill, in order to suit the purposes of the Opposition.

We have a comment that we are altering the Constitution, that people's rights are going to be affected and that this Bill is somehow a threat too to general liberties in Barbados. I see that, in a case where angels have rushed in because fools have trodden, that even so sensible and decent a man, as Dr. Leonard Shorey has produced one of the articles in the *Advocate* newspaper querying the entire structure of the constitutionalisation of the Bill. The only advice which I would give, in that regard, is that persons who are not lawyers should be extremely careful about grasping at an interpretation of legal expression with which they are not trained to deal.

Now, the first time that I ever saw the expression relating to altering the Constitution, to the extent necessary, to give validity to this Bill, was in a Bill which we brought down to change the form of payment of pensions of expatriate, former Civil Servants. Now, there was no shout then and yet, one could reasonably argue, if this principle applies, that you were striking at the whole basis of Public Servants' Pensions because the reason why there is a Clause in the Constitution entrenched for the purpose of protecting Pension is to stop Governments taking away Pensions of Public Servants, unless they are prepared to deal with it, in a way which the Constitution allows. There are several thousand Public Servant Pensioners in Barbados, including Mr. Gladstone Holder, who made no protest at the time, who if the arguments that the Constitution is being altered are correct would have their pensions put at risk, but nobody has protested and their pensions, of course, are not at risk, nor are property rights generally, of this Bill, nor are all rights enshrined in Section Two of the Constitution, which we have to deal with today also, in order to amend the definition of Commonwealth because the definition of Commonwealth is contained in an entrenched Clause of the Constitution and to change it, you have to have a form of words, similar to this.

Now, when I first saw these words, I queried them, so it is not only non-lawyers who should be careful, it is also lawyers because many lawyers, on seeing these words, not being familiar perhaps, with Constitutional Amendment practice, in the last few years, might not understand that this is a form which is used to effect what is called non-textual modification of the Constitution. There are different ways of passing an Act which might be, I am not saying would be, in breach of the Provision of the Constitution through Parliaments where there is a written Constitution.

It is possible Mr. Speaker, to carry out a physical Amendment of the Constitution and include in the Constitution, "this Section shall not apply to" and set out the Act. But, this is regarded in Constitutional, legal circles, as an unnecessary engraving upon the text of what is after all, the sacred instrument of Government.

It is unnecessary because Constitutions should not be about individual Acts, Constitutions are about principles and policies and therefore, the Constitutional lawyers have devised a form of words, the form of words being, "The Constitution is altered by this Act, to any extent necessary to ensure the constitutionality of this Act," which is inserted in the individual Bills which are passed by the constitutional majority, to make them constitutional and to satisfy the requirements elsewhere, in the Constitution, that no Bill shall amend the Constitution, by necessary implication, but it shall amend the Constitution, only if so stated, in explicit terms.
10.50 a.m.

The headline in the *Advocate* Newspaper this morning "Bill to Amend Constitution before House" is wrong. It is wrong. We are not amending the Constitution today. We are not even, although the word is there, altering the Constitution today. What we are doing is altering the Constitution to any extent necessary to protect this Act. That is what is contained in the Act and the whole sentence has a meaning and must be given a meaning.

The alteration of the Constitution applies not to the text of the Constitution and that is why you say alter. The alteration of the Constitution applies to the application of the Constitution of this Bill. That is absolutely all that this Bill means. It is all the Pensions Bill mean and it is all that the Bill dealing with the Definition of the Commonwealth will mean and it is time that the Opposition and those who believe that there is some validity in the arguments of the members of the Opposition as long as they are attacking the Government on points like these, it is time that the public, members and people who should know better give a little credit to the Barbados Labour Party for its upholding of constitutional matters, its unswerving belief in the rights of the citizens, a belief which has been well demonstrated by our voted record in Opposition and by our record in Government.

We cannot, Mr. Speaker, go on dealing with the kind of irresponsibility that was demonstrated when the hon. member for St. Michael South West questioned this Bill on its introduction into the House and very generally afterwards in the lobbies and elsewhere and said that he did not believe in it. With all the knowledge that he got six weeks out of Law School he is going to stand against constitutional experts in and out of Barbados who have devised the means of passing Bills socially or otherwise desirable but apparently touching upon constitutional provisions without actually amending the Constitution.

The whole point of the form of words is not to amend the Constitution. The whole point is that you do not have to touch the Constitution if you use this

form of words. I imagine that the Opposition wishes to take away from the Barbados Labour Party the rightful praise and appreciation which it will get from the many thousands of plantation tenants throughout the country and not all plantation tenants are in rural areas either.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the tenants at Belle Gully, at Waterford or at Wildey are any longer seriously engaged in the practice of agriculture but they are sitting on lots in plantation tenancies which have become urbanised. Their ancestors contributed the same labour of the land as did the ancestors of persons in Walkes Spring and Dunscombe in St. Thomas and they are entitled to the same privileges that are recited in the First Schedule to the Act among the tenancies which will be caught by this Act.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Government has obtained a careful thought-out legal opinion from experts available to it, not Barbadians, as it happens, and if any hon. member wishes to see the opinion, I will be glad to let him have it. I believe it is intended to publish the opinion, if the Newspapers will do the Government the courtesy of publishing the facts and the truth and not merely the impressions created by the hon. member for St. Michael South West and by Dr. Leonard Shorey.

The end of the Opinion, if hon. members do not mind my reading from it – I think it will be of assistance to all of us and to those who read the Official Gazette will see it in print:-

“This alteration or modification is a “non-textual” modification. That is to say, the actual text of Section 16 of the Constitution is not to be amended but merely over-written for the purposes of the special circumstances of the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Bill, 1980.

Again, Clause 36 does not constitute an alteration of Section 16 for all purposes but only for the purposes of “this Act.”

The Tenancies Freehold Purchase Bill, 1980, when enacted cannot be considered ordinary law since it was passed by the special requirement of the Constitution, that is to say, in the manner and form prescribed therein.”

If I may just interpolate, Sir, I think that the writer of the Opinion is anticipating the decision of the House and I hope that all hon. members will forgive him for that presumption but the Opinion is intended to see the light of day after the vote. To continue with the Opinion –

“The Tenancies Freehold Purchase Bill, 1980, when enacted would evidence the fact that the constitutional restrictions on the supremacy of Parliament in Barbados are workable and constitute an

effective check on the erosion of fundamental rights by ordinary law for if such restraints did not exist, there would be no need to enact the legislation by a special procedure. Ordinary law would have sufficed.”

In other words, Sir, the Opinion is praising the fact that the Government is respecting the Constitution and exercising within the framework of the Constitution itself the powers which the Constitution gives to Parliament to deal with certain things in a particular way. Those Parts of the Act are not an erosion of the fundamental rights to the Constitution. They consist of an expression of respect for those fundamental rights.

Some say that we should have let the Act go as it is and therefore we must let the Act go as it is, start working. The Sugar Producers' Association which represents the plantations agree with it and then at some stage, some tenant gets his title and some maverick of a landlord decides for whatever reason he may care to bring that he is going to obstruct the Government's will.

Do you think that I believe, Sir, that those who own Pickerings Estate in St. Lucy, Turner's Hall Estate in St. Andrew and who have an interest in The Thickett in St. Philip would hesitate to embarrass the Government with a Bill such as this? I would prefer to see somebody ask how many people on the Opposition bench have an interest in a plantation tenantry rather than see poor Dr. Shorey being dragged into an argument which for all his erudition and learning is above his head. He is not legally trained.

11.00 a.m.

If people want to get down to a certain level, it is time that they understand that motives can be questioned on all sides in matters such as this. I challenge the Opposition if they think we are doing something wrong to vote against plantation tenants getting their land after 350 years. I challenge them to cast a vote which will effectively be a vote against the whole scheme of the Bill. If it is their privilege, let them put their votes where their twisted words have lain.

✓ Mr. Speaker, I have represented a rural constituency for fourteen going on into fifteen years now. I know the demands of the people to build proper houses. I know that people want to be able to bring the convenience from out in the yard inside the paling inside the house. I know that they want to have a proper road to a proper house where they can live in comfort, where they can build for the future. Both political parties in this country and the Barbados Workers' Union have all fought over the years and all supported the rights of sugar workers, plantation workers to better pay, and we have a situation where I imagine that our sugar workers are still the best paid certainly in the developing world, but we need to

give them an opportunity to be able to put that pay into the most productive investment recognised by a Barbadian, a house and land of his own where he can put down his roots. This Bill will give Barbadians that opportunity, and it is disgraceful that the noble purposes of this Bill should have been compromised by fatuous opposition, destructive opposition, opposition that does not know how to build up, knows only how to tear down, opposition which seeks to drag this country down so that in the resultant disorder a lot of unscrupulous people can gain power once again for their own personal ends.

Mr. Speaker, I have the greatest pleasure in begging to second the motion that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. M. C. C. WARD: Mr. Speaker, there is a strange thing about the human race that in every generation they are always marked by complaining. They never seem interested in looking back to see the history that has brought the world or the country wherein they live to the present state and condition it is. You will experience it in your home with your children; I experience it and many people do. Today this piece of legislation which is before Parliament is a debt being paid to generations by the society, both as Government has insisted upon the present owners of the plantations as well as the Government taking a share in making sure that people will be able to own land that their ancestors have worked and laboured on and which they so justly deserve. I do not believe there is a single piece of legislation that has been in Parliament since I have been honoured to be a member of Parliament that I am taking so much delight in taking part in as this piece of legislation today. One Boxill got up somewhere and said the Prime Minister was fooling the people because you could not even graze a goat on the land, it had no soil. Only a billy-goat would make such a remark. Here is the Government making arrangements, passing legislation that everything orderly may be conducted where the people who have worked on agricultural land in Barbados and their ancestors for many years can now own a piece of land to call their own, and he is saying that you cannot graze an animal on the land. That means he is saying that it has a rocky surface which is ideal for construction. In other words, if a poor person bought land and had to spend several thousand dollars to build a foundation in mould, it would cost them a fortune, but under the legislation the land that the people will buy in the main is land that the plantation does not use because it is not arable land and the owners could easily erect a stone building on it, and we are being criticised for that. I could not imagine a man with any kind of intelligence criticising the Government for trying to sell land where the owners would easily be able to construct a building on.

The important thing about that Mr. Speaker, is that the Government is taking their fair share in providing this land for the people. As I understand it, where roads have to be run in, the Government will be running in the roads and water supply, and making sure that other utilities are run in. On the other hand, the plantation will not be able to profiteer on the people, but will have to sell the land at a reasonable price. This is the most progressive legislation. Every human being is entitled to own a piece of land in the country where he lives. In other words, Mr. Speaker, you know and I know about chattel houses. If you are on rented land and you have repairs to do, you again have to do them in board because you do not know if you have to move at any time. When a man owns the land where his house is and he has repairs to do, he can do it in stone and it can be left from one generation to another that the termites cannot get at it. This is very simple nuts and bolts talk, but it is the type of language that the people out there understand. When they need a loan to send their child to some special courses or for medical attention, they do not have to run about to M.P.s to back notes; they will be able to take the documents, their conveyance and their titles to a bank, and do not have to bow and say good morning, Sir, can I possibly get the loan from you or would you back the note. They can go to the bank manager and say here are my papers, I want a thousand dollars. They are men in their own rights.

Mr. SPEAKER: They have their own collateral.

Mr. WARD: They would have their own collateral. They would be men in their own rights. This is progressive legislation. I am not surprised that the Opposition are in a certain amount of confusion and are perturbed about it. This is devastating legislation for an Opposition. This is the type of legislation no Opposition wants to hear about. This makes a man a man in this country and, it is long overdue. What the Opposition must be saying now is that they are sorry they did not get it in before. The hon. member for St. John said during the last Budget Speech that it was an election budget, but he did not know that the election was not this year; the election is next year and it is going to affect next year's election; so he was correct in saying it because the implementation of this legislation is fantastic.

I have the honour to represent an area of agricultural workers in Lower Greys and Boarded Hall, and I am calling the names for very good reasons, and I have already gone and told the people not to move their houses but to keep them where they are because if you move, you will lose the right to buy the land. Another interesting thing about the whole thing, Mr. Speaker, is that the plantation owners in this day and age realise that they cannot oppose this because every human being has the right to own a piece of land just as the

plantation owner has his house and the worker is entitled to his portion of land in nearby districts.

11.10 a.m.

Although many of these people living on this land now may not still be in agriculture, their ancestors have worked on plantations and earned them the right to buy this land.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I did not grasp all the Prime Minister said in regard to the area of land, but I would like to draw attention to something in regard to tenantry land generally, not plantation tenantry land, tenantry land which this may affect as well. From the time I was a boy going to school I have been going through Hanschell Land at Eagle Hall, and you must have heard the proverb, where the irresistible force meets the immovable object, but two sets of legislation in Barbados prohibited the land referred to as Hanschell Land from being sold. There are willing purchasers and willing sellers, but because the lots of land did not apply with Town and Country Planning legislation they would not pass them, because some are 1800 square feet and 2000 square feet, so on the one hand the owner could not move the people and on the second hand he would not sell them the land, so in other words this would have gone on for the next 200 years and people would still be living on the land, living in board houses, because they would not own the land where they could put down permanent structures, and I am hoping that during the winding up of this debate either the Minister of Housing or someone else will clarify this point, because Hanschell Land is a disgrace.

It is in the major part of St. Michael, I have said basically speaking the roads are quite well laid out as far as could be expected, but the roads are in terrible condition and the people want to buy, and they want to build, and we are insisting upon a code of rules which prohibit these people from buying, and I am hoping that this will be clarified so that the people in Hanschell Land will be able to buy their land.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, I have great pride in taking part in this debate, I am proud to think that I own the house I live in, and I know how I feel when I do anything with my house, I am doing it with my own property and I feel proud to think that my Government is making it possible for every small householder in this country to own the land where his house is.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I listened very patiently to the fulminations of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister against the Opposition when no member of the Opposition has spoken on this Bill. I don't think that in a serious debating Chamber that we should come in here to answer statements made on public platforms or mis-reportings which we see in the Press from time to time. We

come in here to state the merits or demerits of the particular issue and to put the case for the Government and the objections, if there are objections, which the Opposition may have to all or any of the aspects of any measure which we are discussing.

I must apologise for entering the debate late, it was due to a misunderstanding as to the time at which the House was convening, Sir, and none of the other members apparently were aware or remembered that the sitting was suspended until 10.00 a.m., but I was privileged to hear the Prime Minister say words to the effect that the initiative was one of the most far-reaching — I am going to paraphrase what he said because I am trying to find it in my notes — and revolutionary bit of social legislation which has been brought to the floor of this House.

Way back in 1961 in the Manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party it was stated quite clearly and specifically that it was the intention of that party, or this party to which I still belong, to take over the plantation tenancies and to make the people who lived in the plantation tenancies owners of the lots of land which they were renting from the respective plantations. That is contained in a written document. It was not contained in the document of any other political party prior to that time, and I cannot remember whether it was in the Manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party of 1956, because I do not have a copy, but it certainly was in the Manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party in 1961.

In 1962–63 the Ministry of Agriculture, in pursuance of the avowed declaration of the Democratic Labour Party, instituted a comprehensive survey of the plantation tenancies in Barbados, Mr. James Cookston King was at that time the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Agriculture, and the result of that survey disclosed that there were some 4,900 acres of plantation lands which had been rented out in tenancies. I wish to make my definitions clear. The 4,900 approximately — it could have been 4,980, I cannot remember the precise amount, but 4,900 and it was not quite 5,000 acres — the 4,900 acres were of varying size lots, some was agricultural land and some of the land could be described as what we call in Barbados house spots. Some of these plantation tenancies, like Kendal in St. John, were well laid out tenancies with services available, and other plantation tenancies like Springhead in St. Thomas, St. Andrew, St. James border, but mostly in the St. James area, were almost inaccessible and had no services whatsoever.

The history of the matter is that the matter was then referred to a committee to see how best these properties could be transferred — ownership of both the agricultural land which I admit in most cases would have

been marginal agricultural land, and the spots on which the dwellinghouses were — could be legally transferred to the existing tenants, whether these tenants were still working on plantations or had gone into other areas merely to seek gainful employment outside of the plantations.

We are dealing with the time frame that with an election in 1961 December, a survey carried out between 1962 and 1963, a very comprehensive survey, a copy of that report I do not have unfortunately, but I remember many of the outstanding recommendations and details to that report carried out by Mr. King. Some time late in 1964 as a result of some of the difficulties of the time that it would take to implement the policy of the then Government, the Democratic Labour Party Government, and because of certain dislocations which were taking place right in the metropolitan area here in Bridgetown, we introduced a Bill to deal with the settling of the persons who lived in tenancies, not only plantation tenancies but all tenancies, and this was the Tenancies (Development and Control) Bill of 1965, and this Bill was debated during the month of I believe July, 1965 and passed in that year.

11.20 a.m.

I am reading Sir, from a report in the Advocate newspaper — with your indulgence Sir, I will read very briefly — of June 23, 1965. This is what was stated Sir:

"The Barbados Government has its eye on the problem of"

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it that you are complaining to the Chair against the Report in the newspaper?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am not complaining against the Report.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Standing Orders of this Honourable House do not permit what you are now undertaking.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not quite understand Sir, I understand that there is a Standing Order which says that Hon. Members may not read while they are in their places, but during the course of a Debate, one may read from any relevant document and one can also say that one intends to make it a document of the Honourable House, which I intend to do, Sir and thereby, I will be complying with the Rules. I am quite willing to make it a document of the Honourable House.

"The Barbados Government has its eye on the problem of substandard tenancies and plans in the future for re-development, but in financial

co-operation with the owners of the tenancies and the Government also plans Legislation to make the 4,900 acres of plantation tenancies available to tenants, whether they work on plantations, or not. This was revealed by the Premier, the Honourable Errol Barrow yesterday at the House after more than six hours' debate adjourned consideration of the controversial Bill to provide for the control and development of tenancies.

Mr. Barrow, in whose name the Bill stood spoke for nearly two hours. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Ernest Mottley supported the Bill but said that it cut both ways in favour and out of favour of tenants. Others taking part in the debate were Mr. W. R. Crawford, Mr. J. W. Corbin, Mr. Freddie Miller and Mr. Lloyd Smith.

Mr. Barrow told the House that the burden on the Barbados Housing Authority had become intolerable. The Authority had become the first and last resort for people wanting to own something, more permanent and substantial for themselves and for ejective and tenants. The Premier was at that time speaking on his much discussed Bill to provide for the control and development of tenancies.

After giving a brief history of the Island's iniquitous plantation system on lands to which they never got any legal status, Mr. Barrow said, 'we regard this Bill as the most important piece of social Legislation to be enacted in the past 100 years'."

Then, it went on to say what the Bill sought to do, which I do not want to go into at this stage, but the urgency of the Bill was outlined later on, when it was disclosed, the Premier disclosed that there were cases where tenants has petitioned the Government and that every Member around the table had received petitions, where they were being ejected, Hinds Land, Cave Hill, 24 cases; Collins Land, Black Rock, 44 cases; Dodson Land, Black Rock, 28 cases; Harmony Hall, 131 cases; Parish Land, Barbarees Hill, 60 cases; Thomas Gap, 21 cases; Burke's Land, 18 cases; Constitution Road, 18 cases; Ellis Land 7 cases; Weymouth, 9 cases. I would not worry to go on reading the document Sir, I will send it to the Clerk, in due course.

The background to that Act of 1965 Sir, was to quiet the tenants in occupations of their land. You will be aware, Mr. Speaker, that at that time you could give a tenant who was not an agricultural tenant, as little as one week's notice — particularly in cases — this was done where the tenants no longer worked on the plantations and although it is true that we had repealed the Located Labourers Act — a former Hon. Member for St. Thomas, the late Dr. Hugh Gordon Sylvester

Cummins was largely responsible for having that iniquitous piece of Legislation repealed — people were still being ejected and here these cases were actually before the High Court at the time. What the Government did at that time, not only froze the tenants and quieted them in the occupation of their lands, which they were renting from the plantations and many tenancies, for that matter, not only plantation tenancies, but also froze the rents, at the level which existed at that time and those rents have been frozen at that level in 99.9% of the cases, up to today because the procedure whereby rents could be increased was so involved, that most landlords did not consider it feasible to go to the court to ask for increases of rent because they would have had to carry out various improvements and so on.

At the same time, the Government carried out a programme, realising that the rents which the landlords were in most cases receiving, were not economic rents, the Government being at that time, concerned about the people, carried out a systematic programme for electrification and improvement of the roads in tenancies where we got the land owners' consent to carry out these improvements. So that, the people who were in tenancies which were reasonably accessible, did not have to endure the primitive conditions without any public utilities, or conveniences of modern life.

The Government stepped in and carried out a programme, in a reasonably short time, for the improvement of these facilities in those areas. Between 1965 and 1976 Sir, the next thing which was done was that a special Committee was set up to try to devise legal ways and means in which the avowed policy and declared policy of the Government to transfer the Titles of these lands, bearing in mind, the requirement of proper planning and the need to have settled communities and not merely give people spots of land, as the expression goes. Bearing in mind these different factors, a Committee was set up between 1972 and 1973.

One of the main difficulties, Mr. Speaker, was the problem of getting surveys done because of a shortage of qualified surveyors in this country. The Government started with the Housing Authority — later the National Housing Corporation — estates and commissioned the Surveyors' Association as a Body and required them to start working immediately, in order that those people who had been living on the Housing Authority lands, in single units and semidetached units, other than high rise, I do not remember what they call them, those reserved for people who did not want to purchase their houses, in order that this transfer could be effected.

Many people in the housing areas today, have paid up entirely for their house, but because up to today, as the Hon. Member for Christ Church South Central, the Deputy Prime Minister has adverted — we cannot up to,

today, I believe he has not succeeded, although he said that he does not understand why it could not be done.
11.30 a.m.

People have paid off entirely for their houses. Under the policy which was initiated by the Government over which I had the honour to preside as Chairman in the Cabinet, paid off entirely and have not had to pay any rents since but they have not got their conveyances because of the problems which we encountered, not so much legal problems but problems in carrying out our surveys even where the land was Government land.

Now, if the Surveyors' Association as a body could not or did not carry out the function which was allocated to them on Government owned lands, you can imagine the problem then with tackling those plantation tenancies. The only reason why the declaration in our Manifesto of 1961 was not implemented was the problem of getting action from the surveyors and I make a prediction that that is still going to be an almost insurmountable problem unless we are going to recruit a large calibre of highly qualified people from outside to come in and assist us on this exercise which will have the fullest support of the members on this side. Why should the people on this side of the House oppose a policy which was started and partially implemented by us? That is only a lot of drum-beating which I hear going on on the other side, of beating a drum, beating a drum, because the record is there. I could go on now and vote.

Now, do not let us pass it over quickly because elections will come and elections will go and I doubt that 200 people would have had conveyances, even if the elections were not until December next year. I doubt, except in very rare, rare cases it would be possible to transfer a title in these plantation tenancies as easily as some people are being led to believe by the propaganda which is emanating from the other side. It is not an easy job.

Unfortunately in Barbados the history of the land tenure system is not a straightforward one. We have never had registered land in this island. When people worked on a plantation they would say, my girl is growing up and she is getting married or the boy is ready to come to work on the plantation and he would like his own house spot and the Plantation Manager would tell him put it below or above Mary Jane.

You know in your own constituency that there is sometimes some very difficult terrain when you go down to Indian Ground, Boscobel, The Baltic and those places, that there is no plantation owner going down there with a neon-light with any surveyor saying we must have a neat parcel of land here for James Brown

who is coming to work on the plantation to put his house. The plantation owner says, put your house below or above somebody and pay me 12 cents a week. That is how it was done and this is how the big problem now is going to confront anybody who tries to implement the provisions of this Bill. That is the big problem.

That is the first problem because no Barbadian once he pays his money and he says that he has the freehold absolute in possession of the legal estate in the land is going to accept any striggy line on a piece of paper. He wants a proper plot and sale and the conveyance, of course, can conform with the provisions of this Act but the point is getting the plot.

I would suggest, Sir, that those members who have not been to the parish of St. George to a plantation called Drax Hall, pay a visit up there. Drax Hall Plantation is the oldest sugar plantation in Barbados. It is the oldest one as far as I can remember. It is mentioned in the Schedule to this Bill. Now, you have Drax Hall proper. You have Drax Hall Hope. You have Drax Hall Woods. You have Drax Hall Jump. Let me take you to Drax Hall Jump or Drax Hall Woods. There are 257 acres of plantation tenancies of grub land in Drax Hall. Drax Hall is over 1,000 acres. There is no main road after you swing off the road going to Ellerton in any part of Drax Hall except to the plantation houses which are about 150 yards from the main road and after that you are on what the country people used to call, a white road, so you go to the Jump, or you go to the Hope or you go to the Woods and scattered like pepper seeds in the horizon are houses all over the place. When somebody stops speaking to somebody down there they move up to the top of the hill.

There are no proper roads. There are about three main arterial white roads in Drax Hall. Some overlook French's. Some overlook Brighton. Now, you can go in there and say, well, I am going to give you 300 sq. ft. of land but the people have not defined any boundaries for themselves. Disputes are likely to arise between how far this person was occupying and the other person was occupying.

I was taken up there by Mr. Drax and his estate agent when we were discussing the taking over of Drax Hall, a few years ago, about 6 or 7 years ago and one gentleman went and built a church right in the middle of the road out of stone. His idea was that you could walk around the Church but it was most inconvenient. I would not want to call the gentleman's name, but I know his name and I can take you and show you where he built a church right in the road. I think the hon. member for St. George South would know the late Mr. Nurse's shop and he built it right in the road. Now, that is a road that leads down to French's and Buttonville.

Now, there are 257 acres like that and you are telling the people, 'Praise God from whom all blessings flow, praise him all creatures here below, we now introduce the Tenancies Bill and everyone will have a show.' But, what kind of a show are you going to have? A puppy show. The people are settled in their domains. What we need in Barbados is a proper plan, built within the framework of the Physical Development Plan, which was initiated by my Government and introduced by the Hon. Attorney General earlier in this Session, not only to build a town in St. George but to build proper communities with all of the facilities offering pavilions and so on and we have to examine carefully whether it would not be more profitable for any Government to move some of those people out of the spots as we initiated in Spring Head in St. James and bring them down to the facilities rather than giving them a plot of land far removed from the services and then there will be demands from them as there will be now taxpayers and as such they will be saying, we are taxpayers and you must put in proper services for us.

I say without any contradiction that rushing this legislation through is an Election gimmick because it cannot be implemented to the satisfaction of the Committee and the people who live on the plantation tenancy within a reasonable space of time. What you can do is to get up and say that the Democratic Labour Party had it on their Manifesto but we put it on the Statute Book but the Statute Book is not a plot and sale.

This is the point that I am making and every Lawyer in here knows the problems that we have with people who have disputes over where their boundaries begin and where the neighbour's land ends so unless we have an army of highly qualified Surveyors who are going to come in immediately like the U.S. from the time of Thomas Jefferson and George Washington, who I believe himself was a Surveyor, always had at their disposal the Royal Navy or the British Army and the U.S. because of the settlement of the country they always had a whole battalion of military surveyors and engineers who could carry out things like that.

11.40 a.m.

Now I have not heard that the Defence Force is training any surveyors. If they had been it would be well laudable. It would be extremely laudable to have a corps of the Defence Force engineers to go in and carry out this work for us because this work needs to be done, but when you pass the Bill what is going to happen after? I would say this that far from resisting it in the way that they resisted the passage of our Bill which is the real important legislation preventing people from being turned off the land and where they pay very low rates, the plantation owner would welcome this especially where the Government is fixing the remuneration at rates which were higher than they expected to get. I would say to the

hon. member for St. Thomas, the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister that he should be aware that most plantations up to about 15 years ago were sold on the basis of the amount of arable land; rab land was never counted. If Drax Hall was 1,000 acres — Drax Hall was an unfortunate example because that has never passed out of the Drax family for 300 years — but if Drax Hall had been put on the market, say, in the 1950s, it would have been advertised as 847 arable acres or thereabouts. They would not mention the rab land at all because you only pay for the arable land. So after all these years if we are being so revolutionary.....the hon. member mentioned that people on this side have interest in plantations. I do not own any plantation, I want to tell hon. members that, and I can give the Governor-General or anybody without integrity legislation a complete list of my assets and my liabilities at any time. In so far as anybody in my family is concerned, they would willingly give up.

I was born in the middle of a sugar cane field. I can take you and show you the spot right now. The Deputy Leader of the House knows that I was born in the middle of a sugar cane field, and he was born on top of a hill where he could overlook the sugar cane field by me; but I was born on the flat, so when you look out you could only see canes all around. But I am saying I am sure that they would be willing to give over to the tenants. After all these years, why should we now be compensating landlords for land which they never considered until this building boon came in Barbados, say, about ten to fifteen years ago and people have begun moving out and commuting into work. They moved up to Locust Hall and South Ridge and this place and the other place, and all the way down, and the Closed Brethren begun — I see the hon. member was read out because he participated in the exercise, he either was read out or walked out — but before the Closed Brethren monopolising all the rab land sites, plantations were sold on the basis of how much arable land you had. As a matter of fact, they did not even put in the cane carts in those days, they were just thrown in. If you had 500 acres at \$500 an acre that would be \$250,000; so they themselves never considered this land to be of any benefit to them.

When I discussed the takeover of Drax Hall, our idea was and I still put it on the Government that what the Government should do now to show their good faith is to take all the land. Do not let us mess around because it will take a little time too. I suggest to the Government to take over the land; don't expropriate it. Do not amend the Constitution, use the Land Acquisition Act and take over the land. That is not unconstitutional, that is the law of Barbados, and let us sit down and look at some proper planning and see whether we are going to build communities or whether we are hurriedly higgledy-piggledy going to tell somebody they can have 300 square feet or 300 square metres for the house spot they are living on.

There is another aspect of this, Mr. Speaker. Even at the risk of boring you, this is a very important bit of legislation and I think I have a contribution to make even at the risk of boring Your Honour, as long as I do not break the Rules of the House. A lot of these people, Mr. Speaker, as you know in your own constituency not only had a little house spot, but frequently they manage to inveigle the plantation owner to let them have a quarter or half quarter as we say to grow some provisions, and these people have been the backbone of peasant farming development in this country. It is true that in places like the constituency of St. Philip both North and South that due to the money that came back here from the Panama Canal when it was completed in 1930 — a lot of people do not know that the Americans did not build the Canal — Barbadians built it; over 40% of the total labour force of Barbados was engaged in the building of that canal — and the money mostly went in St. Philip and they were able to buy because the landlords were able to sell some tracks of land, some two, three, four or five acres, but with respect to the rest of the land where you had workers on a plantation, invariably they would ask the plantation to allow them to rent a piece of the land for growing provisions and so on which would not necessarily be an appurtenant to the residence in which they lived, and which invariably was a board and shingle house.

Mr. Speaker, nowhere in the Bill which we have before us is any provision being made to take over any agricultural land from people who are living in the country; so willingly the plantation owner may say, you want to buy it, I offer it to you, the Government can fix the price, we have no quarrel with the price. If there had been some objection to the price that the Government is offering, there would have been a howl from the plantations a long time ago, but as I pointed out, when these plantations were bought all over the place up to ten or fifteen years ago they did not pay any money for the rab land; so that is what the Trinidadians call "laniappe" something you got off the top. It is not anything they had to invest; there is no investment they are being deprived of. Anybody who invests now in rab land in Barbados would be like the Closed Brethren who want it for developmental purpose. But if you took Drax Hall or any of those other estates, this is land that has been lying down there. When I did the calculation with the owners of Drax Hall, we would have been paying them over \$1 million at \$3,000 an acre. If the Government bought out the 257 acres, they would be paying them well over that figure because instead of \$3,000 an acre it would be pretty close to \$4,400 an acre, so why should they complain?

I would say that a real revolutionary Government would say well you have been enjoying this land long enough and these people have been paying rent long

enough, do like our Government did say, if you have been renting all these years, this amount goes to the purchase price, and you might really have to amend the Constitution because you would be saying this land now would be vested in the Government for nothing, but I do not see any reason why the Land Acquisition Act should not be used.

If I may go to the other aspect. First I am saying that the plantations are not going to object because the amount of money they are getting now by way of rental, because of the far seeing provisions of the 1965 Tenancies Control and Development Act they have not been able to exploit the tenants or move them off the land, and the rent that they receive is hardly worth paying a bookkeeper to enter up in the books when it comes to the end of the month. Very small incomes they are receiving from it and their rents were frozen as far back as fifteen years ago in 1965; so the tenants are not under any distress, so the only point here is ownership, can you improve your house if you do not have security.

11.50 a.m.

There are more ways, I feel, of approaching this matter than by saying, well we are going to fix the price and everybody who wants to go and buy a house spot can do so. In Israel you have Moshav but you have the kibbutz. In the Moshav in Israel, which is a mixed kind of economy, it is not an entirely command economy, the people who live in the country on farms have eight or nine acres. If we are really moving towards a progressive kind of society in Barbados now, we would be looking now to form some co-operative movement whereby the people who still work on the plantations would have some right to purchase part of the agricultural land that he is capable of looking after by himself and with his family perhaps, say, an acre or two at a control price. There is no provision in the Bill for that, so the country people now are being proletarianised by being given house spots.

Now we have tenancies, and I refer to a tenancy to which the hon. member for Christ Church North Central who spoke before me referred, Alkins Land, Eagle Hall. It is an absolute disgrace. When the hon. member said that the roads were laid out, what he means is that they are straight, but the hon. member could not really mean that that was proper development in Alkins Road, because if you walk through there you are liable to break off your toe, or if you are riding a bicycle you might break up the spokes or break up your motor car springs. Frequently there is a traffic jam on Eagle Hall corner and anybody who is coming down there would have to think twice before they go through Bosvigo Tenantry. The tenants are there, the landlord refuses to do anything about the roads.

We sent in the Chief Town Planner to look at Bosvigo Land and we discovered that some people were living on 300 and 400 square feet of land. The minimum under the Board of Health used to be 2400 square feet. Then with the instigation of the Housing Authority it was reduced to 1800 square feet. That is the minimum lot on which a house should be, but you have in some of the urban tenancies, or tenancies in the urban area, places like Spruce Street, where you will find that there are houses on 300 and 400; 500 and 600 square feet would be ones with grounds. Most of them in Alkins Land, according to what the Chief Town Planner reported to me, at that time were on lots as small as 400 square feet. If the hon. member would discuss the matter with the Town Planner he would tell him what an insurmountable problem it is.

Are we now going to fortify that kind of undesirable development? Or are we going to use the provision in the Act where the Town Planner says no, this is an undesirable development? You now come back to the point that I have been making. For those people there is no relief, so the only relief now is central and proper planning not only of the urban areas but planning of the rural areas as well with a cost benefit analysis being done to ascertain whether bringing the services to the people would be better than bringing the people out to the services, as was done with the people at Springhead initiated and started by the Democratic Labour Party. (ASIDES). I have heard the hon. member trying to claim credit for that, but if he goes back and searches in the files he will see when the land was acquired. All of the people may not have been out in 1976, but the land was subdivided and the roads put in. The point I am making, however, is this, that we need instead of rushing to say that we have legislation to show that we mean business, why don't we sit down and try and do some proper planning to see whether we are now serving a better purpose by developing stable communities, both rural communities with the requirements of rural communities

Mr. SPEAKER: I have heard you say this about six times already.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I was only summing it up, Sir, some members were not in their places. I know it may be unpleasant to hear it coming from me.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no reason for your repetition.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Some members were not in their places when I said it.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no justification for you to repeat it.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I will not repeat it, as long as it has sunk in, Sir, I am very glad. I now come to the other aspect of this. Referring to the same debate and the same document which I said I would make a document of the House, on page 1

Mr. SPEAKER: For the benefit of the Hansard Reporter, the date is very important.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The date, Sir, is the 23rd June, 1965, it looks to me like page 1 of the Advocate newspaper:

"The Premier charged that if the land owners were not trying to escape the responsibility of the Local Government Act, all that they would have had to do was to lease the land to the tenants. Mr. Barrow said that during the discussion of the Development Plan nobody suggested that the Government should put aside \$13 million for the purchase of tenancies, and added that it would be unfair to ask the taxpayers to find \$13 million to put into the pockets of a few whose grandparents had paid less than half million dollars for all the tenancies.

The Premier referred to a Question tabled in the House by Mr. Stanley Sealy in December 1964 and the Government's Reply in March this year. He also read extracts from the Abrahams' Report and later said that the rents should not be increased, the Government would do all the tenancy roads within the island. The machines must come off the highways and do the tenancies and go back to the highways, he said.

He said that the tendency among real estate owners was to pressurise the Government to cut land into as small portions as possible, they were not concerned about the health and comfort of their tenants.

Is the Government justified in an island where most of the people live in tenancies in relieving landlords of their social and moral obligations to the rest of the community?

Mr. Barrow referred to a map of St. Michael which had been placed before members on the other side of the Table designating all the tenancies which would be affected."

The point, Sir, that I am making here is this. One, I invite the hon. member for St. Thomas, the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, if he thinks that he is going to have any resistance, to get the land from the plantations first; those who would give would give and those who would

sell would sell, let the Government get control of all the plantation tenancies and sit down and do a comprehensive plan with the assistance of the Town and Country Planning Officers, but within the general framework of the Physical Development Plan of the island and proper planning requirements, both rurally and in the urban areas as well, and this would be our approach, but there are insurmountable difficulties.

We are the persons who initiated the idea of the take-over of plantation tenancies. On the border of the parish of St. Philip and the parish of St. George there is a place called Moncrieffe Plantation. The hon. member for St. Philip North used to live all up there and he would know that the Government of which I was a member transferred the tenants from down in the back and brought them out and now we have a beautifully laid out model tenancy very close to District "C" station. Every time I pass through there it is almost a joy to see the kind of habitations that can be constructed and laid out with proper planning. Now, if that can be done with Moncrieffe, I wonder if the hon. member for St. James would say that he does not know about Moncrieffe, because he should speak to the hon. member behind him, the member for St. Philip North, and he will tell him about Moncrieffe.
12.00 noon.

That is what proper planning can do. I now come to the Constitutional aspects of the Bill. I remember Sir, in 1975, we introduced certain Constitutional Amendments after nearly 10 years of Independence. We circulated the Government Departments and Ministries and asked them, from their working of the Constitution, what changes they felt should be made. We then printed a book, we circulated that book and all hell fire broke loose. You would think that we were trying to burn the country down, from the furore which was engendered, created by the Opposition, the Church and everybody else.

The Government has been into power now over four years, four years and three weeks, nearly four weeks and not one change has been made of those 27 or so Amendments to the Constitution, not one single change has been made. But here, within the past month, or so, we have had three Amendments to the Constitution which on the merits, as far as, overseas Civil Servants are concerned, but this one, of course, goes to the fundamental rights, rights of Civil Servants. They might not be changed for the worse, but nobody has said anything about the indirect and insidious way of changing a Constitution, without amending the Constitution itself.

Now, the Hon. Member comes in here today and he says that we are not really amending the Constitution, I am not going to shed any tears about any landlord, or

any of those capitalists in this country, who wake up one morning and find that they do not have any more control over the disposal of their worldly goods, but I think that I have some respect for the Law and the Constitution and I have already suggested, that there is another way in which a Government could acquire tenancies, plantation, or otherwise, in this country, without this kind of offhand approach to an Amendment to the Constitution which says, Section 36:

"to prevent uncertainty".

This is the way you amend the Constitution of Barbados:

"Section 16 of the Constitution is ordered by this Act to any extent necessary to ensure the constitutionality of this Act."

The Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, the Hon. Member for St. Thomas says that he is not amending the Constitution, he is only altering it. The next time that any of the Hon. Members has a male dog and they want to do something to him, to prevent him from spreading his maker's image, they must tell him, he is not altering him, he is only amending him. Why do we have to play with words? The dog knows that he has been altered whether you tell him, you are not altered, you are amended.

So, you come in here now, and you tell the Hon. Members in this Honourable House now, that you are not amending the Constitution, you are only altering the Constitution. But, what does Section 36 say?:

"to prevent uncertainty, Section 16 of the Constitution is altered by this Act."

In what respect, Sir? (ASIDES). I knew that you would fall into the trap. In no respect because then, you would know where it was being altered, not the respect of dealing with land purchase, or anything, but "to any extent necessary to ensure the constitutionality of this Act". So that, any number can play, anything goes.

When you go before a High Court now, to challenge something which is done under this Act, and they refer you to Section 36, how is the judge going to interpret that something is done, "to any extent necessary to ensure the constitutionality of this Act"? This is now Legislation in the Open. Any number can play.

You are tampering with a Constitution which is the most sacred document, once you decide to commit it within the four corners of the Act, a Constitution of a country, particularly the entrenched Provisions of the Constitution. You are telling us that Section 16 of the Constitution is not amended, it is only altered, "to any extent necessary". So, what may be necessary today, may not be necessary tomorrow and what is necessary tomorrow, may not be necessary the day after. So, from day to

day, you will say that whatever we are doing now is necessary to ensure the constitutionality of the Act. I have never seen anything like this in my life.

We introduced 37 Amendments to the Constitution drafted by Civil Servants and I was the only person really to object here on the Honourable Floor of the Honourable House to it. You know why I objected to it? I was over there, I said that I did not believe in changing the conditions of employment of the people down at the bottom of the ladder, in the Civil Service and putting it in the hands of Permanent Secretaries. I am the only person who, on the Honourable Floor of this Honourable House objected to the constitutional changes, in that respect because I said, well, if that is what you all want, O.K. But, after four years, nothing has been changed.

All the talk which we heard about judges and this person and the other person, their rights being affected, none of that has been changed, none of it has been altered, none has been amended, after four years. When you consider the sermons which were preached, the meetings which were held with the Ecclesiastical whatever you call them, or Ecclesiastical mugwumpies as a former Hon. Member for the City would say, the Ripikin Chiefs of the Ecclesiastical establishment, with Hon. Members of the Opposition, with members of Opposition parties, you would think that the world was coming to an end. After four years, you cannot find anything obnoxious, so that you change back the Constitution to where it was. After four years, three weeks and a few days, you have found nothing. Is this the way that a Constitution is going to be altered, or amended?

Well, listen to this, Sir. You will remember that our Bill... I do not think that you were an Hon. Member yet, Sir, but certainly you were a member of the fourth estate, had not been elevated to the third yet, but shortly thereafter. I cannot remember your being against this Bill because I think that you had your eye on a rural Constituency. But, be that as it may, I am imputing highly proper motives to Your Honour. But, listen now to your colleagues of the press on July 4, 1965, reading from the Sunday news Sir, on the Editorial page and the headline is "Tenancies". Without burdening you Sir because you would have been aware of this, a man who, at that time.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am the servant of this Honourable House.....

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

Mr. SPEAKER: So, I cannot be burdened by an Hon. Member.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I thank you, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have got to listen.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Yes, Sir. On the Editorial page, Mr. Speaker:

"The implications of the Bill" referring to the same Tenancies Development and Control Bill,

"are serious enough to warrant most serious attention. In the first place, it seeks, according to one Minister to give security to tenants; but of other people's rights".

We are giving security to tenants saying that you cannot put them off the land and they said that this was serious, that we were giving security of other people's rights.

Today, you are changing, or altering the fundamental Provisions of the Constitution and the same newspaper has not said one mumbling word.

"It therefore transforms them from tenants into squatters."

Well, that is bad Law, Sir, so I would not worry to comment on that and the Advocate Editorial is not noted for the soundness of their legal opinions.

12.10 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: That part is irrelevant.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: It is, Sir.

"The Plantation owners who have made the object of public derision just as they were during the "windfall issue" would never dream of ejecting from the Plantation Tenancies, people who owed three months rent."

Yet I cited 21 cases involving over 500 tenants in which the same thing was happening and I recited that about seven or eight days before and it was reported in the same newspaper but they said that the Plantations would never dream of evicting people. Oh yes, I see there was a qualification. They said they would never dream of evicting people who owed three months rent but in this case they were evicting people who owed no rent at all. I apologise, Sir.

"No man who needed the services of another as a Plantation owner needs the agricultural labourer, would dream of removing him from close proximity to the Plantation."

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Rules of this House command that Debates must be relevant and I submit to Your Honour that the hon. member is reading a Newspaper Report in connection with

a Bill which has already been passed. That Bill that he is speaking about is a Bill which was passed by this Honourable House in 1965 and a commentary or editorial on the Bill at the time cannot be relevant in my submission to this Bill that is before this House. He would have to bring a commentary on this particular Bill.

In my submission the hon. member is wrong in quoting an Editorial in this House on this present Bill because there is no Editorial on this present Bill and I ask for a ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: What the hon. member is reading from is in reference to a Bill which has already been passed in this Honourable House but not in this session. The Hon. member may continue. Thank you.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In any event I was not reflecting on the legislation.

"And that is why these plantation tenancies were maintained even although they were uneconomic propositions. But what they lost in rents they gained in service. What the government can do now is to pay for these tenancies and take them over; or, having had them valued, they can pay the interest on that valuation. In this matter the proponents of the bill fail to recognise even now that they are hastening the day of mechanisation." I will not make any comments, Sir.

"Two previous acts dealing with tenancies exempted the Plantation tenancies, but this bill commits the travesty of including them. Its effect will be merely to increase friction by seeking to incite public opinion against a minority class, or to find a political "gimmick".

The proponents of the bill claim that it is the most important piece of social legislation passed during the last hundred years. This extravagant claim overlooks the repeal of the Located Labourers Act which freed plantation tenants from compulsory service to the landlord. And the manner of its introduction and passage through the legislature serves not merely to highlight its demerits, but to underscore the contention and antagonisms which will last as a result for another hundred years. It is a bit of legislation which raised disturbing prospects."

This Newspaper was fighting a rear guard action against fighting those people in the settlement of their occupation. Sir, I will not quote any more. As I said I will make it a document of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: You promised to make it a document of the House definitely?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Yes, Sir, I will take it, extract it and pass it on over to the Clerk. I will undertake to do it. I did not want to interrupt my debate to unbind the relevant pages. You know I always stick to my words. I will make it a document of the House.

We on this side of the House since our Party inaugurated the whole concept of the Consolidation of the persons in their habitation, you cannot get an improvement in the living standards in the policy of the buildings which people occupy unless people have some kind of security and that ultimate security has got to be in the way of ownership because no one is going to build a substantial residence except the gentleman who built the Church in the roadway up in Drax Hall Jump. No one is going to build a substantial building on somebody else's land even with the security which was given them by the 1965 Legislation so there is no need for anyone to get over there and say no matter what they read in the Press that this Party, the one to which I belong, is opposed to the idea of people owning their land or plantation land because that is precisely what we had said.

We have been criticised for not doing it before. I have tried to explain the insurmountable difficulties with which we have been confronted as a Government in trying to get action due to shortages of personnel, managerial personnel, professional personnel and so on. If on the other side they think it can be done overnight, *tarde diem*. Like yesterday I would have voted for it because I want to see those instant conveyances that are going to dramatically transfer the title of land from plantation owners and other tenantry owners to people who are paying rent up to now. I want to see it, Sir. I am always looking for miracles. I have not seen any yet from this Government. I have not seen any from my Government but if they think that miracles are going to happen both with the Surveyors and the Legal people in Barbados, that they are introducers of miracles, I also wish them luck.

I must say this, Sir, that I am not satisfied about the way that Section 36 appears to amend the Constitution. I have done a little investigation on it and I do not think that is the way that the Constitution should be tampered with. I am not in favour of Section 36. I am in favour of everybody in Barbados owning something. I do not believe ultimately in overall state ownership and command economy. I believe that if the State takes over anything, it should be with the aim and objective of ultimately divesting itself of landlordism. That is why I criticise the ADC. The ADC should not be any substitute for the planters who own the land which the ADC bought. Even during my tenure of office I kept telling them so.

The Springhall Project is one step in the right direction which was initiated by my Government and I would like to see all the ADC Projects which have been steadily

losing money — it has never made a penny in any year — I would like to see them vested in the people who have to work on the land, the people who do the real production in the Island and I want to see in the tenancies, in the plantations, that the people be given not only house spots but they be given somewhere where they can help the food production and the agricultural production in this Island.

All I am saying in answer to my learned friend, the hon. member for Christ Church South Central is that I am not satisfied that the Bill makes this provision in sufficiently clear words.

Whenever he does that and moves an amendment to that, I will be for it but I am not going to vote for an amendment to the Constitution in that way as it is proposed under Section 36.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do you really mean Section 36?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Clause 36.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do you really mean Clause 36?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Yes, Sir, I said Section but I mean Clause 36.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I hasten to reply very briefly to a few of the points which the Rt. Hon. member has made and particularly to my friend's doubt concerning the constitutionality this Act and indeed the manner in what he called changes to the Constitution are being affected by this Legislation.
12.20 p.m.

The first point I must emphasise is that this Bill does not alter the wording of any section at all of the Constitution of Barbados. When this Bill has been passed, Section 16 of the Constitution remains in the same wording as it has been since 1966. In short, Sir, it is a non-textual amendment of the Constitution and therefore outside of the confines of this Bill and limited only to the purpose of this Bill will there be any alteration if he wishes to use the word or modification of the effect of Section 16 of the Laws of Barbados. The hon. member is a lawyer, but there are times in which he speaks in here more as a politician, a partisan politician than as a legal luminary, and his speech on this occasion is obviously guided by the strongest partisan political considerations rather than any careful objective and analytical legal approach to the question of Clause 36.

There are two areas in which this Bill, if it is passed, even without Clause 36, will most likely affect the operation of the fundamental provisions of the Constitution. In the first place, Mr. Speaker, we are

seeking to confer on tenants the right to purchase a lot on which they resided or which they rented from an owner. As a corollary to that, Mr. Speaker, we are therefore saying that a person may not refuse to sell to a particular person this land on which they lived or which they rented. Now once the policy is decided on, and I take it that the hon. member is in favour of that policy, then it is obvious that to ensure that it complies with section 16 of the Constitution one must have a clause in this Bill saying that to any extent that the provisions of this Bill may not be in conformity with the Constitution, then the Bill still remains valid, and that is made abundantly necessary because of the provisions in Section 49 of our Constitution which calls for any law which seeks to modify the Constitution to be passed in a particular way. The second reason why it is necessary to have Clause 36 is because we are saying that a tenant will purchase the land at a specified price. Now that price may or may not be a reasonable price as called for under compulsory acquisition legislation. It may be a more than reasonable price, that is what the hon. member has said in a particular lot, but it may be a more than unreasonable price in another set of circumstances, but since the question of reasonableness of the price is more often than not a question of fact, then unless we in the legislation add certainty to this part of the legislation, we will have a plethora of actions all alleging that the legislation is contrary to the Constitution. Hence the necessity for Clause 36 of this Bill, and it is formulated in language that is the usual language used not only in Barbados but in other countries with written constitutions and fundamental provisions from time immemorial. If the hon. member would have preferred us to use the Latin phrase *pro tanto*, rather than the English phrase "to any extent necessary" then of course we would have, but his attack may be why are we making legislation so difficult for simple people, we would say who have to deal with the legislation and being himself a person who could talk about the Church, he would say that even in the Roman Catholic Church these days the liturgy has changed from Latin to English. But the hon. member has no point; he is going to make a song and dance about Clause 36 because he wants to excuse his performance in relation to the former constitutional changes which he brought before this House and the manner in which he dealt with the changes which took power unto himself more than he had been given in 1966, and when people said he should not have so much power, we know what was the long and short of that debate.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. member that we intend as the Constitutional Commission has recommended to patriate the Constitution completely firstly, and secondly we intend to carry out further constitutional amendments in keeping with some of the recommendations of the Constitutional recommendations, and particularly we will, do in relation to the judges so that there is no political appointment as happens at

present in the change that went on, or we will do it in relation to the Director of Public Prosecutions too, so he need have no fear in thinking that that is going to become a political issue whenever he wants to.

I submit, Sir, that on the best legal approach to Clause 36 that the hon. member is totally mistaken that his analysis is analytically and legally unsound, and that I prefer in this case to follow the advice of the several officers who have advised me on the constitutionality of this Bill and the necessity for this Clause and its wording, and they include people of the highest legal expertise both in Barbados and in Canada and their expertise has been available to me. Therefore I can recommend strongly to this House the necessity for Clause 36 and its legal validity, and I can assure the public that they are not losing any fundamental right at large and that the public at large can rest assured that their fundamental rights are not being undermined by a non-textual modification which would have come about only to the extent necessary for the purposes of this Bill.

One writer on this subject, Sir, in quoting from Clause 36 refused to quote the whole Clause and said that it is an alteration "to any extent necessary" but it goes on, the very vital words "to any extent necessary to ensure the constitutionality of this Act." For no other purpose at all that amendment is being made, and if you are being objective and fair and construing the Clause you must also read the additional words to show the extent to which the constitutional change is being made.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am on a point of order. Now the hon. member could not have been listening to me.....

Mr. SPEAKER: You mean you rise on a point of order.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Yes, I rise on a point of order. I read the whole Clause as you are aware because you were listening. If the hon. member was not listening, that is his problem.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no point of order.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The hon. member cannot lose a battle, you see, Sir. I listened to him very carefully and I do not know what he is objecting to except that he recognises in retrospect that his argument is basely and unfounded. He knows he has no legal argument and it is his right to get up and look at the politics of and the politics of it is more than what he is concerned with. He cannot come in here and object to conferring on tenants the right to purchase the spots on which they have resided for a long time or which they have farmed for a long time and his only attack on the Bill is that the timing of the Bill is wrong, there is no need to be

blowing a trumpet, it is an election Bill just as the last budget was an election budget according to him, and we can wait. That is what he is saying, but if we give him a quick reply, what will happen in the interim is what had happened in the interim whilst he sat aside and allowed, if I may quote a phrase, Rome to burn, because what has happened is that people can lose their legal right to own that land if you continue to delay *ad interminum*.
12.30 p.m.

That is a fact. The point is that the moment this Bill is signed and gazetted by His Excellency the Governor General, no one can in future have the land without the land being burdened with the right and the option of the tenant to purchase the land, and the hon. member knows that as a lawyer, so that to say that the legislation is hasty is beside the point, the legislation is necessary, and indeed my only regret is that we could not have brought it down sooner. The hon. member spent from 1961 to 1976, he said he was convinced of the necessity to do something about the plantation tenancies, and for 15 years what did he do? The hon. member comes in here and complains that why he could not do anything was because there was not a cadre of surveyors.

He told us that under his guidance the economy grew. Could he not even afford then to buy the expertise from overseas, the same expertise he is advising us to get from overseas and saying that he would support it? To have done something during those 15 years, he either did not care or he was negligent in his approach to the matter, or he was forgetful about their necessity. Once he made his statement for what it was worth in order to convince the people to vote for him, he never intended to tackle the plantation aristocrats of this country, he never intended at all to challenge them. It is like when we heard all the talk he has given on behalf of the merchants and he ended up more pro-merchant in this country than any social democrat that I have ever known from any part of the world. I challenged him in here once to take over the big six and he said, "I will do what I want in my time, I don't want you to tell me anything." In other words, his bite and his bark always differ and people in analysing his career must recognise that he can no longer fool people with his blustering manner on issues such as this, it is his performance that we ask him to follow through on.

I am suggesting to him that his idleness for 15 years has meant that several people who today could have gone on and move into owning their lands have not been able to do so, and he should not only support this Bill, he should confess and be humble and say "Lord, I am happy to be here to witness the work of a great social revolution in Barbados." That is what he should do, because it is a social revolution and it is the continuation of the removal of the Location of Workers

Act started by Dr. Cummins and this party that we are seeing now culminating in this social revolution, and this Government like its predecessor Barbados Labour Party Government has always been known as a Government that brings about social revolution in this country in a democratic way within the well known principles of democratic socialism. So I wish the hon. member to rest assured that with or without his vote it will pass. It was part of our policy and we will implement it, and we will implement it fully, Sir, taking into account the problems that will occur in the implementation of the conveyancing of this type of land.

There is a companion Bill to this Bill which seeks to do exactly the sort of things that he said would have been done in order for him to pass the legislation. The Minister will have the power to declare any area a development area and to go in and put in roads, water, electricity and all the necessary amenities that are called for, and hence the purpose of the companion Bill is here. For the benefit of the hon. member, a sites and surveys programme is one that he should have advanced a long time ago from overseas funding if he could not have had the money himself. The World Bank has been for years giving money towards sites and surveys programmes. In fact, our Director on the World Bank, Mr. Drakes, a Canadian, was himself responsible for designing such a project and scheme for the Philippines. The hon. member has never put a project to any institution, whether regional or non-regional, or to any bilateral donor for funding a sites and surveys programme in Barbados at all, and I think he should not remind people that he was interested in this subject so long, because how he could have sat down and allowed Eagle Hall Tenantry, Drax Hall of which he spoke to have existed for these number of years and have done nothing about it, and come in here now and say he is a little worried about clause 36 of the Bill and that this is an election piece of legislation. It was a Manifesto piece of legislation and it was the Manifesto that overthrew the hon. member from his slough and has brought the country to life for four years, so he must wait for several years and watch the implementation of the legislation, and I am sure that the Minister of Housing who is charged with the implementation of this Bill will bring the same verve and vitality that he has brought to his Ministry to implementing this necessary legislation.

I do not think the hon. member made any other point of substance which is worthy of any reply either legally or politically, and therefore I have much pleasure in supporting this Bill, in being present at its birth, I hope to be around for its execution, and I give the Minister and the House my assurance that my department, despite the fact that we could do with some more staff, will give every assistance to the early implementation of all aspects of this Bill as are called for.

Mr. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I have a short contribution to make on this Bill. I think that it is very clear from what has been stated by the right hon. member for St. John that the Democratic Labour Party has had a policy on plantation tenancies, and indeed that this Bill which we are now discussing is a continuation of that policy. This is very very clear. It is also clear that the Democratic Labour Party is not opposed to the Bill in terms of what it will mean for persons on plantation tenancies. The point which has always been made by the Democratic Labour Party as far as this particular Bill is concerned relates to clause 36, and I think that this point has been made by the Leader of the Opposition very very clearly.

Nowhere in any speech, in any publication can anybody produce any evidence which would indicate that the Democratic Labour Party had ever expressed any opposition to people who live on plantation tenancies getting ownership of the land, so this ought to be made very clear, and certainly it has to be reiterated by this side.

I would further want to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that as far back as 1973, in continuation of the policy enunciated by the Democratic Labour Party, a Committee on Plantation Tenancies was appointed under the Chairmanship of, I think it was then, the Chief Valuation Officer. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the Committee comprised of a number of persons and I well recall that one of the Officers of the Barbados Workers' Union sat on this Committee, Lawrence Nurse, and then when he resigned from the Barbados Workers' Union his position was taken by LeRoy Trotman, so it is not a question that the Democratic Labour Party was doing nothing about it.

I would further want to make the point, Mr. Speaker, that the whole question of plantation tenancies has been of concern to a number of discerning citizens of this country for many years, and indeed I will say it has been the concern of institutions which have as their hallmark the development of the human personality and the human being, and the kind of role which people who live on plantation tenancies play in this country, so that I think that it is very clear that this Bill certainly would be moving in the direction of bringing more stability and certainly more justice in this area.

I would want to make the point, Mr. Speaker, that the Barbados Workers' Union has made, as you might be aware, a decision relative to plantation tenancies for many years, and if one were to read publications from the Barbados Workers' Union, statements made by the Barbados Workers' Union in its Press Conferences over the years and also statements contained in the Union Speaks which appears in the Advocate newspaper on page 2, one would see that from time to time the Barbados Workers' Union has been making a very strong case for the whole

re-organisation and development of plantation tenancies in this country.

12.40 p.m.

So that, it is not a question of the Barbados Labour Party Government, or the Barbados Labour Party being the only Institution, or Organisation which has been concerned, or indeed, has made suggestions about how plantation tenancies should be developed, or what should be done in this particular regard.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, if you permit me, to quote from one of the issues of 'The Union Speaks' which appeared in the Sunday Advocate, Sunday, 15th February, 1976 just to give some indication. I am prepared to make it a document of the Honourable House, just to give you an indication of the kind of feeling and concern which this Organisation has had for persons who live in plantation tenancies and I quote:

"Life on plantations has been very dreary and Labourious and very little has been done to make the sugar worker feel other than a neglected person, or beast of burden. Too many people sneer at the sugar worker and regard him as a dread of the community. This attitude has removed any feeling from the on coming generations to regard the sugar industry or agriculture as a worthwhile means of employment.

With the passing of the years and a more enlightened approach to labour, and the placing of agriculture in our economy, a better understanding is emerging and those who work in it feel that they have a contribution to make to society.

The decision of the Government to set aside funds for the sugar industry and the setting up of a Committee to recommend how funds should be spent has not come too soon.

We are satisfied that there is a fertile field throughout Barbados for greater rural development and to this end, we hope to see a complete re-orientation about life in the rural areas. The various plantation tenancies throughout the Island should be given a facelift to bring them into twentieth century community life. Roads, water and light should reach every person throughout Barbados and a new village life should emerge throughout the island".

It goes on. I would further want, Mr. Speaker, to quote from the Annual Reports of the Barbados Workers' Union. The first was a statement contained in the Annual Report of Saturday, 30th June, 1975 at page 13 where it states:

"The Union submitted proposals to revise the Sugar Agreement. In addition to the Wages Proposals, the Union called upon the Government to carry out a Rural Development Programme."

On the 14th August, 1976, at page eight, there was also another statement on this whole matter:

"The Union stated in its last Report that it would see the implementation of a vigorous Rural Development Programme. The Union repeats that this is a vital link in the overall economy of Barbados. The Union feel that as a stimulant to continuous employment, rural development should become an instrument of policy to be planned and conducted as a long term investment."

I think that it is very clear to any person that this whole question of plantation tenancies' takeover and development of the tenancies is linked overall on the question, of the whole policy of rural development in this country.

I believe that it was the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition who today, reminded this Honourable Chamber about the overall policy which was initiated by the Democratic Labour Party. So that, when one thinks in terms and when one tries to suggest, that the Democratic Labour Party has done nothing in this particular area, I think that one has got to put the case most forcibly.

The Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, in speaking on this Bill referred to the areas which are going to be subject to the application of this particular Bill. For example, he tried to suggest that there are Hon. Members over on this Side, who have interests of one sort, or another in a plantation. The Rt. Hon. Member for St. John who, as far as I understand, is the only Rt. Hon. Member over here whose family might have had some kind of connection with a plantation, he would recall himself, that at our Parliamentary Group Meeting, when this particular Bill came up before the Committee and particularly when, in looking through the Schedule for the Bill and I noticed the absence of certain plantation tenancies in St. Lucy. I queried the reason for this and I think that there must be a very good reason for this.

I queried for example, what about Pickerings Plantation. I notice that there is no mention of that, in this Bill. There is no mention of the Cove Plantation tenancies. I know that is for the Committees. There is no mention of these, I have a list of them. Crab Hill Plantation which has a big tenantry, Greenidges in St. Lucy, a part of Crab Hill Plantation Tenantry. We want to find out why is it that these are not included. There must be a reason for this. What about Harrison's Plantation, it also has a tenantry. So that, we would want to know some-

thing about these tenancies to find out if this is the extent to which the Government proposes to go, or whether subsequently, there will be an addition to the Bill, which would include these other plantation tenancies because I think, that if we are going to be initiating an overall policy for the takeover and the development, or the purchase of plantation tenancies in Barbados, I do not know, I do not see why certain tenancies should have been left out.

I am calling on the Government to make some statement on this, certainly, to let us know what the position is. I want to know what is going to happen to those persons who occupy tenancies which have been left out of this Bill. I am not sure about all the tenancies in St. Peter, but I am sure that if you look through this, you might find that some are missing and I am sure that you would want me, on your behalf, to query this also. Let me know. I would like the Hon. Minister who introduced this Bill to let the Honourable House know what will become of those persons who occupy tenancies belonging to Pickerings, Cove Plantation, Crab Hill Plantation and Harrison's Plantation. It does seem to me, as I said, that this Bill is not as comprehensive as it should be and I think that we should get some answer for that.

The other point which I would like to make is a general point, Mr. Speaker, which relates to the whole question of agrarian reform. I think that this Bill, in my view, and the whole purpose of the Bill stops short of being what the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister described as revolutionary. It is revolutionary in some respects, but I thought that it could be much more. In terms of reorganising, the whole question of land ownership and land use in this country and some opportunity should have been taken to try to get a policy coming through and enunciated, in this particular Bill, as far as, that issue is concerned.

It seems to me, that there is need for this kind of policy relative to agrarian reform which should be instituted in this country without delay. But, I would want to repeat that we, in the Opposition, are not at all opposed to the Bill. We have stated our objection and opposition to Section 36 and which, when we reach that particular point, we will certainly be demonstrating our objection, by voting against it.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I got this Bill on the last occasion that I was in the Honourable House before I went to Australia. Two Hon. Members of the Opposition drew to my attention their unhappiness over Clause 36 of the Bill.

12.50 p.m.

During the eight days that I was in Australia I have had the chance to pay some close attention to Clause 36

which seems to be the Clause that has exercised some public disquiet, if certain Newspaper articles are an indication of the public's role and I am going to try, Mr. Speaker, to limit myself since I know that there is another Bill tied to this which we will like to deal with today, by pointing out in as simple a form as I can for the benefit of any doubting Thomases or any member of St. John who may be among us, but I think Barbadians know me well enough that if this Bill, in my personal view, infringes or attempts to aggravate the fundamental rights of the individual as are enshrined in Chapter 3 of the Constitution, that I would have done as I did on the Integrity Legislation, when I found Section 45 offensive to my own personal legal judgment and I voted against Section 45 of the Integrity Bill and if this Clause 36 was offensive to constitutionalism I would have had no hesitation in voicing my dissent to it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of being taught Constitutional Law by Professor Stanley Smith who I believe may also have taught the hon. member for St. John or certainly at LLC during the days when the hon. member was a student of LLC and Professor Smith is acknowledged as a Constitutional Expert and one who has drafted the Constitution for Mauritius.

Now his book at least my edition "The New Commonwealth and its Constitution," this was the first edition published in 1964. The Barbados Constitution had not yet come into force but he reviewed a number of Commonwealth Constitutions including Jamaica which have similar provisions to ours and we have to be aware that whereas prior to 1966 we did not have a written Constitution we now have a written Constitution which makes it very clear that the Constitution is the fundamental law and other legislation that runs counter to the supremacy of the Constitution can be struck down by the Court and declared void.

It can be declared void if it offends against certain human rights provided for in Chapter 3 of the Constitution. Now it is true that Section 16 of the Constitution provides a general right to freedom of private property as provided in Chapter 3 and it provides a number of general fundamental rights on which one of these fundamental rights is circumscribed and hedged about with exceptions which to a large extent can render the efficacy of the main section nugatory.

For example, in Section 16 it says specifically in the General Part "No property of any description shall be compulsorily taken possession of, and no interest in or right over property of any description shall be compulsorily acquired, except by or under the authority of a written law, and where provision applying to that acquisition or taking of possession is made by a written law." Two things must happen "Prescribing the principles

on which and the manner in which compensation therefor is to be determined and given," and spelt out and "giving to any person claiming such compensation a right of access, either directly or by way of appeal, for the determination of his interest in or right over the property and the amount of compensation, to the High Court."

That is very simple language for the layman to understand that no property can be taken away either compulsorily or otherwise unless it purports to be taken away in the form first of all as a written law, such as this before the House today and until the principles upon which compensation is to be determined and the manner how the compensation is to be determined is set out in the Bill and secondly, that the person whose land is affected and who may feel himself aggrieved has a right of appeal or access or review to some judicial body. Now, all of that is provided for in the legislation.

The first point, the legislation complies with Section 16 of the Constitution because it spells out the manner and the form of the principles in the Schedules about compensation. It also provides the right of recourse to the Courts so it does not, in my submission, offend against Section 16, but I must go further because Section 16 of the Constitution is not the only Section that relates to the Bill. One has to read on in Section 49 of the Constitution which talks about alterations.

Since the Bill may be a Bill which can affect the rights of persons owning property, it strikes at the Constitution, but it does not strike fundamentally in my submission because it does not change the language of Section 16, but it does effect Section 16. That is the whole talk about the textual alteration and Section 49 says quite clearly the manner in which this legislation must be passed because it is an alteration to a Section of the Constitution and it requires a two-thirds majority vote and so on. That is Section 49.

In the front of the Bill, Mr. Speaker, the Interpretation Act, Section 3 says "That where the Constitution is affected by the passage of a particular piece of legislation in the front of the Bill it must be expressly stated as this Act does. It says "An Act to provide a right for tenants of lots in certain tenancies to purchase the freehold in those lots; to alter section 16 of the Constitution to assure the constitutionality of that right; and to provide for matters related or incidental thereto." This is the crux "ENACTED by the Parliament of Barbados in accordance with section 49 of the Constitution as follows."

Now if this Bill did not contain these words the Bill could be declared void because it would be in breach of Section 6, subsection 3 of the Interpretation Act.
1.00 p.m.

My first submission to the House, Mr. Speaker, is that in all respects the Bill complies in manner and form, very essential, with the requirements set out by the law that is higher than the Bill, that is to say, the Constitution. So procedurally the Bill is satisfactory.

Now complaint is made that the language of Clause 36 is perhaps too loose, nebulous and meaningless, but I must agree with the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker, that it says quite clearly to the avoidance of doubt, to prevent uncertainty that Section 16 is altered by this Act to any extent necessary to ensure the Constitutionality of the Act, not to override or not to derogate from the constitutionality of the Act. In one of its earlier sections, I think it is clause 3, subclause (2) "This Act shall receive such fair, large and liberal construction and interpretation as will best ensure the attainment of its purposes."

Now you cannot want it any clearer. The Courts are being directed, one of the rare occasions where the judicial function is dictated by the Legislature and told that in the construction and interpretation of the Act it must be construed liberally.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, there is an agreement I believe that the people who are responsible for taking notes and so on should not work over a protracted period. Most members have been in here and Your Honour has been in the Chair certainly from 10 o'clock this morning. I was wondering if this is not an appropriate time.....

Mr. SPEAKER: There is an agreement with whom?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I think between the Debates Committee and the Union about the spread-over, the length of time that the workers should be expected to work.

Mr. SPEAKER: I happen to be Chairman of that Committee and I have not been so advised.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: What I am drawing to Your Honour's attention is that the Reporters have been working from 10 o'clock this morning and it is now 1 o'clock, and I am wondering at what stage the Hon. Leader of the House was going to take the suspension.

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret once again to have to take up the time of this Honourable House to go into matters of this sort. I repeat such matters must be dealt with by the Leader of the House and the Leader of the Opposition, but not inside this House. That is their homework. They must come to the House having agreed upon such matters, and it is on that basis and that basis alone that the business of this Honourable House will be conducted in future, that this House will be informed that an

application will be made to suspend the Standing Orders and upon an application being made the House will be informed that an agreement has been reached with the other side that the break will be taken at a particular hour, and we will observe that hour. The time of the House must not be wasted with all of this.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, having dealt with the constitutionality of the Bill, I just want to make a few brief comments on other aspects of the Bill. It seems to me that in the debate today all speakers have ignored much of what is contained in the Bill in terms of principle. True it is a Bill which advances the social history of Barbados by many years. It is a Bill which seeks the erosion of many of the illnesses and the bad features associated with the plantation system, a system of slavery and the days of colonialism. But, Mr. Speaker, the Bill goes beyond that because the Bill seeks to promote home ownership in Barbados, and this party has tried within the last four years, and certainly within the last three budgets to do positive acts towards the promotion of home ownership, so that Barbadians who love to own their own homes can have an opportunity. Even the poorest of us and the most underprivileged, those who live in the tenancies which have been oppressed for years will now be given an opportunity not only to buy a spot, but having bought the spot, to have the right to add some wall, because one of the problems that has been associated with plantation tenancies over the years, and I saw it when I was Chairman of the National Housing Corporation, is that a man may have lived on a plantation tenantry for twenty-five or thirty years in a chattel house, may have accumulated some savings with a view to putting up a more permanent structure, and the plantations have refused to give him the right to do what you call adding a wall back to the House, because they have always treated the land as their own. With this type of legislation, having given the earth in the sense of that piece of land to the individual, he will no longer be restricted by any considerations of a landlord or plantation owner from putting up wall. Having got the earth, he is entitled to build his wall which would accrue to the land. He now has land within the definition of land as we know it in Barbados. So that the Act is assisting Barbadians, very poor Barbadians, to develop themselves. It is a process of human development.

Mr. Speaker, there are but few Barbadians who would want all of their lives to live in a wooden building, but the banks, bastions of capitalism in this country have been reluctant to make loans and advances to people to improve their houses. Insurance companies have been reluctant to insure chattel houses because of the risk factor. Over a time we will all see that the tenants who make use of this piece of legislation and who are going to be assisted by the Government, and in the legislation

it is said that they can get loans provided by the Government, will improve their houses. I would like to predict that in 20 or 30 years a chattel house in a tenantry would be a thing of the past, and there will be nice bungalows of which everybody in Barbados can be proud.

The accompanying piece of legislation, providing for the development of tenancies, provides for the Minister to designate areas and put in water, lights, drainage and all the basic amenities to enhance the quality of life of dwellers in tenancies, and these two pieces of legislation, Mr. Speaker, are to be commended. What the Democratic Labour Party could not achieve in 15 years, do not blame us for being able to do in 4½ years. They were saying that they expressed concern about plantation tenancies since 1961. The Barbados Labour Party is not interested in expressing concern, they are interested in doing something tangible for the people that they can see. This is a Party not of words, but a Party of action. I am proud to be associated with it, Mr. Speaker, and the legislation has my vote. I broke a conference and flew all the way back from Australia to be here today in Parliament, and I am going to vote in favour of this because this is a piece of legislation that socially develops the poorest people in this country, and they will have my support at every possible turn.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, we started at 10 o'clock this morning.

I beg to move that this Sitting be suspended until 2 o'clock.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the Sitting accordingly.
1.10 p.m.

On Resumption:—

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, I need not remind you, Sir, that I represent people in the rural area, and therefore any legislation which is introduced in this House in the interest of those workers have my whole-hearted support. My reason for making that statement is that it is those people who caused me to be a member of this House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having made those remarks, I would like to say how pleased I am to be present when we are dealing with legislation in their interest, but, Sir, I

want this House to know that it is a difficult task in dealing with certain tenancies in this island, and I shall only mention two which I visit in one case from time to time, in the other case daily. I refer to a tenancy in the parish of St. George, opposite South District School. For what reason I do not know how the plantation owners in those days could have taken those people and placed them in that bottom which I would say could almost be called hell on earth. There is no room, no space for building roads, and in case of heavy rains the water goes down into that area and the people find it actually impossible to get out from there. Therefore, if that tenancy is on the Government's list I see no other solution but to resite those houses in another area, because it is impossible to even attempt to cherish the thought to purchase the rab land in South District. I refer to the district Opposite the school.

The other one is around the area where I live. There is a defunct plantation which was formerly called Harmony Lodge, and there are several acres of land which Foursquare Plantation is responsible for. I have been told, but I cannot substantiate it, that even Foursquare Plantation has no plot and sale for that area of land. Now, the tenants in that land, some pay 8 and 10 cents per week, and some of those tenants have an acre, half an acre or more of land which they try to cultivate, because as you know that area has rab land, but these people still cultivate that land, and from my observation they pay this small amount of rent weekly or monthly. The point that I am trying to make now, Sir, is that you have a dual problem. One, you have a problem if you are dealing with house spots, and the other one is, you have a problem which deals with the acreage of land which those people cultivate at present.

Another point I must draw to the attention of this Hon. House is that many tenants have reached old age and have been old age pensioners for some time now. Many of them have no children, and I am wondering how it will be possible to deal with the purchasing of the land for those people.

Mr. Speaker, I commenced by stating that I am in support of the agricultural labourers of this country who have contributed to the economy of this country and have caused it to go from strength to strength, and that something should be done to alleviate the hardship which they suffered in the past, but I am only trying to point out to the Government certain difficulties which they will have to face in certain areas. When people are paying 8 and 10 cents a week for land, that in my opinion is an asset, especially to elderly people, so while we are going through this exercise and we are passing legislation here today, those points I consider of paramount importance and should be taken into consideration. You cannot even

attempt to call a person around the age of 70 to 75 to purchase half an acre of land or a house spot.
2.15 p.m.

He will not have the funds and therefore, the eight cents, or ten cents per week which he has to pay now, he would be in a better position, than forcing that land on him which he cannot afford to buy. That Sir, is not destructive criticism, it is just pinpointing to the Government, that all is not easy sailing. They have problems to face with this issue.

On the other hand, there are younger people who have their children and grand children and while it is true Sir, that the children and grandchildren might not be interested in cultivating the land, or working on the various plantations, it is my opinion, that those people who were born there, their parents were born there, their grand parents toiled at the various plantations and therefore, the time has come when something tangible should be done and this Bill here today seeks, in some way, to do good for the benefit of those people.

Mr. Speaker, I doubt any Hon. Member of this Honourable House is in a better position to tell you the conditions under which some of those people live, than I can, having been brought up among them, seeing the conditions daily and I agree with the speaker, my colleague from St. Philip who said, that they cannot even attempt to have facilities for latrines and so on of wall because they do not own the land.

I am no expert on the ramifications and the technicalities of this Bill and therefore, I leave it to the legal persons to deal with it, but what I am sure about, is that it is in the interest of the masses and that it is long overdue. I am not competent to deal with the various Clauses and to say this is right, or that is wrong, but what I do know is that the Bill serves a useful purpose. It is a Bill which started a long time ago and if the time has come, one Government planned, another continued to carry on where the one left off and the time has come for us to do something for those poor people, Mr. Speaker, I say here today, with all sincerity, that it has my support.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, just briefly Sir, I shall like to make the final reply on behalf of Government.

In the Manifesto of the ruling Party, it was clearly stated where we would introduce, if we assumed the reins of Government, and implement this particular bit of Legislation.

This morning, I heard speeches made by the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition somewhere in 1965.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition only made one speech.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: A speech made by the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition, Sir. Speeches made from the Opposition Benches then, Mr. Speaker. The Manifesto of the Opposition Sir, which I have before me, has made no reference, nothing at all. I looked at it carefully, it made no reference, Mr. Speaker about the right of tenure to ownership on the plantation tenancies.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a Point of Order, the Hon. Member is not accurately quoting because I have in my hand, Part Two of the Manifesto of 1976. This is it here, Part Two.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I did not know that you had two. I only have one.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Oh, you did not know, but you are still making dogmatic statements.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I see, you had two Manifestoes for one Election.

Mr. SPEAKER: Two Hon. Members are on their feet. On what do you rise?
2.25 p.m.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: On a point of order.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Yes, I rise on a point of order because the hon. member said that he searched through the document and did not find any reference. I just want to point out to the hon. member that the part dealing with Housing and Tenancies is Part II of the Manifesto of which I am willing to give him a copy. There is a specific reference there to plantation tenancies.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I must apologise, Mr. Speaker, because I did not know that they had two Manifestoes for one Election. You had Part I and you had Part II. You have on your desk Part II because this is Part I. Two Manifestoes for one Party for one Election, one dealing with Housing, series Part I and series Part II. However, Sir, I do not understand the speech made by the member for St. Lucy.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Lucy.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: As I understand it, Sir, we are all hon. members. If I had said Mr. Greaves then I would be out of order. If I say the member for St. Lucy I am still in order. The hon. member. I still respect Your Honour's ruling.

The hon. member for St. Lucy, Sir, in his speech quoted from the Barbados Workers' Union documents and it is really to my surprise because all through 1976 I never knew for one single moment that the now Opposition Party had brought out two Manifestoes and therefore I must apologise. I did not know that, Sir, Part I and Part II.

What is surprising is that the hon. member for St. Lucy who is trying to lead one of the largest Trade Unions in Barbados, some 30,000 persons, who would have to sit down and read a document and negotiate for the workers and on behalf of the workers, sat down in here this morning and said that they were plantations such as Crab Hill that were not in the Schedule.

This Bill was given notice of and circulated, not today but for weeks and in Clause 28 of the Bill, Sir, gives the Minister a right by way of an Order to include additional plantations and I will give the House the assurance that it would be impossible for the Government to put in all the plantation tenancies and if he had read the Bill rather than trying to create an impression and deal with the facts, he would have seen this Clause (a) and (b), a very simple Clause.

Mr. GREAVES stands.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Lucy will have to contain himself. I will not hear the hon. member for St. Lucy.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, the Sugar Producers' Association has advised us that they have additional tenancies outside of those which we have in the Schedule and those which we have on file and because of that these had to be put in to make sure that none of the plantation tenancies are left out.

Now it is hard, Sir, when the *Advocate* Editorial reports quite clearly, Sir, I think it was yesterday, that you should take an intelligence test to be a member of Parliament. I am satisfied, Sir, that an attack was made on the Managing Director of the *Advocate* because he did not go to a University, simply nonsense as of paramount importance and this is what the hon. member said basically in his speech this morning.

What he was trying to convey to this Honourable House is that the Government has set out not to include

plantations in St. Lucy because he is the representative of the Parish of St. Lucy. That is what he is trying to convey. In here you have a number of plantations in Checker Hall. I can read them out of the Schedule in St. Lucy but he is complaining about Crab Hill. Clause 28 of the Bill gives the Minister the power to include additional plantations.

The other point which I would like to draw to Your Honour's attention, Sir, is the point raised by the hon. member for St. John, when he made reference to Bayville and he made reference to surveying of the plantations. Now let us be practical. It would be impossible for this Government to survey all of the plantation tenancies between now and when the Prime Minister calls an Election because what he is trying to convey is, he said that it is an election gimmick and Professor Roy Marshall, sometime in July, 1979 who is the Legal Advisor in Law for the Government of Barbados chaired the first meeting to put this Bill in train. Now if it was since July 1979 and it was on the Manifesto pledge in 1976, what type of election gimmick could this be and this is the type of thing you would hear coming from members on the other side.

The problem with implementing the Bill, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition said, is that they do not have enough Surveyors. We know this is a problem with Surveyors. They are not enough in Barbados and we are negotiating with the Surveyors to do as many of these plantations as can be done, not between now and 1981 or 1982 but we will have them done in the interest of the people.

What was wrong with the Bay? The Bay was surveyed but it was the ineptness of the last Administration that they had no plan. The surveying of the estate was done but no planning was done. They surveyed and they surveyed giving the people the idea, the ray of hope that all they had to do now that they had the Surveyors down there was to go and pay their money and they would have a house spot but nothing has been done and now the Surveyors will have to go in again.

The idea also was mooted about how you could simply give a person a plot and you leave the person there. This is not Government's concept, Sir. We are looking at these tenancies where another Bill is coming soon after this one to improve them, to help make these tenancies really good tenancies, nicely laid out with roads, water, electricity and contrary to what the hon. member for St. John said about Springhead and Sion Hill because he knows only too well that I am an expert in that particular area.

I would like you to go into Sion Hill and tell the people in Sion Hill that you brought them there. The

hon. member for St. John went to Springhead at 5 o'clock in the afternoon and the people had to take a torchlight, at 5 o'clock in the afternoon and spot it in his face and say, "I hear about a man called Mr. Barrow but I have never seen him yet. Look you are there", and even in 1967 when I asked a question about the people in Springhead he said that he had no plans for Springhead. It was their duty to carry the load, in 1967, now getting in here and talking about he had something to do with something in Springhead.

When Sion Hill was acquired, Sir, they had to put roads in Sion Hill to sell any house spots and George Moe was taking names and I believe he took some peoples' names for house spots at Sion Hill and it was this Government that set about to demonstrate how that type of scheme could operate to improve the quality of life for people who lived on plantation tenancies, Sir.

As far as the point made by the hon. member for St. Philip about the old age pensioners are concerned and people who cannot afford to buy the land for some reason or another, but he specifically mentioned old age pensioners, the law is clear that you have the right to purchase, not that you must purchase it. If you are in a position to purchase a plot of land alright but failing that the old age pensioner will have the right to pay the rent which they are now paying to the landlord, Sir, I think any fears about the old age pensioner being disrupted or being put to any inconvenience, I hope that such fears can be removed once and for all because they will be protected in this Bill.

The hon. member for St. John, if I can refer to him as "Cannon". the learned hon. — I can give him the whole bit, if you insist, the hon. member for St. John made reference about A.D.C.'s land.
2.35 p.m.

Now there is a scheme, I think it is referred to as the integrated Rural Development Scheme where the lands are now vested in the A.D.C. That is the Scheme under the Ministry of Agriculture, but there are a number of Plantations like Dodds, for example, a place like Fairy Valley and a number of other plantations owned by A.D.C., but the point which I want to make, Sir, is that the hon. member for St. John said that it look a difficult proposition to get off the ground. I am giving this house an assurance, Sir, that some time between now and April of next year the lots of land are going to be surveyed and conveyed to people who live on the plantations. Surely we could not do Drax Hall as the hon. member mentioned. That is a very difficult one, I am told, but we must do the very simple ones first so as to demonstrate that it can be done and that it is going to be done. The people of Drax Hall no doubt are in the scheme of things, but that is a large area, and as the hon. member for St.

John said, a much more difficult one with houses probably dotted all about the place. But you have places like Dodds and Coverley is another one, but that is also, I am told very difficult, and there are places like Waterford and the Belle. These are relatively simple ones and it is this area that the Government is going to demonstrate first how this whole programme can be carried out.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague answered all the problems relating to the constitution and so on and therefore I am particularly proud and happy to associate myself with a Government that has taken such a bold step in bringing to Parliament what can be safely considered as a revolutionary piece of legislation. The Officers in my Ministry and all of the persons concerned in making this dream a reality I should like to salute, and there is no doubt the surveyors who have already conveyed to us that they are prepared to work along with the Government at a price not in keeping with what they would normally charge but in the interest of bringing about this piece of social legislation. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of pride and some feeling of gratitude that I beg to move that this Bill be read a second time.

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I am calling for a division in keeping with the provisions of the Constitution.

Ayes: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS; Hon. H. B. St. JOHN; Hon. L. S. CRAIG; Hon. H. deB. FORDE; Hon. C. L. BOLDEN; Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE; Hon. L. R. TULL; Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER; Mr. ALLEYNE; Dr. CHELTENHAM; Mr. SISNETT; Mr. JOHNSON; Mr. WARD; Mr. SIMMONS; Mr. BRADSHAW; Mr. ODLE; Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW and Mr. GREAVES — 18.

Noes: Nil.

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

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

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, if the House is prepared to have this done in Parts so that it will save time, I will have no objection. Outside of that, I know that we

should call the clauses one by one, but if the entire House is in the mood which I see it is in, I am quite happy to call it in Parts, if there is no objection from the Opposition benches.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: My understanding is that we will call clauses 1, 2 and 3, then we go on to Part I, Part II, and with respect to Part III we will deal with the clauses individually.

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

Clause 2 was called and passed.

Clause 3 was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, clause 3(1) reads as follows: "The purposes of this Act....." It should read: "The purpose....." therefore I beg to move that clause 3 as amended stand part.

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

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

Parts I and II were called and passed.

Clause 22 was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that clause 22 stand part.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, clause 22 deals with the right of a qualified tenant to purchase a freehold lot when the Chief Town Planner certifies on the application of a landlord that the lot is unsuitable for purchase because of its location in relation to other lots or for any other reason. Subclause (2): "The right of a qualified tenant to purchase the freehold of a lot may not be exercised by him if the Minister, by notice published once in the Official Gazette....." leaving out the newspaper business, "declares that the lot or the tenantry in which the lot is situated is required for public purposes....."

During the course of the second reading I of course could only speak on one single occasion. The point was made by the Hon. Attorney General, and the point was attempted to be made by the Minister of Housing and Lands about the policy of the previous Government. I would like to point out that in Part II of the Manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party precisely these points were adverted to, and it is under the heading, which

I will make a document of the House, Plantation Tenantries, and this is how it reads, Sir:

"Immediately after the Democratic Party assumed office we did an assessment of the plantation tenantries in Barbados. These tenantries covered over 4,900 acres. We set about bringing essential services such as roads, electricity, water and telephones to the people in these tenantries.

Most of the people who rented parcels of land from sugar plantations in Barbados lived on lots which were undefined as to area and precise location. The problem with transfer of title on such lots to the tenants has presented not only a financial problem but the problem of redefining and ascertaining with precision the lots to be conveyed.

There has been for a very long time a dearth of qualified land surveyors in Barbados. The Government set about the solution of this problem by —

- (a) a programme of training for surveyors, civil engineers and architects;
- (b) the formulation and publication of a Physical Development Plan for Barbados; and
- (c) the imminent introduction of registration of titles to facilitate and simplify transfers of land.

As an interim measure, and in order to prevent tenants from being ejected from holdings, whether in agricultural or urban areas, this Government introduced and passed one of the most important measures of social legislation in the history of the island in the form of the Tenantries (Control and Development) Act of 1965. By this legislation landlords are prohibited from ejecting tenants from their holdings, landlords are also prohibited from increasing rents, except by application to the court in circumstances where they have improved the tenantries for the benefit of the tenants.

The legislation has had the effect of virtually stabilising rentals for the past ten years and quieting the tenants on their holdings. At the same time, realising that the roads in private tenantries, many of which were in a state of disrepair would not be improved by the landlords on the grounds that the income allowed would be insufficient to cover expansion of such improvement, the DLP Government in the interest of the tenants set about a programme for the complete reinstatement of private tenantry roads throughout the length and breadth of the island.

The programme continues."

I make that point, Sir, because the Hon. Attorney General has said that we had not done anything about training surveyors. The first set of engineers that we sent up were ten in number to do the Higher National Certificate. They did so well, Sir, I believe one of them is now working in the Ministry of Finance, strange enough, as a qualified engineer, that most if not all of them went on to graduate with Bachelor of Science Degrees in Engineering, so when we were accused earlier today of not doing anything to train people in order to take over these tenancies, it is not correct, because we immediately set about a programme of training.

Of course, as in most areas of Government and even in private enterprise, there is a mortality rate — and when I say that I mean it not in the sense of a fatality rate — but there is a rate at which we do not get back a number of people because they are taken up by other Governments and by private enterprise and so on. There is a high rate of, let me say, wastage, but I am not using the term wastage in any pejorative sense, because as I said most of these engineers that we trained have assisted us in the taking over of the tenancies. A lot of them, as well as surveyors and civil engineers we did not get back. I have already elaborated on how we then set about to recruit the Surveyors' Association to assist in this regard.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I have taken the point and I think earlier I told the hon. member for St. John that I did not know they had two Manifestoes. I would like to know which Manifesto is right now. Listen to this: "Although our bill for fuel and oil and lubricants rose from \$22 million to \$69 million between 1972 and 1975, we managed to reduce the rate of inflation from 40% in 1974 to less than 10% in 1975."

Now, you say your inflation rate was not 40% in 1974. Which one do you have now? You have argued in here repeatedly that inflation was never at 40%, but in your very own document, in Part I of Manifesto No. 1 (Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I said that it was never 40%? Me?) I am sorry, not you, the ex-President, President No. 2, the member for St. Michael South West is saying it was not 40%, you are passing the buck, not you.
2.55 p.m.

I believe that they are going to need four in 1981, so you had better start printing now because I feel that we have finished printing, I feel that we have come off the press.

I beg to move Sir, that Clause 22 stand part.

We are off the press, I warn you.

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

The question that Clause 22 stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 23 was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move Sir, that Clause 23 stand part. I do not know which of these documents it should be and I would be grateful if the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition would lend me..... Oh, I know what happened, the Hon. Member for St. Michael South is going to assist me with document number two.

We have now taken Don Blackman off you and he is on a Caddle, one Caddle straddle. I believe that Blackman is going to tackle Caddle, so I can get this from you.

I beg to move Sir, that Clause 23 stand part.

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

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

Clauses 24 to 26 inclusive, were called and passed.

Clause 27 was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Clause 27 stand part.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 27 stand part.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I intimated earlier that Clause.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Twenty-seven?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Thirty-six is going to..... I am dealing with 27, you will see what I am referring to in a moment Sir, if you would just bear with me a moment. It is going to cause a lot of difficulty in this country.

Now, I do not think that most people — I cannot speak for the whole community in Barbados — will object to a price, I do not think that the plantation owners themselves, or the tenantry owners are going to take exception to price being fixed for the transfer of land, particularly where that price may actually be in excess of what they were willing to take, by free negotiation. But, in Clause 27 which we are now dealing with Sir, it says that:

"The Cabinet may by regulation fix the fees for all matters relating to the conveyance of freeholds under this part and fix such other fees as may be required for the purpose of any award, by any arbitrator, or any appeal to the High Court."

I am one of those members of the legal profession who has always argued that we should have Certificates of Title and get away from this nineteenth century conveyancing system which we have in Barbados, particularly where Government lands are concerned. There is no justification for charging fees, on the basis of a percentage of the purchase price and that kind of nonsense which goes on only in Barbados and probably Jamaica, as far as, I know and maybe Trinidad. It certainly does not go on in Antigua, or any of the Leeward Islands where they have Registration.

The point which I am making is not in respect of legal fees. But, I happen to know Sir, that the surveyors now, in Barbados, who are the people we have to rely upon, are up in arms against the dictation by the Government to them of the kind of fees which they should charge. (ASIDES: You mean Franklyn). I am saying the surveyors, plural. The surveyors in Barbados. My information did not come from the source that you might think that the information came from, so the Hon. Member should not go barking up the wrong trees, he might get his shins bruised.

The surveyors in Barbados are not in favour of the Government telling them that they should go and survey land for fees which are blow, or substantially below, what they are accustomed to charging, as an economic fee and fees which are laid down, by their profession and for which there is regulation, by the profession. Once we do this kind of thing, then, we are going to be telling everybody what kind of fees you should charge for what services, but we, in the House of Assembly, the sky is the limit, we are not fixing any stated fees for our time in here, \$10.00 per hour, or whatever you have, for service in the House of Assembly, the sky is the limit.

Now, when you have in Clause 36:

"Section 16 of the Constitution is altered by this Act to any extent necessary to ensure the constitutionality of this Act".

When you force a man to go and exercise his profession, at rates below what may be economically feasible, I am respectfully submitting, that this is an infringement of his fundamental rights under the Constitution. The fact that we may have one or two surveyors in our Party does not alter the matter. I am not speaking on their behalf, I would like to make my position clear. There might be more surveyors in the Government Party, than there are in our Party. As far as I know, we only have two and at

the most three, but I know, that there are more than 10 or 12 surveyors in Barbados, at the moment and my information is that the surveyors are not happy about this Provision and therefore, you have to link up this Provision of fixing people's fees, with the Provision in Section 36 which amends, or alters the Constitution.

Now, if I may put the situation a little more clearly. The Government can fix the fees which the Government wants for doing a certain job. There is nothing wrong with the Government doing that, but if this exercise is to be carried out, in view of the shortage of the professionally qualified persons, whose co-operation the Government will need to enlist, unless you are going to get the Defence Force to frog march them at bayonet point to carry out the surveys, if you want their co-operation.

What I am warning is that this is not the way to get their co-operation, by fixing arbitrary fees because there is no way that you can force them to do it. So, if you fix fees, all I am warning is that when you fix the fees and they do not like the fees, they are going to say, no work. That is all that will happen. So, unless the Government is prepared then, to use Government personnel, which I do not believe that they have the necessary numbers of people to do it, then, you are not going to accomplish the object which we all want to see, that is, the transfer of Title to the people.

This is not a political point which I am making, this is a common sense point of view which I am advancing. Under the Constitution, you cannot compel a man to do a job which he does not want to do. You have situations, in the legal profession, where you have fees fixed for defending people in certain criminal cases and you cannot get certain lawyers to go into court and defend people for these fees. Are you saying then, that the lawyers who refuse to go into Court and some of them are on that Side now praising me, I have never done one because I was never asked and my services were usually bespoken before. You cannot force a lawyer to go and defend a man if he says, I am sorry, I cannot afford it. If a person volunteers to do it, that is a different matter altogether, you can fix the fees.

I have often quoted I think from Midsummer Night's Dream, or the Tempest, where somebody said, they can summon up the denizens of the Underworld and this, that and the other, but will they come? You can summons them, but will they come? You can fix the fees, but can you get the people to do the survey? This is the point which I want to make.

So, in fixing these fees, remember that Section 36 does not give you the right to compel a person to do a job uneconomically.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: We have taken note of the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition's points, Sir and we can assure him that everything is going to be alright.

Nobody is going to take advantage of the surveyors, or any person, Sir. Put the questions, Sir.

The question that Clause 27 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 28 was called and passed.

3.05 p.m.

Clauses 29 to 35 were called and passed.

Clause 36 was called. ✓

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to draw to the Hon. Attorney General's notice that this Clause cannot pass as it stands. It is just a question of slackness, not on his part, the Draftsmen and secondly for notice that I really after much mature consideration do not see my way to support it but the amendment which I am urging on him is that we know that we have a National Insurance Corporation of Barbados but it is not to insure the Constitutionality of this Act. I am sure unless he is taking out an Insurance Policy now from the Act in advance that I suggest to the Hon. Attorney General that the word should be "ensure".

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: There is another one, Sir, The word "altered" is incorrectly spelt. I have "altere". Mine does not have a "d" in it.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I beg to move that Clause 36 stand part as amended, Sir, and that the word should be "ensure" instead of "insure".

I beg to move that Clause 36 as amended stand part.

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

The question that Clause 36 stand part as amended was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:-

Ayes: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS; Hon. H. B. St. JOHN; Hon. L. S. CRAIG; Hon. H. deB. FORDE; Hon. C. L. BOLDEN; Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE; Hon. L. R. TULL; Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER; Dr. CHELTENHAM; MESSRS. ALLEYNE; WARD; SISNETT; JOHNSON; SIMMONS; BRADSHAW; and Mr. SPEAKER. — 16.

Noes: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW; MESSRS. GREAVES and SANDIFORD. — 3.

Clauses 37 and 38 were called and passed.

The First Schedule was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that the First Schedule be passed as amended. I have put in Crab Hill for the hon. member for St. Lucy to let him see how simple it is to be done.

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

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

The Second Schedule was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that this Schedule be the Second Schedule to the Bill.

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

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

The Third Schedule was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that this Schedule be the Third Schedule to the Bill.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: There is just one thing I would like to ask the Hon. Minister. Is it the intention that quite apart from the provision of the Town and Country Planning Act not to apply, is it the intention of the Government that the water restriction zone should not apply? Then, I would like to tell the hon. member, do not do something hastily. Do not put in this because Crab Hill is in Zone 1. I know that for a fact. I suggest that the Minister do it after he has investigated it. As far as I am concerned, I cannot speak for the owners but I am sure that they will be willing to give the land to the Government if they want it. That is not in Zone 1 but since I was borned in St. Lucy and I know about Crab Hill, Crab Hill is in Zone 1. I suggest you take out Crab Hill and if you want to put it back in put it back in after you agree with that? I do not think you should get yourself in that. The hon. member for St. Lucy set you up, you see.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Set me up what. He cannot set me up in anything. He did not realise he had a Bill in his hand, Sir. The position is that we will leave it in and we will take the Town Planning advice on this. Do not worry, we will take care of it.

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

3.15 p.m.

On motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE, the Fourth Schedule was called and passed.

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

On Separate motions of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE, the Bill as amended was read a third time and passed.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Divide, Sir.

Ayes: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS; Hon. H. B. St. JOHN; Hon. L. S. CRAIG; Hon. H. deB. FORDE; Hon. C. L. BOLDEN; Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE; Hon. L. R. TULL; Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER; Mr. ALLEYNE; Dr. CHELTENHAM; Mr. SISNETT; Mr. JOHNSON; Mr. WARD; Mr. SIMMONS; Mr. BRADSHAW; Mr. ODLE; Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW and Mr. GREAVES — 18.

Noes: Nil.

THE COMMONWEALTH COUNTRIES ACT, 1980

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 2 stands in the name of the Hon. Attorney General, to move that further consideration of the Bill to amend the Constitution of Barbados so as to enable membership of the Commonwealth to be more easily ascertained, and to provide for the continued operation of the law of Barbados in relation to certain commonwealth countries, be resumed.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I am asking that in accordance with Section 49 that a vote be taken on the second reading or the numbers be counted.

Ayes: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS; Hon. H. B. St. JOHN; Hon. L. S. CRAIG; Hon. H. deB. FORDE; Hon. C. L. BOLDEN; Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE; Hon. L. R. TULL; Dr. CHELTENHAM; Mr. ALLEYNE; Mr. WARD;

Mr. SISNETT; Mr. JOHNSON; Mr. SIMMONS; Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER; Mr. BRADSHAW; Mr. ODLE — 16.

Noes: Nil.

Abstentions: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW and Mr. GREAVES — 2.

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

3.25 p.m.

Clauses 1 to 7 inclusive were called and passed.

The First Schedule was called.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: In moving that the First Schedule stand part, I move that the word spelt "Vanuaatu" be deleted and the word spelt "Vanuatu" be substituted.

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

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

The Second Schedule was called and passed.

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

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

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with section 49 I ask for a Division so that the numbers may be counted.

Mr. SPEAKER: A Division has been called for.

The question that the Bill do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS; Hon. H. B. St. JOHN; Hon. H. deB. FORDE; Hon. L. S. CRAIG; Hon. C. L. BOLDEN; Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE; Hon. L. R. TULL; Dr. CHELTENHAM; Mr. ALLEYNE; Mr. WARD; Mr. SISNETT; Mr. JOHNSON; Mr. SIMMONS; Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER; Mr. BRADSHAW and Mr. ODLE — 16.

Noes: —

Abstentions: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW and Mr. GREAVES – 2.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, the Standing Orders have been suspended, and I beg to move, with Your Honour's permission, that we re-open the question of Notices so that the Government can give notice of matters not for this meeting, but for a subsequent meeting, so as to allow them to be printed, and put on the Order Paper.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is seeking the leave of the House to give notice of Government Business. There is no objection and the hon. member may proceed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the Report of the National Insurance Board on its operations under the Sugar Workers (Provident Fund) Act for the period January to December 1979. Also, the Auditor's Report and Statement of Accounts of the Severance Fund for the period ended 31st December, 1979.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of lands at St. Barnabas and Mount Friendship, St. Michael and Upton, Christ Church for the purpose of highway improvement. Also, a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of lands at Walmer Lodge, Paradise, Danesbury, Spring Garden, Brighton and Exmouth Gap, St. Michael for the purposes of road development.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Bills: A Bill to reform the law respecting civil liability for animals, and a Bill to reform the law respecting trespass to property.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: On behalf of the Prime Minister I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Defence Act.

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to reform the law respecting civil liability for animals be now read a first time.

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

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

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to reform the law respecting trespass to property be now read a first time.

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

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

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Defence Act be now read a first time.

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

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

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: There is a reply to a Parliamentary Question, Sir.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 45, asked by the Hon. Member for St. Michael South West, is now ready.

QUESTION TIME

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to move Sir, that Question Time be now taken.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time. Question No. 45, asked by the Hon. Member for St. Michael South West, whom I do not now observe in his place. Let replies be laid.

That brings us to the end of Question Time.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to move Sir, that Government Business be now resumed and that Item No. 5 be the Instant Order of the day.

Mr. SPEAKER: Government Business is now resumed. Item No. 5.

BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF TENANTRIES AND FOR MATTERS CONNECTED THEREWITH

Order No. 5 was called – To move the Second Reading of a Bill to provide for the development of tenancies and for matters connected therewith.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: This Bill, Mr. Speaker, is a Bill which, more or less, provides the mechanics in relation to the Bill which we have just passed, Sir.

It gives the Government the right to go in and carry out the necessary infra-structure in the tenantries, Sir, and other related tenantries. I am not proposing, Mr. Speaker, to go into any great detail on this particular Bill, since enough has been said on the other Bill.

What I am now happy about is that in a lot of the depressed areas, we are now in a position to be able to do our best to upgrade such areas Sir. There is very little, Mr. Speaker, which I would like to add, apart from any questions which may come from the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition, in relation to this Bill, Sir and I beg to move Sir, that this Bill be now read a second time.

It is primarily to give us the right to improve, to set up the infra-structure in the very tenantries. Bills which we have just passed through the Honourable Chamber, Sir.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this Bill be now read a second time. Hon. Members in favour will please say aye, those opposed will please say no.....

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few constituency points on this Bill. As would have been obvious, from the previous Bill, the parish of St. Philip, more than any other, contains the largest number of tenantries.

During the Budget Debate this year, I, in anticipation of this Bill, was able to identify, off the cuff, a number of the tenantries which are worthy of development. There are some which are particularly bad, I am grateful that this Bill will allow for improvement to roads, drainage, installation of water supply and electricity supply, in the main.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I understand that this is part of what is known as the Rural Integrated Development Scheme. I am concerned. There is a tenantry and this affects the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works, there is a tenantry in my Constituency known as Thicket which was not in the list on the Tenantries Freehold Purchase Act, but I drew the omission to the Hon. Minister of Housing and I have his assurance that it would be looked into. Well over a year ago now, Mr. Speaker, I had asked for water to be installed — in fact it goes back to the first few days that I was in the Honourable House, it goes back to 1976 — for water and roads to be put in, in Thicket's. Water was put in about one year to eighteen months ago.

I was shown a list of areas for road development. Thicket Tenantry Road was on that list for road improvement. I was told, I think, that it would cost nearly \$200,000.00 to put in a proper tenantry road in there. I was told that this work was going out to private contract and in fact, had been assigned to private contract. This is now September and at least eight months have passed since I was given that assurance, at least eight months since the road was measured and the people of Thicket's have not got their road. Mr. Speaker, I mean, my patience is running out.

I would like to know, from whoever is responsible, whether this now falls under Housing, or whether it falls under M.C.W. I want to know how soon the people of Thicket's will get the road which they truly deserve. There are people who have cars in that area. The road is so rough, it is rougher than where I live at Neils, Sir, the entrance to my house is one of the worst roads in Barbados.

3.45 p.m.

That cannot be done by MCW. I am not asking MCW to do that. That is a private development and I understand there are 11 houses. All of us will have to get together and borrow some money and get a road put in so I am prepared to wait but I cannot accept the same thing for the poor people of Thickets, the tenantry people who were made a promise and saw MCW people come and lay the mains and they are thankful for the water, who saw representatives of a private firm come and measure and cannot get the road and at the same time springs, shocks and everything from the cars are falling into disrepair.

I do not know what priority is going to be given in the dissemination of the services in this Bill. As I have said my constituency has the largest number of tenantries. In the normal scheme of things I would trust, so far as one can trust anything in politics, I would trust that some equitable distribution of service be made so that those areas which are suffering most be attended to first.

I can think, Mr. Chairman, of Chapel Tenantry in Church Village which has at least, in terms of voters about 300 voters in the tenantry and the hon. member for St. Michael South West when he was canvassing in the bye-election against me in 1976 admitted to the people in Chapel Tenantry that he did not know and could not believe that there was any area in Barbados that was not physically set like Chapel was.

After I got in I made stern pleas for water and electricity and I got some water out of the last Government to their credit, the last Government between February and September, 1976 delivered water to the

people in my constituency who voted for me and not for them in Chapel but nothing has been done about the roads and I would say to those who have to deal with the priorities of the implementation of services under this Bill would see to it that the needs of the very many people in Chapel Tenantry are attended to without undue delay. Some of the others are not quite as bad but Chapel is certainly the worst. I can only drive my car to a certain point. I do not mind walking the rest to get to see people and so on in my constituency but a Doctor is not going to do it. They will park on the road opposite Chapel Plantation and tell you to bring the person but a Doctor is not going to drive his car in there so I am drawing it to Government's attention that it is accepted even by the Opposition that the Chapel Tenantry area is the worst district in the whole of Barbados and from that premise I believe it deserves some consideration. As I said so I would just like to hear if anybody on the Government's frontbench can say as to when it is likely that the work in Thickets will be done.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in respect of this Bill I find the two Bills are supposed to run together, the Purchase Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act and this one but I do not find the same consistency in drafting. For example, I do not understand and I prefer to speak on it now, Mr. Speaker, even if you think it is a matter of detail but I would like to submit that it is a matter of policy.

Clause 22 of the Bill itself earlier today provides for notices to be published once in the *Official Gazette* and once on a weekday in each of the Newspapers published in Barbados. Now Clause 3 of this Bill provides for publication once in the *Gazette* and once in a Newspaper. Now if the two Bills are to be taken together, why are you going to limit publication of the Ministerial Designation Order to one Newspaper whereas you are granting the right to each of the Newspapers in respect of the Freehold Purchase and Tenancies Act. It does not seem to me to be consistent with the drafting but it is even deeper than that.

A vast proportion of the people in Barbados do not read the *Official Gazette*. Some of us who get it do not get it on time. I do not know the last couple of weeks that I have seen one delivered at my office or at my home so you rule out a vast segment of people from knowing about the Designation Order because a vast proportion of people do not get the *Official Gazette*.

If you have two Newspapers in Barbados which are published, the *Advocate* is daily and the *Nation* is published through the Nation Publishing Company, three Newspaper, *The Sunday Sun*, the Wednesday Edition and the Friday Edition. It seems to me not only to be discriminatory, not only to be inconsistent drafting with the other Act but to me I do not know if it has been

done for reasons of economy. If so, it is a very false and cheap economy.

It seems to me that Clause 4 could be amended to say that "the Minister shall, within a reasonable time after a Designation Order is made caused to be published once in the *Official Gazette* and once in each Newspaper published in Barbados." That is all you need to say. Amend the words "in a" to read "in each" Newspaper and then you would give a little bit of the publicity to both the *Advocate* and the *Nation* or the Advertiser. If we are going to be consistent in drafting, be consistent.

I must confess that I have complained several times about the methods of drafting and I am told that there are new. I am very old fashioned when it comes to the law and a lot of the drafting seems to me to be a little bit too loose for my liking but I have had representations made by the Hon. Attorney General and defences and I am not going to argue because I am not trained as a Draftsman but in reading a lot of these Bills I can see where the Lawyers can run coaches and horses through them. Those are my only comments, Mr. Speaker, on this Bill.

I would like the Government to take into account that point I made about the amendment to streamline the publication that if somebody misses the *Advocate* they will at least see it in the *Nation* or vice-versa as the majority of them will not see it in the *Official Gazette* in any event.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has spoken about the difficulties which he has been experiencing in his constituency. I think that he omitted to use one expression in relation to Chapel Tenantry. Chapel Tenantry is dangerous. If you go into Chapel Tenantry at night you are confronted by traps and quarries. I am not speaking about the Chapel Quarry I am speaking about the tenancies. The hon. member will tell you.
3.55 p.m.

This is another plea for proper planning and maybe moving the people out because right next to Chapel I believe there is a middle income private development taking place which is a very suitable development, but the agricultural workers are relegated to poising their houses precariously between several bits and pieces of quarries. And if we are speaking about constituencies now, we might as well go back to the one which I represent, and we have a place called Henley in St. John which I am not very proud of because we have been trying for a long time to get the owners up there to see about doing something about Henley tenantry. I am not surprised that I did not get the support for Henley tenantry that I got for the rest of the parish because they attribute the derelict-

tion with which they are surrounded to the lack of interest in the Government which is far from true. This is another case where the plantations were not interested in letting anybody go in there to put the land in order; so this Bill of course has our support. I do not see any abridgement of the constitutional rights of the subject in it and all of us here who represent rural constituencies can cite case after case where proper planning has got to be done, but I hope that the taxpayers of Barbados are not going to be called upon to foot the whole bill for reconstruction of areas where the landlords for generations have enjoyed the rents and profits from the tenancies which these unfortunate people are living in. A proper look has got to be given to the whole land tenure system in Barbados. A comprehensive survey of the land owners system in Barbados must be undertaken and a whole restructuring of the village life of Barbados needs to be undertaken as well. It may appear to be a monumental task, but we have got to start somewhere.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, any representative of a rural constituency will seek every available opportunity to put forward the claims of his constituency for the receipt of greater development than that which appears to be given at the given moment. Any Minister of Government who has the responsibility for making plans or development in a country would be very concerned that he is unable to supply the needs of the country at the given time, therefore we end up with both parties being dissatisfied over what they are able to give to the people in the country. But when it comes to social services in a country, I believe any responsible person would recognise that it is impossible at any time whether it be within a day, within a week, within a month, within a year, within a period to satisfy the social needs of any community in any country.

When I hear members in Parliament decrying the work of a particular department, I like to believe that the member is trying to show to his constituents that he still has their interest at heart, but he recognises the difficulty there is to satisfy that interest. We moved today into a situation which will stand out in history as from today onwards. The Tenancies Bill and the companion Bill will be landmarks in our social development in this country. It places a great burden particularly upon the Ministry of Communications and works that is responsible for social services, roads, water and lights; but I believe that we must go back and we must warn people that we cannot create miracles.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition said he has never seen miracles in his party or during the time that he led the Government; he does not believe miracles can happen while this Government is in power. I once remember hearing a phrase "miracles do happen but it sometimes takes men to help them along." Mr. Speaker, the

hon. member for St. Michael South within recent weeks made a statement in this House. He said no administration in any period can satisfy the demands of the constituents for roads, water, lights and housing, and I think those words should be remembered when we come to talk about social services and social development in this country.

When the hon. member for St. Philip North speaks about the condition of roads in his constituency, first of all I want it to clearly understood that in the Ministry of Communications and Works there is what is called an AMS programme, and the Waterworks Department has worked out a programme of laying four inch mains in districts according to a basic programme. When I took up the Ministry of Communications and Works, I must say that I instructed my officer that the major part of our development for two years would go towards the development of subsidiary roads and tenantry road programmes. I have personally visited well over 84 tenantry roads in this country because I recognise the problem that the Barbados Labour Party would have to face when it came to the Tenancies Bill that was introduced in this Parliament today. The Democratic Labour Party talks about repairs to tenantry roads, but when I went to the Ministry only 9 miles of tenantry roads had been completed under the regime of the DLP's fifteen years in office. Last year alone my Ministry completed 19.5 miles of tenantry roads, and the year before that we completed 13 miles of tenantry roads. By the end of 1980 I am satisfied that we shall exceed the 19½ miles of tenantry roads we completed in 1979; but Mr. Speaker, I would like hon. members to know that if you take the Christ Church West Constituency that is less than two miles out of the heart of Bridgetown, you only have to turn off any opening you find from the time you reach Wildey and you would be surprised to think that there are numerous chattel houses, board and shingle houses sited in these areas where the roads are no more than dirt, and when it rains there are mud holes and puddles.

The Ministry of Communications and Works, even if they were given \$10 million today, Mr. Speaker, could not get into every district to satisfy the needs of the representatives because we have not got the manpower, the country has not got the technical manpower to carry out the development that has been scheduled in that Ministry as fast as we would like to do.

4.05 p.m.

The hon. member for St. Philip North talks about the Ministry's representatives measuring roads and private contractors measuring roads. We worked out a scheme, we said we would give some roads out to private contractors, we would also carry out some of the programme ourselves. We have had Supervisors in my Ministry who have reached the age of retirement and we have gone to look

for them within one week of leaving the Ministry and they have all been snapped up by private contractors and are no longer available to the Ministry of Communications and Works. You must not lay the blame at the Ministry today, the hon. member for St. John talked about training, that they started to train people with a view to the tenancies development, but you must ask how many persons were trained during the regime of the Democratic Labour Party that could be employed today, and the answer may be five or ten, but when a Government sets out more than \$100 million for Capital Development Programmes basically in roads and structural buildings, you have not then got the number of architects, engineers or technical officers available to spread around as is required. In my Ministry we have put forward plans for in-service training, we have already done training at BIMAP, we have asked the Ministry of Education to start courses at the Community College, and the last graduates of the Community College when we tried to recruit five of them they were all snapped up by private enterprise, so this Ministry is suffering because of our own development programme.

Ten years ago, Mr. Speaker, when you went into any village the only thing you saw in terms of water was a standpipe with a cement block under it and mud around it. The Democratic Labour Party started a process of building communal baths and as a member of the Opposition I opposed communal baths, because I thought, and I am still of the view, that you do not get women in this community going into these communal baths. Under this regime we have started to remove standpipes and we are running water into everything tenantry as soon as we can do it. We have said openly that anybody in any village who is in need of a water supply can pay \$20 into the Ministry of Communications and Works and we will put in the water, and what we are trying to do is not to lay pipes today, repave the roads tomorrow and then next week somebody comes in and asks for water and then we have to dig up the road. I have even had to lay down instructions in my Ministry that we now go into private developments and resurface those roads, because in the long run if we do not do it we will pay the penalty, because after you cut a pipe track, you will leave it open, grass grows into it, the whole road is destroyed and in the end the Ministry will still have to resurface the whole road.

As far as I am concerned, the tenancies programme will be shared equitably. The programme that we operate in the Ministry, we visit areas, we look at the density of houses in the area, we look at the problems of acquisition, because, Mr. Speaker, I believe you are aware, the member for St. James is aware, that so far the Ministry is involved in at least two problems in St. James and St. Peter. We have complaints from the representatives that they want a road done, you send in and you start fixing the road, then you hear somebody come out and say "don't

touch my land". We had a case in St. James in which overnight after the road had been cut out and we started to pave the road people came out on both sides and drove four long square irons down in the centre of the road, and we had Solicitors' letters from three companies in Bridgetown warning the Ministry that if their officers trespass they would be prosecuted. It is a question of acquisition.

In most of the unplanned developments, houses are put down willy nilly. You are asked to provide the roads, we go in and do a survey, we say we will put down a road of not less than 12 feet in width. As soon as you start the road you find out that you have to ask somebody to give a corner of land and the problem starts. We have to stop, we have to go through the process of land acquisition. I will give you a typical example. In my constituency, for years the people in Tent Bay have been complaining about proper access to their houses. As Minister of Communications and Works, as the representative for St. Joseph, I decided that they should have a proper road. We went in, we sent in the bulldozers and we started to cut the road. The next thing we heard was a goodly lady called Miss Maxwell telling us that we should not cut her road and I understand she is suing the Government. No more than about 20 square feet of road to give a proper access to some 14 or 15 houses, and the road also improves her land. But you get quarrels about providing roads for people.

As far as I am concerned, as long as there is money, as long as there are technical officers, we will try our best to give roads, water and lights to every village under the sun in this country. Where street lights are concerned, I believe I should make it absolutely clear. I have given instructions to Barbados Light and Power to instal some 677 street lights around the island. I have been calling them daily asking when they are going to complete the programme. At first I was told they had no street lights, then I was told they had 500, then I was told Hurricane Allen come and they had to use 300 out of those for replacements; now I have been told they are having difficulties with their suppliers. The Government does not import street lights, we give instructions to Barbados Light and Power to put up the street lights at places the Ministry considers appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, if the street lights are available, there is an order standing with Barbados Light and Power for the installation of 677 street lights at this minute. We also have to look at the question of small villages and communities. I believe, despite the claims of the Leader of the Opposition and several other people, that any Government must be very careful how it talks about moving people from one place to the next. The hon. member for St. John talks about Chapel Tenantry being dangerous. I wonder if he has asked the people in Chapel Tenantry if they want to be removed from Chapel Tenantry, because you get endless trouble when you start to move

communities. You either break up communities, you break up relations and you end up with a dog fight. Many of us as lawyers who practise in the courts of this country have had the opportunity to observe when you start a new community by bringing people and placing them in an area and interjecting other persons in between. 4.15 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy for the Bill. I hope that the Hon. Member for St. Philip North will understand the way that things are going. I do not think that he was in the Honourable House, in 1971, when the Rt. Hon. Member for St. John made a Statement, after I complained about not doing the roads in St. Joseph. He said, I am getting none in my Constituency either, but come next month, I will move all the equipment to do Kendal Tenantry. I do not want to make the same statement.

The present rate of development is such, that we are hard pressed to get work done. The Ministry ordered a number of lorries because we have to increase the fleet of lorries. We have now found that it is about the same cost to fix a road with barber green, as to fix it in the conventional manner. But, we find that to move barber green from the South in Christ Church, to the North is a problem. The Ministry is now developing plans and we are searching for an area in the Northern part of the country where we hope to set up another barber green plant.

We will do our best, to treat as I said, these tenantries based on the needs, the density of houses and the problems which we find in the area and as long as we have the money and as long as we can find the artisans and the technical staff, this is how we will proceed. We have been hampered within the last six months because many of our engineers have left the Ministry and have gone into private practice. We are finding difficulty in recruiting engineers. As a matter of fact, the Government has taken the situation, we have even regraded the salary of engineers to see if we can attract more engineers to us, but we certainly cannot proceed any faster at the minute.

I can assure all Hon. Members, of the Honourable House, on this Side and on the Other Side, that this Government will treat everybody in a fair way. We are not going to do districts which support the Barbados Labour Party and not other districts. We look at the requirements of an area and we attack it, based on our capabilities at the minute.

Mr. V. L. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have heard a great deal this day, in the Honourable Chamber, about plantation tenantries and I suppose that all of us have already agreed that it is a revolutionary piece of legislation which we have enacted here this afternoon.

Mr. SPEAKER: All I want to hear now, is what they are going to do in St. Peter.

Mr. V. L. JOHNSON: Yes, Sir. I believe Sir, that being a St. Peter man like yourself, I too share the concerns of St. Peter and I believe that we have already taken steps in the first Bill, to look after Welchtown, Portland, Castle, Four Hills, Prospect, Mount Brevitor and all the other plantations although, Mr. Speaker, I did not hear Oxford called.

But, two years, or so ago, I made a speech in this Honourable Chamber regarding the need for re-development of urban tenantries. I represent a Constituency which has in it, a fairly large number of sub-tenantries, tenantries owned by relatively small land holders which fall within the Tenantries Act of more than five houses, on any one location. The point which we can make about all of those tenantries without exception is, that there are not adequately provided for, in terms of services because the owners of that land are not in a position to provide the necessary services which make living bearable in those areas.

Houses are on relatively small plots where it is impossible to get in and out when the rain falls. There is no attempt to provide any road services, so people have to go through miniature rivers of water, in order to get into their houses. Yearwood Road, Crawford Land, Small Land, Strakers Tenantry, Hurley Tenantry, Scott's Terrace, Eckstein Village and so on. Scott's Terrace is not a tenantry in the classical sense, Sir, but it is a private development, the roads have been long since washed away and it is extremely difficult for people to navigate over those very, very uneven surfaces.

But, Sir, when you come to a Constituency like St. Michael West, in today's context, I believe that it is deplorable for people to have to live as they do, say in Eckstein Village. There are no roads of any consequence, some people still have pit toilets in the yard, they cannot make any provisions for improvement because the land is not theirs. The landlords cannot develop the land themselves because they have not the means. Inasmuch as land rents are regulated by Statute and they cannot raise rents which would afford them an opportunity to make the necessary provision of services, I have been advocating, for some time now, that these services ought to be provided by the Government and that the lands should be bought from the present owners. Pay them a reasonable price and the Government then, in turn, sell the spots to the people who are occupying them, but with the proviso that the roads are well laid in and water and electricity services provided.

I am happy to see, that at least, we are drawing closer to that kind of thinking in the Labour Party because we have a Bill here now, which provides for rede-

velopment of other tenancies and I would like to hope that the Hon. Minister, in the exercise of his discretion, will look at these areas and regard them as areas where we urgently need to have these services provided.

Now, Sir, I have heard a lot about parochial services being provided, water and light, in areas which may not generally be classified as tenancies and I would like to lend my voice to the general plea for some consideration, when it is possible, to accelerate services in these areas. First Avenue Grazettes is part of the old Grazettes Development which had roads let in, in the early 50's, but nothing has happened since then and one of the things which has always baffled me is why is it that Governments stand idly by, allow roads which have been developed to fall into such general disrepair that for all practical purposes, you have to go back over again and lay in those services from scratch. It seems a kind of inestimable profligacy, where we sit down and watch these services fall into disrepair then, we have to take taxpayers' money and go all over again. I cannot understand why there is not a systematic programme of maintenance, so that these roads, when they begin to pot, are repaired speedily. An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

The man lost the horse Sir, when you were a boy in school because he did not put in the first nail and he lost the shoe and ultimately the horse because the horse became lame and that analogy is still apt because these areas which I refer to, had good roads done by the Labour Party Government in the 1950's and over 15 years of Democratic Labour Party rule, nothing happened. Now, I am not sure, that we are not falling into the same system again because I am not convinced, that we are as diligent in our maintenance programme, as we need to be.

One of the things which continues to baffle me is why is it, that in new developments, even developments done by the Government, like Oxhards and Husbands, why is it that, in the planning, water mains are not laid in, at least making provision for the inlet of water. Just provide the services to the spot, do not connect it, but provide it, so that when houses begin to go up, you do not have to go and dig up the barber green roads all over again, to lay in the pipe lines.

4.25 p.m.

When you look at places like Oxhards, the roads are all in and every single house has a line across the road where they had to break it in order to get the service across to the otherside. The hon. member for St. Michael North East is asking why do you have to break the road at all and that is a good question. Why are not the services provided at the site? I am hearing that perhaps you would have to lay two mains, one on the right and one on the left but I believe that if planning is gone into

systematically these water mains can be laid and subsidiary services laid across the street for each house and then after the tenant comes in and applies for the service the charges associated with running across the subsidiary line can be applied to the person who is making application for that service and if we do that, Sir, I think we will discover that the standard of our road repair bill will go down considerably because I am satisfied that thousands of dollars, if not millions, are wasted each year in this kind of bad planning with respect to new developments by the Ministry of Communications and Works.

I would like to close with this note that I would urge the Minister responsible to pay careful attention to the Tenancies in St. Michael West where people in the suburban area have a right to expect a reasonable standard of living and which they are now not getting because of the fact that the lands which they now occupy are not their own and they are owned and controlled by persons who are not generally in a position to provide the services to the tenancies in question and I am hoping that my words do not fall on deaf ears and that the people who I have to represent can expect some reasonable approach to solving these problems in the very near future.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, briefly I think the Leader of the Opposition made a query about the financing of this project and he mentioned that he hoped that the taxpayers would not be burdened with this money. I would like to assure him that we are seeking funds from the World Bank to assist us with this project.

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

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

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

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

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

Parts 1 and 2 were called and passed.

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

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

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, 30th September, 1980 at 12 noon.

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

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

4.35 p.m.