

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, 5th June, 1973.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 2.20 p.m. 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. FERGUSON, (Minister of Home Affairs); Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees); Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN, (Deputy Speaker); Mr. L. S. CRAIG; Mr. C. L. BOLDEN, LL.B.; 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; Hon. P. M. GREAVES, B.A., (Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance); Mr. H. deB. FORDE, M.A., LL.B. Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, (Minister of Health and Welfare); Mr. A. MDRRISON; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., M.A., (Econ.) (Minister of Education, Youth Affairs, Community Development and Sport).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Minutes of this Honourable House for Tuesday, 22nd May, 1973, are before you for confirmation. If there are no amendments or alterations, the Minutes will be confirmed.

There being no amendments or alterations, the Minutes are duly confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker I am commanded to lay the following

(1) The Statements showing Money Order Transactions through the Crown Agents for Overseas Governments and Administrations for the months December, 1972 and January 1973.

(2) Statements showing the sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of Money Orders for the months of December 1972 and January 1973.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice of a Resolution to authorise the borrowing by the issue of Treasury Bills of sums not exceeding \$10,000,000 and of such sums as may be required to pay off at maturity Bills already issued and outstanding.

ORDERS OF THE DAY SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18 and 20, be suspended for the remainder of today's Sitting in order to continue the debate in connection with the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals as moved by the Hon. Prime Minister and Minister of Finance. It is now for the Opposition to reply, and they will be granted similar facilities and time to those granted to the Hon. Prime Minister and Minister of Finance last Thursday when he delivered his Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals for the fiscal year 1973-74.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON. I beg to second that.

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker I beg to move that Private Members' Business be now taken in order to enable the Hon. Deputy Leader of the Opposition to reply.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

RESOLUTION RE THE DISAPPROVAL OF THE FINANCIAL STATEMENT AND BUDGETARY PROPOSALS

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, I think that, under Private Members' Business, the Member for Bridgetown had moved a Resolution that this House takes note and disapproves of the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals.

Your Honour, this is the second reply to the Government's Budgetary Proposals since 1971 and the first to which I have the honour to reply. I do so with a degree of deep responsibility, with pride and yet sadness.

At this stage, I should like to ask for leave to proceed with this Resolution in the absence of my colleague, the hon. Member for Bridgetown.

Mr. SPEAKER:

If there are no objections, leave will be granted. There being no objections the hon. Member may proceed.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, I was saying that I do so with a degree of deep responsibility, with pride and yet sadness, since the facts which I am going to reveal should convince the nation beyond any shadow of doubt of the precarious situation this country faces today. I shall endeavour to reveal the truths which have been so carefully hidden. Mr. Speaker, our country stands on the brink of economic disaster through poor economic planning and shoddy financial management.

It has been usual for the Prime Minister in introducing his budget proposals over the last twelve years to classify them according to what he conceives, wrongly of course, to be their main aim or their outstanding feature. And so over the years we have heard of the 'Freedom Budget' as apposed to a 'Freeness Budget' - that was in 1967. In 1972 we heard of the 'No Nonsense -No Privilege Budget' and for sure we will remember how immediately preceding the last election we had the 'Advance Budget'. Strangely this year the budget has no descriptive tag attached to it, but this is not surprising. Nor does it give the Opposition any difficulty in finding one. It is simply a "Misery Budget" aimed at the pockets of the small man. It combines policies which will produce higher inflation with heavier taxation in a situation where over the last two years at least the economy has been stagnant. Human hardships and suffering in this community will be directly increased as a result of this budget. For instance, Sir, last year the Prime Minister was forced to admit that the economy experienced no real growth at all. This year we are told that the areal growth recorded in 1972 was less than one per cent. We trust that the people will now recognise that the Opposition was right in its predictions in the last three years that the policies of this Government will lead this country to economic stagnation. But, Mr. Speaker, the situation is even worse than that outlined by the Prime Minister. Firstly, the index of Retail Prices which was used as a deflator is not sufficiently comprehensive to serve as an adequate deflator, and secondly, even allowing for even less than one per cent growth, if the population grew by one percent - and the evidence is that it did - then the growth recorded has to be cancelled out completely.

Sir, while condemning these defective techniques of assessments and analysis which have always landed us with false information and a distorted view of our economy, and which the Prime Minister consistently employs, there are two other matters that need to be mentioned. Quite often the Minister of Finance budgets for a greater deficit than turns out to be the case. In fact, our deficit invariably ends up as surpluses, even allowing for supplementary estimates of expenditure being introduced during the year. What this means is that the formula for predicting revenue yields and government expenditure continues to be primitive, and as a result of this very shaky statistical tool, the public of Barbados is taxed to a higher degree than is necessary year after year. 2.30 p.m.

The second point is this. The Prime Minister by way of attempting to conceal the rotten state of the economy said, and I quote, "All available indicators point to the fact that our economy is under-going a process of transformation. It is perhaps inevitable that in such a process growth will be measured; even though it will be more self-sustaining." No evidence was provided us that the economy was undergoing significant structural transformation. And we contend it is not. Sir, simply and crudely put, transformation means that the foundation and structure of the economy is shifting from reliance on traditional props like agriculture to manufacture and remunerative services.

A close analysis of the figures provided in Table 10 in the Economic Survey for 1971, but covering the period 1960 to 1971 reveals the following: -

- (a) Agriculture's contribution to Gross Domestic Produce has declined from 26% to 13%;
- (b) Manufacturing and Construction (both productive sectors) declined from 10% to 9%
- (c) Transport has moved from 6% to 8%
- (d) Distribution (which is not a productive sector) has moved from 21% to 28%
- (e) The Services Sector (which includes Tourism) has declined from 12% to 11% and
- (f) Government Sector (again not a productive sector) has moved from 10% to 16%.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the growing points over the last ten to eleven years were Government and Distribution sectors. Once again the Minister of Finance has produced all the evidence necessary to prove the direct alliance between the Democratic Labour Party Government, big businesses in Bridgetown, and the merchant class in this country. One thing is certain, there is no evidence of significant transformation of the economy. No evidence whatsoever that the economy is approaching 'Take-Off' or self-sustained growth.

To return to the specifics of the Budget itself. The Opposition proposes to treat presently four major areas of the economy which the Government ought to have stimulated by its budgetary proposals. Mr. Speaker, let us have a look at the construction industry. It is common knowledge that the stimulation of

the construction sector is one of the quickest ways of putting people, both skilled and unskilled, to work in this country. The hotel building boom of the 1960s has come to an end. Mortgage money for home building is both scarce and expensive and as a result, several construction companies have folded up. Government cannot deny this. The Government Programme of Housing continues to be inadequate to satisfy the demands of the country. What is more, it is now common knowledge, Sir, that it is so corruptly administered that public confidence in it has been completely eroded. But, Mr. Speaker, what is the Minister of Finance doing in a matter such as this? Instead of taking this opportunity to announce a Commission of Inquiry into the administration of Housing within the last ten years - instead of taking steps to stimulate the industry - he has taxed cement to the extent of \$1.35 more per bag, in a situation where there is a world shortage of cement and where we in Barbados are presently experiencing a shortage.

The Prime Minister has taxed plywood which is imported mainly from Surinam outside the Carifta region. The Prime Minister has shamelessly proceeded to tax wood, glass, veneer sheets, galvanise, wood panels and several of the essential components of building. But let us go further, Mr. Speaker. In addition he has taxed sinks, wash basins, bidets, bath and other sanitary plumbing from 8% and 18% respectively to 18% and 25%. Prefabricated buildings and their assembled parts have gone from 10% and 20% to 25% and 35%. Iron and steel, neither of which is available in the Carifta region, have gone from 10% and 20% to 35% and 45% and aluminium has gone up from 10% and 20% to 20% and 30%. After this Budget, Mr. Speaker, all of us who had dreams of getting a home can hardly dream again. The Government's policy in relation to the construction industry is sheer economic madness. In addition to what I have just told you the rent in housing estates, the Pine, St. Matthias, Silver Hill, the Farm, Thorpes Housing Area, all the Government housing estates, is going up from \$6.00 a week to \$15.00 a week. The cost of maintaining and repairing houses is going up and it will be no surprise if landlords who were forced to put up rent earlier through Land Tax, push up rents again. All the evidence seems to be that as a result of the Government's budgetary proposals relating to the construction industry, the industry will be further depressed because of a ten percent increase which is automatically being added to the cost of all building. Sir, the Barbados Labour Party condemns this taxation on the construction industry.

Mr. Speaker, let us have a look at the Manufacturing Sector. The Manufacturing Sector is another area where an attempt should have been made to boost the economy - cause money to turn over and put people in work. This sector is particularly disappointing and this tired Administration seems not to know what next to do. At least 5,000 school leavers are on the labour market each year; and what was conceived as one of our main absorbers of the unemployed - the Manufacturing Sector - has failed and failed miserably. Notwithstanding the empty noises of the Minister of Trade, only seven new industries were created in 1972, providing employment for only 362 people. Already approved industries provided 262 more jobs. But when we remember that over 300 people were thrown out of work by the closure of Plessey, or as it was called originally, International Scientific Limited, the Manufacturing Sector in effect absorbed less than 350 people and this Budget has done nothing to stimulate and give it new life. Feeble support has been given to the "Buy Local" efforts, by Government. Both the furniture and the garment industries are in dire need of help. The furniture industry has demonstrated that it has come of age. It ought to have been given greater protection in the Budget and an opportunity once and for all to meet the demands of the nation. The garment industry too ought to have been given an opportunity to supply 90% of the needs of the country. This would have led to expansion in these industries, diversification of their output and greater employment. Moreover, indications are, that the Barbados garment industry is likely to suffer further contraction as a result of competition from production within

the Carifta area. Surely, Mr. Speaker, a Government with the interest of the people at heart, with the interest of providing opportunities for employment for young people, particularly the young ladies in our community, would have introduced some measure in this Budget to help this important and vital industry. Were the Opposition in charge of the black box, an injection of funds would have been made to the small business man in the Manufacturing Sector. A small Business Advisory Service is needed to improve the marketing, accounting, management and industrial relations aspect of the small businessman. A cut back of government expenditure and a less wasteful use of public funds would have done something to help the manufacturing sector. 2.40 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come to deal with the more important sector, that of Agriculture. This budget is unacceptable from an agricultural view point. It would only have been acceptable if all the groundwork for the introduction of the Common External Tariff had been laid. The Barbados Labour Party from 1970 has argued that there is no clearly defined agricultural policy in Barbados and I think it is common knowledge that our shadow Minister of Agriculture can be considered an expert on this subject. There is no set acreage set aside for ground provisions and vegetables. There is no land-use policy. Indeed, one of the highest yielding estates in the country was Bagatelle - taken out of agriculture to be used for development. I have no intention at this stage to even try to figure out who is the owner of Bagatelle. Every other Government in the area is concerned to grow as much food as possible, that not only provides jobs, but reduces the cost of living and saves foreign exchange. Barbados two years ago was importing \$40 million a year in foodstuff. This figure now stands at approximately \$46 million. Notwithstanding this huge loss of foreign exchange, the food growing policy is in such disarray, if indeed in existence, that there is not a single sweet potato in this country, and it is pathetic to think that Barbadians are now importing sweet potatoes from St. Vincent which are being sold to housewives at 30¢ per pound. That is to mention one item of foodstuff in the country. As far as the budgetary proposals relate to agriculture a tax has been put on fertilisers, when the fertilisers recommended for Barbados, sulphate of ammonia, urea and 20,020 special mixture, have to be imported from Germany. So that in phasing in the Common External Tariff, the Government should have ensured that the items taxed were available in the Carifta Community. Barbados cannot afford any increase in the cost of producing sugar when one of the major ills of the industry is the fact that the cost of production is already too high. The Prime Minister in the course of his Budget referred to the continuing problems of sugar industry. Scientific evidence has proven that the policy of burning canes results in a loss of production and a ruination of the soil. This policy should be abandoned. What is more, experience has demonstrated that it is economically feasible to pay workers a higher wage than that agreed between the Union and the Sugar Producers as a special incentive for them to cut canes green. Yet this Government has no policy in relation to such matters. Much of the difficulty in the agricultural sector springs from the wrong values inculcated in the minds of the people towards farm work by this Government, and by the belief of some Ministers of this Government that agricultural land should be used as a base for speculative profits to themselves. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the people of this country now feel the full effect in their pockets of the bankrupt agricultural policy of this Government. Further, Mr. Speaker, new problems have arisen. I refer to the continuing conflict between the Ministry of Trade and the Ministry of Agriculture. This has resulted in a lack of guaranteed markets for producers and in particular disaster to our poultry industry. Where are we going, Sir? The Prime Minister should banish the present Minister of Trade from his Ministry.

Mr. Speaker, I will now say a few words on the tourist industry. An analysis of this industry will show that whilst it is true to say that it has grown over the last ten years its growth has been uncoordinated,

unplanned and based on such shaky foundations that despite its apparent growth the returns on the capital employed, particularly the smaller hotels have been insufficient to earn the cost of interest. The Prime Minister will know that hotels have been sold out for inability to service debt. A look at the figures in the Annual Estimates will newel that the Hilton Hotel, owned by the people of this county, has constantly failed to contribute reasonable interest charges to the public revenue. Many hotellines in Barbados can confirm this, and I am quit sure the Minister of Tourism is among them.

There can be no doubt that this industry is changing. Tour operators from abroad are taking a longer slice of the cake. The taxi drivers' income has not been reduced but their very existence ahs been threatened by schemes concocted by tour operations and their satellites based here in Barbados. Mr. Speaker, it seems clar that the Government has lost control over the direction of this industry, as indeed it has lost control over the direction of the whole economy. It seems clear that a firm hand is now needed to ensure that Barbadians are not driven out of this industry. The Government should not be afraid to admit that its policy of 4% tax on the gross of hotel revenue less certain deductions has hunt the Barbadian small hotel operator and apartment owner more than the international operator, who is able in winter time to change excessively high matters, but in summer time to reduce the rate of changes to such a level as to force the Barbadian small hotel operator out of the summer trade almost completely. We call on the Government to review its policy on the tourist industry immediately.

Mr. Speaker Sir, we have dealt so far with the overall lack of control of the economy by the Minister of Finance. We have analyzed its impact on the main sectors of the economy. Mr. Speaker I shall now deal with the most oppressive part of the budget, its impact on the cost of living generally in this country. Everybody knows that the cost of living in Barbados is higher than anywhere else in the region, and is growing faster than any other territory in the region. The recent survey contained in the Quarterly Newsletter of the Caribbean Food and Nutrition Institute reveals the sort of comparative data that highlights these facts. The Prime Minister is merely content to talk about the cost of high living and the importation of inflation and leave it at that, but Mr. Speaker the items used in the above survey are not luxury items but essential items which comprise the diet of the average family in this region. The survey deals with such items as pigtails, salt beef black eye peas, condensed milk, children, mice, fish, meal, flour. In the period December 1970 to December 1971 food went up to 20 points in a situation where there was a 12/13% increase in the general cost of living. In the last ten months the cost of living in Barbados has gone up 12.2% and we may well predict that over the next twelve-month period the increase will be about 15%. Let the main in the street understand that they who were making \$35.00 per week at the beginning of the year, by the end of the year that \$35.00 will be worth \$30.00 and not a cent more.

2.50 p.m.

What has the Government done in this budget to case this situation? Is it the intention pf the Government that we must starve to death? I hope not, Sir. Is it the intention of the Government that we must have no loaves at all or smaller loaves? Comed Beef has gone up; flour has gone up, and, though the Prime Minister was carefully not to read these items to you, butter is up, salt pork is up, cheese is up, sausages are up, even the matches, Mr. Speaker, to light your stove and my stove, have gone up. I wonder what price the people, who are working in the various industries, will now be asked to pay for hot dogs and cheese cutters?

Mr. Speaker, the Opposition benches change the Government with indifference, callousness, neglect and insensitivity to the basic human needs. How can we call for greater productivity? How can we compete against our potential competitors from Cattifita Country when the rate of inflation in our country is at least 5% higher than that of any of our Caribbean neighbors?

Mr. Speaker, we call on the Government immediately to take steps to remedy this situation. We call upon the Government immediately to place the Georgetown Accord on the Table of this House together with a White Paper setting out all the implications that will flow therefrom. Is the Government hiding these documents because it knows that Barbados stands to suffer most from the Accord, and to suffer by the creation of the Common External Tariff and will be in the least competitive position to take advantage of the opportunities to be created by the expansion of the market?

Mr. Speaker, much as we have enclosed and have always supported and will continue to support regional integration, we condemn this attempt by the Government at foisting this important decision upon the people of this country without full debate and consultation.

The budget has failed, Mr. Speaker. it reflects the exhaustion of the Government. Men who, yesteryear, claimed to be advancing are now admitting from the Economic Survey, that the orders they are now receiving are to stand still, and not to advance. Maybe, the next order they will get is to retreat. Men who have called for excellence have permitted inefficiency and corruption under their very noses. With the Opposition in control of the black box, we would have been concerned to improve the inefficiency of the Government sector. We would have been concerned with cutting out inefficiency in the Public Service. We would have been concerned with streamlining the apparatus of Government in this country. We would have been concerned with creating greater public confidence in the integrity of high officials in this country. We would have been concerned with informing the public in greater detail of the full impact of the Georgetown Accord. We would have been concerned with providing incentives for greater productivity from the main sectors in the economy. We would have been concerned with incentives for the highly skilled people in this country to save, but we would not have been concerned, Mr. Speaker, with escalating the cost of living of the people of this country.

What this budget reveals, Mr. Speaker, is that the Prime Minister has lost control of the reins of the economy. He is like a jockey who has been thrown off his horse. He shows neither understanding of our problems nor appreciation of the solutions to them. Even the Advocate-News was forced to remark on Saturday last that "it is an insult to our intelligence." The economic generalship which the governing party attributed to their leader, the Prime Minister, has turned out, as we always knew, to be a modern-day myth, and the 'Advance' which we were allegedly given a little while ago is now being repaid with massive interest.

Sir, let me, at this stage, quote from the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals of this Honourable House of June 30, 1967. The Prime Minister said:

"Mr. Speaker, I make no apology for reviving the memory of what we have passed through in a country where freedom of the Press only means freedom to destroy our moral standards and to engineer the destruction of the legally appointed Government of the people. It is necessary, Mr. Speaker, to uncover what has remained covered; to open what has been closed, to let the fresh breezes blow in the nasty corridors of corruption, and let the light shine in the dark corners of conspiracy."

Mr. Speaker, we have set about this evening to reveal the facts which were so cleverly hidden. I would be failing in my duty if I did not salute the hon. member for St. Michael West for his assessment and his vision when some time in 1951 he referred to the Minister of Finance as a 'half-baked Economist.' I can only ask the good Father above, Mr. Speaker, to have mercy on us in the coming years. We can look forward to, maybe, a 'Freeness Budget' in 1975 or 1976. Mr. Speaker, this is a Barrow's Budget affected with swine fever.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member should now formally move the Resolution. There is nothing before the House.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker,. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass. (Pause.)

Mr. SPEAKER:

Unless there is a seconder on the record, the Resolution cannot stand.

Mr. CRAIG:

Sir, I am quite sure that my colleagues on this side.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

On what has the hon. member risen? On a point of Order?

Mr. CRAIG:

On a point of order, Sir. Mr. SPEAKER Yes.

Mr. CRAIG:

Elucidation, as a matter of fact, Sir. I am sure that my colleagues on my left are interested in making a contribution, and they have drawn to my attention.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

They can make no contribution unless there is a seconder to the motion. 3 p.m.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, if the Resolution is seconded by me, can I reserve the right to speak?

Mr. SPEAKER:

Yes, of course.

Mr. FORDE:

I beg to second the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER:

If there are no further speeches on the Resolution,...

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, on my arrival at this House, I heard some sort of garbled nonsense about the lack of an

agricultural policy in this country. Some people talk about an agricultural policy when they themselves cannot spell "agriculture".

When we discussed our Capital Estimates, I brought to this House proposals for agricultural development in this country. The Shadow Minister of Agriculture did not speak on agriculture because he had nothing to say, but he spoke on trade because he was satisfied, if I understood it, that there was a good agricultural policy. What he was concerned with at the time was the question of marketing throughout his entire reply to the introduction of the Estimates this year. When we come to the House asking for money to spend on agriculture, the Shadow Minister for agriculture always has a healthy contribution, but he had very little to say on agriculture, and spent most of his time on marketing. Now I take this to mean that the hon. Minister was satisfied with the agricultural policy, but dissatisfied with the marketing policy of our local agricultural products.

Mr. Speaker, to hear this afternoon the terrible nonsense we are hearing about the lack of an agricultural policy is amazing to me, and to hear people opposing the Budget on an agricultural policy is something which I cannot understand. Now I want to say this: When the Estimates were brought to the House you heard Members on the other side say that this item should be more than what it is and the next item should be more than what it is. If hon. Members on that side feel that more money should be spent in our programme for the year on the social amenities and the development of the country, not necessarily agricultural development because not a word was said on agricultural development in this country, if hon. Members contend that more money ought to be spent on various sectors in the Government, where do they expect the money to come from? Money can come from one source only, and that is by way of taxation. Today you hear the very people who would say they want more roads in St. Joseph or in St. Peter, or more street lighting in St. Peter, St. John, St. Joseph or wherever it may be, criticise the raising of funds to make the provision for these services.

Mr. Speaker, the Government owes a responsibility to the people of this country to provide these services. The people of the country are satisfied that these services can only be provided from taxation, because the only source of revenue of a Government is taxation. Whether the Minister of Finance chooses to tax rum, cigarettes, flour, motor cars or what have you, Mr. Speaker, the money has got to come. The services are to be provided and therefore they can only be provided through taxation. The appropriate person will deal with that when he is winding up the debate on behalf of the Prime

Minister, but I want to talk on the question of agriculture and the cost of living which the hon. Member, who has just sat down, read in the speech that was written for him. He did not even read it properly.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I would prefer you to say that he referred to his notes rather copiously.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I want to suggest that that document be laid on the Table of this House because the hon. Member read verbatim from a document, which, I suppose, the hon. Member for Christ Church West or somebody like that wrote for him. He did not even pronounce the words correctly.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Will the hon. Member give way? Visitors to the Gallery are welcome to the House but they must maintain silence. This is not a place for entertainment.

Hon. A. AC. EDWARDS:

The hon. Member talked about the lack of an agricultural policy when he does not know anything about agriculture. The hon. Member said that some years ago - he was not even sure of his facts - the cost of food in this country was \$40 million and that this year it is \$46 million, and he attributes the increase to the lack of an agricultural policy. I have never heard such nonsense in my whole life, The cost of rice three years ago, Mr. Speaker, was less than it is today. Similarly the cost of flour, salted fish and every possible item that we import was less one, two or three years ago.

Now the hon. Member talked about the increase in the cost of living by twenty points. I do not know if he understands what he means by what he said. Has the cost of living increased in Barbados alone? Are we in a position in Barbados to purchase commodities below the world market price? To deal with this point, I would like to explain myself. Barbados is basically an importing country, Most of the foodstuffs and other consumer items we use are imported from outside and this is common knowledge; so the cost of the commodity to the consumer in Barbados is to bear due relationship to the cost of the commodity from outside. If we import foodstuff from the United States of America or from Canada or Timbuctu and because the price was 10 cents four years ago, must it remain at 10 cents when we have to pay 25 cents for it, having imported it? Is the hon. Member saying that the Government in order to control the cost of living should subsidise these commodities? 3.10 p.m.

Where then will the subsidies come from? We will have to come here and ask for more money to subsidise those commodities and the budget will be a higher budget. The point I tried to make when I replied to his charge that the import bill on food was \$40 million some years ago and is now \$46 million in this. I said he attributes this to a lack of agricultural policy, but it does not mean that more foodstuff is imported in Barbados and it ought to be a credit to the Ministry of Agriculture to keep the food bill as low as it is, because if the cost of wages in the Dominican Republic, in Canada, in the United States of America and in New Zealand increases and if the cost of providing service in those countries increases and we have to import from those countries, Mr. Speaker, it is as clear as crystal to a blind man on a trotting horse that our bill will have to go up. The only persons who would not understand that the cost to the importing country would be more, would be the Members of the Opposition. Therefore, if three years ago the import cost of food to Barbados was \$40 million, let us now examine what has been the c.i.f. rises in the cost of food over those years.

They came in here with a half-baked reply to the budget proposals of the Minister of Finance, but why are they not honest enough to say what the c.i.f. value on the basic foodstuff imported into the country three years ago was and what it is on those same commodities today? Mr. Speaker, they would not want to do that because they would be defeating their own arguments, but if you were to examine it you will find that those prices have increased considerably. Every time a shipment of food or timber or cement or whatever it is comes into this country there is an upward differential in the c.i.f. price. Seldom is there a decline. If galvanize three months ago was sold at \$X per ton, today you are paying \$168 per ton more for that galvanize because the c.i.f. value has increased. Two years ago you were paying for certain items of foodstuff about 25% less that you are paying today, but the cost of foodstuff has risen, as he said, from \$40 million two years ago to \$46 million today. Has he examined the foodstuff? Has he examined the type of foodstuff? Has he stated that there is no import substitution available for some of

the very stuff? I heard a comment from the Minister of Trade some time ago when he was addressing a certain body and he stated that he saw a woman buying mackerel at \$2.00 per tin and he asked her why she was buying this expensive mackerel when she could get dolphin locally. She said that dolphin was too expensive, but at the time dolphin was \$1.00 per pound and this tin of mackerel was a pound tin, but because of the fact that it is in a tin and that it is highly advertised on television and the like she was minded to buy it. Ribena is highly advertised but we have cherries in Barbados. The people in Canada import the syrup made by Miller's industry from the Barbados cherry which is a great source of vitamins, and we in Barbados go for expensive Ribena when we could buy the Barbados cherry product here. When the people want to buy Ribena the cost of living will be higher for them but you have import substitution in the very country.

They talked about an agricultural policy, but the Ministry of Agriculture has been giving every encouragement to the manufacturer of this very commodity. We have gone out and propagated thousands of Barbados cherry trees in order to meet the need of the local industry run by the Miller industry in Deacon's Road. We have even visited his operation and suggested that he should expand and should do more processing of locally manufactured products, and I discussed this with the Minister of Trade and he said he is willing to allow him to have a factory on one of the Industrial Development Corporation sites to do his work. This is because the man is processing locally produced items. He produces pepper sauce but we go and buy the Jamaica pepper sauce and the Tobasco sauce which is more expensive. Let us look and see if all of what the people are purchasing from outside is absolutely necessary. Let us ask ourselves this question, if people use more of what we are producing locally, and if we find that they use more than what we produce then we can increase our production rate. Take the Miller industry, Sir, he cannot sell all his cherry syrup in Barbados, he has to export it to Canada. There is a big market for it in Canada, but the people in Barbados are not using it as well as we would like to see them using it, although it is higher in vitamins than Ribena.

Mr. Speaker, it is not for the lack of education and local propaganda that this is being done, but the Barbadian society feels that anything which comes from outside is always better than what is produced inside. If we were producing shoes, as we are, we would prefer to go to Cave Shepherd's and buy Bally's at \$78.00 per pair to let somebody see us with Bally's on our feet when we could get a pair locally at a cheaper price, so it is a question of what the public wants, it is not a question that we are not producing in the country, it is a question of the people's preference. We have been trying to educate them. In the Ministry of Agriculture, in the Ministry of Education and in the Ministry of Health we have been carrying on nutrition seminars, we have been sending people -out on evenings, at night and throughout the day to teach the housewives and the young people throughout the country, the values of our locally produced foods. 3.20 p.m.

Two or three weeks ago I closed a seminar on nutrition in Barbados which was opened a few days earlier by the Minister of Health. At this Conference we had several people, most of them civil servants, involved in the exercise of going to the people in this country teaching them the value of food - mainly the food that we eat. This sort of thing is taught in the schools. But what happens? They are not catching on as swiftly as people in the Ministries or in the Government would like to see them catching on.

For example, we have established a Yam Processing Plant in Barbados which produces dehydrated yam or yam flakes. If you use a pie from dehydrated yam, Mr. Speaker, you will find that it is better than potato pie or any other pie you can think of, but how many Barbadians are using it? They will use

the imported Irish potatoes, and that adds to the food bill. When the hon. Member is talking about the food bill, I can tell him that we in the Ministry are willing to produce certain things. What is the point of producing them, if people are not going to use them? Out of ignorance we can talk; we can attack people, and we can talk about things we do not know anything about.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member referred to the shortage of sweet potatoes in this country. Is he aware that for the past six months there was a serious drought in Barbados, and the only time we have had an appreciable amount of rain is last night and this morning? I would like to ask the hon. Member a question. Can you plant sweet potatoes if there is no rain? Of course he does not know anything about land. He knows about selling land but not working land. I work land and sell land. (Asides) There is no crime in that. If you sell land you should work land. If you do not work land, you should not talk about working land when you do not know anything about it.

Mr. Speaker, some people are ignorant about the cultivation of land. For the past six months there was a serious drought in this country. Farmers tried to grow potatoes. The hon. Member came in here to criticise the fact that there are no sweet potatoes in Barbados, but he was not honest enough to say that the farmers planted potatoes but they did not grow.

Mr. CRAIG:

Is the hon. Member insinuating that I am dishonest, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am sure the hon. Member means no such insinuation against the Member's integrity. I will ask the hon. member not to refer to honesty or dishonesty of persons.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, I am saying that, when we are debating matters on the air and the people of the country are listening to us, we have to be honest to them and give them all of the facts. Do not let us twist things. Let us give the people the facts. The people of this country know that for the past six months there was no rain in Barbados. If you go through the country you will see land prepared.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Five minutes more.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I am mindful of that, Mr. Speaker. I have had land for the past four months ploughed and not even grass would grow in it. When I am talking about agriculture, I know what I am talking about. I do not get up to say what somebody has written for me. Let us talk about what we know about and let us criticise what we know about. The hon. Member talked about the shortage of sweet potatoes. We have to import potatoes because we could not grow them in Barbados as a result of the drought. You do not irrigate land with sweet potatoes. We do not have an irrigation system here. The hon. Member knows that certain parts of this country have been suffering from a shortage of water because of the long drought we have had.

Mr. Speaker, I spoke to the Chief Engineer of Waterworks concerning a part of my constituency only three weeks ago where the people were getting water about three hours a day. He told me that they could

hot do any better because they had to pump water from Bowmanston well. They have to pump water from the Belle to Bowmanston in order to supply the area. The fact that there was no rain has resulted in a reduction of production in agricultural commodities in the country. In irrigated areas you will be able to produce these agricultural commodities. You can produce them in St. Philip where Mr. Dowding operates his little farm. You will also be able to produce them at Friendship because they have wells and they are in the sheet water area. Mr. Speaker, even if you had irrigation in the areas where you have stream water, you would not be able to produce certain things because there was no water coming from the wells. This has been the situation throughout the country. Let us get our facts right instead of coming here to talk nonsense

With respect to the burning of sugar cane. I agree with what the hon. Member had to say. I

like to be honest. Only this morning I instructed my Permanent Secretary to call a meeting of the Sugar Producers and to invite the Barbados Workers Union for us to discuss the future of burning canes in the sugar industry. I do not know if the hon. Member for St. Michael West has received his notice. We have asked them to come to discuss the future of the burning of sugar cane with us. I told my Permanent Secretary to arrange a meeting for Monday next week in order to give the people concerned adequate time to arrange their business.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member talked about the Cajanas publication. Let him state whether a few commodities from that publication were not taken for the convenience of the Opposition and published in the papers of this country. Let him say that that is not a fact. Let us consider the situation throughout the Caribbean and consider the cost of foodstuffs and other commodities. Do not let us take out a few items and highlight them. Let us compare all the items, and we will then see which Island has a higher cost of living than the other. 3.30 p.m.

Do not let us just take flour, butter and cheese. And remember, Mr. Speaker, they have taken the wrong items.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The time is up.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, I will be closing just now. They have taken the items which we are importing, and the cost of these items to the consumer depends on what price we have to pay for them from countries outside. That is my short contribution, and I am only sorry I could not tear holes in it a little longer.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, at this stage a short suspension would be feasible. I do this mainly to enable the Opposition to utilise their time to the fullest advantage. We cannot be expected to keep the television cameras in here indefinitely. I would have thought the Opposition would have utilised their time to the fullest after seconding the motion of the Acting Leader of the Opposition as has happened in the past. On this occasion unfortunately it would appear as though no other member of the Opposition was

prepared to speak at that stage; so by way of granting full indulgence, I beg to move that the sitting be suspended for half an hour to enable the Opposition to utilise the balance of the time to maximum advantage as far as a live television broadcast is concerned. I hope that will be agreeable. I cannot , suggest anything more, but they should have spoken already and the cameras should be going out now. This would probably necessitate two short suspensions, although I would like to hear what the Acting Leader of the Opposition has to say about this.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, I quite appreciate all that the Hon. Leader of the House has said, but we are not concerned at this stage with the television cameras. To the best of my knowledge whatever time we are supposed to use as far as television or radio is concerned has been utilised. That is what we have decided to do. We are now in Private Members' Business, but we will agree to a short suspension so that the television cameras can be removed. It is as simple as that. I know it was a punchy little speech and they are a bit concerned and worried. We have used the time that we felt like using because we are capable of putting across our story in as short a time as possible, and it has something to tell the public.

I beg to second the motion of the Hon. Leader of the House.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, my understanding is that the cameras will be removed at this stage and that the Opposition will use all the time they have for replying to the Budget Speech.

The question that this sitting be now suspended for half an hour was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.

On resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER:

This sitting is now resumed.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, I do not regard a Budget Speech or Statement as a matter for playing sides because it affects the nation as a whole. Whether you are on one political side or the other, it is a matter that is going to affect everybody and the taxpayers in a community like this are the workers in the community.

Now I do not expect a reply to the statements I am going to make because the Minister of Finance is not here and I have grown accustomed to other Ministers making excuses that it is not their portfolio. There are one or two things I have to point out, not dealing with the question of things like rum and cigarettes which you have taxed. For instance, if I had my way I would ban smoking because it is injurious to people's health, and the fact that we still have a large number of ignorant people in the community who get enjoyment out of taking drugs, means that there is not much difference between smokers of cigarettes and those who take marijuana. The only difference is that those who take marijuana are likely to run a motor car at 100 miles an hour and meet their death, and those who smoke are gradually hastening their death. You get taxation from cigarettes, so I do not think people are going to say that if you do not have smokers you would not be able to enjoy the kind of life you are enjoying. Smokers are buying cigarettes and all it means is that you have to distribute the money they spend on

cigarettes in some other things you buy for the community.

Mr. Speaker, I am worried about some of the statements that have been made by the Ministers from time to time. Even today I do not subscribe to this view that as soon as people get up they start to tell you that somebody cannot read or write. Some Ministers talk about mob rule. You get all these things when people come to the end of finding a way for projecting some thing, and they revert to something people were saying twenty years ago before they were occupying seats of authority. Twenty-five years ago people looking like them sitting on the Front Benches were regarded as incapable of running the country. They have come to run the country because the mob had the vote and translated it by putting people that reflected their thinking. Now we are getting more criticism. The mob cannot read or write, but it is going to select people who can read and write to represent them; so it is no point in saying that somebody cannot read nor write because I do not accept that as an argument. It is the people who cannot read and write who will pay the greatest taxation, because if you subtract those who cannot read nor write, you would not get enough tax to provide a University, Harrison College, Queen's College and the other schools, because there are lots of people in Barbados who are poor and not using these facilities that we can put a penny on here and four cents there and get the money.

The Minister of Finance is not here but I should like to see a Budget and a survey which are going to reflect the distribution of the economy of this country. We have just given the Planning Unit more economists, and they must get down to an economic survey to show how the economy is distributed in the various income groups. We cannot do the job of planning effectively unless the planners are going to get down to some basic framework material to let us see where we stand, because in getting your taxation from the community you have to know what are the areas from which you are getting it, where you have the greatest savings and identify the areas where the economy resides. There cannot be this sort of vague generalisation that when a worker asks for ten cents more he is lazy and does not want to work and you talk about the attitudes of people. Attitudes are created by the society in which you live, not by the job you do. If those who are higher up and better paid are not as meticulous about what they do and say, do not expect a better attitude from those who are less responsible. I am very serious about this.

I have said and I repeat again that an economic survey must contain some of the basic elements of your economic foundation in the society, and the economists in Barbados must be told that you cannot operate an economy unless they are willing to get down to the job and let us know this is how the national economy is distributed, these are the numbers of people you have, your total labour population is 100,000 persons, and of the persons in the community this is the number of people permanently unemployed, so that you know that your total wage bill distributed in earnings represents so much income per annum and this is divided between people of so many categories and you know who are the people working for \$2,000 a year, those working for \$5,000 a year, those getting \$10,000 a year, and those getting \$15,000, \$20,000 and over per year, so that your fiscal policy will be geared to this basic information from which you can draw. 4.10 p.m.

Nothing you do in the fiscal survey is going to affect the man who is working for \$20,000 or over, it is only going to affect him from the point of view of savings. All the Ministers who sit on the front bench would not be affected by the rising of the cost of living because of some of the items they do not use, but this is because you put everything in a picture. Any man working for \$20,000 or over is not affected by every movement in the cost of living, he is affected at some times, because if he is under 40 he will

be able to purchase two or three houses and the cost of living would never affect him. You are not talking about individuals, you are talking about the whole economy, so if the burden of taxation has to fall it has to fall heavier on those who can bear it, it cannot fall heavier on those who cannot bear it. You do not ask a poor man to pay a different price for rum than a rich man. If he is foolish enough to be a rum or whiskey drinker he has to pay the penalty, and we know the poor people like to drink whiskey because this is a status symbol. They have nothing else to show off with, therefore they act as if this is something the doctor ordered. A man who has been bereft of anything, his social position, and his drink with his friends, would feel it, but the poor man nowadays disdainfully looks at rum and says he is finished with it. He will feel then he ought to go into this new area and that his behaviour pattern should be different.

I feel that our budget must reflect some of this, and I am satisfied that if you are taxing rum and cigarettes - and I am saying this because I am a non-smoker and because I am not a person who indulges in alcohol - this is as it should be. As far as the Economic Survey is concerned, I do not think that the people in the Planning Unit are producing the kind of information we require. In the budget it was stated by the Prime Minister, and I quote: "I do not propose to increase the level of income tax, but rather to initiate steps in the Department of Inland Revenue which will enable the Commissioner to pursue more vigorously the task of collecting the outstanding arrears which at 31st March stood at \$4 million approximately." It is scandalous in a small community like ours where the total population is about 250,000 that we cannot identify these defaulters. We must be able to identify these people so that we should be able to collect this \$4 million in tax arrears. This is not new tax, you have already established that you should have paid your tax but you have not paid it. If you have a situation where \$4 million in income tax arrears will be there you have something like nearly 20% of the total amount for a year. I do not have the Estimates in front of me and I do not know if the total amount of income tax revenue that has been projected for 1973-74 exceeds \$25 million, but whatever the amount is \$4 million is going to be a substantial part of this amount because \$4 million is a lot of money in any language. If you have a situation in your Income Tax Department where they have defaulted in getting in \$4 million which has accumulated as arrears, something is wrong. I would like to know what is the policy he is going to pursue, but if you know people owe income tax you should make them pay, you cannot wait until you find out who the persons are and expect them to volunteer this information. In many instances you run down people who are selling breadfruits or yams and haul them before the court and make them pay money for selling without licences, but then you do not deal with income tax defaulters. I feel this is an area which should be pursued not only vigorously but the people should be prosecuted and if they have any property, attempts should be made to have their properties sold out for the money because we cannot have these people not doing what they should do.

In another part of the Budget Speech, on page 8, under Other International Institutions it is stated: "In December, 1972 the Board of Directors of the Inter-American Development Bank approved a loan of \$5.6 million for the expansion and equipment of the Community College. Several other projects including the expansion of the Deep Water Harbour are currently under discussion with this Bank." I stop at this point. I heard the Minister of Communications on one occasion speak about the Deep Water Harbour, but there is a general tendency in Barbados and at the ministerial level that any development that is taking place which involves the workers, the workers must concur. I want to make it clear that the workers are not going to concur in anything that you think is good for them and send it in a package to them and tell them to accept it. The days for that are over. The Deep Water Harbour is very important to the future of this country, but the workers paid the price 20 years ago. The workers agreed that there

should be a Deep Water Harbour 20 years ago but enough was not made of the workers' talents and potential by training and re-training them for the eventuality of the Deep Water Harbour. 4.20 p.m.

The Deep Water Harbour was built, land was made available, but what do we find? The workers are now being accused of carrying on all kinds of practices in order to get more money out of the community, and sometimes they are being accused of increasing the cost of living. This is something to which the Minister of Communications and Works can reply, but I am making a statement from my point of view and from the workers' point of view. Any expansion to the Deep Water Harbour must take into consideration all of the elements that affect the workers concerned.

Mr. Speaker, there was a big row in the United Kingdom last year over containerisation. The Union has agreed to handle container cargo; the Union has agreed to work with bulk loading; the Union has agreed that the Harbour should be expanded, but we find that the workers have to repay the loans that we are getting. There are some attempts now, in a tranship port like Barbados, to have the Harbour opened 24 hours a day as if it were an Airport. In planning for the Harbour, they have not seen the necessity for transport. How must a man or woman get back to work? It is not the planners' business how a man or a woman should get back home after midnight when the buses have ceased running. If the workers have to demonstrate in order to make people see these things, you will then hear of mockery and all of the stupid epithets that were used 30 years ago by the Conservatives, and some people swallow them lock, stock and barrel like some of the stupid yard fowls picking up stone, corn and anything that can be seen. We cannot be placed in that position.

Mr. Speaker, this is 1973, and it is time that we stop this stupid designation of people by any of these vulgar, old-fashioned epithets that have no meaning whatsoever in 1973 when you want to describe people who have to struggle for their rights and their own redemption when they see that they are up against odds. This is something about which I am worried. With regard to the expansion of the Deep Water Harbour, one of the companies imported a piece of equipment that cost \$250,000 without any discussion with anyone. Following the statement that was alleged to have been made by the Minister of Communications and Works, they have the idea that, after that statement by the Minister of Communications and Works, they could send a notice to the Union giving the Union marching orders: "Did you hear what the Minister said yesterday? Get moving with this piece of equipment." I told them that I had never seen the Minister down there in a fork-lift truck. If the Minister told them to get it they could get it, but it must be made very clear that the workers are in control of themselves. No Minister or nobody can give the worker orders that he knows nothing about. Those days are over, so you might as well make up your mind to face facts. Those who are ready for a confrontation, those who are ready for a fight can shape up to fight, but so far as we are concerned nobody is going to push anybody back by saying we are not ready. There will be no white flag to put up, but the workers' rights must be protected.

Therefore we are living in an age, Mr. Speaker, where the development of the country must be the people's development. It cannot be a development for private enterprise. The same people who controlled this country 100 years ago are in economic control today. (Asides.) As far as political control is concerned, the Ministers are sitting at the front. I went into an office today. I have to negotiate every day, but I negotiate once every three years with the Government. I have to negotiate every day of the year for the people in the private sector, so the economy is in the hands of the private sector. Do not let us get the idea that the employers are going to be in a position to listen to Ministers and think that they are getting the cue from the Ministers to have something done, and therefore the Union must come and

do it. The days for that are over.

The reason for that is that I do not have to look to a Minister nor an employer for a favour.

Mr, SPEAKER:

Five more minutes.

Mr, WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, in my view I would like to see thought given to the breakdown in the Economic Survey and a breakdown in this whole economic outlook in order to get a picture of how the economy is working. The reason why we want that is that the Caribbean Development Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, and we have lived long enough, Mr. Speaker, to see that those who held different views from the Economists at the international level and were opposed to granting money for housing are now changing. They fought tooth and nail. I do not know if they are changing because every now and again a Manager is taken up, put in a motor car, and they have to pay \$1/2 million as ransom money. You will hear that an American Consulate was picked up and is massacred, or a British Consulate is put somewhere and crucified.

Fortunately, Barbados is an area where the human personality is respected, and those things do not go on here. But since these things have been happening in Latin America, the Inter-American Development Bank has now changed and the United States Government have agreed to make some money available to the Caribbean Development Bank for housing. We have in our midst Economists who are opposed to the idea that housing, as such, should be a number one priority for development. For that reason we find that social development is lagging. All that is being taken care of and all the Economists want to project is that if you buy more land and put up another factory, if the workers do not want to work for 16/ or 20/ an hour, then they are opposed to the economic redemption we are looking after and the Union is irrelevant to the present-day society and is blocking traffic.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that we are interested in this economic development. We want more jobs for people. We are willing to invest ourselves but, Mr. Speaker, the time has come when I would like to see a complete re-orientation of our thinking about economic development and some of this thinking transferred to the people. 4.30 p.m.

I have said and I repeat again today that I am still of the opinion that the Government Savings Bank can be transformed and translated into an institution that could mean a lot to the people of this country in so far as future development is concerned, and putting more of the Barbadian potential to work. The same way Barbadians can be at Barclays Bank, Royal Bank, Canadian Bank, Nova Scotia and no matter how many you put there they will never be able to direct any financial institution by putting them as service officers in somebody's multi-national institution, they must be able to create their own institution by starting one wherever it is, so that twenty years from now they can direct the institution.

I do not belong to that school of thought that I am looking for some particular area in life. I can do anything. I am not one of those people that were born to do any particular thing; I did not come from that happy situation. I was born poor and a poor man has to do anything, and I would never say I am not going to do anything. It is one thing I am not going to be; I have no intention of being a lackey, and I have no intention of saying things I do not mean. Whatever I say, I mean. I feel we have reached the

stage now that the Government should give some thought to this idea of letting some of its development percolate at the level, so that people in this country can take greater control of some of it. I feel that the time is coming when, if we do not do this, we will find ourselves with a big economic development in the hands of people, who are not the kind of people we would like to see, and then we would find a situation likely to occur here like what the ICUT tried to create for the people in Chile.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of getting into this debate, but I was drawn into it by the hon. Member for St. Michael West, and I want to clear the record on one or two issues.

The first thing I would like to say is that like him I am no lackey, and like him I do not have to ask the Union for any favours as he has not got to ask Ministers for favours. So in that regard we start equal. I would like to say first that I am a bit disappointed that in a democratic institution you can find that the Leader of the Opposition thinks that a visit to the United States -visiting states- is more important - and I have been on one of those trips - than to be present in Parliament where he happens to be a Shadow Minister of Finance, and where he also happens to be the Leader of the Opposition and a possible alternate Government. (Mr. CRAIG: That is none of your concern.) It is my concern because I begin to get worried where serious responsibility in a democratic young nation begins and where it ends, and I want the Acting Leader of the Opposition to know that my reference is no reflection either to the quality, content or manner of delivery of his speech. I am commenting as an Official Opposition where only once per year a Budget Speech is delivered, where you have the substantive Leader as the substantive Shadow Minister of Finance, and he can find and think - in his responsibility to the people whom he says he represents, and 43% of whom he said the party got in 1971 - that a visit to the United States to see cities is more important.....

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

On what has the hon. Member risen?

Mr. CRAIG:

On a point of order, I am sure the Minister of Communications and Works would have to be irrelevant. What the Leader of the Opposition being in the United States is to do with the reply to the Budget Speech?

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order! Let the hon. Member sit.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I am not interested in the internal affairs of the Opposition; I am talking as a Member of this community where the Opposition is said to be the alternate Government. The Prime Minister has at least delivered his speech in person. I am not reflecting on the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I am saying that in a country where there is one speech on the Budget and where the Opposition is supposed to reflect and to express their condemnation of the Budget, visiting the United States is more important than telling the people of the country, whom one day he hoped to lead, what his party would do if they

had the Black Box.

I want to move on. I just mentioned that but it is no reflection on him. I am commenting on how we approach our democratic responsibility and our Parliamentary responsibility. I know what I would have done. I would have flown back if I were really serious about leadership to deliver the Budget Speech reply on a vital matter of this importance. Be that as it may, we all view our democratic responsibility in different lights.

Now let us go on. I want to make that comment and I am very serious about it, because this country is certainly looking forward, to opportunities to select and to decide for the future. Mr. Speaker, on the question of the Deep Water Harbour, there is no doubt in anybody's mind that the time has come for the extension to the Deep Water Harbour. I took up the Ministry in 1971 as Minister of Communications and Works, long after the experts had prepared and investigated the need for expansion. I had no say in the selection of whom should be on it. I had no say in whether Port Contractors or the Union should be on it. I was not the Minister; I was Attorney General; so I am not being saddled and I do not intend to be saddled with any suggestion that in my view and attitude towards this necessary expansion the Union was not involved.

On the question of containerisation, I am satisfied in my own mind that modern shipping trends are changing, and I defy the Union to say that they have ever received any communication from me telling them that they must go in for containerisation or that they must work 24 hours a day. I have sent no messages to anybody. The Union is an organisation for which I have the highest respect. The Union is expected to negotiate with Port Contractors who now at present run the Port. I am like a judge; I am not getting into the arena. The Union must know what are the best interests of the workers. Anything I say in a public speech is not necessarily any direction to the Union, and all I ask for and all I do get is what are the meetings and minutes between the Union and the Port Contractors. I have no say in it, and I defy anybody to say I sent to them saying they must work 24 hours a day - this is a matter between Port Contractors and the Union - or that I said they must handle containers or not handle containers. In due course when the Union and the employers have agreed, I will then see what is in the interest of Barbados as I conceive it and take it to Cabinet to see whether they agree. I do not want myself brought into something when I am an innocent, impartial, interested observer allowing the Union to pursue their activities as the Union ought. I have not sent them any direction and I am completely unconcerned. I am only concerned as to whether the results of the Union and mine coincide in the best interest of the people of Barbados. That is the only reason I get into it, because the hon. Member for St. Michael West cannot say, unless it was sent to him without my knowledge, that I mentioned to the Union any 24 hour working or any handling of containers. I did say, and I stick by it, that today in the shipping world the idea of handling containers is coming around. Whether Barbados can escape it or not is a matter which deserves study and consideration, and already containers are coming into Barbados.

Mr. WALCOTT:

On a point of elucidation, the hon. Member said he never sent anything to me. I made a speech after the Hon. Minister made his speech and I did not worry to detail the speech. If he cannot remember, I will remind him that he made a television speech in which he said that the containers that are at present in the Island would not affect the number of people who would be employed. That speech was made.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I did say so because containers are already here and the Union must have agreed with the Port Contractors to work them but if container ships are coming here as a matter of fact on a regular basis, this would be a matter for the Union and Port Contractors to decide for themselves. I am not concerned. I am concerned that the cargo comes in, that the Union and the workers and everybody are satisfied with the working conditions. 4.40 p.m.

I said so because I know that containers are arriving and I know that the Union must have agreed to work those - and I am not talking about the future, I am talking about the present moment - but I said so. The whole question of containerisation of cargo is a matter which is now occupying the attention of the experts at Geneva and it is not a matter that a Minister can say something, and pronto it comes about. The Member for St. Michael West knows it is a much more involved proposition than just a speech which is reported in the Advocate-News. I am aware of it, too, and I can see the Union's anxiety from experience in the developed countries that containerisation should not affect the workers at the Port in Barbados. I am one hundred percent behind them but do not involve me in trying to push something down the workers' throats or being in a league with the employers, because in my whole endeavour I have never been in any league with the employers in this country. I have always been a working class man, I have been as poor as the Member for St. Michael west, and I have got where I am through the grace of God and with the help of my parents.

In any budget speech, Mr. Speaker, there can always be criticism. If you put on a penny, it could be four cents, and anybody with any thinking ability can always suggest other means in which the burden, as they say, can be relieved for the poor people of this country. For nearly twelve years, this Government has been in power and during that period there have been twelve different types of budgets, some characterised by the Acting Leader of the Opposition, but this budget speech is one in which you will agree, Mr. Speaker, all phases of the economy have been analysed. Barbados does not exist in vacuo, Barbados is subjected not only to the inflationary pressures from abroad, it is also subjected to the monetary chaos in which the great United States of America from time to time finds itself. Only this week or last week the President of the United States of America had to have a meeting with Mr. George Pompidou in Iceland, and one of the major considerations of these two great countries was a method whereby the economic and monetary crisis in which the world has found itself must be resolved, and only today in the 12 o'clock news it was stated that the dollar was under pressure again, and that is the greatest democracy in the world.

Barbados is a small Island of 166 square miles in the Caribbean, some people say it is in the Atlantic, but it is a great country which has to import food from abroad, it has to import its expertise and it is endeavouring to develop and move away from an agricultural community to an industrial community. In those particular circumstances, any budget on the entire economy of the country must reflect and give consideration to circumstances beyond the control of any Minister of Finance. Until we issue our own currency later in the year, we are tied to the pound sterling, and as the Minister of Finance has said in this Parliament before, the moment the pound was devalued, our dollar was automatically devalued. There was no Cabinet decision. When the Jamaica and the Trinidad and Tobago Governments were meeting to decide whether to devalue their currencies, Barbados did not have this headache because of our commitment to the Eastern Caribbean Currency Authority, so that merely indicates that any community such as ours which is an importing community in which, as mentioned by the acting Leader of the Opposition, sugar has been passing through a very bad time and has not been making its contribution to the economy as it ought, the total economy must reflect the adverse and other

inflationary circumstances beyond the control of this Government, their Government or any Government in power, and it does not take a Solomon to understand this.

It is all right to get in Parliament and talk about the cost of living increasing, it is all right to talk about various items going up, but if you are not producing those items in your country and if you cannot control the labour policies in Canada, the United States of America or the United Kingdom, what can you do? You either cannot have it or you pay the price. You must develop your economy. This is part of the total Caribbean integration process. You are going to force the communities in the West Indies to come together, and produce those items, which are costing us so much to import. As the economy stood before this year, we were subsidising and taking the money of the taxpayers of this country to find employment for the whiskey blenders in Scotland, for the fertiliser makers and for the million and one people outside our economy, we were taking the same hard earned money of the taxpayers to provide jobs abroad and to stop slumps and recessions in countries abroad. In a budget like this, there are obviously items which fall under the hammer and which will give one the impression that the time has come when something has got to be done. Take cement - if you once go in for a policy of saying that you are not going to put cement or other products under the high tariff, the incentive for the expansion of that particular industry will never arise. If Trinidad or Jamaica in the context of Caribbean integration realises that what cement they can produce can be absorbed in the territories of the Caribbean, then of course their interest will be to put up more kilns and to increase their productivity, or the incentive will be for Barbados to make every effort to have a cement plant in St. Lucy or elsewhere.

Where do you begin? It is like the chicken and the egg - which started first? Are you going to go along in a slipshod, happy-go-lucky economy or are you going to create barriers which will force the economies of those countries to sit up and take note to assess the areas, quantities and the feasibility of the commodities which they can produce within their region and so work towards providing further employment for their people? Where do you start? Are you going to start at some point where the region itself, capable of producing these commodities, will sit down and work out the blue-prints for alleviating the temporary hardships? This budget will create hardships for people initially, but if as they say, they are committed to Commonwealth Caribbean integration, if they are concerned with long term developments, they will agree, because long after we have left this scene, other generations have got to come. I do not think I am holding the stage longer than the Almighty decides, and that is not too long, but just as you borrowed money to put up the Deep Water Harbour which we are paying for today, just as we borrowed money to put up the Community College, which future generations will enjoy, just as in any capital venture you are borrowing at this point in time, in order that future generations will enjoy the benefits and that they may help to pay for it, what is wrong with this budget which creates an atmosphere in which in the long term the region is going to benefit?

We in the West Indies have always been our worst enemies. We have always been like crabs in a barrel pulling each other down. We talk about a West Indian nation and about West Indianism and yet when the nitty-gritty comes, we can never coalesce, cohere or come together. The Prime Minister has introduced a budget which in the immediate future is likely to cause hardship but for the long term of creating a West Indian integration and a West Indian nation, in making our contribution to the future of this region which is perhaps the most backward in all the international groupings in the world, it has to be done. You have a European Common Market, you have the Far East and you have nations coming together not only for their economic salvation but for their military protection, but we in the region seem to think that time is on our side. Time, Mr. Speaker, is not on our side, and unless we introduce Budgets

like these to create a climate and the atmosphere in which West Indianism, or West Indian co-operation, or West Indian integration, is going to flourish and prosper, then we should stand condemned before the alter of future generations. 4.50 p.m.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, the reply on behalf of the Government has just been made by the hon. Member for St. Michael South Central, who has just taken his seat, so that it relieves me of a considerable burden of making any more effective reply than this.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Then there cannot be two replies!

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, there will be as many replies as any Member cares to make within the Standing Orders and Rules of this Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Thank you.

Hon. P. ML GREAVES:

There is a Latin quotation, Mr. Speaker, with which you are very familiar *Paturiunt montes, nascetur ridiculus mus*, which, when translated simply means that the mountains are in labour and they bring fourth a ridiculous rat. That is exactly what has occurred this afternoon when the Opposition was making its official reply to the debate on the Budget Speech, and it goes beyond this. The hon. Member for St. Michael South Central has referred to the absence of the Leader of the Opposition and the spokesman on financial affairs from this Chamber this afternoon. What we have here this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, is a spectacle, very unusual and absolutely extraordinary, of the Government debating its own Budget Statement. I have never seen, heard or experienced anything like this in the whole history of Parliament. One would have thought that, in fact, there had been no Opposition elected to this Chamber. Only the Mover of the Resolution was able to make some reply to the Budget Statement, and there was a clear reluctance on the part of other Members even to second the Motion made by the spokesman on financial affairs. They did not even make use of the television time that we permitted them to deal with all the facts and figures regarding this Budget before the people of this country. Mr. Speaker, they still have some time left.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the House was gracious enough to rise and offer to them a second time an opportunity to explain things and it was refused. This is the kind of spectacle that we have here this afternoon.

Mr. CRAIG:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I do not think the Member, who has just sat down, understood what the Leader of the House has said.

Mr. SPEAKER; That is no point of order.

Mr. CRAIG:

On a point of elucidation then, Sir. He said that the Leader of the House offered the Opposition.....

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Will the hon. Member give way!

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, firstly, speaking on a point of elucidation, I do not have to give way but I will give way. The Member can only elucidate his own speech, and he cannot elucidate any speech of the Leader of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Thank you very much. The point of elucidation by the hon. Member for St. James is not allowed. Please continue.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

I am willing at any time to give way to any valid points of elucidation or points of order which I have to give way to in any event, but I do not have to give way to any points of elucidation that are not valid when Member rises. That is the point I want to make here.

Mr. Speaker, in analysing any Budgetary Proposals or Financial Statement, it is important to review the whole economic setting in which that statement is made. I would have thought that this is what the Members on the other side would have done with this Financial Statement. I am happy to see, of course, that the usual platitudes of not giving a little bit here and a little bit there are absent from the reply of the

Opposition on this occasion. Very often we have been told that nothing is done for old age pensioners and so on. That, in fact, has no place in the Budget. What was done for the old age pensioners had a place in the usual Estimates when we were considering estimated expenditure, and that is where we made provision for that. If provision is to be made over and above what has been made for them in the Estimates, then we will bring down a Resolution for the necessary funds. I am very happy that the reply has not taken the usual turn it has taken in the past few years.

However, Mr. Speaker, I am still not happy with the kind of reply that we have got to this Statement by the prime Minister. While the hon. Member for St. James was speaking, I made a few notes. To give some examples, he dealt with the construction industry, the manufacturing industry, and he told us that the boom of the 60's in construction is coming to an end. He referred to the fact that cement has been taxed at \$1.34 a bag, and he also referred to other construction components that go into the construction industry.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, we have to understand the economic setting in which the whole Budget Speech has been delivered. In the first place, this Budget was intended to serve three purposes: (1) Revenue collecting. In March this whole House sat down and solemnly agreed to spend \$140 million, even though it was known at the time that the revenue was somewhere in the region of \$120 million. At no time did the Opposition move any motions to reduce any of the items of expenditure, so it was clear

at that time, Mr. Speaker, that the \$20 million in additional money had to be collected because the estimate of revenue at that time was only \$120 million when we needed \$140 million. This had nothing to do with the Capital Estimates which were somewhere in the order of over \$40 million, which we are helping to finance from borrowing. We have to find the \$20 million deficit. This is estimated expenditure over estimated revenue. (Asides.)

Mr. Speaker, when the Democratic Labour Party came into power the whole amount for revenue and expenditure was about \$26 million. Today we have to look for \$20 million additional in one year in order to pay for the goods and services of this country. The Acting Leader of the Opposition, I presume he is.....

Mr. Speaker: Yes, he is.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

He is the Acting Leader of the opposition. He tells us that this

country is over-taxed from time to time. A country can only be over-taxed, Mr. Speaker, in relation to the goods and services that it provides. When one looks at the services that a little country like Barbados is able to provide for the citizens of this country, one can never say that this country is over-taxed. Mr. Speaker, if you look at the tariff rates of this country as compared with the tariff rates of the other Caribbean Commonwealth countries, you will find that Barbados in that regard has one of the lowest tariff rates in the Whole Caribbean. 5 p.m.

It is considerably lower than Guyana and Jamaica. So this Financial Statement is intended in addition to raising revenue, to stimulating the manufacturing and industrial sectors. It must have the effect of controlling if not curtailing high consumption in the country because tariff rates, and the high customs duties, have been imposed principally on items for which there are substitutes within the region, and that brings me to the other point.

This Financial Statement, Mr. Speaker is also intended to foster and stimulate intra-regional trade. Why do we have to go to Britain, the United States, Canada, Australia or Japan to buy goods we require if those goods can be provided by our own people within the Caribbean region? We have, Mr. Speaker, to look to the development of ourselves as a region. Why should we look to the development of the other countries? We talk about cement. We heard that \$1.34 is imposed on a bag of cement. "(this is all a lot of nonsense. The bulk of our cement trade has been with Trinidad and Tobago which is a member of the Caribbean Free Trade Area.

Mr. Speaker, I am being interrupted by voices in the Gallery.

Mr. SPEAKER:

There should be no interruptions from the Gallery.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Not one penny is imposed on cement that comes from Trinidad or Jamaica. -During the year 1971 eight-tenths of the cement used in this country came from Trinidad and Jamaica. During the first nine months of 1972, seven-eighths of the cement used came from Trinidad alone. These are the statistics we

have, on which there is no duty. I will give another example. The new impositions are intended to encourage us and the dealers in Barbados to trade within the region. I am not saying that it will not have an effect on the cost of living. The cost of living is going to increase whether we like it or not. There is not very much we can do about it, because we are an importing country, but I want to make this point as I have made the point earlier, and it is a point about the Common External Tariff. We are as much concerned or more concerned about the cost of living as the Opposition is. I said earlier that our tariffs were among the lowest in the region. I have all the evidence here and I can choose almost any page at random and find an example of the items listed here where the duty in Barbados is a lot lower than in any of the other countries in the Caribbean. Let me give an example say of alcoholic beverages. On Whiskey, Mr. Speaker, the general tariff in Barbados is general \$18.78 and preferential \$17.33; in Guyana it is \$55.04 general and \$52.80 preferential; in Jamaica it is \$58.07 general and \$55.02 preferential; in Trinidad it is \$48 general and \$46 preferential. That is only one example, but this book is full of such examples. In all these items you will find that Barbados is a lot lower in the tariff rates.

Now one has to understand what this Common External Tariff means, and if we are so committed to the whole concept of Caribbean economic integration, and you go beyond this because they on the other side from time to time pay lip service to total Caribbean economic integration instead of political integration, then we cannot quarrel too much with these proposals, because when the Prime Minister introduced that, he said that these proposals are not higher than the tariff rates on the Common External Tariff. What does it mean? It means that from 1st August, 1973, these items and 900 more will have to be adjusted upwards and downwards in order to meet the proposals agreed on by the whole of the Caribbean. What we will have, Mr. Speaker, is the development, the growth of Carifta into a Common Market, and what the region is doing is imposing a common tariff against the rest of the world.

Now we are concerned about the cost of living, but come 1st August and these adjustments have to be made, some upwards and some downwards, in our view the shock one way or the other might be great. This is one way of paving the way for the time when the Common External Tariff comes into force. I agree that it is high in relation to what obtains at the moment, but if we are so committed to economic integration of the region, then we will have to accept this, and what is more, we will have to accept the challenges of the times and let the entrepreneurs in Barbados get up and do more for themselves, for the country and for the future. The cost of living will go up, but a lot depends on consumer reaction. If the consumer

reaction is against the high imposition of the duty which makes the goods brought in from outside more expensive, then the local businessmen should look within the region to import the substitutes that you have here.

To give an example, let us take cotton fabrics. I heard the Acting Leader of the Opposition say that the garment industry needs greater protection. Mr. Speaker, you have seen the duty imposed on fabrics. This in no way affects factories in Barbados. In fact, this should assist the garment industries that have been established in this country. These are the broad principles of this Budget. We are not happy to have to make these increases, but they are necessary because (a) we have to look for \$20 million and (b) we are in a club and we have to accept the total membership of this club. 5.10 p.m

Before I take my seat I want to refer to a point made by the Acting Leader of the Opposition in respect of rents. He stated in his speech that rents in the Pine Silver Hill, Bagatelle, etc., has risen from \$6.00 to

\$15 a week, but that is absolutely untrue. The release states that the rents which were \$6.00 will go to \$10.00 and \$15.00 will be for new blocks not yet constructed. I merely want to clear up that point.

I do not think there is very much more I want to add to this, but I want everybody to take note that we are concerned with the cost of living. If we were not concerned we could have waited until the 1st August and have the whole 1,200 items dealt with at one time.

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

NOES:

Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Hon. P. G. MORGAN, Mr. W. R. LOWE, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. E. EVELYN GREAVES, Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND, His Honour C. A.E.HOPPIN, Mr. A.MORRISON, Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES and Hon. F. G. SMITH -15.

AYES:

Mr. L. S. CRAIG - 1.

MISCELLANEOUS CONTROLS (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1973

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, as the Objects and Reasons set out this Bill would

amend the Miscellaneous Controls Act, 1970 (Act 1970-5) to provide that seven persons instead of five, not being public officers, may be selected by the Minister for appointment to the Prices Commission. This is a very simple Bill. Formerly the position was that various organisations were selected by the Minister of Trade, Industry and Commerce for nominating certain people to the Board. The amendment serves to empower the Minister to make the nominations as such instead of these organisations and to increase the number from five to seven.

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

Hon. P. G. MORGAN:

I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill. Mr. LOWE took the Chair.

The Clauses of the Bill were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee. Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported

accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, the Bill was read a third time and passed. Its title was agreed to. 5.20 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, this more or less concludes Government Business, but before you adjourn I am asking for leave to make a personal explanation. It is in connection with an Editorial caption.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

may I seek the pleasure of the House before you intimate on what you are going to make this personal explanation. If there are no objections, leave will be granted to the Minister to make a personal explanation. Leave is granted.

**PERSONAL EXPLANATION BY THE LEADER
OF THE HOUSE RE AN EDITORIAL IN
THE BARBADOS ADVOCATE-NEWS
DATED 5TH JUNE, 1973**

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

It is merely a question of clearing the air in so far as an editorial, which

appears in the Advocate-News of today, is concerned. It refers to Reporting And Getting House Documents. On the occasion when the Hon. Prime Minister and Minister of Finance delivered his Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals, at the end of the Sitting the Clerk of Parliament took particular pains to see that the Members' rights were protected by ensuring that certain documents which were sent down by the Cabinet Secretary were not given out immediately but were kept to ensure that all honourable Members got their documents first and foremost.

The position is that certain elements felt that, as soon as the Prime Minister had completed his speech, they should have had copies of his speech, but that was not possible because Members of Parliament come first. Members of Parliament must have copies of the speech and of the Economic Survey first. The Clerk tried to ensure and protect the rights of Members of Parliament, and it was not that other copies were not made available. You cannot expect members of the public, irrespective of their status or standing, to receive copies within five minutes after the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance has concluded his speech. That is precisely what took place last time.

I just want to state specifically that the Economic Survey for 1972 and the 1973 Budget Speech, to which the editorial refers, were available. Before the end of the sitting of the House on the 31st May, 1973, the Clerk of Parliament was supplied by the Cabinet Secretary with 30 copies of the Economic Survey for distribution to the 13 Members other than the Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries.

Immediately after the presentation of the Budget Speech by the Hon. Minister of Finance, the Clerk of Parliament was supplied by the Cabinet Secretary with 20 copies of the speech for distribution to the 13 Members of Parliament other than Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries.

The Chief Information Officer was supplied by the Cabinet Secretary with 15 copies for the members of the Press.

In the eighth paragraph of this editorial, Sir, the editorial suggests that the Government Printing Office does not supply an adequate number of copies of documents to enable representatives of the news media to get some.

The Government Printer supplies for the Clerk of Parliament such number of copies as are ordered from him. In fact, he supplies enough for Members' office purposes and extra copies for the public. The copies for the public are placed at the entrance to the Public Gallery.

The editorial also refers to the time of delivery of House papers with the Order Papers and Bills to the news media as well as House Members.

It has been known, Sir, that the Government Printer prints these papers, packages and addresses them to Members and the news media individually, and then sends the whole set of papers to the Clerk of Parliament, usually on a Friday afternoon, for actual distribution by him. We know the system which is in operation in that Mr. Best, the Deputy Marshal, sees after the actual distribution as such. All of these unwarranted statements have been made, and, in fairness to the Clerk of Parliament and to the Cabinet Secretary, I have decided to make a brief statement in order to clear the air. We are not trying to withhold papers from anyone, but certainly Members of Parliament must get their papers long before anybody else. If anyone thinks that he has priority over Members of Parliament, then I think he is thinking wrongly, Sir. That is all I need say for now.

I beg to move that.....

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, with permission, may I say something arising out of the statement which has just been made?

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member knows that a Ministerial Statement cannot be discussed. Exceptions are very dangerous things.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, this concludes Government Business. I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 19th June, 1973, at 12 noon.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the sitting accordingly. 5.25 p.m.

