THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1971 - 76

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION OF 1971-76

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 10th July, 1973

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12 noon o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour N. G. A. MAXWELL, LL.B., (Speaker); Hon. C. E. TALMA, C.B.E., (Deputy Prime Minister and Leader of the House); Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, (Minister of Home Affairs); Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees); Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, MA., (Leader of the Opposition); Hon. F. G. SMITH, Q.C., S.C., B.A., (Minister of Communications and Works); Hon. P. G. MORGAN, C.B.E., (Minister of Tourism, Information and Public Relations); Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, (Minister of Health and Welfare); Mr. A. MORRISON and Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., M.A., (Econ.), (Minister of Education, Youth Affairs,

Community Development and Sport)

Prayers were read.

Mr. SPEAKER:
I have the honour to inform this Honourable Chamber that I have received from the Accountant General Statements and Accounts for the month of January 1972.

Messrs. HINDS, CRAIG and MOTTLEY entered the Chamber and took their seats.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Appropriation Act, 1973.

Also a Bill to amend the Customs Act, 1962.

Also a Bill to amend the Consumption Tax Act, 1962.

With respect to the Bill to amend the Customs Act, 1962, and the Bill to amend the Consumption Tax Act, 1962, I am asking for permission to deal with them in all their stages today.

Mr. SPEAKER:
If there are no objections, leave will be granted.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I do not understand this. The Order Paper contains certain Acts. Am I to take it that notice has not been given of the Acts and yet they have been published in the Order Paper?

Mr. SPEAKER:

I understand that the Hon. Leader of the House is asking for leave to take charge of Items Nos. 2 and 3 on the Order Paper.

Mr. ADAMS:

Leave to take charge of, and not to give notice of them Sir. I think he said "give notice."

Mr. SPEAKER:

According to my Order Paper, notice has already been given.

Mr. ADAMS:

Could that point be checked, Sir? We have no objections to the Leader of the House taking charge of them today, but we have objections to his giving notice of them today where they have already appeared on the Order Paper.

Hon. C. E. TALMA Mr. Speaker, I am merely asking for leave to deal with them in all their stages.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Notice has already been given. If there is no objection, leave will be granted. There being no objection, leave is granted to the Leader of the House to take charge of Items Nos. 2 and 3 on the Order Paper under Government Business.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, under Private Members' Notices, I gave notice of a Resolution of "No Confidence" in the Government. I do not know why the Clerk is glossing over it. I am sure he is not doing it deliberately, so to speak, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER:
Perhaps the hon. member is rather tardy in rising.

Mr. ADAMS:
I scarcely heard the words "Private Members' Notices", and the next thing I heard was "Are there any Bills to be read a first time?"

Mr. SPEAKER:
The Clerk expects all hon. members to pay attention.

Mr. ADAMS:
May I give notice of it now, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER:
Yes.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. ADAMS:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution

Be It Resolved that this House has no

Confidence in Her Majesty's Government in

Barbados and calls on the Prime Minister to resign or call an early General Election.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Customs Act, 1962, be now read a first time.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:
I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS:
Mr. Speaker, that is the very point which I made. If notice had been given of it last week, it would have been read a first time last week. I cannot believe that the Leader of the House has directly sought to mislead you, me, or everybody else in here. I specifically asked whether he was asking for leave to deal with the item, or had notice already been given.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Speaker, I am not misleading the House or anybody else. I was not present on the last occasion. I see from the Order Paper that notice was given for considering these two Bills. I did not see where the Clerk or anyone intimated that they had been read a first time. All I am trying to do is to regularise the position.

Mr. SPEAKER:
I have been informed by the Clerk that notice was given by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture on the last occasion the House met, but it was not read a first time.

The question that the Bill to amend the Customs Act, 1962, be now read a first time was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. C, E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Consumption Tax Act, 1962, be now read a first time.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:
I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 12.10 p.m.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, a Bill to amend the Appropriation Act, 1973, was read a first time.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. F. G. SMITH:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 85, asked by the hon. member for St. George North, is ready.

Mr. MOTTLEY:
Mr. Speaker, on the last occasion when the House met, notice of Oral Replies to two questions was given, but before Question Time was reached the House was adjourned for lack of a quorum Is it correct that these will come up today, Mr. Speaker? I do not think they can be laid on the Table since they were not called.

Mr. SPEAKER:
The Oral Replies given notice of last week will be dealt with today at the appropriate time.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 43, 44 and 49 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting, subject to the usual undertaking given to the Opposition that if there is any matter of urgent business they would like to deal with or of which they would like to give notice, we will remain in and see that these matters are dealt with at a later stage in the sitting after the greater part of Government Business shall have been completed.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, we are not supporting this. Last week we witnessed the spectacle in the House of Assembly for which I honourably exclude the Leader of the House in which the Government could not even honour its own implicit undertakings to remain in the House of Assembly to carry out its own business, and it is too much of a strain on our creditability to believe that apart from one or two hon. members who may care to give specific pledges - I have in mind the hon. member for St. Michael South Central who has so done in the past, hon. members on the Government side are going to remain in here after the dinner hour or around the dinner hour to support Private Members' Time. We cannot see on this side why the Government wishes to deprive Private Members of the House of Assembly of the opportunity of Question Time in its proper place and the opportunity of Private Members' Business in its proper place, that is, between Lunch Time and Dinner Time.

You were absent last week, and you are unaware that members of the Government repaired to the luncheon room and then went home so that Government Business could not have continued, far less Private Members' Business. With this attitude of mind on the majority, bearing in mind that unless there is a full turn out of the Officers of the House and of the Opposition, a quorum cannot be formed without the Government Members. We cannot, and as at present advised doubt we will ever be able in here to support the suspension of the Standing Orders. The only way that Private Members' Business can properly be carried out is in the allotted time set by the Standing Orders. There has been a Standing Orders Committee sitting for a number of years and it has returned to the House with a practically identical time-table for the conduct of Private Members' Business. Members of that Committee included, apart from yourself, the Leader of the House, at a later stage the Minister of Home Affairs, at an early stage the Minister of Communications and Works and numerous other members of the House with long and in some cases useful experience of parliamentary matters, and it was decided then by the Standing Orders Committee that Private Members' Time would effectively continue between lunch and tea.

I submit to you, Sir, and to all hon. members that it is best to observe the time table of the House. If there are any items of Private Members' Business, whether they come from Private Members on this side or Private Members on the other side, no time will be wasted in dealing with matters with which members are not ready to deal, and I suggest and submit most strongly to all hon. members that they should reject this motion. I am inviting the Leader of the House to reconsider it and consider the whole policy of Private Members' Business for the future.

There used to be moments when I formed the impression that this whole, if I may call it, racket of suspending the Standing Orders derived from the fertile genius and sometimes somewhat devious mind of the former junior member for St. Lucy. I used to think that he used to suspend the Standing Orders so as to give the hon. senior member for St. Joseph a chance to make his presence felt in the House, because week after week we used to have the Standing Orders suspended for no purpose except to allow the hon. member to say that he wanted the Government to buy Lammings Plantation, and I think this unfortunate charade has now been elevated to a principle of Parliamentary Government, and I think it is time once and for all, and I would say this, I believe I heard the Prime Minister support the arguments which I am now putting forward on occasions both in this Parliament and last Parliament, that we abandoned this principle, do away with the suspension of Standing Orders except on occasions of really vital national importance, give to Private Members such time between the hours as the Standing Orders give to them and forget this question of speech making and arguments and messages from one side to another about the suspension of Standing Orders.

I would urge upon the hon. member to consider what I have said, and not to suspend the Standing Orders today, but let the House be prepared to do a full day's work for the very ample day's pay which we are at present getting.

I would just add a postscript. If hon. members think we are making this plea for Private Members' Business to pursue the motion of "No Confidence" of which I have just given notice, I should just like to assure hon. members that the Rules do not permit, and I am not going to seek the suspension of any Rules to pursue the matter today. I will in due course ask the Government to set aside one or two days for the pursuit of such a motion. So I would not like that to be drawn across anybody's trail as a red herring at this stage in support of the motion which the Leader of the House has just brought. I would urge him to withdraw it and failing that I would urge any hon. member who feels as I do to make his feelings felt by his vote at the appropriate moment on the division which will no doubt be called for if this motion is pressed.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The question is that this Standing Order be suspended subject to the usual undertaking.....

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, this motion, I would seem to think, is somewhat nebulous. What is the usual undertaking?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

On a point of order, the hon. member is out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let the hon. member please take his seat.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

But, Mr. Speaker, the question has not been put. The manner in which the Resolution has been moved is very nebulous when you say subject to the usual conditions. What usual conditions? As I understand it, the usual conditions are that Private Members' Business and Question Time, at the time set by the Standing Orders. This is the way it has been done during the time I have been in here, and even though you suspend the Standing Orders to go beyond 2 o'clock, immediately after, the time allotted for Private Members by the Standing Orders is taken. Is this what the Hon. Leader of the House means? 12.20p.m.

Is this what the Hon. Leader of the House means? I think it is unfair where the Government does not see that there is any necessity to do at least five items of Private Members' Business on the Order Paper, as they did last week, but they walk in here today to seek to deprive private members of doing their business purely because they have the numbers. I cannot in the circumstances support the resolution, and on the other hand I would suggest that the resolution is not very clear and proper, it is too nebulous. Merely to move a resolution subject to the usual conditions is, in my suggestion, a very nebulous way of doing things and the resolution is not a proper one.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The question is that these several Standing Orders be suspended for the remainder of the day's sitting, subject to the usual undertaking that Private Members' Business will be done at the end of Government Business.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

We will divide on that question, Sir.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, have the conditions of Standing Order 71 been complied with? I will submit that if they have not been complied with, even at this stage, Your Honour can disallow it.

Mr. SPEAKER:

In my opinion the conditions of Standing Order 71 have been complied with, seeing that no abuse of the rules of the House has taken place nor has there been any infringement of the rights of a minority of the members. The rights of the minority of members have been amply provided for at the end of Government Business according to the terms of the motion.

Mr. ADAMS:

The rules of the House say the middle of the day.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have ruled.

The question that these several Standing Orders be suspended for the remainder of the day's sitting, subject to the usual undertaking that Private Members' Business will be done at the end of Government Business, was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

AYES:

Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. G. G.

FERGUSSON, Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS,

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, Hon. L. E.

SANDIFORD, Hon. F. G. SMITH, Hon.

P. G. MORGAN, Mrs. EASTMOND, Messrs. LOWE, GREAVES, MORRISON and WEEKES - 12.

NOES:
Messrs. ADAMS, CRAIG, MOTTLEY and HINDS -4.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:
I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Speaker, we will deal with Item l(b) standing in the name of the Prime Minister.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:
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. LOWE in the Chair.

RESUMPTION OF SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1973-74 No. 7

A resolution for the sum of $22,000 was called.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
When the Committee reported progress the hon. member for St. Peter was speaking. He may continue.

Mr. HINDS:
Mr. Chairman, perhaps it was to good account that when the Committee found itself having to report progress this matter was not completed, because since we were here last much has been aired on this resolution which concerns secondary and tertiary education. I believe that the Director of the In-Service Training Programme for the Diploma of Education has given us a considerable amount of food for thought, and this I would say must be given very careful consideration, it must be carefully analysed and the necessary weight attached thereto, especially when it must be borne in mind that the Director himself happens to be the parson whose substantive post, I think I am right in saying, is that of Chief Education Officer in this island, a post which he held from 1st August, 1970, and I believe he is on secondment to his present post. 12.30 p.m.

Now, if we were to examine carefully what this Officer has said whilst addressing parents, guardians and children at Combermere School's Speech Day, we would see that he spared no pains to castigate our educational system, if I were to put it that way, as a system with which he has had an opportunity to be trifling with from the time of his appointment. I have said on the Floor of this House already, and I sincerely hope that, on this occasion when we have a Minister of Education in this Chamber with us,

what is said here today can be taken for what it is worth and treated as it deserves.

It is a shocking disgrace in this community for the Minister of Education to have to set up any sort of Committee in this Country to tell him what is wrong with our educational system at any point, whether it is primary, elementary, secondary, or any other level. We have Education Officers who are supposed to be experts in their particular field, and it is their duty to enter the schools under their charge periodically and see for themselves what is taking place between teacher and teacher, between head teacher and the other teachers, and between teachers and the children. It is regrettable to say that when these Officers were classed as Inspectors they were known to be helpful, but since they are now Education Officers they have become officious in the discharge of their duties. One finds today that these Officers enter premises, and the principal duty of some of them is to see how much strife they can ferment between some of the teachers and the head teachers. They are not assisting and discharging the functions for which they are paid.

I feel that the Minister of Education can call on those Officers to submit their monthly or quarterly Reports on the various schools under their charge, and he must arrive at what is wrong in a particular group of schools or some section of our school system. We feel that the time has come for us to have an inspection of the Secondary Schools in this Island. We must have this inspection as quickly as possible, and by an authority that is competent to carry it out. It should be carried out by people who do not have to look left or right to extend favours to anybody. We want an inspection that is going to reveal to us where the system has been falling down in this school, that school, and so on.

if one were to read what the Director of the in-service Diploma Programme has had to say, as those of us who have been following up the system know quite well, one would realise that one of the major problems in our Secondary Schools today is that the teachers who are employed to teach the children do not know what to teach; they do not have it within them and I am sure that the Minister of Education will, eventually, come around to appreciating the fact that a great error was committed in this country when the lowering of standards for entering into the Teacher Service was introduced. It was a grave error. Some of us might ask, what is the point of having these schools without anybody to teach in them? One of the worst things you could ever do to children is to give them bad teaching, and that is the result we are reaping today.

We believe, Mr. Chairman, that this in-service Programme to be instituted in this Diploma Course is good and we will support it. One of the reasons why we must support it is that we are satisfied about certain things. I think it was Dr. Shorey who, when addressing the Barbados Secondary Teachers Union some time ago, brought to light the fact that only one-third of our Secondary School Teachers were trained, and that 12.4% of the graduates in the Secondary Schools had received any sort of teacher training. What we also learnt was that only one-third of these Secondary School Teachers were

graduates.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
Your time is up. Mr. HINDS I have a long time to speak.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. member must realise that I have Standing Orders before me and the allotted time for any hon. member to speak on any money Resolution is 15 minutes. The hon. member spoke last week for five minutes on this same Resolution. I am not stifling anything, but according to the Standing Orders I must judge this stage. 12.40 p.m.

Mr. HINDS:
Mr. Chairman, I can be heard further at the wish of the majority, and I am sure the Minister of Education would want to hear me on this.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
The Minister of Education cannot tell me anything relative to the Standing Orders. It is the Standing Orders Committee of the House which has decided on this issue to guide me and all other hon. members. Let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. ADAMS:
On a point of order, in considering the five minutes for which the hon. member spoke last week, has Your Honour taken into account the fact that he was interrupted by the hon. member for Bridgetown and by the Acting Leader of the House, the hon. member for St. Andrew?

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
All this I have taken into account and that is why I have drawn it to the hon. member's notice and I am allowing him to speak for 15 minutes. He may proceed.

Mr. HINDS:
Mr. Chairman, one of our problems that must be acted upon most readily is the fact that we find that at 17 plus rather than at 16 plus the majority of our children take the "O" Level Certificates. It means

therefore that we have come up with a system which apparently is demanding of our children that they spend an average of seven years rather than five or six to cover a course that is estimated to be covered in a period of 2 years less. There is undoubtedly a considerable percentage of wastage if we were to look at it, because if you look for instance at the number of children who take their "O" Levels from the private secondary schools and from the Government Schools, you will find that of those who secure passes from both sets of schools there is a very high percentage of unaccountables; nobody can really tell you or seems yet to have spent time to take up the slack if we were to look at it in that light to tell us what is becoming of those children. These are the things we have to look at in their truest setting and see exactly what has got to be done in the not too distant future.

Mr. Chairman, we will have to extend the deepest sympathy to the Director of the In-Service Diploma Training Programme and extend all that we can by way of assistance to him and his staff, because we have got to bear in mind that the participants in the programme are people who whilst they are doing the In-Service Training course, are taking tired bodies on afternoons into the institution. These are not people for whom I understand there is a plan for allowing them to have a full day course or anything of the kind. It is after they have completed their day's labours that they are going to the institution on afternoons. Honestly it would pay Government much better to my mind to set about taking half of these people by releasing them from their schools or wherever they are now employed and letting them take a full day course or a course for two-thirds of the day or whatever it might be. In other words, let them approach the task with bodies and minds that are ready for accepting what the tutors at the institution would have to offer. But really and truly when people have given of their best throughtout a tiring day and then have to turn around to study for a diploma, I am not saying it is too much to expect of them, but I would rather say that some little consideration should be given wherever possible.

I am satisfied, Sir, that there is not enough concern over secondary education in this country by the people who ought to be concerned, and I speak on this occasion with respect to the teachers themselves. I endorse much of what the Director of the In-Service Diploma Course has had to say about the teachers; I endorse what he has had to say about parents and the like, but what we will have to do in the not too distant future is not merely to try to bring about or motivate the parent teachers association, but we have got to establish one parent teacher association body in this country and have branches of that one body scattered throughout the Island. In other words, you will find that if Queens College are having a parent-teachers association meeting this afternoon, the attendance is very poor. This applies to St. Winifred's and many of the other schools. The reason for this is that the parents of these children still today have the feeling that these parent-teachers association meetings are really not for them and what we are asking the Minister of Education to do on an occasion such as this is that if he were to establish one body for all the schools, it would not be necessary for a mother from Boscobelle, St. Peter or Grave Yard, St. Lucy to journey to the meeting at Queens College, but we want the Queens College Parent Teachers meeting to be held sometimes in St. Lucy where the headteachers and others from Queens College, Foundation Girls' and Boys', Lodge School and others will come out there and meet the parents as near to their homes as possible. It will break down and remove a lot of the embarrassment now occasioned many of these parents and will overcome much of what the Director of this In-Service Training Programme had said in his own way to draw to our attention during the course of his address at

the Combermere School Speech Day. I see, Mr. Chairman, that my time has really come to an end.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
Is the hon. member for Bridgetown prepared to speak?

Mr. MOTTLEY:
No, Mr. Chairman. 12.50 p.m.

Mr. GREAVES:
Mr. Chairman, before the Hon. Minister replies I would like to make a couple of points on this Resolution. I think that basically the Resolution is a worthwhile one, I do not think that in this day and age anybody can say that teacher training is not an important aspect of the life of any school. As a matter of fact, I regard teacher training as an effort to get the best out of the teaching manpower which exists in the educational system.

The hon. member for St. Peter brought to light an interesting point when he referred to the fact that it was pointed out some time ago that over one-third of the teaching force in the secondary schools was untrained. I think that it is important that this Resolution is being discussed at this point in time, because there is a feeling generally amoung graduates - and this programme is designed especially for graduates - that once they have undergone a training course at a university in a particular field they can teach and there is no need for them to be trained further to teach. I think this is a false concept, this is something which I sincerely hope this programme will be able to eradicate, because teaching at secondary schools demands some level of training which can be obtained from a programme of this nature, and that is why I welcome it. I think, however, there are still a number of problems which exist in our schools, and since we are talking of the secondary schools I want to confine my remarks to the secondary schools to which we should pay some extremely close attention.

The member for St. Peter mentioned some of these briefly, and I want to as it were re-emphasise them because I think this is something we should all be concerned with. We are concerned with the business of getting the best out of any situation for our children, and I think that any problems which we see in the system we should try to point out with a view to having them improved. The point which I want to make is that it seems to me that something has got to be done to improve the kind of relationship which exists at some of these secondary schools between the teachers and the heads of these schools. I get the impression that there is not the kind of co-operation which is usually necessary for getting the best out of the people. One hears, for example, at some of these schools that teachers are not involved in planning, that head teachers take decisions without reference to the teachers, that there are few staff meetings

where problems can be discussed, and I believe that teachers learn from each other by sharing their experiences. I think that this is important and that we should try to emphasise that the heads should be people who are capable of manning and organising schools in such a way that they can get the best out of the situation. One of the things which strikes me is the fact that very often people are appointed as heads of schools not so much for their ability to organise or not so much for their ability to work with people but probably more so because they have long service or probably because they are good teachers of the particular subjects they were teaching. One of the things we have to realise in this day and age is that the head of any organisation must be capable of relating to the people who are under him. He or she must be in a position to have the kind of rapport with the staff which will mean that the staff can and will give of their best, and I am not satisfied that this present situation exists in all of our secondary schools. I believe that one of the ways in which this situation can be put right - and I sincerely hope that under this programme some provision will be made for exposing the heads of secondary schools from time to time to new techniques in the development of educational administration - but this I feel would go a long way towards solving this particular problem because I think it is extremely important.

I would for example want to see some exposure in the area of inter-personal relationships and in the area of management techniques, because the success of running a school depends to a large extent on the kind of management techniques and inter-personal relationships which people who are in charge can bring to bear on the situation and get the best of the particular situation. I think this is very important for us.

Another point I would like to make is the fact that one sometimes gets carried away by the fact that we have all these training programmes and once a person has gone through a period of training, and indeed has qualified and has received the necessary paper of diploma, that this is all which is required. One of the points which I would like to make is the fact that training is not the be all and end all, as it were, the important thing in training - and I think this is something which is lacking to a large extent in our educational system today - is the question of devotion to duty. I think that this is one of the things which we should try to get people to do that is, to be more devoted to the particular job which they have chosen to do, and I am sure that if this devotion is there we can get a lot more out of our educational system, because people would be putting in a lot more than they are putting in at present, but I think it is important for me to make this contribution because this is how I see the situation. Not that what I have said will solve all the problems, but at least it will go a far way in overcoming some of the difficulties.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to reply briefly to the points made during this debate. May I again in this reply state briefly that this supplementary resolution for the sum of $32,000 is in order to provide certain equipment and furniture, to provide for the repairs to roadways and the provision of car parking facilities, and to carry out certain other repairs as well as providing lighting on the compound where the in-service diploma programme is to be carried out.

This programme originated because within the Ministry of Education we were carrying out a detailed examination in order to ensure that the children of this country could get an improved education, that whatever standards we have reached, whatever levels of educational attainment we have gained, all this could be improved upon, and we act on the premise that where you have persons who are teaching the children of this country those persons should be encouraged and assisted, as far as is humanly possible, to carry out their duties and responsibilities for the educational care of the children to the best of their ability, and we have always felt that training of the personnel in our schools is one of the significant ways of assisting that personnel to do its job, and better. This is something which has been agreed on by the officers of my Ministry, both professional and administrative, it was agreed on by the heads of schools, by the teachers individually and in their several Unions. 1.00 p.m.

I would like to take one particular point made by the hon. member for St. Peter in which he is making a plea for taking the teachers out of the schools and permitting them to do a full-time course. I can quite understand the premise from which the hon. member is starting, but we are faced with the responsibility of providing teachers in the schools and it is impossible at this moment to do that because of the supply of the teachers. (Asides.) It has nothing to do with financial reasons. In view of the supply of teachers, it would be impossible to take half of the teachers out of the schools and still maintain a standard of teaching and instruction at a high level in those schools. In other words, we need teachers in the schools to carry on the business of this nature. It is not that we are taking them out of the schools at the end of the day when they are weary and tired.

I would like to make one further observation on this matter. Many of our people leave this country and go to North America and particularly the United States. They work during the day and study in the evening, and from time to time we read in the newspapers how they have advanced in their studies obtaining their doctorate and so on in the subjects which they are studying. I would like to point out that the teachers in the schools would not merely be teaching as far as their ordinary time-tables in the schools are concerned, because this is intended to be supervised teaching. In other words, their practical day-to-day duties will be under the supervision of the tutors in the Programme at stated and specific times arranged with the Head Teachers of those schools, and that period of teaching will be counted as part of the requirements for the award of the Diploma at the end of the course. It is not merely a case that what they are doing during the day is divorced and separated from what they do in the evening in the Programme. This is a Programme which is closely integrated in which the professional duties of the teachers during the school day and the instruction which they get in the evening will be correlated and they will all go towards the assessment for the award of the Diploma at the end of the Programme.

This Programme is expected to start within the next month and will run until July. The teachers will remain on the job. There will be about forty students involved in this particular Programme including an offer to some of the territories who support the University of the West Indies in the Associated States

such as the British Virgin Islands and so on. As I have said, their Programme in the schools will be an integral part of the course work for this Diploma.

Now, let me give you some figures. We had at the 31st August, 1971, some 271 graduate teachers in our schools of whom 108 were trained and 163 untrained. That is the position which we had in our Secondary Schools and, because we believe that training is important, we have set up this Programme. We are taking a comprehensive look at the whole question of teacher training in this country, because we believe that this is one of the surest ways of maintaining and improving upon the educational standards in this country. For the young teachers coming into the system for the first time, we have an induction course. For teachers who may be holding acting appointments, or may have been appointed only recently, we have a Preliminary In-Service Programme. We have the normal 2-Year Programme for Primary School Teachers, and a 2-Year Programme for Secondary School Teachers who are non-graduates. Now we have a Teaching Programme in this country for the graduates of the country who may not be trained.

We could not, under existing programmes, provide the abundance of training that we would wish, because this would deprive our schools of the personnel to run the schools. You cannot close the schools and sent the teachers out on training. You have to ensure that both requirements can be met, that is, the requirements of the school for personnel as well as the requirements for training the personnel whom you have. That is why we have arrived at this particular Programme.

Now, I would like to reject categorically the statement and any other suggestions, or connotations, or hints that were contained in what the hon. member for St. Peter was stating that it is the function of the Education Officers in my Ministry to create confusion and strife between the Head Teacher and teachers, or between the teachers and the children.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of elucidation, Sir. I did not say that it was their function, but they have made it their function. He cannot refute this unless he knows it to be true. If he knows it to be true, he can then say something about it. Perhaps, he is going to say he knows nothing about it. My contention is that it is not their function, but they have made it so. I have evidence to bear me out, and I will call witnesses before the Bar of this House if the Minister wants it.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I was making careful notes. If the hon. member wishes to call witnesses to the Bar, under your guidance, or whoever is presiding, he is quite free to do so. That is not with in my control, as

it is not within my control to give him extended time to speak in this Chamber. As you yourself rightly pointed out, Mr. Chairman, you are the presiding officer in this Chamber. I have made a note that the hon. member had said that it is the principal duty of these Officers to see how much strife they can ferment between the Teachers and the Head Teachers and that they had become officious and not efficient.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, this is a Minister of Education and he must be able to understand and to comprehend what is said on this side. They make it their principal duty.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I had occasion to compliment the hon. member recently on having been given a new portfolio of Shadow Minister of Education, and I said long may he remain Shadow Minister. He can make his comments there. I have taken a very close note of what he has said. As far as the Reports are concerned, quarterly or monthly, from time to time Reports from the Education Officers are submitted, and no where in those Reports have I seen where these Officers have made it their duties to do what has been said by the hon. member. 1.10 p.m.

If I understand him correctly, now from time to time these Reports are submitted and nowhere in these report$ have I seen any indication or that they have made it their duty to see how much strife they can foment. Far from the fomenting of strife, it is the duty of the officers and I am satisfied that they try to carry out these duties to the best of their ability to ensure that the system functions effectively and efficiently, and that whatever regulations and rules there are to be followed, their job is to make sure that the principals and other leaders of schools carry these out. I should just like to make that point quite clear.

A number of other points were made, Mr. Chairman, and frankly I was at a loss to see the connection between them and the specific Resolution that is before us. They were quite in order for a general debate on education, but this is merely a request for supplementary provision to supplement the provision that has already been provided by Parliament, and while I welcome at any time hearing the hon. member for St. Peter on education, his views are befitting those on that side and he is well aware of what is going on. He is calling upon me to set up one body of parent teachers association and it must move around from Constitution Road and down to Boscobelle and into Grave Yard or Cave Hill Drive. I would like to state, Mr. Chairman, that it is no part of my duty to set up a parent teachers association in this country. That is the responsibility of the parents and the teachers in this country. We try to facilitate as far as possible if any assistance in this regard is required from my Ministry, but we believe that in certain areas the initiatives have got to come from those people who are the principal agents at that particular level, the parents, the teachers and so on; but the hon. member, the Shadow Minister for Education must know,

I am sorry, should know, might know that within the last two months a National Parent Teachers Association was established in this country which in its aim will be an umbrella organisation for the parent teachers associations in this country. Whether they want to put their headquarters in Boscobelle or Fitts Village, St. James or move around wherever they want their meetings, that is their business; nobody restricts them from doing what they wish to do; so I am certain the hon. member should know when he makes these statements on the floor of the House since he is Shadow Minister for Education.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member states that he does not believe any Committee should be set up to investigate any aspect of the educational system in this country, if I understand him correctly. I always stand to be corrected when he feels I do not understand him correctly. He said there are educational officers whose job it is to tender advice on these matters and make reports. Mr. Chairman, we must be talking about different things altogether because most of the countries that I know of which take a deep interest in the educational system, in spite of whatever staff they have, set up special committees from time to time to examine various aspects of the educational system. Various committees, commissions, councils call them what you will, of persons who have a deep interest in the commitment of education, are called upon from time to time to sit as committees to tender advice on various aspects of the educational system, and I see nothing wrong at all with the establishment of committees to deal with this matter, and this is exactly what we have done. We have a number of committees going studying the matter of the Common Entrance Examination, the curriculum in the schools and a variety of other matters, and this is as it should be, to bring to bear on the problems of education the views, opinions and points of view of a wide range of personnel.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, just to elucidate a point, the Minister has on his files enough information to show direct and assist them with regard to curricula change and adaptation ever since 1949.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD The knowledge of the hon. member as to what I have in my files is indeed very deep and intense.

Mr. HINDS:

I can tell him the official number of the file where he can find it.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to dwell on that point. The point I am making is that the information deals with the situation in 1973 and I am going to call upon persons whom I believe can make a contribution in any aspect of the educational system in this country for their opinions in the hope that I

will get their advice on how the educational system should go. I get the hon. member's opinions in here and I deal with them as they should be dealt with.

Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to say anything more on this particular Resolution. I note that the Opposition supports the Diploma In-Service Programme. I welcome that support and it would be good if they had said they supported this, go right ahead, we are on the right track, but they had to drag in everything else which is not germaine to the present matter in hand.

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

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly. 1.20 p.m.

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, the resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Speaker, Item 2 stands in the name of the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, and I am seeking leave....

Mr. SPEAKER:
Leave has already been granted.

THE CUSTOMS (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1973

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Speaker, as the Objects and Reasons set out.....

Mr. ADAMS:
On a point of order, Sir, on what is the hen. member speaking?

Mr. SPEAKER:
Item No. 2 under Government Business, which is the second reading of a Bill to amend the Customs Act, 1962.

Mr. ADAMS:
With great respect, Sir, I have only heard of it today.

Mr. SPEAKER:
I am not aware that leave was granted.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
I asked for leave to deal with the Bill to amend the Customs Act, 1962 and the Bill to amend the Consumption Tax Act, 1962 when I introduced them, and the Leader of the Opposition objected. I asked for leave and moved the first reading.

Mr. ADAMS:
On a point of order, Sir, on two occasions recently the Hon. Leader of the House has contradicted me in respect of what he described as private conversations which took place between him and me. Hon. members can judge the accuracy of the Hon. Leader's recall upon the nature and the subject of the leave which he sought in respect of this particular Government Order. He sought leave to deal with it in place of the Prime Minister. At no stage today - and I have every confidence that the record of the House will so reveal - has he asked leave to deal with it in all its stages. The hon. member for St. Michael South West agrees with the Leader now that he has asked for leave to deal with it in all its stages, but the record will not show that.'

Mr. SPEAKER:
Has the hon. member finished his point of order?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

If the hon. member will give way, the hon. member will recall that notice of these two matters was given last week, but I sought to have them re-introduced today and the hon. member objected stating that they were already introduced, and I asked for leave and moved that the two Bills be read a first time because this was not done last week. I specifically asked for leave to deal with these two matters in all their stages.

Mr. ADAMS:

Sir, I challenge the Hon. Minister to show me where in the record of the House the words "in all their stages" appear. Those words do not appear. However, Standing Order 42 has not been suspended.

Mr. SPEAKER:

A point of order has arisen as to the propriety of the Hon. Leader of the House dealing with Item 2 on the Order Paper. I am advised by the Clerk at the Table that the first reading of this Bill was given last week and that it was then circulated to members. (Mr. MOTTLEY That cannot be right, Sir). I am further advised by the Clerk that notice had been given of this measure last week, and in view of the fact that Standing Order 44 has been suspended it is quite proper for the Hon. Leader of the House to deal with it in all its stages.

Mr. ADAMS:

Standing Order 42(5) states that an interval of not less than five days shall elapse between the first and second readings of a Bill unless the House on motion made and question put agree to proceed with the Bill at any earlier date, or forthwith. No motion has been put, and in any case, as it happens Standing Order 44 has been complied with, suspended or not.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have been informed by the Clerk at the Table that Standing Order 42 has not been suspended.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

In accordance with Your Honour's ruling, I beg to move that Standing Order 42 be suspended in order to regularise this matter.

Mrs. EASTMOND:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS:

I gather that the Minister is putting to the House an argument in which he is saying we are trying to break the law, we do not think that you, the Judge in this instance, are going to allow us to break the law, so we are going to change the law. If there was ever a case of an abuse of the House it would be to suspend Standing Order 42 which lays down the procedure for the discussion of the Bill in order to circumvent that procedure. 1.30 p.m

Now, what other meaning can be given to "abuse of the Rules of the House", but to suspending a Rule when it proves to be inconvenient and in mid-stream and not from a distance, Sir. We may as well say: "Let us have a House of Assembly without any Standing Orders, because when the majority decide that a Standing Order is inconvenient, they will then move its suspension and do away with it altogether." Let us have a situation in which that is said in a straightforward way. It is not as though this matter is urgent, Sir, because the Government treat Government Business in such cavalier fashion that they did not pursue it last week. The Government are not really interested in doing anything to the people of Barbados except overtaxing them, Sir. The Government treat their House of Assembly affairs with so little consideration as to fail to form a quorum on the resumption from lunch on the last occasion, and now they come the following week on a Standing Order which has solemnly been confirmed, a Standing Order which exists in every Commonwealth Parliament of which I am aware, a Standing Order which governs the procedures of non-Commonwealth Parliaments of debating assemblies everywhere that you give people a little time to consider legislation. (Asides.) I am asked to give way on a point of order, Sir.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw your attention to Standing Order 42(5), and with your permission I should like to read it. It States

"An interval of not less than five days shall elapse between the first and second reading of a Bill unless the House on motion made and question put agree to proceed with the Bill at an earlier date or forthwith."

It is my submission, on my interpretation of this, that the Leader of the House may move that this Bill be dealt with forthwith.

Mr. ADAMS:

Let me deal with the hon. member. He is a fledgling, Sir. He was in the Senate for a short time and was removed therefrom, and he is only a fledgling in the House now. He has not seen these Standing Orders as some hon. members on this side have seen the Standing Orders. I am sure he means well, Sir. I am instructed that he means well. Just for the reassurance of hon. members on the other side, I can tell them that he has recently been quoted as saying that he does not intend to leave that party, he just intends to lead it; so all hon. members can be convinced of his sincerity not least his colleagues. But the facts are that that is not the motion before the House. The motion before the House is to suspend the Standing Order.

Obviously, the hon. member has not been paying attention to the proceedings immediately before I got up to speak, because I also read out that Standing Order with which, I do assure the hon. member, I am familiar. That is not the motion before the House, and he should address his alleged point of Order to the Leader of the House. We will deal with that when we come to it, because we have an answer to that, too.

Sir, the point is that the words "abuse of the Rules" must be given a meaning. The only logical, the only reasonable, the only fair, the only Parliamentary and the only constitutional meaning that can be given to the words "abuse of the Rules" is that when the majority try to change the Rules to suit themselves* There is no other way that the Rules can be abused, Sir, by a majority or the Leader of the House on a motion for the suspension of the Standing Orders. It is clear that the Standing Orders proving inconvenient at the present time, the majority are now attempting to circumvent their incovenience by suspending them and abusing the procedure laid down for the conduct of the Parliamentary Business. I, Sir, with all the force at my command, intend to speak on this measure. I believe that other hon. members on this side are going to deal with it as well. We cannot go on and on having a situation where Rules are treated as only....

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

If the hon. member will give way, Sir, I will withdraw that motion. I beg to move that that motion be withdrawn.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER:

With the leave of the House the Hon. Leader's motion will be withdrawn. The motion has, therefore, been withdrawn. That is to suspend Standing Order 42.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Customs Act, 1962, be now dealt with forthwith. The Bill has been duly circulated; copies have been published, and everything has been complied with and regularised today. I do not understand what all this fuss is about.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS:

Sir, hon. members have evidently not taken into account the provisions of Standing Order 21. I submit that by reason of Standing Order 21 that motion is out of order. Notice has to be given of it. It may be an omission of the Standing Orders. Read Standing Order 21 before you protest. The hon. member for St. Michael South Central above all should know that he should not fly into print or voice when certain members of the Opposition have made a point. Standing Order No. 21 reads

"Unless the Standing Orders otherwise provide notice shall be given of any motion which it is proposed to move with the exception of the following....."

and it is not among the exceptions. I submit it is out of order.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the Standing Orders which were suspended at the very commencement were 6, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 43, 44 and 49.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Standing Order 42 has not been suspended. With the assurance that Standing Order 21 has been suspended, the Hon. Leader's motion is quite in order.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, if Standing Order 21 is suspended, then can I stand up here on a point of order and move that any member of the House be expelled? It is only Standing Order 21 that prevents an hon. member from doing that. If this goes on, Sir, the Opposition will start taking advantage of the suspension of the Standing Orders in the same way as the Government, but we will do it not to facilitate Government Business. I hope hon. members appreciate the significance of suspending Standing Order 21 and relying upon its suspension. It means that anybody can get up in the House and move any motion. It does not have to be given notice of. You can just get up and move it there and then. I hope hon. members understand that.

Now, Sir, in respect of dealing with this matter forthwith, I have to turn to the Bill itself. I query, indeed, whether it can be published in the Gazette before it has been read a first time. I am not so sure that that is not a breach of a privilege of the House, according to Your Honour's ruling some time ago, Sir. I am urging hon. members not to deal with this Bill - I am not anticipating, Sir, but the same arguments will apply to the Consumption Tax Act - through all its stages today. The reason is that these Bills relate to Carifta matters, to agreements reached at Ministerial Councils of the Caribbean Free Trade Association; they relate to matters which affect Barbados' position with the external world; its relationship with its neighbours, and they relate to matters which, although of such momentous importance to repeat a phrase that I have used in other places, have not yet been brought before the House. Therefore, I am urging the House to show its disapproval, indeed, to show its contempt of the darkness in which it has been left on these matters by not dealing with any of these Carifta matters until the Carifta Treaty has been laid in the House of Assembly, until the Chagauramus Treaty has been laid, until the details of the Georgetown Accord are known, and until all of the implications of what is involved in these and in the other associated measures as well as the 900 new taxes that we can expect in August are fully known and have been fully debated in this House. 1.40 p.m

I am not going into the merits of the Bill because I cannot go into the merits. I do not know what it is about. I do know that throughout the West Indies our brother legislators had the opportunity of discussing the implications of CARIFTA, the External Tariff, all the matters canvassed in this and in other documents, and not only matters which affect legislation, but matters which affect the status of their territories. They have already had such opportunities and so discussed them* I have the document here before me.

On 19th June the Prime Minister made a document in the House in which he promised that the Treaty and all other relevant instruments would be laid on the Table in both Houses of Parliament. This has not yet been done, and today is July 10. It is disgraceful in the light of public interest in this matter, in the enlightenment which the public are entitled to expect from a Government, that nothing has been done to make known to the public of Barbados what are the true and full implications of the Carifta Agreement, and the Leader of the House is now trying in the absence of the Prime Minister, the only man I believe on that side who is at all familiar, although how familiar he is will be revealed if and when he comes to the House to deal with this matter, to force down the throats of the people of Barbados one aspect of the

entire Carifta exercise. It is not good enough, Sir. It may seem to be a small matter.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

On a point of order, if the hon. member has read the Objects and Reasons, he would have read that the Council of Ministers of the Caribbean Free Trade Association at its third meeting in March, 1969....

Mr. ADAMS:

That is not a point of order.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

It is a point of order. It is relevant because this Bill is based on a decision in 1969 and the Georgetown Accord was signed on 4th July, 1973.

Mr. ADAMS:

That is not a point of order. The Minister who has just got up does not understand either the issue or the argument. The argument is that this is only part of the whole. Forget it happened in 1969. When the Bill comes to be debated I will ask if it happened in 1969 why wait until 1973 to deal with it? That is a different point, because I would not have thought that any member of the Government would boast that they have waited from 1969 to 1973, but it may be, and I am sure that if it is or not is a matter of blissful ignorance in the mind of the Hon. Minister who has just sat down as to why we had to wait from 1969 until now. It may be that the publication of the Treaty would cut the ground from under the feet of hon. members on this side when we seek to attack the Government for waiting so long. The hon. member does not know and I am in the same state of ignorance as the hon. member. I do not know and I have no way of knowing why the Government has waited so long unless I can see the Georgetown Accord and unless I can see the Chaguaramas Treaty as it was signed. Until I see these things I cannot adequately deal with a matter such as the alteration of the Brussels Definition of Value and amend the Consumption Tax Act in order to provide for uniformity in the Brussels Definition of Value.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know about them because the Government has deliberately kept the people of Barbados in a state of ignorance. One may hazard the suggestion that if he keeps his own Ministers in ignorance it may be something that Ministers themselves have contributed to. It is a wicked nonsense to treat the people of Barbados in this way. Sir, suppose it was said that this point was new and fresh and that the Government was unaware of it; but these are only small things, and so we are saying that they support it. But that cannot be argued. Question 110, standing on the Order Paper and given on the same day that the Prime Minister made his statement, says:

"To enquire of the Appropriate Minister: -

1. Will the Government cause a copy of the document known as the "Georgetown Accord" to be laid on the Table of this Honourable House?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to publish a White Paper on the Treaty setting up the Common External Tariff for the CARIFTA Area, so that the implications of it may be debated before the Treaty is signed?"

The Government has had notice of this point from us and from the people of Barbados I believe in the approaches of our fellow West Indian legislators to the effect that you should have taken the whole Accord to the House before going to sign the Treaty, and yet the Government comes in here so unprepared that it is only the fortuitous circumstances of the suspension of the Standing Orders which is one of the protections of ordinary business in here which have really been sought in order even to get the matter debated in the time it wants.

The Prime Minister has not laid the documents on the Table of the House which he has promised to do. Question No. 110 has not been answered. No hon. member in here is in a position, I dare say, and certainly no hon. member on this side can apply any reasonable argument to explain the delay between the Agreement which was reached in respect of the Bill as is now placed before us and the time when it is actually placed before us.

In all these circumstances I would urge on hon. members not to support this motion. Must it be said of Barbadians that with a long parliamentary tradition (for after all people like us - and all hon. members know what I mean except the hon. member for Christ Church North Central - have been in Parliament for a good deal longer in Barbados executing the affairs of our country with a measure of independence from Colonial Office control than people like us have been handling their own parliamentary affairs in other West Indian Islands) that the seeds of Parliamentary democracy, for which the Barbados Labour Party fought so steadily from 1937, have taken such shallow root despite the presence of hon. members in the House, like the Leader of the House and indeed the hon. member for St. John and that parliamentary democracy proves so tender a plant that alone in Barbados does a Government treat its legislators with such contempt as this, that the entire Carifta area can discuss in their Parliaments and out of their Parliaments, can come to decisions based upon free political exchange between well informed political parties and their representatives, but alone in Barbados we have to take everything in Carifta for

granted on the say-so of not even the Prime Minister, but of the Leader of the House?

Sir, words fail me at this point and I would urge hon. members not to regard any remarks made from this side as mere rhetoric. I would urge hon. members on both sides to treat very seriously their own position as parliamentarians. From time to time the hon. member for St. Andrew used to utter words sometimes perhaps no more than a vulgarity, but at times they had a very deep and important meaning. He used to point out to hon. members when advantage was sought to be taken and sometimes when it was not sought to be taken at times, but when it was sought to be taken he used to tell hon. members that he did not come in in a dung basket. None of us came in here in a dung basket, but the dung basket mentality is the mentality of those who believe that the House of Assembly is to be a rubber stamp or a place where nothing is ever discussed with seriousness, that the only business of the House of Assembly is to come in here and say eighteen-six, and that is what the House of Assembly is for.

Sir, I think the Leader of the House can pass his mind back to the days when the hon. member for St. John was in Opposition. He can even cast it further back when the previous junior member for St. Joseph, Grantley Adams was in the Opposition, and let him think of both how the Opposition and the Government would have behaved in those days if measures such as this were sought to be railroaded through the House, 1.50 p.m.

I expect persons like the hon. member for Christ Church North Central to do this, because he showed his contempt for the hon. members on this side by his treatment of the hon. member for St. Joseph last week. I do not really expect it from the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, because although his opposition in the years 1956-58 was somewhat equivocal, yet he had a foot safely in both camps in those days to know what is right and what is wrong, but I do not expect it from the Leader of the House nor from the member for St. Andrew. It is time that the Government understand that the members of the House of Assembly must be treated as men in here, and it is the Government members themselves who have to learn to understand that. Hon. members who know better should be ashamed to mislead the hon. member for St. Lucy, the hon. member for St. Michael North East and the hon. member for Christ Church South Central. I would be ashamed to think that the hon. member for Christ Church South Central would subscribe to railroading matters through the House of Assembly without an opportunity for informed debate.

We do not seek in any way to make either this motion or the Bill when it comes up the opportunity for a Carifta debate because we either expect that the Government will initiate one or that the Opposition will force such a debate on the Government, but let things be done in the fullness of time, let things be done at the appropriate moment. When jurors stand before the Supreme Court counsel are told that the time for challenge is when they come to the book to be sworn and before they are sworn, but let us deal with Carifta when the Prime Minister comes to the book to be sworn on this project of his which he has

conducted for so long without giving the House of Assembly an adequate opportunity of debating all its implications. You cannot debate it in a budget speech alone or in petty measures like this or casually in financial resolutions, it must be debated as an issue. A great deal of nonsense is going to be talked by the Prime Minister - I can anticipate this at least - he is going to say that a Treaty like this does not have to be debated. He is going to tell you about the Royal Prerogative, that a Treaty is made by prerogative power and that the House of Assembly does not have to deal with it. He will tell you perhaps, if he knows or if one of his officers remembers, that it is only in the United States that a Treaty must be approved, but my answer to that is that it does not have to be approved by law. Going back into mediaeval times, the King had power to rule and conduct foreign affairs without reference to Parliament, but these are not mediaeval times and we should not be asked to rubber stamp powers appropriated to the King in those days.

In the same way the European Common Market Treaty was debated in the British House of Commons before it was signed, in the same way the Carifta Treaty was debated in Parliament before it was signed, so all matters connected with this Treaty should be debated here and the Government might then be assured of a free passage for all dependent and consequential legislation which arises out of the debate. Come to the House and let us debate it and there will be that much less opportunity for delay and time wasting which come, I am glad to say, as much from hon. members on the other side as it always does. I am urging the Government to take advice and counsel on this. They have already withdrawn one or two motions relating to this and I would urge them to deal with this in the same way. As far as .I am concerned, I have no intention of dealing with the merits of the Bill today because I only know that the people of Barbados want to hear about Carifta and they want to hear about it in full, not piecemeal. I only know we are getting nothing but a piecemeal bite of this. It is within the constitutional competence and it is part of its political duty to consider the Treaty, so far reaching are its effects before you begin to consider the effects themselves, and I am urging on hon. members to deal with it on this basis.

If I could make a suggestion, I would urge hon. members to take a break at this time and take counsel during the period, because you cannot conduct business impromptu, you make mistakes that way, especially when you take advice from the hon. member for St. Michael South Central. (Hon. F. G. SMITH: You never challenged it when I was Attorney General, so it must have been good advice.) I am urging hon. members to take counsel now, take a break now and let us see when we return which aspect of Government Business is most suited to have dealt with today.

Just to deal with the last relevant point, it is not for me to tell the Government how to conduct its business, but I would point out that the Bills which were circulated and read a first time and whose debate has perhaps to some extent been prepared by hon. members are those Bills which appear from Items 5 to 10 on the Order Paper. These are Bills dealing with the Transport Board, a whole Bill dealing with the control of the importation, sale, storage and use of pesticides, a small Bill to amend the Health Services Act, the repeal of the Infants Vaccination Act - not very much to that, although I am sorry the hon. member for St. Joseph is not in his seat to remind hon. members of the Government that he asked

about this quite some time ago - an important Bill dealing with the Soil Conservation (Scotland District) Act and another important Bill dealing with narcotics. These are the important matters hon. members have come prepared to deal with, they are the Bills which were properly circulated, and some of them are long Bills which may take a long time in Committee, yet the Minister is urging on us that we deal with something not properly circulated in our view or read a first time, although the Minister responsible for them is not here, and I am urging on hon. members to get on with the remainder of the business of the House. 2.00 p.m.

The Prime Minister is not here. Tell the Prime Minister that he should have been here. Let them tell the Prime Minister, if they feel prevailed upon to withdraw it, that he should have been here. (Asides.) It is said that they did not feel like dealing with it. Do not be directed from afar, I would suggest to hon. members. Sir, those are the grounds upon which I urge all hon. members to vote against the motion to deal with this matter forthwith.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly amazed at the Leader of the Opposition. He has got something off his chest which is totally and absolutely irrelevant. What is worst is his confession that as Shadow Minister of Finance, he is supposed to shadow the Minister of Finance, he has not got a clue as to what these Bills are about. These Bills, Mr. Speaker, have nothing whatsoever to do with the Georgetown Accord. If the Leader of the Opposition has a grouse about the Georgetown Accord, then he can raise it at the appropriate time but, certainly, in these Bills he is totally irrelevant.

Sir, other West Indian Islands have already adopted the Brussels Definition of Value. I will tell him how it arose. It has its origin in the Customs Corporation Council which meets in Brussels and seeks to co-ordinate and align the Custom procedures of as many Governments as will do so. It is intended to facilitate world trade in the sense that if all or most of the Customs administrations have the same Rules and Definition of Values, then importers will not have to learn different procedures in different markets. What has this got to do with the Georgetown Accord?

Now, other Caribbean Islands in the Carifta Free Trade Area have already adopted the Brussels Definition of Value, and the object of these Bills is simply to replace....

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the hon. member is irrelevant. He is dealing with the merits of the Bill and not with the merits of the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I was just about to draw that to the hon. member's attention that he seems to be anticipating the merits of the Bill.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I am not dealing with the merits; I am dealing with the arguments of the Leader of the Opposition that the Georgetown Accord must be laid before we can deal with the Bill. He is the Shadow Minister of Finance, and I should not have to spend my time explaining things to him. After he was conveniently absent for the Budget Reply, he now comes here saying that he does not know what it is. There is no wonder he did not want to reply to the Budget. He does not have a clue as to what it is all about.

Mr. ADAMS:

Sir, I wish to be heard on a point of explanation. The Hon. Minister has said that I am associating this Bill with the Georgetown Accord. The point that I made will be quite clear from the Official Report of my speech, and it is that these Bills are part of the whole Carifta exercise. I venture to say that at least three times in my speech the phrase "part of the whole Carifta exercise" will be found, and the hon. member is seriously misinterpreting the burden of what I have said when he accuses me of saying that it is part of the Georgetown Accord. I said that I do not know if it has anything to do with the Georgetown Accord, because I have not seen the Georgetown Accord in here. That is what I have said.

I cannot, Sir, reach with eyes to Trinidad and look through walls. After all we were not invited on this side. The Chief Justice was invited to Trinidad, but no member of the Opposition was invited to Trinidad to witness any signing. I do not know what went on in Trinidad, and I have no way of knowing. My knowledge is derived from in here, and what is done officially in Barbados. I do not want to know any more than any other member of the public, and the hon. member should not seek to misinterpret what I have said.

Mr. SPEAKER:

You have made your point.

Mr. ADAMS:

I do not know if he did it out of ignorance, or if he did it deliberately. I am not sure which is worst.

The question that the Bill to amend the Customs Act, 1962, be proceeded with forthwith was put and resolved in the affirmative the House dividing as follows;

AYES:

Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. F. G. SMITH; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. LOWE, Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Mr. E. GREAVES. Mrs. EASTMDND and Mr. MORRISON - 10.

NOES:

Mr. ADAMS; Mr. CRAIG and Mr. HINDS - 3.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, as the Objects and Reasons set out, the Council of Ministers of the Caribbean Free Trade Association at its third meeting in March, 1969 agreed to the introduction of a uniform system of customs valuations based on the Brussels Definition of Value and further agreed that Member Territories of the Association should adopt the Brussels Definition of Value. This Bill would amend the Customs Act, 1962 (Act 1962-18) in order to implement the latter of these agreements.

As certain hon. members of the Opposition do not seem to be fully aware of what this is all about, despite the lateness of time and the fact that the luncheon interval is near, I will still attempt to give some more information. As far as the adoption of the Brussels Definition of Value is concerned, the Council of Ministers of the Caribbean Free Trade Association did what I said a few moments ago. At the second meeting in November 1970 the Council further agreed that Member Territories should examine the proposed new text of Brussels Definition of Value prepared by the Commonwealth Caribbean Secretariat and submit their comments to the Secretariat in order to enable a final decision on the text of the Brussels Definition of Value to be taken by the Carifta countries.

Now, the Brussels Definition of Value is stated as follows:

"Article 1 (1). For the purpose of levying duties of customs the value of any goods imported for home consumption shall be taken to be the normal price, that is to say the price which they would fetch at the time when the duty becomes payable on the sale in the open market between buyer and seller independent on the following assumptions:

The normal price of any imported goods shall be determined on the following assumption:

(a) That the goods are treated as having been delivered to the buyer at the Port or place of introduction into the country of importation." 2.10 p.m.

The normal price on any imported goods shall be determined on the following assumption:

"(a) that the goods are treated as having been delivered to the buyer at the Port or place of introduction into the country of importation;

(b) that the seller will bear all costs charges and expenses incidental to the sale and to the delivery of the goods at that Port or place, but

(c) that the buyer will bear any duties or taxes applicable in the country of importation.

The present system of valuation for customs purposes in the Carifta countries differs from the Brussels Definition of Value in two important respects -

(1) the treatment of air-freight and (2) the treatment of buying commissions.

The position in Barbados, Mr. Speaker, is that the main departure from the Brussels Definition of Value relates to the treatment of air freight and buying commissions in relation to the dutiable value of imports. The Brussels Definition omits low cost charges or expenses incidental to the sale and delivery of the goods, whereas in Barbados 25% of air freight charges is excluded from the valuation of goods for duty purposes and in respect of buying commissions an allowance not exceeding 5% of the value of the goods may be claimed in respect of the dutiable value of imports.

The position, Sir, can be explained further and this is just to regularise the whole matter and to facilitate, as the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works has explained, and regularise the position.

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:
I beg to second that.

The question that this Bill be now read a second time was put and a division was catted for.

Mr. ADAMS:
Mr. Speaker, may I draw to Your Honour's attention that there is no quorum?

The Bell was rung.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPEAKER:
Let the numbers be counted, Mr. Clerk.

Seven hon. members being present, there is now no quorum in this Honourable House, and the House automatically adjourns until next Tuesday, 17th July, 1973, at 12 o'clock. 2.15 p.m.