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, 13th November, 1973.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.05 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. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P., (Acting Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology); Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees); His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN, (Deputy Speaker); Mr. L. S. CRAIG; Mr. C. L. BOLDEN, LL.B.; Hon. F. G. SMITH, Q.C., B.A., (Minister of Communications and Works); Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, (Minister of Health and Welfare) and Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., M.A., (Econ.), (Minister of Education,Youth Affairs, Community Development and Sport).

Prayers were read.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have received a card from Mrs. Eleanor Gill, widow of the late L. E. R. Gill, thanking hon. Members for their kind sympathy and thoughts at this time.

Mr. J. B. SPRINGER entered the Chamber and took his seat.

MR. R. St.C. WEEKES' APPOINTMENT TO

THE SUGAR PRODUCTION AND EXPORT

CONTROL BOARD AND THE SUGAR

INDUSTRY AGRICULTURAL BANK

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Before the business of the House is proceeded with, there are two matters with which I would like to deal. There is a vacancy on the Sugar Production and Export Control Board and also one on the Committee of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture was formerly a member of these Boards, but by virtue of the fact that he is Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology we have to nominate someone else in his place. I have pleasure therefore in nominating the hon. Member for St. Philip South as a member of each of these Boards in place of the present Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:
I beg to second that.

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

PAPERS LAID

Hon. F. G. SMITH:
Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following documents

(1) The Statements showing Money Order Transactions through the Crown Agents for Oversea Governments and Administrations for the months February, 1973 to May, 1973.

(2) The Statements showing sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of

Money Orders for the months February, 1973 to May, 1973.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of a parcel of land at Church Street, Bridgetown to effect highway improvement.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of $14,320 out of the Consolidated

Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1973-74, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1973-74 No. 24 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER:
Questions are in the name of the hon. Member for St. Andrew but he is not in his place at this time.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:
Mr. Speaker, the Replies to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 68, 70 and 84 are now ready.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER No. 6

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Speaker, in accordance with our policy for the past three or four weeks and in order to expedite this motion of "no confidence" which has been amended, I beg to move that Standing Order No. 6 be suspended for the remainder of today's Sitting. It is our intention to do Government Business and then go on to this provided the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is in agreement.

Hon. R. St.C. WEEKES:
I beg to second that.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. R. St.C. WEEKES, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply. Mr. LOWE took the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1973-74 No. 21

A Resolution for the sum of $7,783 was called.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Chairman, this is to supplement Item 53 of Head 27. The purpose of this Item, as the note in the Estimates reads, is to provide for the payment of awards against the Police and fees for appeals to higher courts. During the course of the year there were two matters which engaged the attention of the courts, these matters were matters which went against the Commissioner of Police, and the Courts awarded costs against the Commissioner of Police in the sum of over $7,000. The amount in the vote is only $960, so clearly this is insufficient to satisfy the costs awarded by the court. The purpose of this Resolution then, Sir, is to supplement this vote by a sufficient amount of money to pay these costs.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

I beg to second it.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, I would have thought that the Government would have today voted a far greater sum and put it into a fund, because in any democratic society, I believe the Crown is treated in the same way as a citizen. I said before and I repeat now that I have heard the Hon. Prime Minister say that the Crown is no different from ordinary persons, but the way things are done particularly under this Head it would

appear as if the Government thinks the police are a law unto themselves. 12.15 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, there are several instances in which persons who have appealed against the Police have been awarded costs, and I can vouch that there is one outstanding matter where costs of $20 were awarded against the Police and the money has not yet been paid. There are several litigants who find themselves in the same position. On the one hand, let us take a traffic case, or a criminal case, which goes before the Court; if a person is convicted and the information is brought in the name of the Commissioner of Police, if the money is not paid within a specified period that person can be held and thrown into jail for not paying the money or for being in contempt of the Court; on the other hand, Mr. Chairman, you may appeal from a decision of a Magistrate in one of the Courts; you go before the Divisional Court and you are successful; costs are awarded, but you cannot recover your costs. If persons would revert to the position of levying against the property of the Commissioner of Police, or the person in whose name the complaint is brought, probably we would have speedy action. But you have cases for speeding and criminal cases throughout the length and breadth of Barbados, which have been brought by the Police, where people have been successful and they cannot get what is due to them.

Mr. Chairman, we have in this country a Magistrate sitting in St. Peter where people who appealed against his decisions won their appeals, but several of them up to today have not yet received the costs of the appeals. Government must realise the situation. It stems from a lot of matters which should have been looked into. You put young policemen out on the road and within two days they will start reporting everybody. You have several policemen who will. report people, and when they get in the Court, you will think that they never had any training at the Training School.

Mr. Chairman, you put young qualified lawyers, who have not had any court practice, to sit on the benches of these Courts, and you expect them to give decisions like any other lawyer who has practised outside and has had experience; therefore, they are bound to make errors. They are human beings. First of all, the salary scale of Magistrates - I have argued from 1964 - is too small and you are not going to get qualified people sitting on the bench. In the circumstances, you must run into problems.

I have said already that Magistrates and Judges occupy a peculiar position in our community and they should be well paid. If you have a proper salary scale you would be able to get qualified persons to do the job. If you use the Magistrates' Court bench as a recruiting grade, then you will get people without the necessary experience and you will have to be prepared to spend money on appeals when the Police lose cases. You cannot put inexperienced lawyers on the bench; the Police appear before them and lose their cases, and the litigants cannot receive their costs. The Hon. Minister, who introduced this Resolution, knows full well that it has been the practice of the Government since 1964-65 to try and recruit inexperienced lawyers and put them on the bench. If you are going to recruit inexperienced lawyers to do the work of Magistrates, then you should provide a large enough sum so that the litigants

who are successful will get their costs. Litigants who lose their cases have to pay costs within a specified period.

Mr. Chairman, if a litigant is successful, he walks down to the Court week after week to recover his costs, and is told that no money has been paid in for him. This is grossly unfair, and I feel that the Government should provide a sum large enough so that litigants who are successful would be paid their costs as expeditiously as possible. In such circumstances, I would feel that the Government should carefully review the salary scale for Magistrates and Judges. Mr. Chairman, we are lucky in Barbados that we have not yet had any reports of Magistrates or Judges being bribed. Later in the day we will be dealing with the Hire Purchase Act. You expect a Magistrate to sit down and adjudicate on cases of this magnitude when his salary is in the vicinity of $300 to $400 a month. You have Magistrates getting $400 or $500 a month, and they may be called upon to adjudicate on cases involving thousands of dollars in a day. The Government should look at this situation very carefully.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I very well remember on a previous occasion when I had to point out exactly what is the truth in matters regarding the Police. I think the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works was then the Attorney-General in the Other Place. I recall his taking the opportunity to mislead the public, and he definitely did so on that occasion. I believe that he acted, as some Ministers feel they should act, as a sort of cover up for Departments such as the Police and others, but I am sure that the Minister of Home Affairs as well as the Minister of Communications and Works have since lived long enough to see that the Police have swept so far and wide in the execution of what they thought to be their duties that it is no wonder we are faced with this type of Resolution before us today.

I am sure that you and I must have had cause from time to time to see the number of judgements going against the Crown as in the case of the Police and so on. I understand that some hon. Members have been so touched by all of this that it has been expressed to the Prime Minister that justice need not to appear at all times to have been done, but rather that justice should have some sort of political flavouring so that the Prime Minister might be persuaded, had he not been one of the people who, above all people, has been conscious of the fact that justice is not a cloistered virtue. He might have been persuaded to go along with that suggestion and to appoint Judges who would give decisions in favour of the Police, or in favour of the Government, or in favour of the Crown, as the case may be, irrespective of the type of evidence before the Court. 12.25 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, you and I must realise how dangerous that type of thing must be. Someone must have gone haywire at that particular time to make that suggestion to the Prime Minister or even to make the suggestion to another body.

Now I want to state one case. I am satisfied that there is a lack of training on the part of the police recruits. I have said so over and repeatedly and I am repeating it again. I am satisfied that we have had enough experience which could be drawn upon from some of our retired police officers here, particularly those who have specialised in investigating crime perhaps for almost or very nearly thirty years; and at no time has the Commandant at the Training School tried to draw on the experience of those people in our own country to see what kind of contribution they can make to the training of recruits who are to go out and take the places that some of these same retired people held in earlier years.

I am sure you will agree with me that that is not the best attitude to be adopted by any training officer, whoever he might be. There is undoubtedly a breakdown in the liaison between the Attorney General's Office, the Crown Law Office and the Police. Now it happened about four Tuesdays ago, I think, that I happened to be going at about ten minutes to nine during the morning along Bay Street in front of the Bridge Police Post when I witnessed a bag of cement fall from a loaded vehicle in front the Bridge Police Post, at the door. Standing six or seven yards from the doorway of the Post was a policeman in uniform, and there were about three or four other policemen in plain clothes. I had to reverse my car. I turned to the policeman in uniform and said "You have it right at your door now. Do something about it." Do you know what this policeman in plain clothes replied to me? He said "Enact a Statute first." It was in very good language, very elegant, but that is what he told me. I said "All right, Sir.", and as soon as the road was clear I went on.

But, Sir, I remember that earlier during this year the present Minister for Communications and Works piloted through an amendment to the Road Traffic Act here to protect people, and I think that the onus was placed on the driver of the motor vehicle, and on the same day provision was also made for a vehicle that was 8 feet wide, a little wider than that which was used in the past, to be accommodated on the roads; but up to four Tuesdays ago, the police stationed at the Bridge Post did not know. They were telling me that we must enact the statute first. In other words, they are saying that the police do not have legislation to deal with this when a bag of cement falls at the door of the Station under the eyes of policemen one of whom was in uniform.

If this is what is going on, what purpose are we serving here? Certainly there is a breakdown in liaison somewhere at some point and it is a very serious matter, because if you are sending policemen on duty to put in force Laws which we passed in this Honourable House and they know nothing about the Laws which were passed, what justice can people have on the highways? What success do you expect these policemen to meet when they come into court? That is the reason why you will find that the policemen, not knowing the law, we have to provide these court costs and this kind of thing.

A lot of the policemen want something more than refresher courses. Something is wrong with the Police Force. I have said it repeatedly. The Police Force is a loose type of federation. I want to put it this way. You have the Royal Barbados Police Force, but many members of the Force will tell you that it means the Real Police Force and others will tell you that it means the Royal Board Police Force, and the Commissioner - well he is just the President of it all. It is not good enough for us to have a fine Commissioner, a man of sterling and excellent qualities who is not able to bring these qualities to bear upon the situation such as it is. What you are going to find eventually is that our present Commissioner, as excellent a man as he is, will sit through his years until retirement, and what progress can we say that the Royal Barbados Police Force has made under this present officer?

We are of the opinion that there can be no improvement in the administration of the Force as it is at present. It can do us no good. It has brought all sorts of harm to the Police Force already, and if it brings harm to the Force, it must bring harm to the country as a whole.

Time and time again we have heard the names of members of the Force associated with all sorts of misdeeds in our community. We must not run and attach a lot of importance to this, that and whatever we hear, but there are times when we find it extremely difficult to disbelieve what the police themselves offer as evidence from time to time. It is a known fact that policemen go on duty today, and every policeman who goes on duty, particularly the young policemen who have now come from Training School - it seems to be the way they are trained - they go on each street and see to it that they position themselves at a point where there is no activity, where nothing is taking place. In other words, you cannot say that the policeman has not been on duty. You cannot say that he has not been working. You cannot say that they are not entitled to their pay for that matter; but policemen stand on the corners of the streets where people are passing by and in the hearing of the policemen they are using the most abusive language, the foulest and filthiest language, and what is more, some of the policemen join in.

Now we have got to try to correct this situation. There are some members of the Force who detest, who are fed up with the type of behaviour that some of these young men display in the Force. We are proud of that type of policeman. 12.35 p.m.

We have got to do something to stamp out that type of behaviour. Today the Force is no longer the type of disciplined Force that it was; the Force today is more warlike than one could ever have witnessed in the life of the Force. We do not want to see this continue and we hope that this type of behaviour would be soon brought to an end.

Mr. Chairman, I see that you have given me a signal, and I must respect it, but I do hope that the Chief Immigration Officer and the Chief of Police would go into this matter - rather I should say I hope that the Crown Law Officers who must advise the Chief Immigration Officer would give the advice which is necessary. These are things that we have got to go into; but, Sir, I must come to an end.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, I want to correct one or two impressions which the hon. Member has made. I want to go on record assaying that we have a very good Police Force, but like any other organization there are one or two persons who are not endowed with a sense of dedication, and this is what happens in all professions. The Police Force is made up of men and women from the community; they are not special people. They are our sons and daughters - they are the sons of our constituents and the daughters of our constituents, and you don't become special because you join the Royal Barbados Police Force. Anybody who has ever read or listened to the speech that any one makes when addressing the police recruits at the passing out parade knows that they are told that their six months' training is only an aid in the process of learning and the police are just like a lawyer who has to learn, or a doctor or an engineer. An engineer who has got his B.Sc. is just a beginner. So a policeman who has passed out of the school six months ago is not expected to be a perfect person; he has got to get experience in dealing with people, and as his process of dealing with human beings continues, he has got to improve and if he is dedicated to the task before him then naturally you will get an improvement in his performance and his efficiency.

On the question raised by the hon. Member for St. Joseph, the Government does not appoint magistrates. As far as I know, when I was Attorney General, one advertised for a magistrate, one got applications, one has to fill the post, and one uses the best material that one has. Whether the salary is not enough or whether the salary should be raised to attract more experienced people is another matter. But there is a question of making maximum use of the material that has applied to be a magistrate in this country.

Now this question of having to pay costs is nothing extraordinary. Almost every single day, policemen lose cases, lawyers lose cases, and Judges get over-ruled by a higher court. So what is all this magic if a policeman loses a case and costs are given against the police? There is nothing magical about this. If you read the Law Reports - as a matter of fact, some of the clients of lawyers instead of paying $8,000, sometimes the costs could amount to $20,000 or $25,000.

The police are not lawyers; they are only people from the community who have gone into the Police Force. I see nothing wrong if policemen lose cases and the Government has to pay costs. This is all part of a process of justice and of legal experience, because you can lose a case for a multiplicity of reasons. The policemen.....

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of elucidation, Mr. Chairman. I would like the Minister to answer what I asked. The Hon. Minister is trying now to make out a case. What I said and what I would like him to answer is that when the police lose a case the Crown does not pay as expeditiously as when the litigant loses the case against the police. Let him answer that and stop beating around the bush about the policeman is not a magical person. Nobody has said that the police cannot lose cases.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, I do not have to answer the hon. Member as he wants me to answer him. All I am saying is, I do not shed any tears because a young policeman loses a case. It is all part of a process of learning. The hon. Member for St. Joseph has lost cases and his clients have had to pay costs. The Leader of the Opposition has lost cases and his clients have had to pay costs. So if a policeman loses a case and the Government has to pay the costs, what is that? You can lose a case for a multiplicity of reasons. For instance, a policeman has a witness and when the witness gets into the witness stand, the witness lets him down. What is the policeman to do? You would know, Sir, that you can lose a case through no fault of your own. Even in your district, something happens to you; three people are standing who have witnessed it, when they go to Boarded Hall the evidence of two of the witnesses vary, and you lose the case. Is it your fault? So when a policeman loses a case, there is no magic about it; there is nothing to condemn as long as there are policemen, and as long as there are lawyers - even judges get over-ruled by a superior court; so you are going to kill a little policeman when the law is supposed to reside in the bosom of judges and a higher court over-rules them? So you are going to kill a little policeman who is not a lawyer because he loses a case in a magistrate's court and the Crown has to pay costs.

This is not as serious as the Opposition is trying to make out. Look at the vote for 1971-72. The money for the vote for costs against the Police is $640 or thereabout; 1972-73 $750, not $20,000. This is just a bigger case on this occasion because it was in the Supreme Court. Six hundred and forty two dollars in 1971-72 and $750 in 1972-73. So as far as Government is concerned, the Government will not condone the police not paying costs. If it is drawn to our attention that there is $40,000 in costs unpaid by the Police, this Government will bring down a Resolution to get the costs. This particular Item was drawn to our attention and this is why the Resolution is here, but if the other side knows of any cases where costs have not been paid, whatever it is, this Government will not condone costs not being paid. We can only come to the House for money for those cases that have been drawn to the Government's attention where there is non-payment of costs; and I would say to the Opposition, if you know of cases where costs have not been paid because the money is not there, the Minister responsible for this particular Item is ready and willing to bring down a Resolution to meet those obvious obligations. 12.45 p.m.

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, is the Hon. Minister now telling Members of the Opposition that we must now be sleuths to go around the courts to find out when costs are not being paid? That is all I would like him to say in clear cut words.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I am putting the Government's position, that we are not aware as a Government that there are outstanding costs not paid by the Police. No request has been made to the Government to vote any sum other than this sum to meet those obligations, but if the Member has a client who has costs awarded against the Police, which has not been paid, a simple letter from him to the Ministry responsible will get his client's cost paid. The Government gets blamed for a multiplicity of things of which it is innocent. How can we with a deep and sincere respect for law and order, for the maintenance of justice on which economic progress can be made, condone the non-payment of costs awarded by a court set up in this country to administer justice ? The Government is willing to meet its obligations provided somebody draws it to the attention of the Government that these debts are outstanding.

I am asking you to understand that the Police will lose cases as long as there is a Police Force and they will lose the cases for reasons beyond their control. They will continue to have to pay costs. The Police are only a reflection of the community, they are the sons and daughters of Barbadians When a man goes into the Police Force he has the same weaknesses and prejudices as we who are sitting in this House, but I would like to go on record in answer to the hon. Member for St. Peter as saying that we have an honest and hard working Police Force in this country. I make exceptions because we would have bad eggs among them but everyone of them should not be branded the same because of the one or two bad eggs who do not do their work.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Chairman, I have contributed most of what could be said on the general principles of this Resolution on an earlier occasion in connection with costs not paid by the Crown in a civil suit, but especially in view of what has been said by the hon. Member who just sat down, I think I can make some small contribution to this debate because I am intimately concerned with a part of this Vote although I no longer have an interest in it, yet $4,000 of this vote represents costs awarded in a case in which I was counsel.

The hon. Member who has just sat down, I am sure, gave a speech that was full of sincerity, but perhaps not quite so well informed as it may appear. I would not like anybody to think that the laws of Barbados say that every time a policeman loses a case he has to pay costs. That is not the law, in the ordinary way, police are protected for the very reasons which were set out by the hon. Member for St. Michael South Central, from the consequences of losing cases because it is known that they are not lawyers and that they only bring cases upon the basis of their being policemen, and the law is in fact that

no costs shall be awarded against a constable unless the information be dismissed and that the magistrate is of opinion that the information or complaint was frivolous or vexatious. This is a point I would ask the hon. Member to bear in mind, that if in an ordinary case costs were awarded against the Police it is because the police behaved frivolously or vexatiously in bringing a charge, and I myself hardly ever, if at all, remember costs being awarded in those circumstances. The costs are invariably awarded not through the fault of the police but basically through the fault of either a Magistrate, a Judge or a Crown Law Officer who has given bad advice. Indeed I think that in all these cases it will be found that those costs have arisen through that, so I do not think that any high defence of the police is called for along the lines that the hon. Member for St. Michael South Central has spoken. What I think we should defend the police in is the embarrassment in which the police are placed by the smallness of the vote and by the liability of the Commissioner of Police to pay costs in cases, in which he is the Respondent or Appellant, which perhaps are right outside section 119 of the Magistrates' Jurisdiction and Procedure Act, 1956-57.

You see, Sir, we are in a difficulty here. The Estimates voted the sum of $960, according to my copy, for costs awarded under section 119 of the Magistrates Jurisdiction and Procedure Act, 1956, but none of the costs which are being supplemented today are in fact awarded under that section. Technically I do not see how that section can be used to pay the costs of the police at all, not with the note in the Estimates being what it is, because to the best of my knowledge in none of these cases has a Magistrate adjudged the police frivolous or vexatious in their conduct. I am glad to see the vote being made - one of my clients as I say will be $4,000 better off, funds which he has already paid to his lawyers, and another person I believe will be $3,000 better off - but there is a misunderstanding of what is involved in this vote. $960 is more than an adequate amount for all the costs that the Police would be liable for during the course of a year for frivolous and vexatious conduct. It is by no means enough for the costs which the Chief Immigration Officer in particular is liable to pay, and the Commissioner of Police to a lesser extent, as the result of successful or unsuccessful appeals as the case may be. I think it is extremely unfortunate that for lack of understanding of what is involved, the Commissioner of Police should have been subjected to threats that his private motor car and his furniture would have been levied on and sold for this money because the Government would not vote money to pay him. Perhaps minor officials in the Police Force are liable to blame as well.

I remember when I wrote to the Chief Immigration Officer to ask that these costs be paid to save a levy within a certain period of time, some junior functionary of the police wrote very grandly to me to say that my matter was being looked into. If you have to pay the Commissioner of Police's costs, they are obtainable from you in the same way as a fine, and if you do not pay the costs within a certain time you can go to prison for the costs of the Commissioner of Police. I could sometimes wish that the police would understand, that this particular functionary at least could have understood in the circumstances, that he is not in a position to tell anybody that he is looking into a matter where he owes a person a sum of say $4,000 or whatever it may be in respect of costs.

The Minister has said it only has to be drawn to the Government's attention and this money will be

paid right away. It is my opinion that the Government was aware that it owed, certainly the $4,300 matter, before the Commissioner of Police and the Chief Immigration Officer were so aware, because the proceedings were carried on entirely by the Crown Law Officers including the Attorney General himself. He carried on the case, he lost the case, he heard an order for costs, a bill of costs was sent to the Attorney General in the amount of some $5,000, he sent down two lawyers to appear and challenge the bill of costs which was reduced, if my memory serves me correctly, there was a review and it was reduced by $1,000 - I am obliged to the Acting Minister of Finance - so I believe the Government knew it had owed this money before the Chief Immigration Officer knew that he owed it, and I believe that to say that you only have to tell the Government and they will pay the money is to throw dust in the eyes of the public. I believe that the minute the Crown Law Officers came away - they had a minor victory in that they got $1,000 off the costs - with a knowledge of what the costs should be that the machinery for paying the costs should have been then set in motion. 12.55 p.m

It is some months now since these litigants have been waiting. On the other matter, I have observed the papers in the Registry up to last week. I was present when someone asked whether we should go ahead and seize the Commissioner of Police's car. I do not believe that a man holding an office as Attorney General, or Commissioner of Police or anybody else, should be placed in this position. Civil actions against the Crown are carried on against the Attorney General.

The hon. Member for St. Michael South Central was a former Attorney General, and I am sure that he would have seen to it that a Resolution was brought down to pay any costs which the Attorney General was ordered to pay rather than having the furniture at Cherry Tree Cottage seized by the Provost Marshal and made liable to sale. I am sure of that, and I believe that this Resolution is long overdue. I will not vote upon it, although I have no interest in it. I have had instructions to seek to collect the money. I will, therefore, abstain when the voting comes around, but that does not mean that I do not support it very thoroughly and regret only its lateness in coming to the House

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Chairman, there is not very much that I can say by way of reply, because I consider that the reply has already been given by the Minister of Communications and Works. There are two points raised by the Leader of the Opposition. He queried whether Item 53, Head 27, was the proper item from which this money should be paid, but the Hon. Leader of the Opposition should appreciate that the money would be paid out according to what is in the Magistrates' Courts Jurisdiction Procedure Act, 1956. The money is paid in keeping with the notes in the Estimates. This is what the Accountant General goes by.

In moving this Resolution, I was very careful to read the note in the Estimates. I will read it again for the benefit of the hon. Member:

"Provision for the payment of costs awarded against the Police."

So long as the note in the Estimates reads as in fact it does, that is sufficient authority for the Accountant General to pay the fees.

Mr. ADAMS:
On a point of order, Sir.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:
On a point of elucidation.

Mr. ADAMS:
It is a point of order, because it must be out of order to read only a part. The note reads "Provision for the payment of costs awarded against the Police and fees for appeals to higher courts (section 119 Act, 1956-57)," which means that section 119 has been incorporated by reference to the note in the Estimates. The hon. Member once had training as a lawyer, and he should know what incorporated by reference means.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:
Mr. Chairman, I would hate to have to prolong this, but the hon. Member must know that he is wrong. In the first place, I only read that part that concerns us today. The other part does not concern us today, and that is what has been read by the hon. Member.

Mr. ADAMS:
On a point of order.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:
What is the point of order? Am I breaking any of the Rules of this Chamber, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Chairman, I am respectfully submitting that the hon. Member is misleading the House. I am sure he is doing it unconsciously because he does not have section 119 of the Magistrates' Jurisdiction and Procedure Act, 1956 before him. Section 119 refers only to costs payable by the Police. There are, in fact, no fees for appeals to higher courts payable by the Police anyhow. Those things are done free, gratis, and for nothing Section 119 refers to costs payable by the Police, and it must be read as a matter of grammar as qualifying payment of costs awarded to the Police.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Chairman, I will not take my feet again on such a frivolous point. That is not a point of order. I will maintain my position. Anyone who has a copy of the Estimates can see, in parenthesis, where Section 119 of the 1956-57 Act has absolutely nothing to do with whether there is sufficient authority for the Accountant General once a claim is made on him to pay the fees, because this provides for the payment of costs awarded against the Police. In both of these cases before us at the moment, the costs were awarded against the Police.

The other section deals with fees for appeals to Higher Courts. It means that when costs are awarded against the Police, then this is the item to meet those costs, or when the Police are appealing in a matter to a Higher Court and are obtaining the Assistance of Counsel, then this is the item to meet those fees. The matter is plain and simple, and the hon. Member is trying to mislead this Honourable Chamber. Anyway, I think we are all intelligent people here and know what is happening this afternoon. This is one of the minor points of which I thought I should reply. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that there are some other points on which I should have replied, but I do not believe that there are of any importance or substance.

The question that a Resolution in the sum of $7,783 do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1973 - 74 No. 23

Resolution for the Sum of $14,284.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of Head 9 - Ministry of Finance - Item 15 - Temporary Staff - $14,284 the note explains the matter, but a fuller explanation will be given at this stage. The sum of $81,456 was provided in the Current Estimates 1973-74 to pay for the services of the Temporary Staff at the Valuation Division. This amount has been found to be inadequate to pay Temporary Staff to the end of the financial year. Certain revision of salaries took place and an additional amount is now necessary to continue the employment of one of the three temporary officers. The funds necessary to cover the incremental credit amounted to $5,284.46. The sum of $9,000 was a nitted to pay for the re-engagement of a certain officer during the current Financial Year. The sum of $14,284.46 was not anticipated when the Estimates for 1973 - 74 were prepared, hence this supplementary in the sum of $14,284 under this Item. 1.05 p.m.

In so far as the other item is concerned, the sum of $6,634, is required. The sum of $13,400 was provided in the Estimates, and again this has proved inadequate. Expenditure to the end of the financial year was an additional $6,634 which was paid in respect of the preparation and printing of valuation notices. Expenditure under this vote to the end of August, 1973, was $12,897 of which $524 represented an uncommitted balance and the amount asked for is considered necessary to meet expenses for the remainder of the financial year.

I beg to move that Head 9 stand part.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

I beg to second that.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, I think that we have already expressed our feeling on the question of the land valuation tax; but I think it is right that the Opposition should again say to the Government what the general public at large has been saying. First of all, Mr. Chairman, everybody knows that taxes are necessary, that money has got to come from somewhere; but the Government is not operating as a democratic Government at all.

There are several instances where the public has got to believe in not knowing where they are going or where they stand. When the new system was introduced - and it took three years for the members of this same Valuation Board to go around and assess land - objections were put in. I have heard Ministers, I have heard the Minister of Finance come in here and say that if you got a tax bill that was wrong, all you had to do was to carry it back. I have known people who have carried in tax bills because the area is

wrong, the names are wrong, and up to now nothing has been done and no reply has been received; but yet second tax bills have been coming out, and the system is such that a person does not know how to operate. You object to the first tax bill and you get no reply, and if you do not pay within a certain rime, you lose money; and if you do riot pay at all, the Government is entitled to sell out your land.

The Government is not looking at this whole operation with any sense at all. Take St. Philip. The Hon. Acting Minister of Agriculture will tell you that there are persons in St. Philip who bought land a couple of years ago at $1,500 and $1,800 an acre. Overnight the value has gone up to $8,000 because up the road someone sold a piece of land for $8,000, and therefore you find that a person who has bought land at a reasonable price now finds himself taxed out of all proportion. All that you have to do is to make a simple mathematical calculation and you will see that on this valuation you will buy your land again in 10 years' time by buying it out from the Government.

Another point; Mr. Chairman. People who have bought agricultural land situated next door to development land, find themselves in the same situation. In this day and age when agricultural land is valued for agricultural purposes, you can understand what is happening now when agricultural land is valued as development land and the Town and Country Planning Department tells you that you have to use it as agricultural land.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the Government has come to its end, and they should get up and say so because we are in a difficult position. First of all, you cannot tax agricultural land on the basis of development. That is the first problem; Secondly you cannot send out two tax bills without replying to objections because you are asking people to go to the bank and borrow money at high interest rates to pay the Government and the Government does not pay interest on the money they pay back.

If you pay earlier, you get 10% discount. What is the position with the first tax bills? If you want a transfer you cannot transfer because of the Property Transfer Act. Yet we are being asked to vote more money for additional staff while the work that should be done is not being done. Why are we voting money for additional staff? What is the additional staff doing? I heard about printing valuation notices. Why are you printing new ones when the old ones have not yet been adjudicated?

I know that the Government says that they have 18 Members on that side and therefore they can always win by virtue of the vote; but to the people outside, who are watching on, it is like the Minister who spoke and defended the Police. All that I am saying is that we have ministerial Government, and Ministers are responsible for their departments, and therefore if the departments are not functioning, and if the Ministers cannot get their departments to function, they must be big enough and bold enough to

resign; but you cannot come in here and maintain that you are a Minister under a constitution that establishes ministerial Government and at the same time they say "do not mind; they are little people, sons and daughters of us Barbadians who are not doing their work."

I think that the lawyers on that side should know what ministerial responsibility means. In England when a Minister finds something wrong with his department, he will take his lashes and resign. Some of them over there are not big enough to resign because they are frightened to go back in James Street; so they want to shirk their responsibility. When we complain that a staff is not working well we are told to write to the Minister and he will try and get something done. That is not the way.

The question that Head 9 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 36 - Ministry pf Education (8) Scholarships, Grants and Subventions - was called.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Mr. Chairman, as the note to this Head 36(8) says, the sum of $28,887 is required for payment of salaries attaching to three posts of Tutor on the establishment of the Barbados Community College. As is well known to this Honourable Chamber, the Barbados Community College was set up by an Act of Parliament, 1968-23 to provide courses of instruction in the fields of agriculture, commerce, the fine arts, liberal arts, science and technology. The College is operating in the fields of commerce, liberal arts, science and technology and there are some 923 students enrolled in that institution, broken down as follows- 208 students in the division of Science, 276 students in the division of Liberal Arts, 345 students in the division of Commerce and 94 students in the division of technology which started in January of this year. 1.15 p.m.

So those are 923 young Barbadians making use of opportunities that are provided in order to improve their skills and their knowledge in the hope of improving their personal lives as well as making a contribution to national development.

It is proposed to develop the College further through the introduction of the Division of Fine Arts and also the Division of the Health Sciences and in this connection proposals would be coming to this Hon. Chamber at a later date for full financial provision for the school of the Health Centres. And it is also proposed to provide staff in order to deepen the programmes in the Division of Technology through the introduction of courses in Land Surveying. These are all areas in which there is a need for further skills

and human resource development in this country, and I am therefore very pleased to be able to present this Supplementary Vote here to this Hon. Chamber, and I beg to move that Head 36, Item 5 stand part.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:
I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Resolution for the sum of $49,805 do now pass.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:
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. L. E. SANDIFORD, MR. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of two Money Resolutions in Committee of Supply. Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, the two Money Resolutions were read a first time, a second time and agreed to respectively.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Deputy Speaker, the next Order - Order No. 2 stands in the name of the then Temporary Minister of Communications and Works; the substantive Minister is now here, therefore he will proceed with Order No. 2 and also No. 3 both of which stand in the name of the Temporary Minister, then, of Communications and Works.

BILL TO AMEND THE UNDERGROUND WATER CONTROL ACT, 1951

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:
Order No. 2 is the instant Order of the Day.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:
Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think in moving the second reading of this Bill I can say that there is no magic in it. The Government found at one time that the Chief Agricultural Officer was Chairman or member of nearly 20 odd Boards and consequently since the Government's emphasis is on agriculture and the improvement of the agricultural aspect of the community, we felt that the Chief Agricultural Officer should be free as far as possible to advise the Minister on how the agricultural aspect of the country can be improved and expedited, and this is just to remove him from being Chairman of the Board and appoint the Chief Engineer of the Waterworks and the Chief Medical Officer; it would still involve a member of the Ministry of Agriculture, an officer from the Ministry of Agriculture appointed by the Minister and not more than five other persons appointed by the Minister responsible for Waterworks. This is the main purpose of the Bill; it is to reconstitute the Board and relieve the Chief Agricultural Officer from wasting his time, and requiring him to devote it to more useful and profitable purposes.

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

Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND:
I beg to second that.

Mr. FORDE:
Mr. Deputy Speaker, although the Bill in itself looks harmless on the face of it, I would like to issue a warning to the Government, There are certain areas that are restricted under the water zone. Some of them are probably subject to review from time to time for release on a proper zoning system having regard to the opinion given by Mr. Tulstrom, the water expert, among other people, but I would like to counsel the Government against releasing certain areas of the water zone that would threaten the health of the community. I am going to be very blunt. I am speaking of the Belle area. Now agricultural land in the surrounding Neil's Plantation has already been released for the purposes of the industrial estates and they do pose a danger to the pollution of the water zone in the Belle area. 1.25 p.m.

My information is that there is now an application pending for Belle and it may be thought that areas of the Belle can be released for a few people to speculate at the expense of this country as a whole, and I am counselling the Government about it at this stage, and particularly the Minister of Lands, because very

often after applications have been made and approved, one is faced with a fait accompli. I mderstand that the attorneys for the Belle have idicated quite openly that they are willing to ispose of these lands to the Government of rbados or any other buyer, and I ask the Government to step in in the interest of the country as a whole for the protection of our water and to protect the Belle, Do not let it pass into the hands of private speculators, even though they may be Barbadians in the legal profession or in the banking profession, because there is a danger involved. That is all I have to say. No words, no names have been called but I believe that if the Minister thinks by moving the Chief Agricultural Officer off his Board, things will be better, this is not so because eventually it is going to be the opinion given to agriculture. The Minister's Board might be all right, but I am asking him to stand up very strongly on the water protection aspect of this matter. If it means a clash with his ministerial colleagues in Cabinet or with other advisers of other Ministries, stand up as I know he can stand up on this issue of water in this country.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I shall not be long but I share his interest in the water position in Barbados and anything that is likely to pollute it or to prevent the public of this country from getting pure water I will certainly be an opponent to and to any measure which tampers with it. I can assure you that the Government itself looks at this matter very carefully and seriously. It is true that there are certain houses already existing in the Zone 1 area, but they have been there even before it was properly zoned. We are reviewing this situation and we will not permit any building in Zone 1 areas in future. The only problem which I know has arisen is that people who have houses there want to do extensions. The applications have to come to the Board, but we will not be permitting any building in this area.

What I would like to see is that the people in Barbados stop taking water for granted as has been the habit, and think of building tanks or cisterns on their roofs to hold rain water as happens in Bermuda and other places. Water is not going to last forever, and unless the Government takes serious steps to conserve it, one bright morning people are going to wake up and find that the water is not as pure nor as great in volume as previously, and we have to appeal to householders to think of using water which has been collected on the roofs. I am not going to mention metering at all, but we have to find ways and means of cutting down the consumption and the conserving of water in Barbados. Government must be vigilant to see and make sure that no use is made of pesticides or anything that can percolate through the pure water supplies to endanger the lives of the inhabitants. I move the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what I.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:
Is the hon. Member speaking after the Minister's reply?

Mr. BOLDEN:
He has not replied. I am in a good mood today, and if Mr. Minister wants to jump up like a yoyo before his time he is not going to deprive me of my right to speak.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:
No one is going to deprive you of your right as long as I am in the Chair, but the Hon. Minister who moved the Bill has just spoken and you have now risen to speak. You attempted to speak before and was corrected, is that not so?

Mr. BOLDEN:
Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is so.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:
May I hear the hon. Member now?

Mr. BOLDEN:
Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is all good and well to shift around personnel on Boards, but what I would like to see the Government do, is to shift around the use of water in this country. It is all good and well to talk about preserving certain areas or releasing the Chief Agricultural Officer to do other work and to advise the Government, but I think the Government should first get the Board to work. You apply to a Ministry when you are digging a well or anything and you have to wait for about 11 months to get an answer.

The second point is that if you travel the whole east coast of Barbados starting from Gemswick and going to St. Andrew you can find that for practically nine months of the year water is running into the sea. Ask the Government and the Board what they are going to trap that water which is running into the sea daily? They will appoint Boards and free the Chief Agricultural Officer to do other things and

appoint the Chief Engineer as head of the Board. The Hon. Minister said he was not going to talk about meters but he should talk about conserving the water we have in Barbados. He must also talk about the standpipes which are left running day and night under his Ministry, but at the same time if a house owner wants to put in an American fitting in his house they will put a meter on it, and these fittings are superior to the Canadian and English junk which is being used in this country daily. This is what I think the Board should do. These are the instructions, when they change the Chief Agricultural Officer and appoint somebody else, and I will say something now which will hurt somebody. I hope that the next time anybody rings the Ministry and asks for a decision, you do not hear the gentleman telling them to go to his home, because he would be writing the report that night.

I hope the Minister will investigate the whole use and allocation of water in this country. Then you will begin to know how water is administered in this country. It is not a question of appointing Boards, the point has been reached in this country when we have to look at the correct allocation of water, at who applied in accordance with some principle but do not allocate it to your friends and to people of certain ethnic groups. If you want to know more, I will tell you more, but I want to see the new Board functioning in accordance with the principles already laid down. That is all I would like to say at this point because I am going to say a little more shortly.

The question that the Bill be now read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 1.35 p.m.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker. I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill Mr. LOWE took the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:
Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:
I beg to second that.

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

On the separate motions of Hon. F. G. SMTH. seconded by Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, the Bill was read a third time and passed. Its title was agreed to.

THE ELECTRICITY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1973

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Deputy Speaker, the next Order stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works, and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Electricity Act, 1936.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:
Mr. Deputy Speaker, the purpose of this Bill is to revise the fees chargeable by the Electrical Inspection Department in accordance with the Electricity Act, 1936 (Act 1936-2). In the 1972 Budget Statement of the Hon. Minister of Finance, he stated that a review of the fees chargeable by Government Ministries and Departments in respect of certain services was being undertaken, and it was expected that during the year increased schedules of fees would be brought into force covering a wide category of services. It is still too early to make an estimation of the amount of additional revenue from these sources. The main purpose is to bring the fees chargeable in line with present-day costs and money values. The intention of this revision of fees, Sir, is to bring the level of fees in line with present-day value and costs, the fees as set out in the Bill which amends the Schedule accordingly.

I think that this Honourable House will agree, after looking at the fees, that they are very reasonable;

there are no unnecessary burdens on anyone; they cannot be said to be excessive, and I should not expect much political capital to be made out of what is a reasonable and justifiable expense. Just as the expense has gone up for inspection and for all other services rendered by private enterprise, these charges by the Government are very reasonable.

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

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:
I beg to second that.

Mr. BOLDEN:
Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Hon. Minister says that he does not expect anyone to make political capital out of this matter because the fees are not excessive. I must ask, how does the Government carry out its calculations when it begins to raise things? If you take a careful look at the new Schedule which will be introduced, you will observe that the fees set out at Item 1 have been increased 100% for the basic charge and 150% on the charge for outlets. That is a matter which affects the average householder. They have now raised the fees from 10 cents a point to 25 cents a point, and that is a 150% increase. You would not mind paying an increase, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you could get an Inspector when you want one and if the Inspectors knew what they were doing when they came to you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I built a plant in St. Philip and called in the Inspectors, who inspected the plant and told me that I had something grounded off. They visited my place three times and turned down the job three times. The last time they came to inspect the job, my electrician told them that they were using the meter incorrectly and they passed the job. These things will affect the average householder, and you have increased the fees by 150%.

With regard to Item 2 dealing with installation under one kilowatt, the increase on the basic charge is 50%, and the points charge is increased by 100%. Now when industrialists increase the cost of their product likewise, the Government should not say anything. With regard to Item 3 dealing with the question of inspecting a job over one kilowatt, the basic charge is now increased by 150% and the outlet points by 100%. A new charge has now been introduced for every routine inspection, but I am at a loss to understand what "every routine inspection" means.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have asked questions in this House already. I have asked the Government to

give the Department the authority to go around and check the buildings particularly those in Bridgetown so that we would not have all of these fires. I now see a section introduced for every routine inspection, test and report on any business or industrial installation $10.00. How is this to be carried out? The Hon. Minister must not only get up and say that this is noncontroversial, etc. It may be noncontroversial to him because he is running so fast today that he cannot even take time to get up and speak. He wants to get out of this Chamber quickly. The fire is too hot for him in here today. I do not mind an increase in these fees, if you are going to get efficiency and you are going to get the work done.

Sir, I have had an instance where one Inspector could not determine whether two 2-way switches are counted as one point or 2 points. He could not tell whether an extension from a main line to a bureau was 1 point or 2 points, and it was the subject of a court case. These are the factors that should be looked into if you wish to increase your fees when the Inspector does not know whether he is dealing with 2 points or 4 points.

I went to the Department some time ago and a clerk told me that I would have to wait until he went upstairs to get something signed, or I could go about my business. The electrical system in this country is in disarray. The officers cannot even tell you what qualifications they have. You can fool them all the time, Mr. Deputy Speaker. You merely have to run a line; put a switch in the corner and put a bulb at the end of the line, and you can trick them. If you increase the fees, you will also increase the number of tricks that will be played on the Inspector. 1.45 p.m.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am ready to reply. I do not want anything like just now. I just want to assure the hon. Member who reminds me of what the Union complains about. An employer is paying workers 6 cents. The Union asks for another 6 cents and you tell them that you cannot give them a 100% increase. One hundred percent increase from $1.50 is $3. There is no use trotting out percentages and giving the impression that the Government is putting a great burden on the taxpayers and killing them. $1.50 cannot pay an inspector to go to St. Lucy. Even $3.00 today cannot pay the Government to send an inspector to St. Philip to inspect a house. Do not try to mislead people that the Government is putting an unbearable imposition on the public of Barbados.

What I can tell the hon. Member is that I am coming down in another two or three weeks with a Bill establishing a Board for the registration of electricians. That Bill is going to Cabinet and if it does not go up this week, it will go next week. We are establishing a Board for making sure that people, who go to inspect houses have passed and possessed a certain degree of competence. We are licensing electricians and we will see that they are capable of performing their duties. We will see that they possess the degree of competence for the job which they walk around saying they can perform.

Do not let the Opposition come and tell the people about 150%. Do you think that $25 for a big industrial concern worth $1 million is too much for an inspection? Do not quote percentages. Mr. Deputy Speaker, in a matter like this, it is just like when drivers' licences were $1.20 and they were increased to $5, It was said that it was a big percentage increase. I say that these advances are extremely reasonable. The Member has raised the question that the Electrical Inspection Department should have the right to inspect a building where it is suspected that the installations might be a fire hazard and might cause damage. If we do that, we will have to put in a fee.

The people of Barbados must be told that they have certain civic responsibilities. This idea of fooling people that they will get everything for nothing, and free and without paying for it is bad political policy. It may get you votes, but one day you will wake up and find that this freeness mentality, this idea that everything must be put on a platter without paying anything on their own behalf will have a rebound.

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of explanation. I never said that people should get everything free. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. Member who has just sat, told the people of Barbados not to pay for the houses, that they should get them free.

The question that the Bill be read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on the Bill.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair. The House went into Committee on the Bill Mr. LOWE took the Chair.

Clauses 1, 2 and the Schedule were called and passed.

On the motion of the Hon. F. G. SMITH, seconded by Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee. Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. F. G. SMITH, seconded by Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, the Bill was read a third time and passed. Its title was agreed to.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE SUGAR INDUSTRY (REHABILITATION, PRICE STABILIZATION AND LABOUR WELFARE) ORDER, 1973

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Government proposes to deal with Order No. 6 which stands in the name of the Temporary Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology.

I beg to move that Order No. 6 be the next Order of the Day.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

I beg to second that.

The question that Order No. 6 be the next Order of the Day was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. R. St.C. WEEKES:

-Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Resolution deals with the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilization and Labour Welfare) Act, 1947, (1947-30). This is an annual exercise, but I consider it my duty to give this Honourable House certain information which I have in my possession.

The Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilization and Labour Welfare) Act, 1947 (1947-13) provides for the raising of a levy on all sugar manufactured in this island. This Act was amended in 1951 (1951-52), 1952 (1952-11), 1964 (1954-43), 1936 (1956-25), 1956 (1956-26).

The Act also provides that the monies received by way of levies should be collected by the Sugar Production and Export Control Board, and that the Cabinet shall direct the allocation of these levies to three funds -

(a) the Sugar Industry Capital Rehabilitation Reserve Fund,

(b) the Sugar Industry Price Stabilization Reserve Fund,

(c) The Crown in its Right of the Government of this Island for the Labour Welfare Fund.

The monies allocated to the Rehabilitation Fund and the Price Stabilization Fund are administered by the Sugar Industry Capital Rehabilitation Reserve Board and the Sugar Industry Price Stabilization Reserve Board, respectively. 1.55 p.m.

In 1955, certain negotiations took place between Government, the Workers' Union and the Sugar Producers, and it was decided to include in the amount allocated to the Labour I Welfare Fund, an allocation of 40 cents a ton for the establishment of a Sugar Workers' Provident Fund. Forty cents a ton were collected in respect of the years 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, 1960 and $1 per ton since 1961. This year, it is proposed to increase the allocations to the Sugar Workers' Provident Fund from $1 to $4.60.

The Sugar Workers' Provident Fund Act was enacted in 1969 (1969-54), and was proclaimed on 3rd November, 1969. Provision was made for $2,000,000 from the Price Stabilization Fund to be transferred to the Sugar Workers' Provident Fund, but this was not done until November, 1963, and an additional amount of $1,011,139 was also transferred to the Fund representing the interest on the $2,000,000 from 1963 to 1971.

To date, funds transferred from the Price Stabilization Fund to the Sugar Workers' Provident Fund are $3,511,139. All transfers from the Price Stabilization Fund have been agreed to by the Tripartite Committee which is comprised of the Barbados Workers' Union, the Sugar Industry and the Government; and the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilization and Labour Welfare) Act, 1947, provides that the Board must make regulations for the transfer of funds. However, the Labour Welfare Fund is administered by the Crown, and the disposition of funds under this Act, is decided by Government.

Since, 1968, the rate of levies was fixed at $13.20 per ton (in 1967 the rate was $14.46), but there have been changes from time to time in the allocation of the levies to the respective Funds, and therefore no precedence is being created by the proposed readjustment under Labour Welfare Fund this year.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, those are the facts relating to what this Resolution seeks to provide. I now beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
I beg to second that.

Mr. BOLDEN:
Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is a man called Nixon who is in a lot of trouble, but at least his speech writers are sufficiently intelligent to Write a speech to make him appear to be intelligent and upright.

Sir, this is foolishness in the Civil Servants writing a lot of tripe and sending Ministers in here to read it. This is only an example of wasting the Government's time. This is all foolishness in the civil servants who think they can fool the people down here and now they have written this foolishness and sent the poor Minister here to read it, and all he is doing by reading this speech is trying his best to make himself appear to know something about what they have sent down here. This is just the advice that the civil servants give; this just shows the type of civil servants who are sent to advise. That is the problem; the civil servants are the people who create these problems. Sir, this is an annual exercise. Everybody fellows from time immemorial that there was a levy on all sugar manufactured in this Island. We passed the Bill in this House to make provision for that, so this a waste of Government's time when you get civil servants trying to show off and make the Minister look foolish; and the Minister should have enough sense to throw this speech they have written back in the waste paper basket and tell the civil

servants it is foolishness to write that type of speech. The civil servants are the cause of all this, and that is why this country is as it is today, particularly certain Government departments and moreso the department which the Minister is representing.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the civil servants write a speech which carries through some policy, that is all right, but the poor Minister has not had sense enough to see that the speech written by the civil servants has no policy. The Hon. Minister does not even understand half of what has been given to him to read today. This is just wasting Parliamentary time. It is foolishness. This is just a matter of one trying to show off some brilliance, and the Minister should have more sense than that, to come down here and waste people's time; This is all foolishness. It is time that the Ministers accept their parliamentary responsibility and if the civil servants are not any use to them, report them to the appropriate authorities, instead of coming down here and reading foolishness day after day and thinking that headlines mean policy. Today agriculture is suffering and people outside are starving, and it is time that this foolishness comes to an end in this country.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this type of attack on the Minister must stop. The Temporary Minister of Agriculture has undertaken a duty assigned to him. He comes to this House, whether it is an annual exercise or not, and he endeavours to give to this House facts relative to the Resolution. The hon. Member for St. Joseph may be omniscient and know everything about everything, but the Temporary Minister harmlessly gives the facts about this Resolution and the hon. Member is criticising him. Why should the hon. Member for St. Joseph get up, when the Temporary Minister has given this House the necessary information, and attack him like this?.....

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The Hon. Minister cannot say what I have done. What have I done? I simply said that the time for speech writing has long passed.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Point made.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. Member had no authority to characterize anything the Temporary Minister has said as foolish. How can you say that it is foolishness? Has the Minister misled the House? Has the Minister given the House facts or not? It is improper to come in here and characterize the speech made by the Minister as foolish? It is impertinence on his part, when the Temporary Minister has only

endeavoured to enlighten the House on the history of the Bill; and the hon. Member gets up and has not made one point yet. 2.05 p.m

He has not made one point. Ask him what point he has made in his whole speech except to abuse civil servants and the process of the House.

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order, I am asking the Hon. Minister to withdraw that. I have not abused the process of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I will ask the Hon. Minister to withdraw that remark.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I withdraw it. What I am saying is that the purpose of the House, I imagine, is to do Government's business and to explain to the public, not to "the know alls" over there, because they seem to know what everything is all about, but we are here to explain to the public and to the House the purpose of this Resolution. The Minister has given a clear history of the Resolution and the hon. Member gets up in his omnipotent and omniscient manner and tries to belittle the Minister. He is acting as Minister of Agriculture for the first time, he has been with Communications and Works for some time, but he has given this Hon. House with all innocence and sincerity the history of the Resolution in explaining its purpose, and because the hon. Member knows a little about agriculture and a little about geese, he tries to belittle him.

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order, Sir, the Hon. Minister says that I know a little about agriculture and a little about geese, but he was Attorney General and he knew so much about it that they put him now to dig roads.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

The people in this House must show some degree of consideration and tolerance and they must understand that because they may belong to a profession, that does not give them the right to criticise other Members of Parliament. I think it is a most ungracious and insincere attack on the Temporary Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order, the Hon. Minister cannot talk about my being insincere and ungracious, I have not offended the Chair. It he wrote the speech and he is now worried, let him deliver it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

No point of order.

Hon. R. StC. WEEKES:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I sat here and listened attentively to all that the hon. Member for St. Joseph said. Regardless of how he has attempted to belittle me that does not prevent me from performing my duties in the correct manner which I know they should be done. He must realize that I was only appointed Temporary Minister last Thursday, consequently I have to be briefed on this resolution, and it is not fair for the hon. Member to use such remarks against me as Temporary Minister, and also against me as Temporary Minister, and also against the civil servants. It is the duty of the Minister to protect the civil servants and not to allow people who do not share full responsibility as legislators to come in here and attempt to belittle the qualities of the civil servants It is the duty of the civil servants to advise the Minister and therefore you will expect me to get the necessary information from the civil servants. Could I go to the hon. Member for St. Joseph and ask him for information about the fund?

I also agree with the Hon. Minister of Communications and works who has that if I had come in here and only introduced it without giving the background the hon. Member for St. Joseph would have torn it to pieces, and therefore I consider it my duty to deal with all aspects of the resolution. I have given the House the facts and I have no doubt that it will be unanimously passed.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think we should suspend at this stage. I beg to move that the Sitting be now, suspended for one hour.

Dr. the Hon. R.B. CADDLE:
I beg to second that.

The Questions was put and resolved in the affirmative with out division, Mr. SPEAKER suspended the Sitting accordingly. 2.15 p.m.

On resumption -

Mr. SPEAKER:
When the Sitting was suspended, we dealing with Government Business and to that we now revent.

HIRE PURCHASE (AMENDMENT)

BILL, 1973

Hon. C.E. TALMA:
Mr. Speaker, I propose to deal with Order No. 7 standing in my name, and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Hire Purchase Act, 1959

Mr. Speaker as the Objects, and reasons of this Bill set out, this Bill set out, this Bill would amend the Hire Purchase Act, 1959 (Act 1959.19) inter alia to extend the application of the Act, to hire purchase and credit-sale agreements under which the hire purchase price or the total purchase price does not exceed $10, 000. The position is that the Hire Purchase Act of 1959 has been in need of amendment for some time and steps were actually being taken with the result that on the dissolution of Parliament on the 16th August 1971, the Bill died a natural death Suggestions were made in this chamber by certain Members of the Opposition amongst other, and many of those suggestions have been incorporated in this new bill.

There was a suggestion to increase the amount of $10,000 in goods which may be the subject of a Hire

Purchase Agreement, and the Magistrates' Court would have jurisdiction in respect of the entire amount irrespective of the petty debt minimum as imposed by the Magistrates Jurisdiction and Procedure Act, 1956 (1956-57). These two suggestions were made by the Opposition and they have been incorporated in the Bill. The matter has been referred to the Chief Justice, and he approved of the proposed amendments. It is pleasing not only to the Cabinet and the opposition as such, but also to the Chief Justice and Attorney-General.(Asides.)

Sir, the hon. Member for St. Joseph does not seem to appreciate what has been said.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:
I beg to second that.

Mr. Bolden: MR Speaker. The Hon. Leader of the House said that the suggestions of the Opposition have been incorporated, but I think that the facts of this matter are that the Opposition Members are the first persons who not only asked questions, but made certain moves in Parliament for the increased of the amount so that the Magistrates' Court would have jurisdiction in hire purchase cases because of certain experiences which we practicing barrister have encountered in the courts day after day.

When we first made our suggestions, we suggested $10, 000 because the Act of 1959 had raised the limit, and we found that $10,000 would have been a reasonable figure for the jurisdiction of the Magistrates' Court. Subsequent to our suggestions to the Government, the Government has also made certain changes in the duty of certain motor cars which are bought from outside the Carifta area and the prices of some of these vehicles are now in excess of the $10,000 that we suggested in 1970 or early 1971.

Now, I would have thought that the Government, taking into consideration these new duties and the new prices not only in respect of motor cars, but certain things like agricultural machinery which are quite different from hire purchase agreements, would have acted differently. It is easier as you, Mr. Speaker, would know, to deal with a matter of this kind expeditiously and with less cost in the Magistrates' Court than to deal with it in the Supreme Court. Under Section 14 of the Act, a Magistrate has certain jurisdiction and the law imposes certain conditions upon the owners of goods. We are not against the question of whether the consumer exceeds the amount for which legislation is not passed. I should like the Government to increase the sum from $10,000 to $12,000.

Mr. Speaker, let us look at this Act in its true perspective. Let us consider the time and the period in which we live and what the Act means to us. Money is difficult to come by and has been difficult to come by over a number of years. The Government is saying that we are a developing community and must advance. I have heard statements made by people on the other side that people have T.V. in their houses; people drive motor cars and run shops, etc., but 90% of the Barbadians are living on credit. The only way in which we can get along is by credit, and we must protect the people who are entering into these hire purchase agreements.

If we intend, at this stage, to go forward in our agricultural production, if we intend to go forward in our industrialisation, then we should have an Act whereby the hire purchase price of an article is so placed that these persons who are involved would have a certain amount of protection by the Courts from the owners of goods who may be unscrupulous in giving them an article today, and if they miss a payment next week, to take it back. I know of one hire purchase firm in Barbados that as soon as you miss one month they will seize the article and you cannot get it back unless you pay two months' instalments and the cost of recovering the article plus an extra fee.

Anybody who knows the Hire Purchase Act will know that if the owner of goods should seize the goods outside of the terms of the Act, he will lose his goods. A motor car in 1970 which could have been purchased for $6,000 or $7,000 today will cost you $11,000 or $12,000. From the time the new Customs and tariffs duties were increased the price of things went up by at least 1/3 of the cost if they came from outside the Common Market area. If we want to have semblance of prosperity, then I would suggest that the Government should consider this aspect of the Bill and raise the hire purchase amount. The new tariff and prices have jumped in the last year far in excess of what had been anticipated when the recommendations were made to the Government in 1970.

Mr. Speaker, I would mention that in the Committee Stage when we move that the sum be increased, it is not going to affect the Government in any way. All it is doing is, to make the figure under the Act an amount that would bring it within the range of the Magistates' jurisdiction whereby these matters could be dealt with expeditiously with less costs to the owner and the hirer.

I am glad that the Government has seen fit to accept the suggestions of the Opposition, and I think that the Government will accept any amendment which we may make during the discussion of this Bill. We are not making amendments to show that the Government does not know what it is doing, but we want to protect 90% of the Barbadians who are today using hire purchase goods and who do not have money.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Speaker, one phenomenon of the postwar years has been the rapid increase in the hire purchase agreements, and they have come to be accepted today as the standard form of financing consumer credit. Although the system of hire purchase has been known to financiers for several years and has doubled over the century, its true significance has only recently dawned upon the economists, public financiers, and, certainly, our legal fraternity. 3.25 p.m.

May I join with the hon. Member for St. Joseph therefore in saying that it is good to see that the Government can recognise that a worthwhile and constructive idea has come from the Opposition; but I believe that I am correct in saying that for several years now the Leader of the Opposition in his then capacity of Shadow Minister of Finance has called on the Government for a wider approach to the whole issue of hire purchase and for a complete overhaul of the laws governing consumer credit.

May I therefore formally go on record in this House as seconding his call and as stating that this forms part of the policy of the Opposition and of the Barbados Labour Party and that we will seek, both in this Parliament and in the next, particularly if we form the next Government of this country, to review consumer credit, to review all of the laws dealing with consumer credit and particularly the laws dealing with hire purchase as well as with the lending of money both on short term and long term financing, and particularly in the consumer business of this country, and also to deal with the laws governing pledges, pawn-brokers and friendly societies.

It is not often that we get an opportunity to challenge part of the Government's fiscal policy on this type of amendment, but we consider that part of the problem occurring in the country today has been the failure of the Government to deal with a proper review of the laws governing credit and particularly the laws governing hire purchase. It is well known that one of the boasts of the Government in the last elections was that people by way of hire purchase, for instance, could have acquired a lot of consumer durables; but we believe that the Government should have reviewed the entire system of hire purchase, and not simply to do as it is doing here, putting a limit to magistrates' juridictions or putting the onus on the owner to declare to the hirer the true value of the goods where the goods are $10,000 and over, but we believe that there is need for more fundamental changes in this Act, and that one of the fundamental changes is that side by side with a review of hire purchase, Government should pass an amending Act.

This, Sir, has been called for on numerous occasions by Senator St. John when he was Leader of the Opposition, and by the hon. Member for St. Thomas, the Shadow Minister of Finance, and I am sorry that the Government has not seen fit to come down with comprehensive legislation of this nature. This is only a piecemeal bit of legislation, and it will not solve the problem. There is no protection given in the substantive legislation on hire purchase transactions as a whole, and I am considerably disturbed about those persons who are involved in hire purchase transactions above the limit set under the old Act and indeed above the limit being set in this new Act as well, because there is little protection by way of

making it obligatory to the hirer to disclose certain vital information to the purchaser, and also lacking in the legislation is the provision whereby the Minister of Finance in times of economic crisis like the present time can by order restrict consumer spending on durable consumer goods which take out of Barbados very much needed credit that could be re-directed into the economy to finance expansion in the areas of capital formation and the building of equity capital.

I do not think, Sir, that it is good enough for the Government at this time to come with a piecemeal bit of legislation. What has taken the Government so long? A useful idea governing comprehensive legislation has either been in the Legal Department or moving between Ministries for so long that even the budget has overtaken its true usefulness. If the Government is on the ball, it must recognise that these matters need updating and speedily.

I will not oppose the Bill and what it stands for although it is not enough and is not evidence of sufficient thinking of the use of hire purchase in the economy and the necessity to regulate it properly. It seems to me that the Government has not got any idea on this aspect of the monetary and financial affairs of this country. I am willing to assist them to aid them in this respect. I would ask the Government to appoint a high-powered committee, and we will bring in legislation asking the Government to do that. We trust that the Government will not reject this legislation on narrow political grounds.

I am always conscious of the fact that as soon as an idea i$ put forward by the Opposition, the Government is anxious to say that it is doing it, but I am urging a review of consumer credit in its broad aspect. I want to state that it is necessary and that we will be hammering in this Parliament for new legislation, and we will press to get comprehensive legislation brought to this House, to have a comprehensive review of the relevant legislation rather than this piecemeal bit of legislation which is now before the House.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member is urging that we review further the law pertaining to hire purchase. He also appears to be asking that this Chamber set up a Committee to go into all aspects of hire purchase, I am saying that it will not be necessary because this Bill is intended for limited purposes. The Government has no intention of further amending the Hire Purchase Act. The Government intends to repeal the Hire Purchase Act. The Government will bring down comprehensive legislation to deal with the matter.

The question that the Bill be read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative without

division.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA seconded by Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair. The House Went into Committee on the Bill. Mr. LOWE took the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA moved, seconded by Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND, that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

3.35 p.m.

Mr. BOLDEN:
Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the figures "$10, 000" in line 3 of Clause 2 be deleted and the figures "$12,000" substituted therefore.

Mr. ADAMS:
Mr. Chairman. I beg to second that. I suggest that this amendment be accepted. It costs the Government absolutely nothing. The hon. Member who has moved the amendment is an experienced man in hire purchase matters and I would urge hon. Members to harken to the experience of the hon. Member in this particular matter and accept the amendment. The hon. Member is widely recognized by the court particular in these matters. It is known that the duty on motor cars has gone up. I will urge hon. Members not to regard this as any matter of party spirit but to regard it as a serious suggestion based upon the experience of persons who may be yet more experienced that those who have advised the Government. I will urge that $12, 000 is the more suitable sum than $10,000 in all the circumstances of the case.

Mr. BOLDEN:
Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I would like to point out briefly why I moved the amendment. Sir, the particular thing in this is, motor cars. Motor cars used to be $6,000, $ 7,000 and $8,000, and today those which cost $6,000 in the past have now gone up to $11,000. The price of some

cars today is $18,000. The price of the big cars like Mercedes Benz has gone up, and I am trying to bring these cars and other articles within the jurisdiction of the magistrates so that problems that would be likely to arise, would not now arise, if the amendment is accepted.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Chairman, I place some value on what the hon. Member has said, and I will accept "12,000" in place of "10, 000".

The question that the figures proposed to be left out stand part of the question was put and resolved in the negative without division.

The question that the new figures be there inserted was put and resolved inn the affirmative without division.

The question that Clause 2 as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 3 was called and passed

Clause 4 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA. I beg to move that Clause 4 stand part.

Hon. P. M. GREVES:
I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS:
Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer to the magistrates' salaries bearing in mind the normal monetary

limit on the jurisdiction of the magistrates' court, and especially bearing in mind this Act. There May be many administrative matters which will achieve the purpose of giving a more substantial salary to these magistrates but there is no doubt that on the whole the responsibility in the civil jurisdiction of the magistrates' court has increased, as indeed in all other jurisdictions and because of the responsibilities which the magistrates have today they deserve some consideration.

Mr. Chairman, along ago a chef Magistrate should have been appointed. The work in the civil jurisdiction has increased and in recent times there has been a general increase in the workload of the district magistrates and the time has come remuneration of the holders of these posts. I am not picking out any individual; I am speaking generally.

A point I should like to make is that it should be made clear that parliament is the body which makes law and not the chief Justice. I say that because of certain attitude that are shown in certain quarters. It should be realized that politicians make law because politicians are there to judge between the conflict of interests. Having regard to certain observations made by the hon. Member for Christ Church West I hope the Government will accept the suggestions put forward by him because nobody can deny that the judgment of the hon. Member for Christ Church West is mature. He exercises very mature judgment in matters of this sort.

3.45 p.m.

I believe that if you are asking people to deal with $12,000 hire purchase claims you should pay them a little more. The Chief Metropolitan Magistrate in London is paid the same as a High Court Judge and I do not believe any difference is made between them. There is no reason why there should not be one or two Magistrates whose special responsibilities and abilities are recognised by payment of special allowances.

The question that clause 4 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill, with an amendment, in Committee. Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND, the Bill as

amended was read a third time and passed. Its title was agreed to.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (NO. 3) ORDER, 1973

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, this is more or less the customary procedure in so far as creating posts on the Establishment is concerned and also the establishment of temporary posts. This Order has been laid in Parliament for this reason. As the Addendum sets out, this Order provides for adjustments in the Establishments structure of the undermentioned Ministries and Departments at a total annual cost of approximately $1,345,333. Of this amount $798,403 is already being paid to temporary staff, and the real additional cost is therefore $546,930.

The first department concerned is that of the Auditor General and for this department there will be the creation of the additional posts of one Senior Auditor and three Auditors in order to strengthen this Department to cope with the increased workload arising out of the introduction of the new Payable Order System.

In the Ministry of Finance and Planning the creation of an additional post of Chief Accountant to be assigned to the Department of Inland Revenue to undertake and supervise special investigations especially in cases where tax evasion is suspected. Then you get the establishment of many posts in the Accountant General's Department where many of the temporary posts will be established, and there will also be the creation of new posts, one Accountant and two Clerical Officers.

With respect to the Department of Inland Revenue, there will be the creation of the following posts: 3 Senior Inspectors, 2 Inspectors, 4 Tax Officers, 1 Accountant and 4 Assistant Accountants; the abolition of one post of Senior Clerk, and the establishment of the existing six temporary posts of Clerical Officer on a permanent basis.

Then in the Prime Minister's Office there is the establishment of 26 temporary posts of Air Traffic Control Officer/Cadet on a permanent basis and the creation of the following posts: 1 Chief Instructor, 2 Instructors, 4 post of Air Traffic Control Officers/Cadets.

It is a question of strengthening many of these important Departments and Ministries as set out in the Addendum, In the Training Division there will be the creation of additional posts of one Assistant Secretary, two Executive Officers and one Training Officer because the work of the Training Division has been expanding and a very good job is being done by that Division. When it is strengthened, it will be able to give fuller courses.

For the Police Department there will be additional posts, 1 Sergeant, 1 Corporal and 13 Constables. The Police Band is something of which we are all very proud, we appreicate it immensely and its members are even more highly appreciated when they go abroad and perform at many important functions in the United Kingdom and other parts of the Caribbean.

Then you get the External Affairs Ministry, 1 Senior Assistant Secretary and 1 Stenographer/Typist; the Ministry of Agriculture, - Meteorological Services are being strengthened by the establishment of a post of Senior Clerk; in the Post Office 6 Clerical Officers and 3 Postal Officers; various posts in the Ministry of Education, the Public Library, the Government Industrial Schools, the Audio-Visual Aids Department and the Ministry of Health and Welfare. (Mr. CRAIG: We can read the Addendum too.) I was just giving a general run down of the entire situation. It is merely a question of creating some more essential posts and establishing temporary posts which have been going on for the past few months.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mrs. EASTMOND:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, we are asked here this afternoon to legislate, but we must admit that we can only legislate for numbers. 3.55 p.m.

In other words, we can pass legislation to provide staffing for any Department of Government or the entire Public Service. We can pass-legislation to equip the Service with three times its present numbers, but we cannot legislate for efficiency; we cannot legislate for productivity. You will bear with me, Mr. Speaker, that this question of productivity in the Public Service is a question of the work attitude that we

have to study and deal with most severely this afternoon.

I am sure that no Member of the Government would this afternoon attempt to rise in defence of anything I may say in this respect, for the Government has had it within its hands long enough and for so long that we may ask ourselves: "How long is too long?" (Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE "If it is good.") Throughout the entire Service, there is hardly anything other than frustration that has taken charge of the various Departments of Government. Throughout the entire Service conscientious workers do not know when they are right from when they are wrong, and, rather than being criticised, in the manner in which they have been criticised by Members of the Government, they prefer merely to appear at their offices at the appointed time and see that they do absolutely nothing that is wrong and make sure that they are not caught loitering on the premises after hours. That is briefly the state of affairs in some of the offices of the Public Service of this country.

Sir, there are a few Departments where you will find officers more than willing to work in the interest of the Nation. They try to advance, but the performance of some of the Ministers on the other side have tended to retard their willingness to advance. In other words, as some people say, there are advancing backwards. These are the things the Members of the Government are trying to defend this afternoon, but they cannot do so. They have been living with these things too long, and as a result the Service as a whole feels that there is hardly anything that is right for anybody to worry about. This is a very sad state of affairs indeed.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to steal the thunder of hon. Members on this side or even on the Government side who will have to speak after me, but you will find that there is no Training Officer attached to a Department like the Inland Revenue Department. Exactly what is the Government doing for such a Department? We may provide staff for this or that Department, but how far can we expect to get? This is not merely a question of putting officers in the field and making efforts to collect money. You may find that there is need for training in this Department. All of these things I feel will be dealt with appropriately by other speakers.

Now there are several real estate agents who come to this country transacting business involving large sums of money and they fly out of this country without paying their just dues, and that is something that the Government will have to look into.

Mr. Speaker, I should now like to deal with the Queen Elizabeth Hospital where we had established certain temporary posts. The Tutor is now to be put on a permanent basis. You will be having a Principle Tutor, a Senior Tutor and 3 Tutors with the accompanying salaries attached thereto. Now, we are told

here that one of the prerequisites of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is to be accepted for reciprocal recognition of the Nursing Council of England and Wales, and the School of Nursing should be properly staffed. Mr. Speaker, even with all of these recommendations that have come before us this afternoon, no real attempt is being made to staff the Tercentenary School of Nursing at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital properly. 4.05 p.m.

No attempt is being made to staff it properly and adequately. I believe that the Department of Labour has been responsible for sponsoring one case in the United Kingdom and I am told that despite the fact that the person left Barbados as a qualified staff nurse, on arrival in the United Kingdom she was merely relegated to what amounts in Barbados as a mere nurse's aid and was required to take a lot of examinations and what not.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this, in our view is a very serious matter, and when the note tells us that these staff adjustments are designed to meet the requirements for permanent staff so that the School may maintain a high standard of Nursing Education, exactly what is the high standard of Nursing Education? Is it the standard applicable to the General Nursing Council of England and Wales? I ask that because that is the standard at which we should aim. That is the standard which we should set ourselves, and if we are falling below this by making these staff adjustments I am saying here and now that the Government is once more attempting to fool the young men and young women who have tried to make nursing a career, because after they have been trained they find that they cannot be accepted because the Government should know that whatever prerequisites it has, the School should be properly staffed.

The Government replied to some questions that I tabled some time in the past about the same Tercentenary School of Nursing at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and therefore it was revealed that there were a number of acting appointments. The people had years of experience, but that does not mean that the people who are filling these posts at the time could have been considered people properly qualified and equipped for such a school and to meet such high standards.

What led to the tabling of these questions was to bring this out for the benefit of all of us, and I am glad, Mr. Speaker, to see that an attempt is being made even at this late hour to do something about the staffing of this Institution; but there is nothing here which tells us that we are now putting qualified people in this School.

That is the point. We are creating posts. If we merely create posts and leave them there and still have a lot of substitutes and acting staff, where will we ever get? I remember the Leader of the House telling us at one time that we were turning out nurses like flying fish - by the hundreds - that nurses were

graduating from the Tercentenary School of Nursing in great numbers so that we could have put them for export; but as we have heard and learned, some of them cannot even fit in the District Hospitals, and this brings me to the point that what we have as District Hospitals is a perfect disgrace to this community.

You still have, Mr. Speaker, the same old time method of dressing up a lame foot. You still have as in the past, the tearing of long strips of domestic and bandaging a sore foot because there are no better, no proper bandages available as one would expect to find in a hospital as such. You still find that the people in these District Hospitals are still as hungry as they were in the past when you had them at the almshouses. You still find, Mr. Speaker, that there are poor people whom this Government took from one parish, removed from their families and their friends and carried them far away into other parishes, isolated them, so to speak, so that they cannot be visited as regularly as in the past when some of their own relatives would turn up at times with a little meal to help them.

But, Sir, the Government has tried to make us believe that they are upgrading these people by providing a new name for everything, and that is all. But what? There is the same old starvation treatment and the same dirty treatment. Mr. Speaker, I would like the hon. Minister of Health to deny that in the St. Michael District Hospital you still find patients in the garbage cans on the premises looking for something to eat. Mr. Speaker, we agree that some of the people who are housed in these institutions have peculiar traits and peculiar ways; but I am sure that you will agree with me that a patient who is not hungry would hardly find himself or herself in the garbage can looking for something to eat or to put by to eat later the evening or night. What I am saying is that the Government will come to this House and say that they feed these people; but is there anyone in a supervisory capacity, is there anyone carrying out their duties with any manner of diligence, are there any humane feelings to see that these poor people, remembering where they come from and how they had to go to the almshouses - I am sorry Sir, District Hospitals, because they are no longer almshouses, they are no longer begging alms, because the Government gives the alms and they do not have to beg - but what we are saying now is that the Government cannot this afternoon boast that the physical accommodation, the health of any individual who was in a former almshouse and who has been transferred to a District Hospital has improved in any measure.

What I can tell them is that there are hundreds of poor people that the present District Hospitals cannot accommodate, and this number is growing and growing and that the Government is making no provision whatsoever to accommodate these people. I do not want to say that there is a total disregard but what I want to state is that you will find that time and time again when some of the relatives even try to get a doctor to assist some of these people it is not what it should be. In one of these District Hospitals not so long ago a statement was made by a poor person to one of our Welfare Officers that this person wanted medical attention; and the officer seeing the condition of the poor person, wrote a note and sent the person to the clinic saying that every effort should be made to let a doctor see the person immediately.
4.15 p.m.

In the opinion of the Welfare Officer, this person was far out. Every Government officer in the Ministry of Health was concerned; they wanted to know how dare him to write saying that the doctor should see this person on arrival.

But instead of seeing that the poor person - nobody was concerned about the doctor attending this person on arrival, - they were prepared to have this officer put on all charges, he had usurped his power and all this sort of thing, they said. That is nonsense. We are dealing with people who go there not because of their love to go there but circumstances drive them there.

The Government needs at this stage, not merely to appoint a Sister or a Staff Nurse or else. Let them appoint these people, but unless these people are carrying to bear that humane touch to their task and that feeling of sympathy for those poor people, we are doing absolutely nothing; but the Government is asking for numbers to staff this institution and we will support their request. We are only asking and praying that we do not provide this money as a matter of mere form, but that some good will result from any efforts on our part.

Mr. Speaker, the question of the Mental Hospital. The question of the post of a messenger-driver. At the Mental Hospital there is more trouble than anything else. This does not touch the surface of the problems at the Mental Hospital. We have had cases at the Mental Hospital where you will find that not so long ago, they were beating up patients down there; the nurses were beating them up in public.

It ought to be that, when you speak to a person who is a patient in the Mental Hospital, you nurse and nurse and beg at times and do everything that one can possibly do not to irritate that person, and to get the person to come around to the officers' way of doing things and the nurses' way of doing things. But, Mr. Speaker, all of these are the things that one would find. Whatever we do, however it maybe, we will find that throughout our whole health and welfare system the Government cannot boast that since abolishing Local Government - put it that way - that they have introduced anything better to cater to the needs of the sick and suffering, or that they have provided any body of persons whether they are civil servants or else who could interpret the needs, the hopes or the aspirations of these poor persons, the sick and the unfortunates who depend on our welfare system, whatever it may be - nothing better than in the days when we had our Local Government system. What will you find? Hifalutin terms. Somebody wears a posh uniform today that they did not carry in the days of Local Government and that person is feeling that he is more secure; hence with security of tenure he does not have now to be pleasing nor to be as nice or courteous to anybody else as he had to be in the past. That is what you will find, Mr. Speaker.

But we are appealing to the Government to bear this in mind; whatever is done by way of welfare is done for the poor and unfortunate mass of people in this country, and remember, there are thousands upon thousands who need help today. There are people who have been forced during the past three or four years - though we have this pride in our motto - they have had to strip themselves of this selfish pride because circumstances are now dictating to them forcing them. So we come face to face with the situation, Mr. Speaker, that we have got to do something; the Government has got to provide - if it is attempting in its own way and has found that it has not measured up in the way it had anticipated - but in what way could the Government have anticipated this or that? The Government on the whole works on a kind of hotch-potch basis. I well remember that the present Rates and Taxes Division was headquarters of our welfare state and almost overnight the decision had been taken by this present Government, that we were to see several bulldozers push the building down. Simply because a day or two before the photographs of one or two people had been seen - simply because these people had been seen posing from the balcony or a verandah of the building upstairs, it was to be pulled down. Don't mind that it was the central place where all of our poor welfare people could go near the City of Bridgetown it was to be pulled down. But now what you find? The offices have been moved to there where all this traffic is, where the heavy traffic is by the old hospital. What could be more unsuitable a place for these poor people? Many of them have got to go there. We still have the case, Mr. Speaker, where many of the old age pensioners have to find themselves at a most unsuitable place. 4.25 p.m.

We still have the case, Mr. Speaker, where this House provided an increase for old age pensioners but many of them are still coming to my office and to the offices of many other hon. Members of Parliament to say that they have not received the increase, that the cards have been taken away from them on all sorts of silly pretexts, and we say there is something wrong in our whole welfare system. I believe that you will find an officer who is doing his best, but how many others there are whose best does not measure up to the worst of some of the others? That, Mr. Speaker, is what you will find in our system of welfare, and I am asking and counselling the Government to examine the whole structure of things, provide somewhere to house these poor people whose families no longer want them around them. It is quite unfortunate that some of these grandparents who have made the supreme sacrifice to bring up their grandchildren, should be put to this kind of treatment in this day and age. Some of these grandchildren feel so aloof from their grandparents that if a friend comes home to see them, they feel that it is degrading and humiliating to them to have to introduce the friend to somebody, who does not look as good as they. They would rather have them at some of these institutions. That is exactly what is happening with some of the people in this Barbados of ours. I believe that I have said enough to cause the Government to address its mind to those things that are really necessary, to those things that really matter, and I am sure that there is no necessity on my part.....

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I want to draw your attention to the relevant section dealing with the time limits of speeches. The hon. Member has been speaking for the past 35 minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER:

As I understand the Standing Orders, the hon. Member is speaking first on behalf of the Opposition and therefore has unlimited time.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, let us get on with the debate. Let us turn to the Ministry of Education. We have here before us part of the recommendations of the United Nations adviser on organisation and management, to the Barbados Government who conducted a survey of the organisation of the Ministry during 1972. When one looks at it to see the recommendations and what Government has brought before us here today, one sees that the Ministry wants a Senior Education Officer and a Deputy Chief Education Officer. To bring such an elaborate scheme without first publishing a White Paper on education and on educational reconstruction, - and this is a Government which promised us a new Education Act in 1962 and this is now 1973, nearly 1974 - you now find the Government with the shameless boldness and the effrontery to come here with this kind of scheme without going into the details, but it gives us an indication of a lack of administrative ability by those responsible for the scheme. I think I am right in saying that the last time we had a White Paper on education was when we had the Howard Hay den's Policy for Education, sometime around 1945.

The Minister of Education must know and must admit that we now have no adequate inspection of our secondary schools by experts. We do not have it by any duly qualified Education Officers, you find that we now have one Education Officer for secondary education, but that does not mean that our schools are inspected as such. I think there are possibly four District Education Officers who visit the primary schools regularly. I know that you have a District Officer for Infants' Methods, one for Home Economics and one for Handicrafts, but one of our biggest mistakes I believe is when the Government failed to make use of our advisory Education Board and our five constituent committees. Our educational system as it is known, is modelled in some respects on the system of England and Wales, and it has been so for quite a number of years, but for some unknown reason we seem now to be trying to mimic the American system. Why this is so, we do not know, but what is important to us is that the Minister will be willing to tell us why he prefers to use what we call ad hoc committees for dealing with matters of education.

What has been put before this Honourable House today? It cannot be said that our Committee for secondary education has had an opportunity to examine it and to approve of it and to recommend it for the consideration of this House, nothing of the kind, but instead of Government producing a White Paper on educational reconstruction, it seems that they prefer to produce a white elephant on education. When you look at the net results of education as a whole over the past years, Mr. Speaker this bears out in no uncertain terms exactly what I am saying with respect to Government producing a white elephant on

education. We have had an admission from the Hon. Minister of Education time and again of the poor quality of the work of our schools, because we must recall the appointment of the Dr. Shorey Committee which was to go into matters of education with special reference, I think it is, to the common entrance examination. 4.35 p.m.

We also had the appointment of the Nicholson Committee to go into matters relating to our Overseas Examinations and the results of the G.C.E., etc.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when we find ourselves with these committees, they tell us that the Ministry itself is aware of the fact that something is not clicking somewhere. If this is the case, what are we doing? It is true that Mr. Nicholson has been in education, but there are numerous others in our midst on whom we can call. Dr. Shorey is in education, but there are numerous others in our midst who could be co-opted. We are urging upon the Minister to co-opt people who have spent their lives in education and let them tell us exactly what is wrong with our educational system. It is not good enough to appoint a committee year after year, and all one will hear after a year or two is that a committee has reported. Not one word apart from what I have mentioned, is told to the public. The reports are never published, or made public, and they are all paid for by the taxpayers' money. Not even the various Education Authorities in this country are given an opportunity to study any of these reports for the benefit of the nation.

After all, Sir, it is not the Minister's system as such that we are trying to perfect. It is a system for the benefit of the country as a whole, and what we produce, or fail to produce, is what really matters. All of these things we have to look into one way or another. I believe that as time goes on, we certainly will come around to appreciating exactly what is meant by all of this. Why is it that these Constituent Committees are not functioning? Why is it that the Government so prefers to follow the advice of outsiders? Somebody will come here and spend three months in Barbados, or three weeks in Barbados, and write everything about education or agriculture, and the Government is prepared to swallow line, hook and sinker every word that is said or written by these people. But the people whose lifeblood is in education and in everything for the nation - people who have proven their worth all through the years - have not been invited by this Government and asked to do anything to help us.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen that our Ship of State is running aground. Would the Minister of Education not throw out a lifebelt? Would he not throw a rope overboard? Would he not call for help at some stage? Do not let the Minister go on trying to grasp at everything merely to say that this is done to his credit. The credit must go to him. They are trying to perfect a system that when discredits are so great that they can provide some sort of side entertainment. In Guyana they are now going to legalise abeah to entertain the people while the principal actors get on with what they really want to put over to the people at the same time, but that is not good enough for us.

Mr. Speaker, the primary school teachers are complaining that they are not getting the help that they really deserve from some of the Education Officers. What is the Ministry of Education doing about this? Perhaps the Ministry will say that if they are complaining, then they should complain to the Ministry. I understand that the Ministry keeps its doors open one evening a month in order to get people to spend their last dollar with which they could buy white rice to go to the Ministry to complain about whose child did not do this and that. It is sufficient to say that the fact that these primary school teachers find it necessary to complain to somebody other than the Ministry itself, is telling us that the late opening of the Ministry has not been as successful, or has proven as successful, as Government would have thought.

If the Ministry had put its proposals in a White Paper and had given the public, the Professional Bodies, the Education Authorities and the Teachers Union an opportunity to study them and make comments, then certainly when the Government comes before this Honourable House it would not find itself standing on shaky ground on which it finds itself this afternoon.

We now come to the point of this Curriculum Development Committee and so on that the Government proposes to set up. There was a time in the past when teachers were given an English Handbook of Suggestions for Teachers. I think it was published by the London Board of Education, and Head Teachers in consultation with other members of the staff were charged with the responsibility of drawing up curricula suitable to their respective schools.

Now, what is taking place at the present moment, or is likely to take place in the not too distant future, is that all children will be following the same guide. In the past a teacher had to depend on his own initiative and do a lot of thinking, but that is not so today. For instance, Sir, we are now very concerned about the metric system but it would appear that the system is being taught from the top to the bottom. In your day and mine, Sir, I am sure it would have been the other way around. What you will find is that teachers in private schools and in the Government schools would welcome a syllabus right now to tell them exactly where to go and where they are going. 4.45 p.m.

Nobody knows anything about anything except that you see T.V. programmes which very few, to my mind, even some who are giving demonstrations, do not seem to be able to demonstrate successfully. Mr. Speaker, I believe that I could wind up on this point. We are asking the Government to concern itself with doing something for its Youth Affairs Department for those between 8 and 18 years of age. We are asking the Government not to use these 4- H Clubs and those other youth clubs which they may have as mere political arms, political tools, because it is causing others to lose respect for them and not to give them ample support.

If we took a census of these various clubs which are functioning, under the National Youth Club Movement you will see how near to 18 years of age are the members of these clubs, and the reason is simply that by the time they become 18 years and another election comes around they will be so well initiated, so well inducted, that they will then be able to vote. So what we are asking the Government to do is not to put politics in all this. For Heaven's sake, if you are going to do something for the youth of this country remove politics from it all and let people with a sense of responsibility come forward. We want them to have a sense of direction and not a sense of political motivation. Let the youth grow up, teach them what is right and leave them to judge for themselves when they reach the age of 18 which way they should go, and I am sure that with the type of educational system from which you, Mr. Speaker and many of us passed through in the past, we are confident that if we were just to give these people what is due to them and leave them on their own, that by the time they reach 18, they could decide for themselves and could give many of us lessons in a few things in which we ourselves may be lacking, although older in years.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I believe that the Government, the Ministry of Youth Affairs and Education should try to avoid some of the overlapping which is now taking place in some of their functions, and I do believe that if this was investigated in its truest sense, you could find that you could eliminate some of the staffing that is now being called for in this particular department and that some officers perform the same functions that officers are called upon to perform in another department.

We need therfore, more correlation than there is at present. We need too better liaison than there is at present and if we were to get these things examined in their truest light, I believe that we would be able to save the taxpayers of this country a very considerable sum and we might not have to spend as much as we envisaged here this afternoon, or even if we have to spend this sum, it could be spent over much broader fields and the officers made available for serving the community in a much wider sphere than is envisaged in many respects in this Civil Establishment Order.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Speaker, I have sat here this afternoon and listened to a good dissertation by the hon. Member for St. Peter and from his display of versatility I believe that if he continues so, he will end up in the position of Leader of his Party. He has set out initially in his remarks to blame the Government, but then carried on an interesting dissection of the Barbadian society and pinpointed the stresses and strains which exist in the society removing the blame from the Government for these ills.

I recall that in his opening remarks, he stated that while one may legislate and create posts, that is no

guarantee whatsoever that you will get efficiency, performance or productivity. I think that no one will be stupid enough to disagree with him. We cannot legislate for the attitudes and maladjustments of people in any society, and many things, which this Government, or any Government may set out to do with the best intentions, very often flounder because of the peculiar attitudes taken up by the people who are responsible, or who have to carry out these duties.

To go back to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the proposals set out here, I would like to draw to the attention of this hon. Chamber that since 1966 nursing education at the School of Nursing at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and hence the qualifications of that school have been recognised by the General Nursing Council of Great Britain. There are no longer any prerequisites to be met. The prerequisites have already been met and have resulted in the recognition given to our nurses by the General Nursing Council of Great Britain.

I will point out that the Council has laid down that their prerequisites for recognising training at the School of Nursing here are simply that the Senior Tutors should have the certificate referred to as the Diploma or Certificate in Sister Tutorship; and I will point out that the particular tutor has a B.Sc. in Nursing, and therefore the prerequisites laid down by the General Nursing Council of Great Britain have been more than met.

No one will deny or want to deny that there are problems in teaching all over the world. I accept that there are problems in teaching within the School of Nursing, and this again comes from the fact that you are dealing with people. People have peculiar attitudes, and because they have peculiar attitudes you find very often that students who have to come into play, or into the way of these people sometimes have to suffer from the peculiar attitudes carried by tutors.

But, Sir, as the hon. Member knows quite well, the system under which we operate in Barbados, is not a system that allows action to be taken as speedily as we would like, or as speedily as the people would like. I know that many people in this country believe that the Minister is the beginning and the end of everything and become very disappointed when they learn that this is not the case. But while complaints can be made, very often with some justification, for the removal or for the disciplining, of individuals, you find that this is not something in the hands of the Minister. These matters have to be referred to the Public Service Commission, and the process is tedious, time consuming and even frustrating to those who seek justice at the hands of or from the Public Service Commission. 4.55 p.m.

There is a lot that can be said when one thinks in terms of the Mental Hospital but I do not think this is an occasion to enter into any long deliberation on the state of affairs at the Mental Hospital - or, as has

been mentioned on my left, to present a white paper. I think we have to realize that we are dealing with problems in Barbados which have existed for a very long time and it is no point coming in here and waxing greatly upon what the problems are without thinking at any moment to identify the cause of these problems.

Over and over again, within my short stay in this Honourable House, I have heard people talk about the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the St. Michael District Hospital and the Mental Hospital, and none of it has been enlightening. In fact I only have to go into the bus stand in Fairchild Street and I can hear the same remarks being passed, and I also ask myself, are we no better than the people in Fairchild Street Market in the discussions which we carry on in this Honourable House of Assembly? We have nothing on them. This is unfortunate, because the same type of remark, the same manner in which these things are expressed, too often we find them being expressed in here, and at this level, I would believe that people, who are representatives of the people of this country, should be far better in presenting their case and helping to identify the problems or the causes of the problems which exist in this society. These problems do exist and it is no point coming in here and rehearsing day after day that these problems exist. I think it is time that we do a lot more than that, and, I am one of those people who want action but there are a lot of factors which are involved in getting action and this does not lie with me. Very often the very people you set out to serve, hamstring and impede the progress which you would like to have in what you do.

Sir, with regard to the Mental Hospital - a case has been made out for the creation of this post. I will not pretend neither will anybody on this side pretend that the creation of this post as set out here in this paper will solve the problems of the Mental Hospital. Therefore, in my opinion it will be a bit facetious for anyone to try to accuse the Government of trying to solve the Mental Hospital's problems by the mere creation of a post of driver/messenger. We do not accept that, because we know you do not solve problems by the creation of a post.

Mr. Speaker, I have assumed responsibility for the Ministry of Health and Welfare; I assumed it a short while ago and I know that there are many problems within the Ministry of Health and Welfare. I am sympathetic to all the preceding Ministers who occupied that position because I realize that they had to depend on advisors to assist them in their work, and some of this advice given to them might have been given for purely ulterior motives. Unlike me they are not in a position nor do they have that knowledge which would cause them to pinpoint some of this advice which was given for purely ulterior motives. I accept that it is an arduous task but I would also like to tell the hon. Members here that we are not solving the problems or making the solution to the problems any easier when we by our behaviour indicate to the people in those institutions that they can run politics rather than giving the service which they are expected to give.

Mr. Speaker, when we come to the question of welfare service within this country, we are faced with a rather interesting change within the Barbadian society. We can get here and we can criticise it, we can deprecate it, but in truth there are changes which occur in this society similar to those all over the world where today you find that old people, the older people in our society, are being discarded by the younger people. This is not only true of Barbados. This is also true of bigger countries such as the United States of America; it is one of their biggest problems in the United States of America - how to care for the elder people of the society. The young people of today have no regard for them and in this respect, I value the remarks of the hon. Member when he commented on the behaviour of the young people to the old people today; but there are over 19,000 old people in this country right now and a large number of them would like, I believe, to have somewhere other than the present position which they occupy, where they can rest more peacefully, but this is an arduous strain on this Government and on the taxpayers in this country to provide the type of institutions which would cater to a large number of people in this country; and I am not one of those people who believe that you can always solve problems by just spending money. Many people seem to think so, but that is not always true. Very often you have to go a step further and try to identify the cause and deal with the cause. Very often the spending of more money may create more problems. So we have to look at the whole society in stages.

We have tried out an experiment in this Ministry of Health and Welfare where we indicated that we are prepared to finance the return of some of the elderly people in the institutions back to their homes, but nobody wants them back; and when you look at it on a cause efficiency basis, we find from the Government's point of view that it would be better if people would come forward and accept the responsibility to maintain people in their homes by making adequate monetary releases when the month comes or the week comes rather than having these big institutions with their maintenance, but we find that people are not interested in that. The young people just do not want the old people around. Maybe they just do not want to have any intercourse with them; and you find this is a serious problem of the Barbadian society. We cannot solve that problem merely by coming in here and criticising and shouting, and things of that nature, and feel that we are going to find more money, because all money that comes to Barbados comes simply by way of taxation, by loans or by grants, and the vast bulk of this money comes by way of taxation and I do not think that people of Barbados are going to like increased taxation for anything. I don't believe so. We have to be very careful when shouting out the remedy for this, when you think of the problems of people in the institutions, we know that it is difficult to get the people to provide a service for these old people in these institutions; this again is an attitude that they do not care for them. Very often they seem to fail to realize that their turn will come; that they will also get old and when they get old they will be wanting somebody to look after them. So I agree with the hon. Member when he analysed the situation in the Barbadian society and said we should seek to identify the stresses and strains within it but in so doing, it should be obvious to him that the Government, or the Opposition for that matter, cannot be held or blamed for the ills that exist in this society. We have a responsibility to help find a solution for them but at the same time a responsibility is there for the citizens of this country to assist Parliament in developing the best type of solution quickly and efficiently, and if we do not get the cooperation of the citizens of this country a lot of the efforts of hon. Members in this Chamber are going to be frustrated. So while I do agree that the society has changed and there is a reason for concern, I do not believe for one moment that getting in here shouting out repeatedly these anxieties and and these criticisms is going to alter the position in the Barbadian society one bit. We have to do a lot more, and when I say that we have to do a lot more, I mean people on this side and on that side will have to do

a lot more in trying to refine the attitudes of the people of the Barbadian society. 5.05 p.m.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Speaker, the parts of this Civil Establishment Order on which I am going to speak are very few, but I would like to begin by speaking on the Head, Finance and Planning, It is proposed under this Head to create an additional post of Chief Accountant and to assign him to the Department of Inland Revenue. Let me say that there is need in Barbados for a greater scrutiny of tax evasion, and to this extent the intention of Government in this field is welcomed. I however regret that from the point of view of the establishment this officer is being placed directly in the Ministry of Finance and Planning rather than in the Department of Inland Revenue, and that he will be seconded from time to time no doubt to the Department of Inland Revenue is a bit regrettable. I think his position should be permanently under Inland Revenue where he is in direct contact with his colleagues, directly responsible to his Head of Department and not having to look beyond to the Ministry of Finance and Planning itself.

One other aspect of this matter that worries me considerably is this. Under the Income Tax Act of 1968, the duty to enquire into private members' affairs is placed squarely on the shoulder of the Commissioner of Inland Revenue, and Parliament has seen fit to give that Officer some of the widest powers to pry into the private affairs of the individual, and it seems to me that we must be very careful when allocating staff or in putting staff in departments where in the exercise of their powers under the Income Tax Act they may well be compromised. I believe that the duty of secrecy which is set out in the Act can be better upheld and the obligation honoured if this Officer is not under Finance and Planning answerable to the Minister as such but among his own professional colleagues and tax Officers in the Inland Revenue Department, and I am going to ask the Minister whether he would not see fit to move the Head in such a way that the Chief Accountant is in Inland Revenue proper rather than in the Department of Finance and Planning and merely being seconded to Inland Revenue.

I want to deal a bit with the Inland Revenue Department. I feel the Government does not in terms of establishment appreciate the volume of work which confronts this department as a solid revenue gathering Department. It has had tremendous shortages of staff for some time, I think it has operated on temporary staff for some time, and despite that the level of performance in the department has been tremendously high. It has been able to increase its tax gathering activities without having any great significant increase in the number of staff, but the department still needs further support. I have never understood myself why there seems to be a fear in the Government to attach specifically to some of the larger departments of Government like the Department of Inland Revenue, a legal officer and why these departments must wait on the Attorney General's Department for advice. From time to time and very frequently so, we pass legislation in this Parliament that places an additional burden on the Legal Officers in the Attorney General's Department. Indeed with the new responsibilities arising in the realm of external affairs alone, it must be rather difficult for the Solicitor General to carry out the responsibility in relation to advice which he must give the Governor-General on Civil Establishment matters so far as the Civil Servants are concerned, and it seems to me that the Departments like the

Inland Revenue Department and now the National Insurance Department, and to some extent Social Welfare, can well do with their own legal officers. There is no point having only a Chief Accountant being appointed if the actual procedure and advice on the method and investigation of tax evasion is not going to be well documented, and if he is not going to have proper legal advice during all steps which he may take.

I believe the Government must give very urgent attention to having a specialist in taxation matters just as, for instance, in other parts of the Caribbean - Jamaica and indeed in Trinidad - so that people with a legal interest in this subject can make a contribution to stop an evasion, looking at the loopholes and obtaining the expertise necessary in this field. I know that within the Attorney General's Department now, there is a very Senior Officer who is very competent on tax matters, but very frequently the work of Inland Revenue has to wait several months before he can give an opinion, not because the Officer is being tardy in the performance of his duty, but because of the lack of numbers in the Attorney General's Department. I urge Government to look at the practice which has been adopted in Jamaica where a calibre of specialists has been created in this field, and Government will find that not only will this post pay for itself but it will increase the revenue that Government can take in because of the high expertise that is available under this Head.

In this General Order as a whole, Mr. Speaker, attempts are made to regularise on a permanent basis some of the temporary posts which have been going on from year to year. I welcome this, but I do so with certain reservations. If one looks at other departments of Government - and one would like in this respect to cite the Registration Office - one still finds too many people in temporary posts with no security of tenure and many holders of the temporary posts are becoming frustrated because they are not appointed on the permanent staff. It is true that within the last year and half the Government has had a United Nations adviser on organisation and management. He is looking at the overall structure and manpower in the Civil Service and seeing whether we are using the manpower to the best of the potentiality of the resources both human and financial available to this country. I believe that one of the urgent areas to which he should direct his attention is the area of the temporary clerks. If it is necessary to have temporary clerks for this length of time then it seems to me that their mere existence would be conclusive evidence of the necessity for having them appointed permanently. Some of them are not there holding on only for people who are on leave or to facilitate people who are going on leave, some of them are holding on because at the time the supplementary vote was requested, one had to put up a case by way of Supplementary Resolution for additional temporary staff, and some Permanent Secretaries seem scared sometimes to impress on their Ministers the necessity for long term planning, so this is prolonged, 5.15 p.m

I can cite many instances of individuals by name, and, obviously, I hestitate in this Parliament ever to refer to individuals even by way of commendation, but I can cite individuals by name in the Civil Service who are very, very, frustrated in their jobs because of a lack of getting substantive appointments. There is no room in the Establishment for them, or they have been acting for a long time and there is no

prospect offered to them of permanent appointment. Why I am belabouring this point, Mr. Speaker, is that the result of this frustration in a lack of interest in their jobs. Young persons, particularly the women in the Service, who began with the intention of giving of their best to the Service find themselves either at the last moment being forced to look to private enterprise for some substantive post, or find themselves not caring less about how well they perform in their jobs because no notice is being taken of them,

I am asking the Minister to look at the Registration Office particularly on this point. This is not a question simply of the Public Service Commission not appointing or not carrying out its duties. The Public Service Commission can only appoint people to permanent posts where there are permenent posts available. But every time I have tried, both formally and informally, to find out the reason for these long acting appointments and temporary positions, I have been told that substantive posts have not been created. I am appealing, on behalf of this frustrated minority, to the Government to rationalise the whole aspect of temporary staff and to make sure that some of these people are given an incentive to remain in the Service for a very long time. It is for them, Mr. Speaker, in their individual capacities, but it also poses a problem as to how soon they can be promoted.

In the Registration Office for instance, we have had instances where officers are highly competent, very skilled in performing their jobs, deserving of promotion, and not subsequently appointed, and another officer who has been in the Service for several years is subsequently appointed but very mediocre and is brought in, in an acting capacity, or sometimes confirmed in a higher appointment over the officer who knows the job better than he does. This happens not only on the legal side of the Service, but also in Departments like the Social Welfare Department and also some of the Administrative Branches. I trust that, now the problem has been outlined, the Minister will see some substance in it and will, probably, draw it to the attention of the Establishments Division to see how we can rectify it as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome, and I hope I am not trespassing on what other speakers are going to say, about any attempt to rationalise Civil Aviation. This is a subject that is not often discussed in here. I believe that on our side the Leader of the Opposition is as knowledgeable in this field, despite the fact that he has not flown an aircraft formally, as the Prime Minister is. I do not trespass on his speciality in this field, but it seems to me that we need, in Civil Aviation, to recognise that not only do we need more staff, but more competent staff. I should like to see the very competent Air Traffic Controllers certainly Upgraded and upgraded rapidly so that we would not have any acts or omissions perpetrated to the detriment, financial or otherwise, of the country. That is the only comment I will allow myself under that Head.

I am not going to range generally over the whole aspect of this Civil Establishments Order. It is a

substantial sum of money involved, and a substantial number or posts being created, but I think I must allow myself this comment. Sometimes it is hard to believe that at all rungs of the ladder of the Civil Service we are getting good value for our money. Having been in the position of a Deputy Chairman of the Public Service Commission, I find it is a bit constricting to lash out at civil servants either in their individual capacity, or in their general capacity, but let me say that in some rungs of the Service - both senior and junior officers - there is a great need for a change of attitude towards work. I should like to join with the hon. Member for St. Peter and the hon. Member for St. Michael North Central, the Minister of Health and Welfare, in saying that out people should be motivated towards national goals.

I believe if I had to make a stricture on this Government, it would be that it has not motivated the people enough. I am not sure whether it started with this Government, or with the whole approach to politics in this country, so do not take my indictment as an indictment that is based all along the line on a close analysis. But certainly I have noticed within the 14 years since I have returned from the University a falling off in the standards of people's attitude to work. There are too many people, including some in the Civil Service, who feel that their duty is to be clock-watchers and that time stops at 4.30 p.m., or sometimes at 2.30 p.m. and they claim that there is no point in killing yourself for the Government, as though they do not recognise that each one of us is part and parcel of the Government of this country.

If an undeveloped country such as Barbados must raise its living standards, and if it is to do justice in the true sense of that word, social justice to the community at large, then we cannot continue to have the situation where a small segment of the community are very rich and reasonably well off and others are riot so well off, or where a segment of the community are working hard and the others are just getting money and could not care less what service they gave for that money. The Civil Service today takes up over 45%, I believe - I do not have the actual figure, but the Minister of Finance could give them to me - of the National Budget. The members of the Civil Service must recognise that every time taxes are paid by every one of us, including themselves at least 45%, I believe, of every dollar goes towards maintaining the Civil Establishment of this country.

I believe that recent statistics may show that the figures are on the other side. For instance, in St. Vincent 51.7% of the National Budget is spent on civil servants' salaries. I do not think our figures are as high as that, but the implication of this to the country is that the salaries load on Governments in the Caribbean including our own is so high that the rest that is left for Social Welfare and ameliorating social injustices in this society is small as compared with what we are putting into people's pockets. Civil servants, as the recipients of this large amount of public expenditure and public finance, must recognise that they have to give in return an extra effort in terms of performance. Their productivity must be stepped up.

I do not care how much we change to a 5-day week and work it badly. If I see a civil servant giving

me in 40 hours, good 40-hour work with zest and enthusiasm, then I am satisfied. I am aware of the fact that some of the Ministers take home work. Although Parliament does not meet regularly, all Members of the Opposition, - and particularly the hon. Member for St. Peter, takes his work so seriously that I think he puts in more hours per week in researching his papers than a lot of civil servants put in at their desk - take home work. I am appealing seriously to the civil servants in this country, regardless of which Party is in power, that they must, particularly the senior civil servants, set an example by being businesslike and producing to the maximum. There is only one way in which we will eventually control inflation and reduce the economic crisis, and that is by increasing the production of the country as a whole. 5.25 p.m.

I would like to see the Establishments Division look to the future, not only at the restructuring of the Civil Service, but trying in salary increases to some productivity arrangements whereby we can award people, not automatically by automatic increases every year or by being placed on a certain specific scale, but that we will be able to give awards for efficiency and production.

Mr. Speaker, in Japan, one of the richest countries in the world the basic wage is sometimes very low. it is something that both Trade Unions, those for public servants and the one for the private sector could profit by having a look at. The basic weekly wage is low, but the benefits accruing at certain points are so high that you will find that the average Japanese worker has outstripped his American counterpart in the terms of the standards of living and his take home wage.

Strikes are things that are called in Japan sometimes. Sometimes a big strike in Japan is a two hour strike; but the Japanese employer in the public and private sector recognises that he has a duty to his employees, creating as a result, a happier society.

I would like to commend it as a good precedent for Barbados. I know that the United States have watched the Japanese experiment so closely that it seconded some of its very senior Trade Unionists to the role of Labour Attaches overseas, in order to observe productivity in the sectors so that they may have the benefit of it in their Labour movement at home. Rather than some of our people in the Civil Service Association just making noises, they would be well advised in their travel to observe this aspect of the matter.

I would not like to go down in Hansard as merely trying to be critical of the Civil Service without saying some of the good points one has found from time to time in the Service. I think that by and large one has had some officers who recognise that they have a duty to work hard. It is the first time in dealing with the Ministry of Finance that I would like to say now that Mr. Osbourne has left that he was one

such Civil Servant. He came up the hard way; but he was strict in duty and he worked very hard. He gave loyal service to both political parties as a true Civil Servant, and performed very well

I would like to think that the example of a person like Mr. Osbourne is not lost on the Civil Service. I feel that members of the Service should try to motivate the younger members and also motivate some of the older members who have fallen by the wayside, and in turn try to motivate the country as a whole. If there is one thing that I would like to use as a catch phrase in saving us from our economic ills, it is to see that the Government declares and gives it real meaning, a productivity year in the Government itself. In talking about that, this Parliament could improve its productivity itself as a first example. I should like to think that our Order Paper is dealt with as you have tried so hard to do, expeditiously - fast and properly, make points and get on with the job. As the hon. Member said, let us be an example to the rest of the country. Let us get going and do the job properly. Setting an example to follow not only as a catch word, but in accommodating the differences between our side and the other side.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Mr. Speaker, let me take up the challenge put out by the hon. Member for Christ Church West and deal expeditiously with my comments on this particular Bill. I want to deal specifically with some of the points raised by the hon. Member for St. Peter. Let me first of all set out what this Resolution is about as far as the Ministry of Education, Youth Affairs, Community Development and Sport is concerned. Some 35 posts are being placed on the permanent establishment. Of these, 26 have already been provided for as temporary posts, so these are posts already in being and the persons are already in the posts. What this Order is doing is asking for these temporary posts to be made permanent and for twelve new posts to be provided.

What are these new posts being asked for? There is the post of Senior Personnel Officer and a Personnel Officer to deal with the problems and the matters relating to the recruitment of staff including teaching staff for the Ministry, training matters and all the other matters which generally come under personnel in order to provide better service including the motivation to which the hon. Member for Christ Church West has referred. There is also the post of Senior Clerk in order to ensure that supplies which are necessary for the schools are ordered on time and that they get out to the schools in time so that the teachers can have the tools needed to get on with the job.

There is also the post of Chief Accountant. The Ministry of Education is one of the big spenders in the Government and it is necessary that an officer of this level be available so that the financial matters of the Ministry can be dealt with at the proper level and that greater financial expertise can be brought to bear on the financial, administration of the Ministry.

Also proposed are the creation of the posts of Senior Draughtsman and Statistical Assistant to ensure that the informational bases to support requests for educational developments and innovations can be supplied.

There is also the post of Secretary to ensure that both the Permanent Secretary and the Chief Education Officer are provided with the necessary assistance for them to carry out their meaningful intentions. There is also a request for the post of one Deputy Chief Education Officer who will be in charge of a new division in the Ministry which brings together examinations on the one hand and the programme in the schools, the curriculum and the subjects in the schools and the syllabus and so on.

This will bring together these two divisions and this will be the quality control section of the Ministry and will provide for the type of foresight and consultation and discussion and liaison of the secondary schools to which the honourable Member for St. Peter made reference. 5.35 p.m.

A Senior Education Officer for one of those Divisions, the Curriculum Division, and two Education Officers; these are the new posts; 2 Education Officers, one for the Technological and Vocational Education - and I need not state how important this is - and another one for the field of Business and Commercial Education, to ensure that the progress in these areas is properly developed and properly implemented. These are the areas in which the twelve posts will be used. Like my colleague, the Member for St. Michael North Central I will repeat that none of us on this side, none of us in the Government - I do not know if it can be done from out there, but none of us - and it is not our responsibility to ensure that qualified people are put into the posts. We set the qualifications and we create the posts but the function of recruiting the people, that is the responsibility of the Public Service Commission. We can merely point out the need and bring to this Chamber the need for additional posts and the qualifications and so on which are attached to these posts and then leave it to the Public Service Commission to fill these posts.

Now I have been asked to deal with a number of questions and I want to deal with them in a business-like way. The first question is, why are foreign advisers used? Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the instance of foreign advisers being used in the educational system of this country in recent times is really minimum. Most of the committees that have been set up and most of the advice on educational development in this country have come from educators in this country, and I can go back to the establishment of the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic, one of the very first committees which I advised the Cabinet and the Cabinet agreed to set up in this country, by far the majority of people on that committee were Barbadian educators. The Board of Management for the Barbados Community College and all the work related to the establishment of that institution, there were no foreign advisers in that. There are almost 1,400 students now in the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic and over 900 in the

Barbados Community College. The committee to review the performance of students in the overseas examination - again this is a local committee that is set up; this is a committee of local educators. I do not know whom the hon. Member for St. Peter is referring to; if he wishes to select the persons who should go on these committees, on the Boards or on the constituent committees, however he wants to style it, he may have his chance and he can do it when they are setting up the Shadow Committee to look into the performance of candidates. He can remain at the level of the shadow; that is where he is now and that is where he will be.

Now, Sir, the other committee of management. There is a Committee to look into the Common Entrance Examination, and again, this is a Committee of local educators with experience in the educational system at all levels and there are no foreign advisers on that. It is all local personnel and all local expertise that we have been drawing upon.

Now we get the other question. Sir, we have had a UNESCO Planning Mission in 1969 and this produced a report on priorities in education in this country, and the reason for this is simple - that UNESCO is the accredited world body today dealing with educational matters and when UNESCO produces a report, or a report is produced with the stamp of UNESCO, that report can be taken to other international agencies if one is searching for external finances to provide the additional school places, and this is the comment of an accredited organization and agency on the state of education in the country, it sets out the situation, can you assist us in this regard. And that is precisely why we have been able without any long, drawn out, protracted discussion with the Inter-American Development Bank, to obtain a loan of $5 million for the development of the Barbados Community College and the campus at the Erie, because there was an authoritative report bearing the stamp of UNESCO which the Inter-American Development Bank could accept as a statement on the educational system. That is why also we can use such a document to present to the same Inter-American Development Bank in discussing a loan for the establishment of the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic. This is the use to which the foreign expertise and foreign missions coming to this country are used. It is the same thing again in this connection; we now have another UNESCO mission in this country at the present moment and this particular mission is operating in similar fashion because we have a request before the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, popularly known as the World Bank, for the request of over $9 million to provide additional secondary schools in this country and that institution is not going to accept as an authoritative statement on the educational system of this country a report signed by Mr. W. C. B. HINDS....

Mr. SPEAKER:
Who is he?

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I wish I knew. The hon. Member for St. Peter.

Mr. SPEAKER:
Thank you.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:
I could not present such a report to that particular body, Mr. Speaker. So there is a particular reason when foreign expertise is brought in, and I am hoping that out of the request that we have made to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, that one of the secondary schools will be located in the parish of St. Peter for the very Member to assist his constituents in gaining increased educational opportunities. I certainly would not speak against his own constituents. 5.45 p.m.

Then he said that because we set up a committee this shows that something is wrong. If you set up a committee to enquire into the common entrance examination or the performance of students at overseas examinations, this shows that something is wrong. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you are aware that from time to time - and it is good management practice - you should keep your procedures and practices under constant review. From time to time it becomes necessary to look at what you are doing, where you are coming from, where you are going and to constitute committees of persons who are knowledgeable in the particular areas, who can make a valuable contribution to come and study these matters, but I do not know what is the matter, maybe on a substantive motion a particular point may be raised, but only this morning before coming to this Hon. House, the Acting Chief Education Officer advised me that the situation - as far as the supply of teachers for the primary schools in this country is concerned - is better now than it ever was. Some 143 persons with the qualifications for entry into the teaching service cannot be placed because there is a very good supply of persons opting to go into the teaching service, so we have to look at the production of our "O" Level results. I do not know what the hon. Member is talking about.

As far as reports not being published, Mr. Speaker, the annual reports of the Ministry of Education when they come to hand are laid in this Chamber, and the last one, that was laid, was the report for December, 1970 to 31st August, 1971. The report for 1972 is now being finalised by the Chief Education Officer and that will soon come to hand, as well as the 1973 report, but these will be laid on the Table of this Hon. Chamber in due course. The report of the Committee looking into the performance of candidates in overseas examinations was printed by the facilities in the Ministry of Education and has been widely circulated among teachers and educators, and a seminar on that particular report is being organised and scheduled to come off shortly, so it is not a case of reports being pigeon holed or put somewhere. Indeed the same report we are dealing with now is directly meant for the use of the Government in analysing the needs of the system.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to go on for much longer, I think I have dealt with the main points. I have pointed out that it is necessary from time to time to set up committees to review the work that is going on in any sphere of activity, that this is an acceptable management technique so that you know where you are coming from and where you are going. As far as the Education Bill is concerned, this is a matter on which wide consultations have been taking place, and I certainly believe that it is better to hasten slowly on a matter of this sort. When I get requests from the teaching bodies that instead of dealing with a matter at this particular time that we should wait and give them a little more time to study it, I try as far as possible to meet these requests. The last one was from the Barbados Union of Teachers asking that we hold our pursuit on this Bill until 10th November this year. That date has now passed, so I expect that this will be coming shortly to Parliament. I will determine when a White Paper should be brought to this House, I will not bring one on the instructions of the Member for St. Peter. Perhaps if the shadow Minister for Education on the instructions from the Leader of the Opposition asks for such a paper, I will certainly give consideration to it, but not from the Member for St. Peter.

Mr. Speaker, I think that I have dealt with all the points that have been raised by the hon. Member, and I am very happy to be able to present this to this Chamber. I would like to point out that this does not constitute a response to the total requests of the Ministry of the needs of education, because I certainly believe that for each substantial area of educational activity in this country there should be an Education Officer whose job it is to see that the particular subject is being given the type of attention that it should be given at all levels of the system whether that goes for Mathematics, English, Commercial studies, the whole range of the curriculum so we are building up gradually. We ask for staff in order to carry out the very job of quality control which is so very necessary for development. Mr. Speaker, I have been very glad to be able to make this contribution.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to point out on behalf of the Opposition, initially at least, a non-partisan note, because first I want to speak about Items 1, 2, 3 and 4 in the Addendum From the basis of the chairmanship of the Public Accounts Committee rather than from the basis of the leadership of the Opposition I make these remarks.

It is very gratifying to see that what the former Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee urged on the Government, and what I believe has been urged by the Auditor General and by all persons who have been concerned with the condition of the public accounting and public financing of Barbados' independence, has been accepted to some slight degree in this Civil Establishment Order. In the first Interim Report of the Committee of Public Accounts which I had the honour to sign although most of the work was done before my chairmanship of that body, we pointed out the lack of opportunity for promotion of Accountants in the public service and we saw as a consequence, the lack of interest at the upper levels, in the Accounting system in the public service in doing the work to the highest possible

standard and a resultant failure to keep the public accounts up to date at all times in accordance with the law under the Financial Administration and Audit Act. It will be remembered that a few years ago when the Public Accounts Committee began its work, the accounts of many Government Departments had not been properly presented to the Auditor General for audit since Barbados became independent. Even after the Committee drew to the attention of many Permanent Secretaries that their accounts had not been presented for two and three years past the period that they should have been presented, we found that Permanent Secretaries blamed these shortcomings upon a lack of staff and not upon a lack of responsibility in themselves as accounting officers.

The Auditor General has drawn the attention of the Committee for housing the public of Barbados to the fact that balances which should be got monthly, weekly or even daily could not even be got annually. I hope that with the increase in the strength of the Accountant General's Department that the Accountant General will no longer have the excuse that staff difficulties have prevented the Treasury from keeping up to mark in the presentation of the public accounts of this island.

There are things in the accounting branch of Government which every time they are repeated, I believe they would make listeners' hair stand on end. We have heard in the law courts of this island in trials of fraud how the balance shown to the Government's credit or to its overdraft in the commercial banks will sometimes be anything from $750,000 to a million and a half dollars out with the balance shown in the Treasury. 5.55 p.m.

It could be $750,000 too much, or it could be $11/2 million too little. We have heard this said in the law courts. More recently information has come to light that where it comes to overseas purchases, no reconciliation has even been made between the Treasury's Accounts and those of the Crown Agents in London and that discrepancies in the order of $21/2 million have been found in the accounts because reconciliation, apparently, is difficult and has never been attempted. All of these matters, of course, I assure this House are being dealt with by the Public Accounts Committee.

We, in that Committee, can only go back to published accounts. The Auditor General is unable to publish his accounts up to date. The most recent Appropriation Accounts which I have is that for the year ended 31st March, 1968. I believe that that for 1969 - four years ago- has been prepared and may well be either in the hands of the printer, or in the course of circulation. Our accounts will only be three years in arrears, but I give the House the assurance that, despite the lateness with which we examine these accounts, we are doing our best in the Public Accounts Committee on an entirely non-partisan basis and on a basis entirely free from political faction. We are doing our best to satisfy the people of Barbados that there is, at least, some small body of men who do not wish to tolerate waste and corruption. Nobody has accused this side of the House, so far as I know, of any excesses along that line. There is very little that I can add in respect of the Auditor General and the Accountant General except

that we look forward to better results from the gentlemen concerned.

As far as the Inland Revenue Department is dealt with in this Order, I would only say this - I am saying something that has been said so often in the House that I am almost afraid to repeat it to hon. Members. There is one Department of Government where the result of work can be seen. You can see it directly with your own eyes. You can see the ratio between expenditure by Government on staff and a return in terms of revenue to the Government as a result of work done by that staff, and that Department is the Inland Revenue. You can appoint an Inspector, and in a matter of weeks he can carry out an investigation that brings in enough money to the Government to pay his salary for a year. Very often the inspectors in the Inland Revenue Department can be heard to say - I am not suggesting that they reveal the identity of the politicians, or the people whose incomes they are investigating - that they have been doing an investigation and their salaries for the next two years are going to be paid when all of the taxes are collected.

We in the Opposition, over and over again, have said that one of the reasons why income tax is so high in Barbados, or one of the reasons why we are taxed at this tremendous proportion in the middle ranges of income, is that the collection procedure is inadequate It is easy to come into the House of Assembly and to impose income tax, but the ease with which income tax can be reduced and collections still remain at the same level can be seen from the election reduction made in 1971 by the Prime Minister - the reduction made for electoral purposes - and the fact that income tax, indeed, very soon recovered its former level not only based upon inflation of income.

If we can strengthen the Inspectorate right away; if we can work a field audit programme and ensure that tax is paid on income from all sources including trade, agriculture and so on, then we can effect a great increase in revenue and savings for the Government. I only wish that the Government had listened when especially Senator St. John, a former Member for Christ Church, pressed from the time he entered this House, as I remember it, for the Inspectorate of the Inland Revenue Department to be strengthened. I wish the Government had listened there and then and strengthened that Department.

I have made a suggestion in here, and so has Senator St. John, that the legal framework for part-time officers, or officers taken on for particular investigations, should be established so that if it is not thought desirable, or wise, in a particular situation where it seems that collections in a particular field have fallen below what they should be, to take on a full-time established Inspector, it could be possible to appoint, subject to the necessary conditions for establishing secrecy, perhaps, Accountants, or Attorneys-at-Law, who have time on their hands, as is done in many other countries for the purpose of certain field investigations on a fee basis. You would appoint them to carry out a particular field investigation for $X. I believe that that is also a method in which a great saving to the Government could be effected in the field of inland revenue.

With regard to Civil Aviation, the hon. Member for Christ Church West has been very kind in his references to my expertise in this matter. Too kind, perhaps, as I think he may very well have been able to assist the House in outlining, in the light of recent events in the law courts, the need for better training of Air Traffic Controllers. We cannot expect to find the service entirely free from human error, and we cannot blame an entire service upon the basis of an occasional lapse of concentration, or an occasional act of misjudgement. Air Traffic Control is well known to be one of the most difficult and exacting of the modern technical skills and professions which have been called into force by the great technical advances made by mankind in the last 30 years.

It is a tremendous responsibility putting persons in an Air Traffic Control Tower and leaving upon their shoulders the knowledge that an aeroplane with 300 or 400 persons depends upon its safety on their skill in directing it to a successful landing, or controlling it on a successful take off. 6.05 p.m.

Training, a proper system, a proper understanding is what is needed and we cannot blame any individual in these matters. For this reason we cannot complain on this side of what is being done in connection with the creation of an Air Traffic Control Cadet Scheme. We look forward at some stage to hearing from the Minister responsible for Civil Aviation the nature of the scheme and we look forward to him giving us some understanding that this is being done on a proper basis, for the mere fact that one goes to Seawell Airport once a week and one is President of the Flying Club, does not necessarily make one an authority on Civil Aviation matters.

There could have been few exchanges in this House which are better remembered by those who participated in them or those who witnessed them or read about them than the famous debate between the present hon. Member for St. John and the hon. Member for St. Michael West in which the hon. Member for St. Michael West in those days so despised and sneered at for his ignorance, was able to wipe the floor and dust his hands off afterwards with the present hon. Member for St. John who revealed a most thorough-going ignorance based upon the highest possible pretended knowledge of Civil Aviation matters at the time. Well, he may have learned something since then in addition to learning to fly. Let us hope that he will enlighten the House as to whether he understands what is involved in a proper air traffic training scheme and the management of air traffic control matters.

Sir, from time to time when civil aviation matters of this magnitude have come before the House they have been matters which were themselves controversial as opposed to the policy of the departments or the administration of the Departments to which the Order related. Upon this occasion there is perhaps less controversy over the actual appointments since so many of them are merely the confirmation of

temporary appointments along the lines which we in the Opposition have heard for many months and years in here; and the actual cost of the Order - well it states that it is of the nature of $1/2 million.

Nevertheless, I fully anticipate that although it is said to be only $1/2 million annually, the confirmation of temporary posts in causing the easing of pressure on the vote for temporary staff is going to lead to more pressure from departments yet again upon that vote. I do not anticipate that the vote for temporary staff is going to be reduced in next year's Estimates, and unless we are very grateful, we in the Opposition will have to begin yet another round of asking and inviting the Government to do away with this system of Government by temporary officers and establishing posts where it is shown that they are really needed.

This Order has cleared out some of the dead wood in many of the Departments of which we have complained. I very much hope that if the life, electorally speaking and otherwise, of the Ministers responsible for these several departments, primarily the Ministers of Health and Education and the Prime Minister, is spared for yet another year or two of suffering longer, they will take heed to what I have heard and not build up yet another structure of temporary posts to torment and beleaguer the new Government when it comes into office in 1976 or such appropriate time before as if forced upon the present Party in power by the weight of public opinion.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, Sir, pertinent questions have been raised in respect of the Ministries of Health and Welfare and of Education and they have already been very properly dealt with by the Ministers responsible. I merely rose to take this opportunity to make appropriate comments on any matters which I think were pertinent and relevant and which could be of some help. The hon. Member for Christ Church West spoke of the Chief Accountant being assigned to the Inland Revenue Department and he also spoke of acting posts which still exist in the Registration Office.

I have taken notes of the various matters which I consider pertinent and relevant and important, and I will see that the Establishments Division look into certain important points which I consider have been raised here this afternoon. Generally speaking, I think that the Leader of the Opposition summed it up correctly when he said that it is a very lengthy Civil Establishment Order which is far from being controversial and which sets out to strengthen and create new posts in certain key Ministries and Departments and to establish in other cases posts which were temporary, and have been temporary for some time, and to put them on a permanent basis.

I am hoping that we will look into the points raised especially on Civil Aviation, the Inland Revenue

Department, the Ministry of Finance and Planning and one or two other Departments which were touched on.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT GALL HILL CHRIST CHURCH

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the next Order is a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Gall Hill, Christ Church, for the purpose of constructing a road to connect the Gall Hill and Silver Hill Housing Areas. It stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance. It is very straight forward.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is for the acquisition of two adjoining parcels of land - there are two parcels because there are under separate ownership - comprising a total of 1,060 square feet or thereabouts.

The intention is that the land should be utilised for the purpose of joining the Silver Hill Housing Area with another road connecting the two areas so that the area can be better served by

the bus routes, and so that persons living in the Gall Hill area can make use of this new road for the purpose of taking their children to the newly constructed Day Nursery which is on the point of being opened.

There is no dispute, Mr. Speaker, on the price for the property, and the only reason that we are acquiring it compulsorily is that the Government should have an indefeasible title to the property.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
I beg to second that.

Mr. BOLDEN:
Mr. Speaker, at least the Government is moving in a direction which shows that they are taking into consideration the location of these developments and connecting them as closely as possible to provide single service in the care of health and everything so that one would not have to duplicate these services for adjoining areas. But, I believe that the Government in its planning of these housing areas, should not wait until things have reached such a point that they have to come and negotiate for lands like these to get new roads.

If the Government's new policy is to centralise things in these areas, I will hope that it will be extended further than the Silver Hill and Gall Hill Housing Estates. I have spoken in this House, before, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to bring to the attention of the Government now that we are dealing with these Housing Areas that there is one famous one in St. Joseph called Lammings. They have started a housing area at Lammings, but north of the area where the houses are placed is a large cane field. The houses are placed on the worst portion of the area, an area with a very steep gradient which runs into a big gully.

Mr. SPEAKER:
The hon. Member has gone off the subject.

Mr. BOLDEN:
Mr Speaker, with all due respect, I am dealing with the question of the acquisition of land for housing areas.

Mr. SPEAKER:
This deals with Gall Hill and not Lammings. 6.15 p.m.

Mr. C. L. BOLDEN:
I am dealing with the principle of the centralization of certain areas. All I am asking now is that the

Government would look at this area and acquire the area north of the houses and remove the threat of fire from a large canefield and in the same way that they can come now to connect two housing areas together, provide a single day nursery and a single community centre, and we will have the same thing in the St. Joseph area. That is all I am asking. All I am saying is that there is sufficient land area for this to be done, and I am trying to save people's lives.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Speaker, there is a minor point which I want to make on this Resolution, and that is with regard to the nature of the wording of the Schedule to the Resolution and, indeed the Resolution itself. The House is being asked to "Resolve that the House of Assembly approve of the compulsory acquisition by the Crown of the two parcels of land described in the Schedule hereto." Sir, the Schedule begins to describe these two parcels of land as,"Firstly, all that certain piece or parcel of land the property of Gwendolyn Jeffers situate at Gall Hill, in the Parish of Christ Church in this Island containing by admeasurement 540 square feet." There is no "secondly". "Firstly" should be omitted if this was the total description, or something must be wrong since the Resolution speaks of two parcels and there is, in the Schedule, one parcel which is the first parcel mentioned. I will ask the Minister to take a little more care with the Resolutions which are being brought to this House. It is either right or wrong here. This is the element of productivity I was taking about, Sir. I do not believe it is merely a typographical error. Something has gone wrong. It seems to me that something is wrong in the Resolution to that extent, and perhaps in the meantime the Minister will get an opportunity to correct that and ask for an amendment on the matter. But it seems to me that in the Schedule there should be a "second" parcel of land that this House is being asked to approve of additional square feet.

Sir, the Resolution is incomplete, I submit to the House, and really the Minister may wish to postpone debate on the matter.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member is right; we will correct it.

Mr. FORDE:

The second point I want to make on this, Mr. Speaker, is that the purpose for which we are being asked to approve this Resolution and for which the land is being acquired is a worthwhile purpose - constructing roads to provide proper bus service and connecting up housing areas. I would like to deal with that purpose, Sir. I believe that that purpose could be applied Island-wide and I invite the Government to have an overall plan such as is shown in the Development Plan, designating under existing legislation including the Compulsory Acquisition Act of 1949 and the Town and Country Planning Act, areas which it has decided in the future to acquire for these specific purposes, and I am sure that we are capable of speeding up the processes of Resolutions such as these and have a much

better way of going about it and at the same time restricting the prices - inflationary prices - that Government is sometimes being asked to pay for these lands for these purposes.

I would like finally to ask the Minister of Lands to see that the first area that he should deal with, in conjunction with the Minister of Communications and Works, is the area of Christ Church West where there are plenty of tenantry roads that need to be acquired for improving the roads for the poorer section of that area. I would like to ask them to acquire roads in my constituency for this same purpose - linking up roads and rationalising the procedure. That is the only comment I want to make, Sir. I would add that I will be ready and willing to accompany the Minister of Communications and Works and the Minister of Lands and go through the area in my constituency that I am speaking about but, it is not in the politics of Barbados for them to be seen with a Member of the Opposition. However, this is a worthwhile purpose but it seems to me that we need some long-term planning. I invite the appropriate Ministers to get together and have some long-term planning for road development. We may not be able to acquire it all at one go but the Government can set, under the Town and Country Planning Act for a period of time a compulsory purchase notice on the land which would stop values from being inflated, because the value would be taken to be the value at the date of that notice and from time to time perhaps when the money is available Parliament could then be asked to deal with the particular case. That is an idea that I throw out to the Government.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to join issue with the Hon. Member for Christ Church West on the question that it is not in the politics of Barbados to be seen with a Member of the Opposition; that is not the correct thing. He knows me better than that. I think he knows the problems in the Ministry of Communications and Works. It is a question of money, it is a question of priority, and when you have figures of only $210,000 and $220,000 to do roads, subsidiary roads and tenantry roads for the whole Island of Barbados, I think he must realise that certain roads, however badly they are needed, must be left out. The only way I find that you can do the roads in Barbados is to tackle the job meaningfully; the only way is if you get millions of dollars to tackle it meaningfully.....

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is the Hon. Minister speaking about road repairs or - what is he speaking about?.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member is being given just a little latitude.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, all I am saying is that the Minister of Communications and Works was asked by the people to run a bus service in the two housing areas. My Ministry carried out a survey and we thought the request was reasonable and in order to do it we had to acquire the two parcels of land mentioned in the Resolution but which because of a Printer's error was not included in the Resolution. I think my hon. colleague, the Minister of Lands will seek to make the amendment with regard to the second part - the second parcel of land. I think it is an oversight on the part of the Printery. 6.25 p.m.

The Government document sent to the House had it so it cannot be the Government's fault, it would have to be the fault of the Printery, and I think that the Members of the Opposition will be charitable enough to accept the amendment to the Resolution because this is not controversial. Any acquisition of land to build a road to run a bus service for the poor people of this country certainly cannot meet with the objection of the Opposition.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, Sir, we appreciate what the Hon. Minister was just saying, but what about the Official Gazette and the publication of this notice? Does the Official Gazette carry the correct notice? That is very important, let us see that that is right.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, it may be expedient that we defer this Resolution temporarily in order to save time and proceed with the next matter until some research is made to accommodate the Opposition.

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order, Sir, the Leader of the House must not make statements about accommodating the Opposition. One is trying to see that the records are correct.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order. With the permission of the whole House this Resolution will be deferred until later in the Sitting.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. R. St.C. WEEKES, the Resolution was temporarily deferred.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

The next Item under Government Business, Sir, stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance, and it is to move the seconding reading of a Bill to amend the National Insurance and Social Security Act, 1966. (Asides.)

Mr. SPEAKER:

I cannot hear myself; let the hon. Members speak in undertones.

THE NATIONAL INSURANCE AND SOCIAL SECURITY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1973

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, this Bill is to amend the National Insurance and Social Security Act of 1966. The purpose of this amendment is to enable the National Insurance Board to take care of all the administrative expenses of National Insurance. Under the provisions of the National Insurance Act, the National Insurance takes care of all its administrative expenses except of course the salaries of its officers. As a matter of fact, it reads ".....other than expenses by way of salaries payable to persons holding offices on the Board's establishment."

Now, the intention of this Bill, therefore is to remove that restriction so that the National Insurance can take care of the administrative expenses including salaries, pensions, etc. of its officers. This is in short what is intended. When an acturial review of National Insurance was done about a year ago, this point was made by the Actuary who reviewed the scheme, and he commented that for a scheme of limited coverage, such as the one Barbados has, a great subsidy cover out of general taxation, would have a relatively low priority among the various items of Government expenditure required for social purposes. In other words, what he is saying is that the question of the Government continuing to be responsible for the administrative expenses of National Insurance is a matter which the Government can itself shed and it could properly become the responsibility of National Insurance. It is estimated that the additional cost to the fund in satisfying the salaries of the staff would not exceed more than 0.3% of the earnings of which National Insurance contributions are collected. That indeed is very negligible, and I move that this Bill be read a second time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, the time has really come in Barbaods for the whole operation of the National Insurance Scheme to be properly considered and analysed by the House, in my submission. The Scheme which was started in 1966 by legislation and came into force some time later has always been - and I am glad the Minister has used the words "a scheme of limited coverage" - but I would have preferred if the Minister had concentrated on that aspect of the Actuary's comments rather than concentrating on the aspect of saving the Government some $300,000 to $400,000 a year, which is the present amount now voted in the Estimates for the Government's contribution by way of the salaries of the public employees who man and run the National Insurance Service.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

On a point of elucidation, Mr. Speaker, I just want to make this point clear, that at no time did I concentrate on any amount of money which would be a saving to the Government. I never even mentioned any savings to Government, I never mentioned what it meant to Government in terms of expenditure, I mentioned what it was in terms of insurable funds, I mentioned the relation 0.3%, but I never mentioned Government receipts or Government expenditure.

Mr. ADAMS:

Sir, I am sorry. I have tried in my heart to have good feelings towards the hon. Member's capacity to administer a Department of State. I have tried very hard to give him the benefit of every possible doubt as to my own more serious doubts about his intellectual capacity for the different jobs which he holds, but over and over again the Minister gets up, and requires by a demonstration of a total lack of knowledge of what he is talking about, to have things explained to him in words of one syllable. At the present time, the Government is subsidising the National Insurance Scheme to the tune of $384,000 which is what the staff of the National Insurance, who are paid from Government funds, receive. 6.35 p.m.

The Minister says that at no time did he say there were any savings for the Government. What is this Bill about? Are we lunatics or children in here? He is not teaching the first form of the St. Vincent Grammar School! What this Bill is about is to remove that load from the Government and place it on the National Insurance Fund. It is lunacy that over and over again the people of Barbados and this House are treated to this exhibition of ignorance. We see a Press Release, or whatever it is, describing the Leader of the Opposition as telling untruths and the body of the Press Release points out that the Leader of the Opposition, in every specific respect, has been accurate.

In here already today, we have had some explanation of Note 53 to Head 27 of the Estimates in which clearly the Minister does not understand what is in front of him; does not understand the ordinary principles of English grammar; does not understand the ordinary principles of construction of an Act of Parliament, or a note in the Estimates. He gets up here and makes a speech in which he says that it is not high in the priority of Government in a scheme of limited coverage - I am repeating it from memory, Sir - such as that of the National Insurance Scheme in Barbados to provide the salaries of the persons involved. Does he not understand what he is introducing in the House? He does not understand what the Actuary is telling him. He says that it is not necessary for the Government to pay the salaries of the people working at the National Insurance because the scheme is of limited coverage. Do we have to put up with a Minister who cannot understand anything about anything at all that he introduces in here? I am sorry, Sir, if I have lost my calmness in respect of this matter.

I came in here to talk seriously about National Insurance, to talk seriously about the nature of the scheme and where we go from here, and I am going to be interrupted by some nonsense about he did not say anything about savings for the Government. What is this Bill about, except saving the Government $384,000 and charging it to National Insurance instead? If the Minister does not know that there is a difference between the Consolidated Fund and the National Insurance Fund, I believe that there are Members of Parliament in here who know, and two or three Clerks, several Reporters as well as a whole gallery of people.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That may not be referred to in the debate.

Mr. ADAMS:

I am sorry, Sir. I am going to address you on these several points. First of all, there are one or two little, technical points which I was going to ask to have explained, but since the only person who is charged with the responsibility of explanation is, obviously, not firing on any cylinder, if he has any cylinders to fire on, at the present time, it is useless to ask. I am just going to throw them out and, perhaps, if the hon. Member for St. Michael South Central - I wish the hon. Member for St. Andrew was in the House - can explain them perhaps he will get up and give what assistance he can in this regard. The Minister of Education, obviously a most necessary Member of the Cabinet and of that side of it which sits from there down, can get up and explain things.

Now, I do not understand the language of the amendment, because I have never been able to find the Civil Establishment Order which sets out which posts are on the establishment of the National Insurance Board and which are not. I have made enquiries. Today at the National Insurance Office I made enquiries. At the time when I rang, it was twenty past two. I was told that the Director was out of the Island; the Assistant Director could not be found; the Assistant to the Assistant was at lunch; the person

who should have been answering the telephone in the Director's Office did not know who was the next person in seniority, but I might ring a certain number and ask Miss So-and-So to see if she would tell me. At this stage I gave up. I believe I was justified in giving up. Obviously the disease which starts at the top purged right through every administrative level of the National Insurance at the present time, and I much regret the high words of praise which I gave to the National Insurance Scheme and its administration some years ago appear to be a source of complacency rather than a source of an effort to do better, because I cannot say that the Scheme appears at the present time, from the few enquiries which I have been making recently, to be so.

Now this Act says that all expenses properly incurred in the administration of this Act or the Regulations. I would like to be satisfied that the persons who are currently employed at the National Insurance are going to be remaining on the roll, so the speak, of the Public Service of this Island, because it seems to me that there is some potential contradiction in making them the employees of the National Insurance Board, which is not a statutory corporation in the sense of the National Housing Corporation, but it is still not Government as such. I should like some assurance of the position of these persons, their future employment and their interchangeability with other members of the Public Service. The Act, to the best of my knowledge, still says that members of the Public Service shall be the persons responsible for carrying out the National Insurance Scheme. If anybody understands the question and is capable of understanding what is written down in a file by way of answer, I should still like to know what the mechanics would be. Will the National Insurance Fund in future pay a lump sum into the Consolidated Fund, and will the Accountant General still be charged with the payment of the several salaries, or will there be some other system? This is a matter of pure information, Sir, which I do not take to be any matter of Party division.

Now, in relation to the Actuarial Report and the limited coverage of the National Insurance Scheme, the Actuaries have always been extremely conservative in dealing with the National Insurance Scheme as a whole. The system of benefits is calculated, perhaps, somewhat pessimistically as the Actuary himself has admitted in his Report. The level of payments into the Fund was good. The level of contributions was high as earnings rose rather more rapidly than was projected at the time of the original Actuarial Survey. Therefore the National Insurance Fund has made a lot of money. I believe that the total intake has been something like $35 million. I do not have all of the figures, Sir, but even the last Report from the Fund shows that it was $20 million or more invested. It is bringing in terms of interest rather more than is being paid out in terms of benefits at the present time. The level as well as the capital itself is still growing. The reserve is still a few millions; therefore, the National Insurance Fund is a big money-maker. Not much money is being paid out; a lot of money is coming in; so much money is coming in that it is constantly being invested, and the Board is in possession of more and more money.

Now, when you face a situation such as this, in my submission to the House, you have to do certain things. First of all, you must have an Actuarial Survey to give you your projections as to whether this temporary money-making condition will vanish with time as persons become insured and reach certain

ages and begin to draw the old age benefits at the age of 65 and, therefore, the level of benefits will rise eventually to meet the income of the Fund. You have to see whether that is the case. You have to see whether a constant increase in contributions, for after all contributions although there are fixed in terms of any given year, you pay so much of your salary up to a certain amount, and so much if it is more and so on, yet they are calculated actuarially and statistically, I believe, upon a percentage of total of the earnings of all insured persons. This, perhaps, is the total to which the Minister was referring and attempting to use without completely understanding what he was dealing with.

First of all, you have to see if there are more benefits. Secondly, you will have to see if the increasing benefits can be matched with an increase in contribution based purely upon the percentage contribution that you are paying at any one time. 6.45 p.m

It seems to me that such presumably is inflation, but Barbados is nothing if it is not a country of inflation as the Prime Minister so proudly tells us. You will have to raise that to say $60.00 and I can see that in the 1980s it will be $75.00 or maybe the upper limit of $100 if you are still using the same model of contributions. Therefore, although benefits will be increasing, you will still be having contributions increasing in advance of benefits because this is one of the great advantages of this particular type of scheme that when you increase contributions, the contributions come in right away, but the benefits paid do not come in until some years later when the persons have reached a particular age.

Well, you look at these two things, Sir, and if you still think that demographically and financially the scheme can carry a little more weight, then, as in my suggestion, you look around for new benefits and that is the first point which I am putting to the House. We in the Opposition heard a lot of talk that we criticise the Government and do not offer an alternative policy. We are offering an alternative policy in this particular respect on national insurance. The Government has shown today what its policy is. Its policy is totally to avoid the results of mismanagement of the public finance by raiding the national insurance funds even of the few dollars which the Government was paying in salaries before. Our policy is to give the people greater benefits out of national insurance funds than they were getting previously.

Now, the terms of reference of the Actuary who reported on the National Insurance Scheme were somewhat limited. I hope to find it in a moment. The Actuary was only asked to advise on (1) the cost of salaries of staff from national insurance funds, (2) the erection of a building from national insurance funds and the third is withdrawn, (4) the introduction of the maternity grant, the deletion of the first three waiting days in respect of sickness benefits, the question of increasing the weekly rates of sickness benefits from 60% to 75% of earnings and the relaxing of the qualifying conditions for entitlement to sickness benefits.

I know that this is one thing that the hon. Member for Christ Church West should surely know about because he was a member of the Board that dealt with much of this - the qualifications for getting sick benefits at all relating to whether you were employed or not, and the payment of benefits to self-employed persons and also the revision of earnings groups under the scheme.

We have already referred to something to do with the reduction of the age in respect of old age contributory pensions from 65 to 60 years.

While in some of these cases the Actuary has recommended that the Government take the steps that the Board is contemplating in this, he has advised caution; but here today at this meeting where a comprehensive scheme, a comprehensive report and projection and everything to do with national insurance has been presented - I have a copy of it here - the Minister has only given us a three minute speech relating to a third of the matters on which the Actuary was asked to advise. We should be better treated than this, because it must be known to the Government that the Barbados Labour Party proposes to introduce a free National Health Service in stages based upon the National Insurance Scheme. This must be known to the Government despite the failure of the Press to give our proposals, made in many speeches and writings over a considerable period, any real coverage. Yet, we think that it has been canvassed sufficiently for most thinking persons, certainly most persons who would like to be considered as thinking persons, to know that this is part of the Barbados Labour Party's policy.

Just in passing, Sir, I would like to deal with the columnist, E.L.C., who writes in the Advocate-News. I have been urged to reply to E.L.C. Sir. There are certain prejudices which are acquired in youth. Unfortunately, in common with many English-speaking conservatives, - for the English-speaking world is the sole bastion of believing that the Government should not provide free health services for its citizens - in common with many English-speaking conservatives, E.L.C. in the years of 1946 and 1947 acquired a prejudice against the British National Health Service and he has never in all his development since then, seen any reason to get rid of it. It would be useless for all the young doctors who come out to tell him that they can hardly contemplate a situation in which persons are likely to become bankrupt as a result of a crippling disease and as can no longer happen in Western Europe and in most of the Arab countries - the Arab countries where people cannot read or write have National Health Services for their citizens based upon oil revenues etc.

It is useless to tell E.L.C, that. E.L.C, asked whether we in the Barbados Labour Party, and me in particular, understood what the cost of a National Health Service would be.

Mr. SPEAKER:

But E.L.C. is a red herring, as I understand it.

Mr. ADAMS:

No, sir. He is talking about a National Health Service and I am going to say what the cost of a National Health Service would be. Suppose you say that there are 100 doctors in private practice in Barbados. They declare to the Commissioner of Inland Revenue - I believe this is too high - but suppose you say an average income of $50,000 a year. That is $5 million. Suppose that you immediately put an upper limit on all of the money that will have to be paid out in national insurance to the doctors. This is a very high upper limit. It would never reach there. But I do not believe that all the doctors in Barbados declare more than $5 million in personal income to the Government, so it is not so hard to find out what a National Health Service Scheme would cost.

Sir, you only have to go into Bridgetown and ask some of the very sensible people who run drug houses how much it costs for the drugs that you import and how much is the cost of the drugs that you re-export - because there is a flourishing trade in the re-export of drugs - and you arrive at the cost of drugs. It is not very difficult to cost, and having costed it around say $51/2 million to $6 million, you say (1) try to take $1 million off the people's backs in the first year then $11/2and so on.

This can be done, but the Minister responsible for National Insurance and those responsible for discussing and overseeing - perhaps overseeing is too high a word - discussing his work in Cabinet do not appear to have the vision, the imagination that the people of Barbados expect from them.

The people of Barbados know that the National Insurance Scheme is a money making scheme. I am suggesting that they want to hear how it is that they are paying $2 million or more in national insurance contributions and that their national insurance scheme is making another $2 million in earned interest and is only paying out $1.6 million or whatever the present level of benefits is.

Well we in the Barbados Labour Party are proposing - our proposals are well in the stage of being worked out - that the persons who are receiving sickness benefits should immediately receive at the same time as the doctors' bills are being paid - should immediately receive drugs at such reduced prices as would allow them to pay a sum, not quite a token amount but a little over a token amount which perhaps would prevent them from suffering some crippling disease for want of the means to pay for an expensive drug.

I know that this can be carried too far. I have the comments of the Senior Consultant at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital to the effect that it would be most unusual indeed to meet any disease that could only be cured by $200 in drugs and that drugs are commonly over-prescribed by physicians.

All of this does not concern the broad terms of the scheme. When you set up the scheme you try to ensure that it is properly managed and from the very restrictive way in which the National Insurance Scheme is managed particularly in regard to No. 7 condition that was referred to the Actuary - the qualifying conditions for entitlement to sickness benefits - I have very little doubt that there are numerous Civil Servants in Barbados who are thoroughly capable of refusing to pay and making it difficult for persons to obtain sickness benefits and to draw benefits to which they are not entitled or only marginally entitled.

I said that rather than the Government trying to make a profit out of national insurance, the people should make a profit out of it, by way of increased benefits. I want to read what was said by the hon. Member for St. Andrew in the debate in 1966 when the National Insurance Scheme was introduced. That is the present Member for St. Andrew. He was then, apparently Minister for National Insurance. He was commenting on what the contribution from the Government to the fund was, and this is exactly what he said: 6.55 p.m.

"The contribution made by the Government to the Fund is the payment of the staff of one hundred persons to run the Scheme; not one cent will be taken from the Fund for the payment of the staff to run this Scheme. The annual recurrent expenditure for salaries will be borne by the Government and will be voted in the Legislature at the beginning of every financial year." This is a solemn pledge given by the then Minister that not one cent will be taken from the Fund for the payment of staff to run this Scheme, and no matter how obscure the speech, no matter how little understood his own arguments are by the hon. Member for St. Michael North West the fact is that the House is now being asked to go directly contrary to a pledge given by a Minister of Government upon the inception of the Scheme - directly contrary. There was no reference to it. If I had not referred to it, not one hon. Member on the other side would have said a word about it.

Sir, it has always been the understanding of the House, the Senate, Parliament and the people, that the Government intended to contribute to National Insurance by way of the Civil Servants who would be put there to run it, and this entire Scheme was going to be or is sought evidently to be overthrown by the Minister with some obscure argument that it will cost only 0.3 percent of the insurable earnings. I do not think he knows what 'insurable earnings' mean, but he certainly cannot think that 'insurable earnings' refers to the Consolidated Fund. He must know that this phrase refers to the National Insurance Fund and if it will only cost 0.3 percent - a figure that he can get from the Reporter even if he does not know

what page it is on - if it would only cost that, he knows that what he is introducing is a charge on the National Insurance Fund.

Now we may ask, Sir, why this charge. Now the financial position of the Government - the amount of money in the Treasury and so on - has again been the subject of plunging into waters by the hon. Member - too deep for him to understand whether there is money in the Treasury and so on, but at least we know there is a deficit on the Consolidated Fund and that this deficit is increasing every year by some millions of dollars. I do not want to anticipate anything that I am going to say in the "No Confidence" debate when, as I am informed, it resumes tomorrow; I do not wish to steal my own thunder; I do not wish to steal from my own arguments or those of any other hon. Member what is going to be said, but everybody in Barbados irrespective of any statement made by the hon. Member for St. Michael North West knows that the Government has not got the volume of money sufficient over the last few months anyhow to deal with its immediate liabilities. There is no contradiction about that. Where the Chamber of Commerce is complaining - and it is a matter of record that persons to whom the Government has owed money have made representations to the Chamber of Commerce that they cannot get their money. Let us assume that the Government is slow on paying its debts because of a shortage of funds - I dare say that this will be the subject of further comments in here. I will actually ask hon. Members to do me a favour; let us have this out tomorrow. Let us talk about National Insurance today, because we will have every chance to have this out later on when I quote my figures, and I would not like to see any hon. Member make a fool of himself - and I do not think I can say that in Parliamentary terms, Sir.....

Mr. SPEAKER:
You will be very offensive.

Mr. ADAMS:
Sir, I do not wish to see any hon. Member mislead himself as much as the hon. Member who spoke immediately prior to my rising. The National Insurance Fund on the other hand is replete with funds; it is full of funds. The National Insurance Fund can advance money in enormous sums to the commercial banks on deposit for a year or whatever; enormous sums of great liquidity. For what? For the commercial banks to lend, then out to swell the volume of consumer credit even more and distort the economy of Barbados even more. What is it? Twenty million dollars, Sir? Again, I have not got all these figures but as anyone will freely admit.....

Mr. SPEAKER:
Of course the second reading is concerned with the principle and not the details.

Mr. ADAMS:

It is the principle we are dealing with, Sir. It is not the details of how much money is in any given Fund, but the National Insurance Fund has money; it has money at the present time and it is a great temptation to the Government to sink its hands into the National Insurance Fund to get itself out of such long-term financial difficulty as the Minister of Finance has managed to run it in by too great a belief in his own mustique and too little attention to what is going on under his eyes. The first effort to raid the National Insurance Fund came when we had the Treasury Bills issued. The National Insurance Fund was now to invest in Treasury Bills. What are Treasury Bills used for? To pay the Civil Servants; to pay the short term liabilities of the Government. 1 dealt with it, the hon. Member for Christ Church West dealt with it very admirably at the time. Now again, the National Insurance Fund has to take on another $384,000. No doubt the Minister will get up and say what part the Actuary has in this, but the Actuary's recommendations are based firstly upon the limited nature of what he was asked to recommend on, and secondly, upon another very important thing which I have mentioned - Item 2 in his terms of reference - but which as yet has not been dealt with in my speech or that of the Minister who introduced the Bill; that is, the erection of the building in Fairchild Street. Now when recommendations are made that you should take X step or Y step but you do not take Z, that you do A and B but you do not do C, if you decide to take step Z and to do C, surely you must review X and Y and A and B.

Now the Actuary has not recommended the building of a building in Fairchild Street. The Actuary does not think that this is a wise idea to be financed from the National Insurance Fund. We are talking about the new building at the corner of Fairchild Street and Probyn Street - the giant monstrous white elephant. Now this has a history, Sir. When Marine House was bought, you came in here and we gave limited support to the idea of buying Marine House and the argument which was used on this side, which was personally put off by the Prime Minister who gave me certain assurances on the matter - I well remember the annoyance of the hon. Member for St. Michael South Central when the Prime Minister said he would tell the Leader of the Opposition something, and apparently the Member for St. Michael South Central thought he was being left out of a secret - whatever I had to be told was told me right there behind the Chair, and certainly as far as the building was concerned there was nothing confidential about it; it was that the purchase of Marine House would enable a much more modest building to be put up in Fairchild Street - save much of the cost - because Marine House was giving two acres of office space, whatever the amount is, Sir, and therefore he would be able to reduce the amount of office space in the new National Insurance building. 7.05 p.m.

The Actuary has pointed out that the National Insurance Office currently occupies Government owned premises at no direct cost to the Fund. He went on to explain that although there should be 30% of the National Insurance funds put into long term investments, yet he would not recommend putting the whole investment in one long term investment. I think that is a very fair summary of what he has said, although perhaps I do not know when the report was written in relation to when the building was started, but because it would result in a short term saving to the Government this is being done - putting up an office building - and because it would also result in another short term saving to the Government the Minister is introducing this Bill to save the Government the cost of the National Insurance salaries. Let us never

think, Mr. Speaker, that because there is such a favourable position with the National Insurance at this time that it means it will always be favourable. Let us not think that because the fund is making so much money that you can take the capital of the fund, lock it up in the way recommended against by the expert, and yet when you meet your difficulties with persons reaching pensionable age - and the number will multiply very rapidly indeed, no matter what the democratic position in Barabdos, no matter whether we have emigration, a lower birth rate, a sudden epidemic that carries off a lot of old people - because the number of persons who will have reached the age of 65 of necessity is going to increase, and the Government will find that they cannot meet the payment of benefits at that time.

The Minister for National Insurance has said that the First National City Bank of New York is not the greatest holder of National Insurance funds. I have to come to the conclusion, that I have already addressed hon. Members on, the conclusion I have reached upon the Minister's capacity to absorb facts and comment on them. I do not wish to get up on a point of order when he makes a reply; we had some figures given us from the last reports, and then we were given an advance by the Prime Minister, who whatever his faults, has never had any aversion to reading from a child.

Fixed deposits. I am quoting now what the Minister for National Insurance said from his seat. He said the First National City Bank of New York is not the greatest holder of National Insurance funds. Hon. Members heard it, and if he wants to deny it let him get up and deny it now, otherwise let him hereafter for ever hold his peace. The figures that I have are as follows:

Barclays Bank, Broad Street $1,000,000

Bank of Nova Scotia 1,000,000

Canadian Imperial Bank 750,000

Bank of America 800,000

First National City Bank 500,000

Barclays Bank, Broad Street 3,050,000

I want to hear what the special deposit was at the First National City Bank of $5,450,000, a total of just under $6 million invested in the First National City Bank, and the Minister will sit in his seat for people in the House to hear and say it is not the greatest holder of National Insurance funds. I call that insolence, and every time he denies something he only confirms my belief that it is true.

Mr. SPEAKER:
Let the hon. Member contain himself.

Mr. ADAMS:
I must ask these questions and say these things, because he and his family are ruining CBC.

Mr. SPEAKER:
This is going too far; personal comment must not enter into it.

Mr. ADAMS:
Constantly on CBC you hear the Acting Minister of Finance contradicting the Leader of the Opposition, and every time I make certain points, you realise it is his mistake. I hope that CBC will have the honesty upon this occasion to point out point by point the contradictions I have been able to throw in his face.

Now, Sir, we in the Opposition do not believe that the Government is taking a wise move in making the first beneficiary under the relatively large short term gains which the National Insurance Fund has made the Government itself. We do not believe the Government should be the first beneficiary of the National Insurance Fund in terms of its preserved position over its first few years. People are not fools, the ordinary people in this island who pull their pockets are fully capable without reading any of the actuarial figures of understanding that they are paying but not receiving. They know that if they pay $x per week, when they reach 65 and their x's will have added up to a certain sum that they should receive that certain amount. 7.15 p.m.

Now, I must tell hon. Members that they had better - especially the members of the Cabinet - pull their socks up and pay attention to what is happening in the Watergate affair. We feel that it is useless bringing certain matters before this House. We presented the most cogent evidence in respect of a former Minister of National Insurance, and when it was confirmed neither the Members on this side of the House nor the public got any results. I am asking hon. Members not only to look at the social security aspect of this Bill which we are seeking to pass today but also to look at the situation where these same funds are becoming a political football, or some kind of special assistance to certain persons highly placed in Government. (Asides.)

We in the Opposition are voting against this Bill along the general lines that the policy which is enshrined in it is not the best policy to be followed in respect of National Insurance funds.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I shall not be too long. (Asides.) Let me warn the Leader of the Opposition not to get on the floor of this House and fool the people without trying to work out the mechanics of a National Health Scheme. Do not get on the floor of this House and try to work out a Health Scheme while on your feet. Work out a proper Scheme and go to the public with it. Tell them how much it is going to cost and how much you are going to give them. The Minister said that not one penny of Government money would be used, but that was when the Scheme was being initiated and the Government had no idea how much it would cost.

Mr. ADAMS:

The Minister said that not one cent would be taken from the fund.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I accept that. Nobody knew how much it would cost at the time.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, Sir. Is the Minister saying that the Government introduced a National Insurance Fund without knowing how much it would cost and without knowing what the benefits were, merely to go on the air and broadcast something?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

If your Party had introduced a Scheme such as this 20 years ago, we would not have had people

walking along the streets starving, or poor people in the Almshouses, because they would have been able to get something.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, Sir. Is the Hon. Minister saying that people are walking about here starving?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

That is not a point of order. The Barbados Labour Party should have had a Scheme on the Statute Book 20 years ago. When the Government started this Scheme it was impossible to know exactly what it would cost and it was necessary to use money from the Consolidated Fund to pay the officers, who were working on the Scheme. Since then, it is clear to the whole Island that the Scheme is now in a position to carry its own administrative expenses. Can anybody in his right mind say that what we are attempting to do, is wrong? You should not ask the Government Treasury to pay the expenses of the staff working on this Scheme. Is this a criminal act? Why should the Public Treasury be asked to pay the staff involved in this Scheme when it has millions of dollars invested in the banks in Bridgetown? All the Government is saying is, that the Scheme is viable and profitable, and it should pay the staff.

Sir, they are trying to prove to the people that the Government is raiding the National Insurance funds in order to support a bankrupt Treasury. If the Board has millions of dollars invested in the Banks, then it should be called upon to pay its staff. Mr. Speaker, it is quite clear that the object behind the Bill is that the Board should be able to pay the staff, and there is nothing criminal in that. The Act itself lays down that the Scheme must be reviewed. The Government is in the process of reviewing the Scheme with a view to increasing benefits and so on. All of these matters are being discussed, and the Government intends to give a true reflection of what this Scheme is costing the Island.

Of course my friend, the Hon. Minister of National Insurance, will deal with the Leader of the Opposition in due course. Nobody in the Opposition can accuse me of anything like what is taking place in the Watergate affair. If you want to accuse me of anything you can go outside and do so, and you will face the Chief Justice for it. Not one of you over there can accuse me of using my position as a Minister in order to get anything.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

You can accuse other people, but nobody can accuse you.

Mr. SPEAKER:
On what has the hon. Member risen?

Mr. MOTTLEY:
On a point of order. Mr. SPEAKER That is no point of order!

Hon. F. G. SMITH:
The Leader of the Opposition cannot give people the impression in this House that the Government is raiding the National Insurance funds in order to help a bankrupt Treasury. I will deal with him when he is dealing with the "No Confidence" motion. 7.25 p.m.

I want to sit right now. This is a Bill to amend the National Insurance and Social Security Act, and its purpose is to make the National Insurance Scheme bear the real cost of running the Scheme. I was on the Estimates Committee for five years and every year I told the Director that we should not have to take money from the Consolidated Fund to run the Scheme. The Chairman, the Minister of Finance agreed with me that we should not take money from the Consolidated Fund to subsidise the Scheme.

We have allowed public officers $3 million to help build houses and the Opposition has mentioned that the Government took $3 million from the Fund to help public officers with loans. That would be a social service which they could not criticise.

The building which is being put up is one which will house the national insurance people. It is a building where they can be housed properly and which can create an image to the public as a lasting memorial of the scheme created by the D.L.P. and which the former Government should have introduced 25 years ago to benefit the poor working classes in Barbados.

Hon. C. E. TALMA and Mr. BOLDEN rose.

Mr. SPEAKER:
The hon. Member for St. Joseph caught my eye.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that the Sitting be now suspended for three quarters of an hour.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to second that.

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

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER:
The Sitting is now resumed. When the Sitting was suspended, the hon. Member for St. Joseph was about to begin his speech.

Mr. BOLDEN:
Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister for Communications and Works to whom I would have to give the title of Defender of the Faith rose in defence of the Government on the National Insurance Scheme; but I have said before, that the hon. Member sometimes takes leave of his senses, and I think that he has done so again in his speech on this occasion.

First of all, he sought to challenge the hon. Member for St. Thomas when he said that the scheme of the Barbados Labour Party was a free national health scheme based on the National Insurance Scheme. When the National Insurance Scheme was introduced, nobody knew what would happen to it and therefore that was the reason for the Minister making the statement that he made. I think that he is contradicting his own statement. He cannot have it both ways. He goes further and says that people are walking about starving and that the people should have had this kind of scheme 20 years ago. Around 15 or 20 years ago there were people like a man called Sleepy Smith....

Mr. SPEAKER:
Who is Sleepy Smith?

Mr. BOLDEN:
He is not in here. I am saying that at the time there were people like a man called Sleepy Smith and another called Errol Barrow. There was another one called Frank Walcott and they did not find it necessary to introduce a National Insurance Scheme, but the Hon. Minister, when he had the opportunity to do it, took leave of his senses and of the country and ran away. He comes back now and tells you that the scheme should have been introduced at a time when he had an opprotunity to do it and did not do it.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:
Mr. Speaker, on a point of elucidation, I left the Labour Party in 1954 and left the island in 1958.

Mr. SPEAKER:
That is no point of elucidation.

Hon. F. G. SIMTH:
All right, Sir.

Mr. BOLDEN:
Mr. Speaker, instead of the Hon. Minister getting up and admitting that the scheme is making money and admitting that those people who are paying money into the scheme are penalised day by day and that about $1 million is being lent out on interest and that the very people who should get money out of it, who should be getting a bit on their returns are not getting, he comes here and makes all kinds of statements.

I know a case in St. Joseph where a woman went to hospital to get an operation on her eyes. She spent weeks and weeks in hospital and she submitted to the officer the certificates which she should submit to the National Insurance people. They told her that she should submit one from the Visiting Surgeon to say that she could not work before she could get one cent out of the Scheme. The Minister is coming here and defending something when he was in

Parliament..... (Aside: I was not in the

Government, I was in the Opposition.) We are in the Opposition now and we are suggesting what we can do with the National Insurance Scheme; but he is telling you that when he was in the Opposition he could not make any suggestions. Is it not clear that we have more sense than he did?

What we want to say is that we believe that the scheme is making sufficient money and we must look at what is being paid to these persons who are paying money into the scheme. I know of a case where a man was in hospital and when he came out he applied for disability benefits. They sent him a letter telling him he must go to the Board's doctor for examination. 8.35 p.m.

I have a letter in my office which shows that he was told that because he had not gone to the Board's doctor for examination, his claim had been disallowed. The person was a patient at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and in answer to his claim which they ignored, he was told that he should have gone to the Board's doctor for examination. The Minister should look into things like this. These are things that need to be corrected with the National Insurance Scheme. If people keep on hearing of the millions of dollars made under the Scheme and see that nothing is coming back to them, this must bring dissatisfaction. After all, it is the people's money that is being paid into the Scheme.

At a time like now, with the report that there is a food shortage all over the world, don't you think it would be appropriate that part of that money be lent to farmers in order to increase the food production in this country? We hear day after day about how other Governments are taking steps to remedy the situation in their respective countries. Take the question of the production of essential commodities in this country. The same way the Government is going to put money in a building which does not generate employment, the money could be used at this time to create employment in other areas. What the Government should do now is to improve on the cleaning of the streets and be thankful that an epidemic has not come into this country; and I think when they leave here they should announce the increased benefits which would be paid to people who make claims under the scheme.

Another thing is this: payments should be made promptly. There are many people whose claims have not been allowed after they have made their claims and they have waited for weeks upon weeks, although they were entitled to benefits. They have gone back to work and they have not been paid. Employers will tell you that they find it better to pay the workers and not wait until they are paid from

the Fund. These are things that the Government should look into.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe this will be the last debate before this Parliament finishes, in which you will hear the Government claiming laurels for having passed the National Insurance and Social Security Act, 1966. I believe one should be very firm in stating correctly the geneaology and the historical aspect of this Act. Let it be recognised that it was under the Barbados Labour Party that a Committee was set up with experts from the ILO to advise the then Government about the implementation of such a scheme. The initial request in respect of this National Insurance proposal came from the then Minister of Health and Welfare the Hon Freddie Miller, senior Member for St. George. It is to his credit as an individual that this Act was finally implemented by the Government that succeeded the Barbados Labour Party, and I would not like the Government to believe that this country only acquired a view or foresight in 196.1. There are many measures in the field of welfare - there are many measures in creating a welfare state that began in the regime of the Barbados Labour Party. I am sure when this Government is turned out of power and is succeeded by us on this side there will be measures on the working board, as there should be, which we will review, and if they are good and proper we will take over and implement, and I am sure we will not be so ungrateful as to keep the full credit for ourselves.

I will always believe that there was a recognised acceptance of the view by political parties in this country that both the Barbados Labour Party which is a democratic socialist party, and its successor the Democratic Labour Party to which we gave birth, have done some good for Barbados; and when it comes to this National Insurance Scheme, Members of the Government should at least recognise its geneaology. So Members of the Government Party should let the people in this country understand its history clearly and stop mis-representing it; and that is why when we hear the Leader of the Opposition speaking so highly of this matter, it is because he too is cognisant of the work that was put in by his late father. 8.45 p.m.

Let us get this quite clear. That is why we speak strongly, because we are concerned about developing the national insurance concept where we move not only to a national health service, but as the hon. Member for St. Thomas has said before that he looks forward to the day not only where you have full employment but where the unemployed are able to benefit from social welfare and security benefits in this country. The Barbados Labour Party when it takes over the Government will move the economy so fast that there will be no period as the Acting Minister of Finance says, a period of economic tranquility, we will be in a period of progressive development so that we can eradicate unemployment, and so that we can use the national insurance funds in order to give security to people who are unemployed temporarily from time to time as happened before. If the Government is bothered that we have ideas, if they are on their toes - and I think the hon. Member for St. Philip South was the only Member whom I see registered the point of ownership - when an idea has come as that thrown out by the hon. Member for St. Thomas, register it and take action on it. I see the hon. Member has quickly made a note and has told the hon. Member at his side that they can implement it, never mind we might make political capital

out of it, but that is part of legitimate politics, but let us get it quite clear.

We intend to develop the National Insurance Scheme, and if the Government wants to develop it with us it is our duty as an Opposition constructively to tell you to move forward at a faster pace than you are going. We believe that the Actuarial Report does show that the time has come to review the benefits under the scheme and that to ask the country at large to carry $300,000 is not an unreasonable burden. I would like here to make certain pleas and to join with the hon. Member for St. Joseph in asking for a speeding up of the claims. It is not often that I use personal experiences in this House to make a point, and on this occasion I hope I will be forgiven for so doing, but one of my employees was recently, unfortunately, ill and I recognised my duty towards him and went ahead and paid him, but he had some considerable wait until he got money from the scheme, and I believe that the Employers' Confederation and the Chamber of Commerce have asked the Government to devise a sensible system whereby employers can advance money to the employees who are genuinely ill and then claim a rebate from the Government, This is something which needs quick attention and there can be sufficient safeguards for the Government that mala fide claims are taken care of without disturbing the implementation of the scheme.

I would also like the Government to look at the impact which inflation has made on the scheme. To pay $100 as funeral benefit in these days is really not so much; it is of some assistance but it is not much. Those of us who are in politics from time to time have to assist the needy in those circumstances, I would like to see also when there is, a death in a family that the officers do not insist on waiting until you go through the whole rigmarole before they implement the scheme. I think they can do the initial investigation themselves and if they are satisfied, they can go ahead and deal with it quickly, because there are hardships from time to time. I would have wished that a few guidelines would have been implemented. I think this provides an opportunity for me to make a point that I have tried to make in some way from time to time in this House. When a report as significant as a triennial review of the National Insurance Scheme is done I think it is incumbent on the Government to do a bit more than to lay the document on the Table of the House. Somehow it seems to have become set policy in Barbados that the best way to inform a country is to lay the document and forget it or keep the document locked up in your files as though there is some great secret to be withheld from the Opposition or the public at large.

I think the Government would have been well advised not only to have laid the Actuarial Review, as it must do, but to have placed before this House what is referred to in parliamentary language as a Green Paper - and if we want to do our own thing let us call it a Black Paper - as to how the scheme should be developed, and then bring down a subsequent paper on Government's proposals so that there could have been a substantive debate taking place in Parliament. Why this is not being done in more Ministries I cannot understand because that is an opportunity.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
If the hon. Member will give way, it is now almost five minutes to nine and this matter appears to be controversial. I beg to move that further consideration of this matter be postponed.

Hon. R. St.C. WEEKES:
I beg to second that.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

Mrs. EASTMOND:
I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the Sitting accordingly. 8.55 p.m.

On Resumption on Wednesday the 14th November, 1973.

(Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair)

Mr. SPEAKER:
When the Sitting was suspended last evening, the House was considering the Second Reading of a

Bill to amend the National Insurance and Social Security Act, 1966. The hon. Member for Christ Church West was then engaging the attention of the Honourable Chamber. He is now privileged to continue for another 15 minutes.

RESUMPTION OF CONSIDERATION OF THE NATIONAL INSURANCE AND SOCIAL SECURITY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1973

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Speaker, when the House was suspended, I had made three points which I should like to recap very quickly. One was that it was true to say that the geneaology of this Act pre-dates 1966 and certainly pre-dates the coming into being of the Democratic Labour Party Government. I should like again to underscore this aspect of my speech to say very briefly that I think that any objective analysis of the Labour Party regime must admit that the Labour Party in Government was deeply conscious of the welfare of the sick, of the aged, of the infirmed, of the weak, and may I say, of the unemployed. It was because of this that various welfare measures were implemented and that prior to 1966 we set up a Committee to look into the question of social welfare culminating finally in the Stockton Report and then, eventually, in the National Insurance Act.

I also said that one of the reasons why we are concerned about the implications of this limited amendment is that prior to this amendment we would have expected to have seen a White Paper outlining the Government's intention of expanding the benefits to be given under the National Insurance Act. I said, Mr. Speaker, that it seems that the Government has not yet learnt how to produce for this House and for the benefit of this country a White Paper setting out proposals so that the legislature may have an opportunity of debating those issues rather than operating on the present procedure where Ministerial Statements containing Cabinet decisions are sometimes made, in fact more often than not are made, outside of the House, on television, and Parliament is the last to know what is happening. I consider any improvement of the National Insurance Scheme and benefit sufficiently important, and may I say it should be a sufficiently non-partisan measure at this stage, that it should at least have the House to be taken into the confidence of the Government on this matter.

Regardless of what was said in 1971, or what will be said in 1976, the country must understand that both of the major Political Parties in this country accept the concept of a welfare state, and, regardless of what columnists may say in relation to our belief, it is an accepted fact now between the Political Parties that the welfare state is here to stay and to be expanded so that we could redress the social inequalities which exist in the society. That is why I regret part of the speech of the hon. Member for St. Michael South Central. In this instance, he really was not as objective as I know he is capable of. He was really doing what he sometimes accuses other Members of the House of doing: taking all the political laurels

when he knows that on these matters the Parties are agreed that wherever possible we will help the infirmed, the weak, the disabled and those who are worse off I may admit to him that as on this Bill we differ on how we should go about doing this. As the hon. and learned Leader of the Opposition has said, we believe that it was necessary to place the full running expenses of the Fund on the National Insurance Fund. I will go further and say that I think the Government should have written off those expenses even if in future to allow the cost of all of the salaries to be borne by the Fund.

Sir, Government has written off debts or monetary obligations, that sometimes have been encouraged by other Boards which do not perform as well as this Board, and indeed by some Boards which have not been engaged in this type of social legislation which is so necessary in this country. We say that the figure of $300,000 is a substantial figure and it is the sort of figure that the community as a whole, and not only persons who are having the benefit of this scheme, should be only too willing to bear. That is the difference. It is not simply an accounting measure. The point being made by the Leader of the Opposition was that the burden should have been a burden which the community as a whole should be prepared to bear. Just as you conceive that the burden of the Severance Payment Fund should be borne as a whole by the community, that is why Parliament has to make rebates from time to time. (Asides.) I have heard sotto voce "Who paid?" Of course, it came out of the Treasury. Of course, the community as a whole has borne it up to now, but I would respectfully contend that Section 2 of this Bill, when coupled with Section 3, is not only to cast the burden of the salaries of the staff which are coming in future after commencement of this Act, but also now to take out of the operating revenue of the Fund during the current financial year the lump sum of expenses that occurs prior to March, 1972.

Mr. Speaker, if it is not taken out of operating revenue, if it is taken out of reserves, then the reserves could only have been cash balances that could have accrued out of the revenue which comes in monthly from the Fund. Call them what you will, you will have to take into your Capital Account, or sign a cheque drawn on the Fund withdrawing money from the Bank, or from deposits, or from any form of investment, in order to get the $300,000. Reserves are no more than accumulated income which you turn into capital. This is what we are urging on the Minister. Was it really that necessary? The money has already been spent. Why bring it back into the Consolidated Fund at this stage? Make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker, the country as a whole has had indirect benefits from this Fund.

Earlier this year the Hon. Leader of the House introduced into this Parliament a measure to amend, I believe, the Treasury Bills Act in order to enable the Treasury Bills to be floated borrowing from the National Insurance Fund, and the level of investment one gets on a short-term Treasury Bill may not be as high as the Fund could have earned otherwise in other circumstances particularly with interest rates going at 10%. I am sure the yield of short-term on lending from the Fund to the Treasury is not a yield of 10%. What we are saying is that these indirect benefits are being provided to the Consolidated Fund as a whole. When Government can borrow from this Fund to give soft-term loans, as the hon. Member for St. Michael South Central says, to public servants at a lower rate of interest than they could obtain at commercial banks today, you can see the position. 12.10 p.m

The rate of interest in the insurance companies is 10% reduced to 91/2% for prompt payments, and in commercial banks lending for five years the interest is at 12% on mortgage. Public servants are getting it at a lower rate so that if the Government had to use the Consolidated Fund for this purpose to provide these funds rather than the National Insurance Funds it would cost the Government a bit more and they would hardly get the full amount from their public service.

My contention is that this exercise was not necessary. I believe that we have made that point in many ways, but the Minister may not be convinced because now that it is a Cabinet decision he may feel in duty bound to continue with a Cabinet decision of this nature

Let me say this: I warn the Minister that in future when he is dealing with something as major as improvements to the National Insurance Fund to treat this House with the courtesy, if I may put it that way, that we should expect and which we deserve. Let us know what our proposals are before hand. Let us debate them in here. Let us try to help you in here. Far be it from me to believe that the Opposition has all the sense, but I certainly would not be fooled into believing that the Government has all of it either. It is for this reason that on a matter that is fundamental to the country and is accepted between us we should have joint consultation.

We are not suggesting that the Opposition governs the country, not at this time, not until we have a proper constitutional change, but what I suggest is that we can assist the Government in giving better government to the country. If we are asked to be constructive, if we are asked as you ask us to do not to be just critical but to be constructively critical, come and take us into your confidence. Come in and consult with us on these points. That is all I would like to say, Sir. We have restated our position, and may I repeat them. We promised the Minister that we will leap ahead faster than the Government is doing in this Parliament. We believe that we can raise the benefits at a faster rate than this Government is doing, that we can improve the investments of the funds for a higher yield, and we believe that we can reduce the administrative cost and account for it in a proper method. We believe that we have the know-how to use this Fund to produce benefits equal to national health service and finally, unemployed benefits for people who are employed part of the time but who have not been contributing to the Fund. These are the policy goals in the Barbados Labour Party and if the Government wants to adopt them in the interest of the country we will second the Government in adopting this.

We are magnanimous and big enough and we are sure enough of the policy which we will be taking from now to the next three years that we can convince the country of our policy, we can convince the country that we have the heart, that we have the mind, and that we have the ability.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I hardly listened to all that went on because in truth and in fact the majority of us should know that the time for revising, for reviewing this scheme has not yet come. They know that as well as we do. You cannot revise a scheme of that magnitude just after seven years. They come here and lay down wrong principles. They try to mislead the people with a lot of nonsense. They should know better, especially the last speaker, the one from Christ Church West.

He happens to speak with a profound knowledge of most subjects, but in this case he is obviously off the ball. This scheme will need revision, but not yet. The scheme must be built up. You must have a headquarters. We must have a building where it can function and you must have a Minister in the building and create ah image in the eyes of the people of Barbados and of the entire Caribbean. It is not a question of coming here and saying bricks and walls and this lot of nonsense. It is their building and if the scheme goes on like it is going on and the suggestion made by the hon. Member, who should know better - he represents vested interest as an outstanding and eminent lawyer.....

Mr. MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, do we understand that you represent vested interest?

Mr. SPEAKER:

I wish that the hon. Member would rephrase his words to show that he is addressing the hon. Member for Christ Church West.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

The hon. Member for Christ Church West is one of our eminent lawyers. He is my lawyer for that matter and that speaks for itself. He got in here and said - this is not the Law Courts, this is politics - he got in here and said that the employers should pay benefits immediately, owing to the lack of efficiency on the part of the National Insurance Board and the officers and how it is being administered today. There is something in that, but certainly not every employer could find it convenient and possible to meet that strain. The small employer could not stand up to it. It is a question of strengthening efficiency, bringing up to date the efficiency of the Board and obtaining people to get around these difficulties and adjusting the old thing. That suggestion by the hon. Member for Christ Church West about helping people as such may be all right but you will be throwing too much strain and burden on the small employer who cannot stand it. You cannot expect the employer to collect the money and pay it in to the Fund and see after paying benefits. The Member knows that better than I do. These are all blunders into which he fell.

This Bill is to enable the National Insurance Board to pay its own employers and to refund the Government from the 1st April, 1972. What is wrong with that? The Government has borne the burden all along, and if you have $40 million to $50 million why continue to burden the Government with this amount when the National Insurance Board is now in a position that it does not have to do that anymore, but can establish itself on a proper and viable basis and when they have their own building and their own Minister of National Insurance, Labour etc. and there are offices to prevent the Government renting offices elsewhere, a building that is centrally located for the benefit of the workers of this country right in the heart of Bridgetown. Is anything wrong with that?

If it is going to be suggested that the National Insurance Board must not take care of its own staff and see after paying the wages and salaries of their employees, I do not see it as anything but an unnecessarily drawn out parliamentary sort of debate. The time for reviewing the National Insurance Scheme has not yet come and I will say that in another two or three years, probably after ten years that will be the appropriate time for reviewing the entire scheme. So all of this nonsense that I have heard is just a question of playing politics. It is something like the "no confidence" fiasco that has been going on here for a long time.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak after a long pause to make my reply in this matter which I introduced some time ago. The debate on this Bill is noted more for its emotionalism, which is unfortunate, than for its substance. We have been treated to outbursts and to vituperation in matters of little importance.

I would like to begin, Mr. Speaker, by filling in the blanks purposely left vacant by the Member for Christ Church West when he said that he thought that the history of the National Insurance Scheme should be given. So, these blanks I am very happy to fill in. Early in the 1950s even when Rt. Hon. Errol Barrow was a Member of the Barbados Labour Party.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for St. John.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker. I am terribly sorry. When the Member for St. John, when the Prime Minister of this country was a member of the Barbados Labour Party - again I was wrong. He was a

member of the Barbados Labour Party in his own name. I wish to refer to him by his correct parliamentary title. 12.20 p.m.

When the Hon. Prime Minister was a Member of the Barbados Labour Party early in the 1950's he had been calling on the Barbados Labour Party to accept, even in principle, the idea of a National Insurance Scheme for Barbados. That plea, Mr. Speaker, fell on deaf ears. In the course of time the Hon. Prime Minister and several other persons, some of whom are now Members of this Hon. Chamber, broke with the party and that became part of the policy of the newly formed Democratic Labour Party, and throughout the life of the Democratic Labour Party while it was in the Opposition it had been advocating the establishment of a National Insurance Scheme. That was throughout the life of the Democratic Labour Party. Search the debates of this Chamber and you will see this.

The Barbados Labour Party, clearly to my mind, could not see the wisdom of establishing this scheme until the election year of 1961; in 1961 the then Minister of Social Services - "Social Services" is what I believe it was called at that time; I am not sure, but what is in a name - decided to set up a committee to study a National Insurance Scheme for Barbados; that was in 1961 when the handwriting was on the wall, when the people had indicated not yet by their votes, that they were going to kick them out; that is the Barbados Labour Party. It was then and only then that Freddie Miller decided at that time to have a study made of National Insurance. The rest as given by the Hon. Member for Christ Church West, Mr. Speaker, is correct; but let it be clearly put on record, on the record of this Chamber and of this meeting that the ideas and the whole conception of a National Insurance Scheme for Barbados began with the Members of the Democratic Labour Party. And what better party, Mr. Speaker, should bring the National Insurance Scheme into being but that same party that conceived it?

In 1966 the National Insurance Act was passed and in 1967 the National Insurance Scheme was established. All that, Mr. Speaker, is now history; but I merely, like the hon. Member for Christ Church West, wanted to get the history of this thing clearly understood.

Mr. Speaker, the Bill before this Honourable Chamber is not intended to disestablish the staff of the National Insurance Scheme. It is not. And I go further, I hear Members in their ignorance - I refer particularly to the Member who spoke first after me, the Leader of the Opposition - wondering what is going to happen and how this is now going to operate. This is no precedent in this Government. The Port Department operates like that, Mr. Speaker. The Salaries of the Officers of the Port Department are not a charge on the Consolidated Fund. The salaries of the officers of the Agricultural Credit Bank, Mr. Speaker, are not a charge on the Consolidated Fund. Like the proposals that are here before us the Port Department pays the salaries of its own officers. The Agricultural Credit Bank pays the salaries of its own officers. And what is more, a contribution is made towards the pension into the Treasury towards the pension of its officers. The same applies to the National Housing Corporation, but that is completely

different because this is a national corporation - that is different. The only matter of identity here is that twenty five percent of the salaries of the officers of the National Housing Corporation, is paid into the Treasury towards pension for the officers of the National Housing Corporation.

I am happy, Mr. Speaker, to be able to give a little education on how some aspects of Government operate. I heard mention made in here that the hon. Member for St. Andrew in introducing the Bill at that time, for national insurance in 1966, because he was then the Minister in charge, stated that he would state that not one penny would be taken from the National Insurance Fund in order to pay the salaraies of the staff. Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely correct. That cannot be denied, and nobody wants to deny it; but the hon. Member for St. Andrew never said that this would be the case for all time, because he could not have said it. The Scheme is a Scheme with a built-in provision for periodical review - Actuarial Review - and from time to time statutorily a review of the scheme has to be undertaken. Some such review has already been undertaken by an Actuary, and I made passing reference to this only yesterday. And I go further, Mr. Speaker. This Scheme as I say is for review from time to time. The Actuary makes his own review; the review of which the Hon. Leader was speaking was the Government's review of the Scheme, and in the light of the Actuary's report, that is something else. The Hon. Leader was speaking about how the Government restructured the Scheme; in the light of the Actuary's report, that is another matter. But the Actuary has to make a review from time to time. This is statutory - part of the law of the land. And, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. Member for St. Andrew says that not one cent would be paid, that was for that time, but it was always the intention of the Government that introduced this Scheme. They did not introduce this Scheme and they do not have a clue about how the Scheme was intended to operate. It was always the intention of the Government that the Scheme should carry itself at some point. It would be unreasonable to expect the Scheme to have too much of a liability in its early stages. In its early stages, as the hon. Members know, there were collections without any benefits being paid out. Why was this so, Mr. Speaker? The reason being that the Scheme at that time could not take the burden of paying benefits to those persons who contributed. 12.30 p.m.

In the same way that the Scheme at that time could not take the burden of paying for the officers of the Scheme. The scheme began even before the first contribution was made, so how could you get money to pay unless it came from the Consolidated Fund? It was always the intention of the Government that the scheme which has now proved to be a viable scheme can pay for itself. We have reached the stage, and as the hon. Member for St. Michael South Central said yesterday, he had been querying on several occasions why the Scheme was not paying for its own officers, and we have reached the stage now when the scheme can pay for its own administrative expenses, including the salaries of its officers. This was not undertaken at that time because we did not have the benefit of the Actuarial Report that has now been undertaken, and now that the Actuarial Report has come in we have reached the stage where we can put the responsibility where it rightly belongs, and that is on the scheme.

I heard the hon. Member for Christ Church West say that it is quite proper that the community at large

should bear the administrative expenses of this scheme, and of course it is proper and right and this is exactly what we are doing now. Every single worker in Barbados is by law required to contribute to the scheme; I do not know if the Member for Christ Church West pays his contribution, but every single member who is working whether he is an employee or an employer, as an employed person or self employed, every single member in this country, Mr. Speaker, who is working is by law required to contribute to the scheme, and if that is the case what better interpretation can there be than that the community as a whole should bear this expense, the expense of all those persons who are embraced under the umbrella of the National Insurance Scheme? There are some persons who do not pay taxes because they have not reached the minimum taxable level, could you ask these persons to shoulder this responsibility? I say that they still contribute to the scheme, so therefore the best interpretation here is that as a whole the community should pay for it.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of elucidation, the hon. Member will understand that there are taxpayers who are not contributing to this scheme because many of them are in the high income bracket of investments and making capital gains and are escaping the burdens. That is exactly what I am trying to tell him.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, everybody is entitled to contribute to this scheme as an employed person. So long as you are in employment, so long as you have an income, whether it is as an employed person or as a self-employed person, you have by law to contribute to the scheme.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, Sir, he must not misrepresent to the House what is an Act of Parliament. It is just not true that as long as you have an income, you contribute to the scheme.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is no point of order.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

If he thinks that that is a point of order, he is stupid.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is unparliamentary.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, there are several inputs by the Government into the National Insurance Scheme. It is not only the salaries of officers, Government also pays leave passages for officers, office expenses of the officers, provides an office free of charge, and we are not here proposing to charge National Insurance for any office space. This Bill is not intended to charge National Insurance office space, and they have been occupying premises of the Government for the past seven years rent free, so salaries are not the only input, and Government will still be putting in the cost of office accommodation into the scheme and this will continue, as far as I can see it, for the forseeable future. I say this advisedly, because contrary to what they have been saying on the Other Side, that office building to be known as the National Insurance building will not be the property of National Insurance. These are the many ways they have been trying to mislead this House; this is one of the many ways in which the Leader of the Opposition is trying to mislead the House.

Mr. ADAMS:

Not one of the many ways in which the Leader of the Opposition is trying to mislead the House, if the Minister wants to get an explanation of how you pay for a building and do not own it, he must not say that anybody is trying to mislead the House.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That has always been deemed to be unparliamentary.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, misleading information was given yesterday by Members on that side as to the ownership of that National Insurance building.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The word "misleading" has always been deemed unparliamentary.

Hon. P. M GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw that and I will say that misleading information was given yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition, followed by at least one other Member on that side who spoke about the state of the function of that building.

Mr. ADAMS:
On a point of explanation.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:
I am not sitting for any point of explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER:
The hon. Member is entitled not to give way.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:
Mr. Speaker, I will let him know the facts about that building. As a matter of fact, this has been made known in this Chamber before, but I would not want to say that they chose to forget it/The land on which this building is being erected is the property of the Crown in right of the Government of Barbados. The money is being borrowed from National Insurance funds; the whole country is using National Insurance funds because the funds invested with the commercial banks in this country are used by all who get loans from the banks; so Government is not the only user of National Insurance fund; but what better persons to uses these funds than the Government of Barbados?

Mr. CRAIG:
Sir, if the hon. Member would just...

Mr. SPEAKER:
On what has the hon. Member risen?

Mr. CRAIG:
I am asking the Government to call in its Members.

Mr. SPEAKER:
That is a point of nothingness. Let the hon. Member continue.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That building will be owned by the Government of Barbados, it will be occupied by a number of Departments, and I will give those Departments, which we project at the present time will be housed there. There might be a change, and if there is a change, I do not want to hear hon. Members say anything about it. 12.40 p.m.

At this point of time, it will be occupied by Departments including the Barbados Development Bank, the Labour Department, the National Insurance, and a number of other Departments. At this point of time, and this may be reviewed, it is not proposed to charge the National Insurance any rent for the building. I am using my words carefully. This building is being financed out of the National Insurance reserves and not operating expenses.

Mr. Speaker, there is quite a difference between reserves and operating expenses, if hon. Members do not know that. This, Mr. Speaker, will be financed out of the reserves of the National Insurance. The National Insurance reserves, as have been observed by some Members are in a fairly healthy state. The reserves, according to the September figure, stand at $44 million and not $20 million as we heard yesterday. The reserves of the National Insurance stand at $44 million invested in all the Commercial Banks in this country. Some of it is put on fixed deposits and invested in all the Commercial Banks in this country with varying maturing dates,

Mr. Speaker, I have here on my file the deposits receipts of the National Insurance. The amount is $16,550,000 deposited with the several Commercial Banks in Bridgetown with varying maturing dates starting from the 1st October right down to the 8th September, 1974, because they are 1-year fixed deposits: Barclays Bank maturing on the 1st October, $1 million; First National City Bank maturing on the 11th October, $150,000; Barclays Bank maturing on the 12th October, $200,000; First National City Bank maturing on the 9th October, $50,000 and this goes right down the line. The sum total is $16,550,000.

The sum total invested by Banks as at the end of September is as follows:-

Barclays Bank $5.8 million.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition read out to us a Report as at the 31st December, 1972. I was trying to give him a bit of friendly advice from my seat. I thought it was friendly advice at the time, but it was taken, it appeared to me, offensively that, in fact, it was not the First National City Bank that has the greatest amount of deposits but another Bank. To me, Mr. Speaker, this is a small point, but the way in which that bit of information was used, induces me at this time to let the House know how the money is invested at the end of September: $5.8 million with Barclays Bank; Bank of Nova Scotia $1 million; Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce $2.3 million; Royal Bank of Canada $750,000; The Bank of America $800,000; First National City Bank $5.4 million.....

Mr. MOTTLEY:

On a point of order. I think the hon. Member is reading from a document, and I wonder if he will make it a document of the House, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is his file.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

If he is reading from a document, then he should make it a document of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is no point of order! He is entitled to refer to his file. I have ruled. Let the hon. Member continue.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

I am reading from my file. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, First National City Bank $5.4 million; Chase Manhattan Bank $500,000, making a total of $16,550,000. As I have said before, this is a small point, I tried to indicate this to the hon. Member yesterday.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday I said that I was dealing with the Report to the 31st December. The Minister still is not correct, because he has lumped together the deposits with Barclays, Broad Street, with the deposits with Barclays, Hincks Street, which are in fact, even on those files which he has there, kept separate. He has lumped those two together to get a figure greater than City Bank's. I still am not sure that an additional $500,000 which was deposited at City Bank at a separate time has

matured and therefore that information is correct. Do not mind that. I am reading from a document circulated to the House. I was dealing with the Fund then, and I said that there was $35 million in the Fund and, according to my information, I believe it is over $40 million now. I gave the information that was circulated Hon. P. M. GREAVES I accept that mild correction. I tried to tell the hon. Member yesterday that this was not the case, but he persisted in reading from an ancient document.

Mr. ADAMS:
On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The figures in this document are the same as the figures he has just read out.

Mr. SPEAKER:
That is no point of order!

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:
Mr. Speaker, he is absolutely incorrect; he is now misleading this Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER:
That is unparliamentary. To say that a Member is misleading this Chamber is unparliamentary.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:
I withdraw that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER:
The hon. Member is sufficiently versatile to address himself differently.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:
Mr. Speaker, if a Member says what is not true, it is misleading. 12.50 p.m.

If it is wrong, it is misleading. That is simple.

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order, Sir, I think that this matter should be cleared up once and for all. If the Minister is saying that the figures read out by the Leader of the Opposition are wrong, and he says that they are wrong, they are misleading; and when the Leader of the Opposition says that the figures that he read were figures taken from a document circulated to the House, what the Minister is saying is that the figures which have been circulated to the House are incorrect figures; so somebody is pulling the wool over the eyes of Members of this Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER:

In that context, your point of order is that the word "misleading" is unparliamentary.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

That is not what was said. What was said by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was that the figures that he read were the figures I read out yesterday. I am saying that that is not so, because from figures read out yesterday the hon. Member showed that the First National City Bank had greater deposits than Barclays Bank. Of course I am lumping together all the Barclays figures because it is one Bank. It is Barclays Bank International. Of course I am lumping them altogether but all I am saying is that the figures I am now reading are not the same figures as given by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday. That is what I am saying now. I am saying that they are wrong, and if they are wrong, they are misleading.

Mr. SPEAKER:

You should not do that.

Hon. P. M GREAVES:

What I am saying is, that the figures are, Barclays Bank $5.8 million, Chase Manhattan $5.4 million. These are the figures I read out.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you quite frankly. I know that I am trying hard to respect your wishes that what was done yesterday should not be repeated; but it is difficult for a human being to have sat yesterday and heard the kind of vituperation without being affected and wanting to retaliate in time. I will try very hard to respect your wishes. I know that it is a wish of the Chair and that it was not a ruling of the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER:
No vituperation was allowed yesterday and none will be allowed today.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:
You may interpret it that way. When a person refers to me in terms of ignorance and stupidity as was done yesterday, are you going to say that that was not vituperation? I interpret it as vituperation.

Mr. SPEAKER:
Let the hon. Member continue.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:
I merely state, Mr. Speaker, that his submissions were made with the authority of a Solomon and the credibility of someone who enjoys the highest position in the world. Mr. Speaker, those are my replies to the statements made on this matter.

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

AYES:
Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Dr. the Hon. R. B. C ADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND; Hon. F. G. SMITH and Hon. R. StC. WEEKES-9.

NOES:
Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS; Mr. L. S. CRAIG; Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY; Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; Mr. H. deB. FORDE and Mr. C. L. BOLDEN-6.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair. The House went into Committee on the Bill. Mr. W. R. LOWE took the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed. Clause 2 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

Mrs. G. L, EASTMOND:
I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS:
Mr. Chairman, I am very calm this morning. I appreciate that the Hon. Minister for National Insurance has a case to put and I regret that he should have been so unnerved by the events of yesterday that he has not done himself justice in putting his case. There are one or two small points which I would just make.

The House can only conduct its deliberations upon the basis of the information supplied to it. That is Point No. 1. Point No. 2 is that the House should be conducting its deliberations on a higher level than pettifogging over figures. There is a principle on the one hand and you discuss the principle.

The discussion on principle was interrupted by some minor points because hon. Members will have noted that the Minister has not dealt with any of the points relating to the limitation of the terms of reference of the gentleman whose advice is responsible for Clause 2 which is now before the House. The Minister has not dealt with the point explaining the performance of the National Insurance Scheme and he cannot now deal with it in Committee, and neither can I. He has not dealt with the proposals set out by the Opposition in yesterday's Second Reading speeches. 1.00 p.m.

He has not dealt with the main point made about the building, that it is an unwise investment for the Government or for the National Insurance Board, to put all their eggs into one long-term basket. He has not dealt with any of those points, which you would think, are the points that in introducing a measure such as this and in trying to persuade us that the expenses of the National Insurance Fund should now become a charge. Instead, the only thing the Minister could find to say in direct contradiction of anything that a Member of the Opposition has said is - there are two things and I will deal with them. One is, that the First National City Bank is the major depository of National insurance funds, and the second is, that the National Insurance Board will not be the owner of the building; but these are not the

points to which we are addressing ourselves, Sir. We are addressing attention to the use of the National Insurance Board's money for the building and the wisdom as set out in the Actuary's Report, of investing it all. That is what we are dealing with. I am sure that I never used the word "ownership" yesterday, but what I spoke of was, spending the money on a building.

Now if the money had not been spent on a building perhaps we might even be more ready to support Clause 2. But we are now told that the money is going to be spent, but it is not even going to belong to the National Insurance Board. We cannot go over it again, Sir; we could go over it in the third reading perhaps, but I do not intend to detain the House in third reading. But the cogency of our argument can be seen when it is realized that the National Insurance Board is going to spend 30 per cent of its money on a building and not even own the building; and the Minister cannot tell us what rate of interest they are paying, if they are borrowing the money or what. What rate of interest is being paid to the National Insurance Board?

Now the Minister also said in respect of Clause 2, that it was always the intention of the Government that the National Insurance Board would bear these expenses. I challenge the Minister to find in the debates of 1966 any reference in the speech of the hon. Member to that effect. I challenge the Minister quite solemnly, without vituperation - he says I called him "stupid". I never called him "stupid". I think "stupid" is offensive. Ignorance is a different matter. A man cannot help being stupid but he can often help being ignorant. He can often avoid ignorance by study, by logic, by application and by thought, but it is offensive to tell a man he is stupid because if he is stupid he is stupid, and I do not think it necessary to throw it in his face. So I did not call the Minister "stupid" yesterday. Nevertheless he seems to have absorbed the feeling of stupidity from what was said. I am very sorry if he walks about with a consciousness of stupidity. But I challenge him to find anywhere in the debates of 1966 any statement that can give support to his speech today to the effect that it was always the intention of the Government. The statement made by the then Minister, the hon. Member for St. Andrew, was quite unequivocal - that this would be the Government's contribution; and it is quite separate from the initial expenses, because there was a special talk about initial expenses, and a special vote - I think it was $175,000 - to cover the initial expenses of the Scheme before any contributions began to come in. So the two things must not be confused. The basic expenses were voted once and for all and the Minister said specifically that at the beginning of every financial year the House would be asked to vote a sum for the salaries of the National Insurance. That is in the debate. It is a matter of record and no amount of head-shaking or denial can alter the record. Well, I hear an hon. Member say that he should never have said that.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I haven't heard any hon. Member.

Mr. ADAMS:

Sir, it was an aside. Mr. CHAIRMAN Neither do I hear asides.

Mr. ADAMS:

Well, Sir, I managed to hear it. I am not going to deal with it in any hostile spirit. The point is this. There is perhaps too much optimism about the National Insurance Scheme. The Actuary's Report may have been read by the hon. Member for St. Michael South Central but it has not been absorbed. The Actuary has pointed out very cogently indeed that the amount of benefits will necessarily increase, as necessarily as night follows day, when the pensioners come off the old age pension and come on to the National Insurance Scheme,

Now a point that I did not make - I think I was a little turned aside from serious points by the behaviour of the Minister introducing the Bill, Sir, because this was a point to be made. The Government is going to effect an enormous saving in old age pensions when the National Insurance Scheme comes into full force. What is now spent in old age pensions will be transferred to the National Insurance Scheme, so the Government is seeking to save its contribution - save what is described as its contribution - when in fact every year the Government is going to be making greater and greater saving as a result of the general benefit pattern of the National Insurance Scheme, as the old age pensioners come off the general revenue and go on to National Insurance. I think that the Government is taking a dangerously short-term view of this matter.

Although national insurance will be saving the Government money as time goes on - we did not know until today just how much it is going to save it by way of office accommodation and so on - on which apparently no interest is being paid, but anyhow no doubt the Minister will tell us how much interest is being paid to the National Insurance Fund. The Government is making all these savings but is being greedy at a time of financial crisis and seeking to save still more.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the House should view this as a mistaken piece of piece-meal legislation. It is attractive in the short-term because it saves the revenue $300,000 a year and makes the work of the Estimates Committee, the Chairmanship of which apparently remains in the Attorney Generalship, the supreme political achievement of the hon. Member for St. Michael South Central. He is always reminding us of it. There are very few things he talks about in politics; one is, the surface of Halls' Road and the.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Is that really in Clause 2?

Mr. ADAMS:
No Sir. All right Sir. Another (Asides).....

Hon. F. G. SMITH:
I was born a politician. I was born seeing foolishness where foolishness exists.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
I am listening to the hon. Member who is on his feet.

Mr. ADAMS:
Anyhow I will not bother with Hall's Road and Martindale's Road now, Sir. 1.10 p.m.

The hon. Member for St. Michael South Central is looking at it from the point of view of a Treasury man, an Estimates Committee Chairman man, but that is not the way we have to look at it, we have to look at it with an overall view. The overall view of the increase in expenditure that the National Insurance Scheme is going to have to undergo without any question, as I take it, of increase in pensions that is to be found in the projection of the number of persons receiving benefits now and for 20 years in the future. The Fund seems to have money now, but in 1970 the National Insurance Fund was paying only 476 old age pensions, in 1975 - unless we are lucky to see the end of this present Government - the National Insurance will be paying over 3,500 old age pensions, and the financial position now, will not look like such a good financial position, then. In 1980 it will be paying nearly 6,500 old age pensions, so the Government's scratching away at these short term benefits to the revenue, may in fact be doing a long term mischief to the National Insurance Fund which far from keeping benefits at the present level or within the present framework should, in my submission, be seeking to extend it, so I cannot support the principle of the Bill which is enacted by Clause 2 and by no other clause. We on this side are not supporting the passage of Clause 2.

Hon. P. M GREAVES:
Mr. Chairman, the hon. Member has been given a considerable amount of latitude and I have no doubt that the Chair will grant to me a similar amount of latitude as was given to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

On the first point he raised it is quite true that the hon. Member for St. Andrew when he was the Minister in charge, did not state that there will be a time when the National Insurance will be paying the administrative expenses, and I am referring specifically to the salaries of the officers. As I said earlier, the Minister at that time did not state that it would be the responsibility of Government for all time, and what the Minister could have stated - and which I am sure he must have presumed as any reasonable person would presume and understand it to mean - was that there would come a time when the scheme would have to stand its own expense, because like the Hon. Minister, I happened to be in on the early discussions, as other Members here, before the scheme was in operation, and I know that it was always the intention of the Cabinet that the scheme would have to stand all its expenses. It is quite true what the Actuary says about old age pensioners, but it is also true that the Actuary said that if the level of contributions remains as it is - at this moment I would explain that receipts far exceed expenditure - but the Actuary went on to point out that the position of the National Insurance was no sounder than it ought to be and that if the contributions remained as they are by 1987 expenditure would equate with the income. In other words, the amount of money coming in would be equal to the amount of money going out, and if it continued at that level by 2002 the whole scheme would come to an end, because from 1987 onwards expenditure will then begin to exceed income, and you know what happens to a business when that happens. By 2002 the whole scheme would come to an end provided the contributions remain at the same level.

When one goes around and talks about attaching an additional burden of a health scheme to this, they do not know what they are talking about because they do not understand the operation of the scheme. Mr. Chairman, the Member was right. We are going to increase the benefits under this scheme and these will be announced this week. Cabinet took the decision some time ago, and I showed this on the file last night to the hon. Member for Christ Church and the hon. Member for St. Joseph, so we did not have to wait until this debate to increase it. The release will be made this week as to what those benefits will be, and those additional benefits will be payable as from 7th January, 1974. I am sorry that I did not give it just now, it was slip, there was a little problem here. I took my seat earlier than I should have but I intended letting the Chamber know exactly what the details of this would be. I do not think I can properly give them at this stage but I want it to be known that there will be some changes made from 7th January, 1974 involving maternity and sickness benefits, benefits for self-employed persons and a release on this will be made this week.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I want to say a few words. I was not going to speak on Clause 2 since substantial points have been made by the Leader of the Opposition, but I think that the only point I intended making was that the implication of Clause 2 did show that there had been some review of the scheme.

The Hon. Leader of the House, for whom I have the profoundest respect, in his great enthusiasm today said, I believe, that my speech was misleading, because the time was not right for a review and that it

was not going to happen for 10 years as far as the Cabinet was concerned. The point remains that the end of the Minister's speech, including Clause 2, has shown that a review has been taking place and it bears out my contention on the Second Reading of this Bill that the Government should have come in here and laid its proposals on the Table of the House, because we have found ourselves today, after the Opposition has lodged a barrage for a review of the scheme that the Minister is now going to say that there are some changes to be made. We did not have the benefit of it before the House, we cannot tell them how inadequate they are, but these changes are to be made by Cabinet decree and broadcast in Telling It To The Nation. That is why every time we get in this House, we must really object, and object, strongly. I am sure that if the Minister had asked for your latitude on this point, you would have given him even more latitude and some longitude to take this Committee into his confidence as to these particular proposals. I respect the Hon. Leader of the House. I think he owes me a withdrawal on this point. This bears out my point, I have not been misleading the House, I have been saying that the time is ripe for a review and that the correct way to do it was not to come down, as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition so aptly characterised it, with piece-meal legislation but by comprehensive legislation showing a time schedule to the House. The last words of the Minister have justified every word I have said. I am now satisfied beyond the shadow of a doubt that not only is the credibility of the Leader of the Opposition upheld as the basis of this debate but that the Opposition's intentions in respect of this Act are more than justified, and that the Government does not seem to be able to make a full disclosure. We are sitting down on this because I have not seen a full disclosure made. Is the Government afraid of debate? Do you want us to tell you that you are not adequate? 1.20 p.m.

I will take one further point the Member has made and which the main speaker on our side did not have time to refer to. The Minister said that if he keeps paying out at a particular rate and there is no increase in the contributions in a particular year, this Scheme will come to an end. Mr. Speaker, that is the first principle of Actuarial Science. It is a basic principle. One of the points the Leader of the Opposition has been making is that this is not the time to burden the Fund with a further $300,000 because in 1987, the very year the Minister has been talking about, you are apt to find that you are paying out more than you are getting in,and if you are not careful in your review you will get to the position the Minister forecasts which may well occur without proper management in 2007. That is the point we were making. That is why when we talk about the community at large we do not talk about a restrictive segment of the community.

Mr. Speaker, the Government must understand that there are a lot of people who are neither self-employed nor, indeed, who are employed by any person, who should be contributing to the welfare of this country. The speculators, for instance, who make a lot of money on capital gains by running around buying up land and making $300,000 in a day, should pay part of the burden of running this country. This is why we put it on the Consolidated Fund to use the burden of taxation to redress the balance. (Asides) I am not the Acting Minister of Finance, and I cannot tell them how to levy taxes or how high to go.

Under the Scheme you do not have to pay taxes to be subjected to the Scheme as is thought. You do not have to be a worker or a self-employed person. En passant, let me say that I have from the beginning of this Scheme - the Minister has queried it, and I hope you will allow me this latitude, Sir - not only have I paid for each employee that I employ, but I am one of the self-employed people who contribute on time every time to this Scheme. I just want to make the position clear. It was raised, Sir, and I want it to be quite clear in the Hansard. There can be no doubt about it, Sir.

The other point I want to clarify, Sir, is that it is not everybody who has an income who has to pay under the scheme. I wish it were so. If it were so, I think that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition would not have pursued this point with the vigour with which he has pursued it, and I think he was justified in pursuing it. There are a lot of people with incomes, who have made money out of this country, and who are not bearing the cost of maintaining the poor and the infirm adequately. It is because of this that we are saying that you should let the burden be spread wider than a combination of Clauses 1 and 2 of this Act would have it spread. That is the point we are making.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Sir, what worries me very much in this whole exercise are certain statements made by the Hon. Minister in defence of the arguments put forward by the Opposition yesterday, and he has been spurred on by the "Hon. Road Builder".

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Who is the Hon. Road Builder in this House? I would like to know. There is no hon. Member in this House who is the Hon. Road Builder. If he wants to fight, or if any one of them wants to know how rough I can be - I am not a professional politician, I can walk out and leave this House tomorrow, but if they want to fight, they will get a fight.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

There will be no fight at all.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

He must refer to me in a proper manner. If he is referring to the Minister of Communications and Works, he must do so in the correct manner. I would like to know who is the Hon. Road Builder.

Mr. CRAIG:

Rayside.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:
Is Rayside an Hon. Road Builder in this House?

Mr. BOLDEN:
Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister said that he admits that when the Member for St. Andrew, who was then Minister in charge, introduced the legislation into this House, he omitted to say certain things. He omitted to tell the people that at some future date, the Fund would have to carry its own expenses. These are the things that worry me; these are the things that worry the Members of the Opposition and these, the unsaid things, are the things that are now worrying the man in the street. At the time when that legislation was introduced into this House, it was the duty of the Government to explain things fully. They cannot now put the blame on the hon. Member for St. Andrew at this stage. The Hon. Minister of Communications and Works sat behind there and urged the Minister to say that the Minister at the time did not say these things. He himself said what he would have said if he had been in the Cabinet. I keep saying that the first Attorney General of an Independent Barbados should not operate in that manner. He should not push the blame on particular individuals when he, as a lawyer, knows that Cabinet's responsibility spreads throughout the length and breadth of Government irrespective of whether the Minister was sitting in the Cabinet or not. What is told to the nation, and what is told to this House affect the entire country. You cannot, at this stage, say that a Minister omitted to say something but this is what was said.

Mr. Chairman, neither of them has said, despite the prodding from this side, anything about certain implications which are very vital to this Scheme. If the Government is borrowing the money from the National Insurance Board, What interest rate will the Government pay on that money? The Hon. Minister said that the National Insurance Board will not be paying rent for the use of the building. I do not want it to be said 10 years from now that nobody asked about this matter. I want the Minister to say positively now if the National Insurance Board will ever have to pay rent for the building when it is set up. (Asides) In 10 years' time, you will still be building roads.

Mr. Chairman, the graveyard of the Democratic Labour Party has always been whoever sits down in that seat. These are the things which the people outside want to know. The hon. Member said that he showed us certain Press Releases which were supposed to come out. The Press Releases were supposed to come out, but when did they come out? They were only waiting for ideas to come from this side. We have given you sufficient ideas now, so you can let out the Press Release tomorrow. Tell the people if you are going to increase the funeral benefits which you were paying. You did not show me the figures. Would you like to show me them now? I would read them out for you.

Mr. Chairman, the people want to know whether they are going to get their money earlier, and whether they are going to get increased benefits for funerals. Everything has gone up including the Government's taxation on electricity supplies and inspections 100% and 150%. I wonder whether they are going to increase the funeral benefits to something like $400 or $500. Nobody buries you for less than those figures nowadays. If you are going to take $300,000 to put in a building at this time, then you should let the people know the facts. There is no use coming in here and giving us half of the facts, and coming back here next year and saying.....

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:
On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. 1.30p.m.

Mr. Chairman, there are certain rules set out in the Standing Orders.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
We will have no quarrelling. Absolutely none. Will the hon. Member proceed?

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:
There are certain rules set out on debates in this Chamber.

Mr. MOTTLEY:
Mr. Chairman.....

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:
Mr. Chairman, I wish to draw your attention to Rule 48(1) relating to the functions of Committees on Bills. Section 1 reads-

"A Committee to which a bill is committed shall not discuss the principles of the bill, but only its details."

I think, Sir, that we will make the type of progress to which the hon. Member for Christ Church West referred yesterday within the framework of the Standing Orders. (Aside: Sit down, man.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I am in the Chair. That is no point of order. I must decide and if I decide to give some latitude, I give it. Therefore when any Ministers ask for latitude and I stop them I will stop all. Then we will keep to the letter of the Standing Orders. That I will adhere to. The hon. Member will speak on Clause 2. All latitude given is over.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, if you look at Clause 2, it refers to expenses properly incurred in the administration of this Act under the Regulations. If the Government does not fully disclose to the people of this country what expenses they will apply under this Act, they will have a free hand to spend all the people's money, which is what they are doing now

When we come to Clause 3 I will tell you what is going on with the National Insurance Funds. So answer me when we get to Clause 3.

The question that Clause 2 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:-

AYES:

Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDIE Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. F. G. SMITH; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND and Hon. R. St.C. WEEKES -8.

NOES:

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS; Mr. L. S. CRAIG; Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY; Mr. W. C. B. HINDS Mr. H. deB. FORDE and Mr. C. L. BOLDEN - 6.

Clause 3 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part.

Mrs. EASTMOND:
I beg to second that.

Mr. BOLDEN:
Mr. Chairman, years ago - I do not know if it happens now - little children used to say that if you give me anything and take it back from me, I will set a cat boil for you. If that is so, the people of this country will be setting cat boils for the Government.

Clause 3 says:-

"As soon as practicable after the commencement of this Act there shall be paid out of the National Insurance Fund into the Consolidated Fund an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid out of the Consolidated Fund after the 31st March, 1972 and before such commencement in respect of salaries and allowances to or in respect of persons holding offices on the Board's establishment."

What this is saying is that the Government is asking back the national insurance for the money which they said earlier, they had given to the Board over the years. That is what I was saying just now. Do you know what this means? It has a serious implication. In order to defend Clause 3, they got up and said that the Minister forgot to say something. This is tantamount to giving the people something and coming back and saying give it back to me.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot accept this even if you bring the Act into force. You have the opportunity to come and bring retroactive legislation. Is this not a sign that the Government "is broke"? I would like to hear the Hon. Minister for Communications and Works get up now and defend this and tell us under what principle he can justify calling back for money which they have given away already.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Chairman, over the years, the Government has been juggling around with the Consolidated Fund. However, I am suggesting that things are worse this year than they have ever been. The estimated revenue at Estimates time was $120 million. I am sure that the Acting Minister of Finance will correct me if I have been misinformed on the figures for income tax which he gave in a recent debate in here. 1.40 p.m.

He gave figures for the first six months of the year, I gather, of $23 million income tax receipts. I see that over $23 million - nearly $24 million - was collected in customs duty, which makes a total collection - I see that from documents circulated in the House. Mr. Chairman, I am now giving these figures from documents which can reasonably be taken to be accurate - makes a total of $47 million in revenue from Customs and from Income Tax for the first half of the year. There is an income tax peak in April and another in September, there is no particular customs peak, I gather, although it tends to be higher.....

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. What is the relevance of all this? I do not understand the relevance of income tax receipts and customs receipts to a Bill dealing with National Insurance. I am submitting that.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Since the Third Reading speech, the hon. Member in opening his address spoke relative to the Consolidated Fund. That is one of the things I am waiting to hear about; what has happened with the Consolidated Fund.

Mr. ADAMS:

It is the Consolidated Fund I am talking about, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

You see, on the Third Reading of any Bill.....

Hon. P. M GREAVES:

The Third Reading will come up later on. I am with you, Sir, but I thought perhaps that could probably come up in Third Reading. In Committee, I am not so sure what is the relevance to Clause 3 - the Income Tax and the Customs Tax; I am not quite sure what is the relevance there

Mr. ADAMS:

Sir, I am talking about the Consolidated Fund. The principal components of the Consolidated Fund are income tax and customs duties. I am talking about the Consolidated Fund and I am suggesting to hon. Members that the reason for Clause 3 is because there is a short fell in the Consolidated Fund, and I am just developing my argument very shortly, Sir. I am talking purely about the details of Clause 3 and nothing else. I am not talking even about the principles of National Insurance, and I am going to be very brief.

Now, Sir, the other component of the Consolidated Fund and the projections - I don't even have to go into the other projections - the projections for revenue for this year are $51 million from Customs and Excise Duties and $50 million from taxation; and on the documents circulated to the House there has been a shortfall in revenue. I do not have to go further than that to say that, because half of 51 is 251/2 and half of 50 is 25, and according to what has been circulated, the Customs receipts only came to $23.7 million and the income tax only came to $23 million. Therefore the Government's revenue appears to be down upon the basis of documents circulated and statements made; and I am suggesting that the only reason for the Government seeking to raise the National Insurance Fund as is set out in Clause 3 is based upon the shortfall in the Consolidated Fund. Very simple. I do not think it is a good enough reason. I think this is a way of trying to conceal from the public of Barbados that revenue appears, no matter what may have been said, to be falling.....

Hon. R. St.C. WEEKES:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The hon. Member has been referring to this Government raiding the National Insurance Fund. I can assure you that that is unparliamentary, and I am asking, Sir, that the word "raiding" be withdrawn. No person in this Government is raiding the National Insurance Fund. Mr. Chairman, I repeat, you cannot use the word "raiding". No person in this Government is "raiding" the National Insurance Fund and I am asking that that word be withdrawn.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I think that the hon. Member is completely out of order. The word "raiding" is not unparliamentary.

Hon. R. St.C. WEEKES:

Mr. Chairman, if somebody "raids" your home, would you appreciate it?

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

You are completely out of order, and the hon. Member must take his seat. I have ruled. That is a hypothetical matter that you have raised.

Mr. ADAMS:

Sir, I really had finished my speech but I will just say this. I feel about the raiding of the National Insurance Fund exactly as the hon. Member, who has just sat down would, feel about the raiding of his home. I feel that the money in the National Insurance Fund should be left there. The argument which has been deplored already by many speakers, I submit, applies with even greater force against any retroactive assault upon the National Insurance Fund. We have heard that it is going to be assaulted for some kind of loan apparently interest free - because the Minister cannot speak of the interest rate - to build a building which will not belong to it; it is going to lose the $300,000 a year, the contribution which was solemnly pledged by the former Minister. By 1987, even if the benefits remained at the same level, the Fund would begin to start to lose money, but we have heard that the benefits are going to be increased. We in the Opposition do not believe that the Fund should be tampered with, because we believe in the broadening of the scope of the benefits and the argument about the health scheme and the benefits and so on seems to be misunderstood by the two hon. Members who have taken up the burden of reply. The whole reason why we did not want Clause 2 nor Clause 3 passed is because we want the money to be there to make it possible to have a free health service.

The question that Clause 3 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:-

AYES:

Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. F. G. SMITH; Hon. P. M GREA VES; Dr. the Hon. R. B. Caddie; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. P. G. MORGAN Hon. R. St.C. WEEKES and Mrs. G. L. EASTMDND - 8

NOES:

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS; Mr. L. S. CRAIG; Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY; Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; Mr. H. deB. FORDE and Mr. C. L. BOLDEN - 6. 1.50 p.m.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Mrs. G.L. EASTMOND, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee. Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND, the Bill was read a third time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill do now pass and be cited as the National Insurance and Social Security (Amendment) Act, 1973.

Mrs. EASTMOND:
I beg to second that.

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

AYES:
Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. F. G. SMITH, Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Hon. P. G. MORGAN, Mr. LOWE, Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND and Hon. R. St.C. WEEKES - 9

NOES:
Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Mr. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, Mr. W. C. B. HINDS, Mr. H. deB. FORDE and Mr. C. L. BOLDEN - 6.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 5 be now resumed.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:
I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY:
Mr. Speaker, I think this is carrying this a bit too far, with all respect to the Leader of the House. We have been asked to come here at 12 o'clock, it is now 2 o'clock, and I think we should have some lunch.

I do not think it is fair to ask hon. Members to go on without having lunch.

Mr. SPEAKER:
The comfort and convenience of Members in general, even the Clerks-at-the-Table, would suggest that this is a convenient time to have the House suspended.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER:
This Sitting is now suspended for one hour and will resume at 3 o'clock. 1.55 p.m

On resumption:-

Mr. SPEAKER:
This Sitting is now resumed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Speaker, early I should like to draw to Your Honour's attention the fact that this Sitting is the continuation of the Sitting of yesterday, and when that Sitting began Your Honour will recall that Standing Order No. 6 was suspended, so that the times mentioned in the Standing Order are not relevant as such. The result is, Sir, that normally Your Honour has the prerogative and right to suspend the Sitting at 2 o'clock for the luncheon interval but this did not obtain today.

Mr. SPEAKER:
On what is the hon. Member speaking?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
I am merely saying, Sir, that Standing Order No. 6 has been suspended, that the Sitting is one continuous Sitting and that the opportunity or the right to suspend the Sitting is vested in me as the

Leader of the House. I am trying to lay it lean, Sir, it is within the province of the Leader of the House to suspend the Sitting at lunch time or any time, and that prerogative is not vested in the Speaker as such after the Standing Order No. 6 has been suspended. This is a continuation of the Sitting from yesterday. I do not need to say any more, but for the purposes of the record, I hope we will not see a recurrence of this. It is true that 2 o'clock is the normal time to have lunch, and if Your Honour had merely suggested to me that you felt the suspension should have been taken I would have accommodated Your Honour, but to suspend in the manner you did..... (Mr.

MOTTLEY:
You cannot question the Speaker's actions.) I have been in here for 26 years and I know what I am talking about, you sit down and learn a little.

Mr. SPEAKER:
What was done at five minutes to two was not to question the prerogative of the Leader of the House, it was only meant to cater to the comfort and convenience of Members of the House. I was not aware of the Suspension of Standing Order No. 6, and I am sorry that this misunderstanding has arisen.

When the Sitting was suspended, a motion was moved for the resumption of discussion on Item 5 on the Order Paper under Government Business standing in the name of the Hon. and Learned Minister of Housing, but that motion was not put.

The question that further consideration of Item 5 be now resumed was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

RESUMPTION OF CONSIDERATION OF THE RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT GALL HILL, CHRIST CHURCH

Hon. P. M. Greaves:
Mr. Speaker, when consideration of this Item first came before this Hon. Chamber, the hon. Member for Christ Church West adverted to the fact that there was an omission in the Resolution. I am indeed grateful to the hon. Member for drawing my attention to this, and with your permission and the leave of the House, I should like to move an amendment to the Resolution. I should like to assure hon. Members, and I know in fact that they are all already aware, that due notice has been given of the Order to acquire

this property, both in the Official Gazette and in the daily newspapers as required by the law. With your permission I should like to proceed to move the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER:
Permission is granted.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:
I circulated yesterday what would be the amendment to this Resolution, and I beg to move that immediately after all those words appearing in the Schedule

"FIRSTLY ALL THAT certain piece or parcel of land the property of Gwendolyn Jeffers situate at Gall Hill, in the parish of Christ Church in this Island containing by admeasurement 540 square feet or thereabouts Abutting and Bounding on other lands of Gwendolyn Jeffers, on lands of the National Housing Corporation, on lands of Samuel Drayton being the part of land secondly herein described and on a road 16 feet wide or however else the same may abut and bound." the following words be added

"AND SECONDLY ALL THAT certain piece or parcel of land the property of Samuel Drayton situate at Gall Hill, in the parish of Christ Church in this Island containing by admeasurement 520 square feet or thereabouts Abutting and Bounding on lands of Gwendolyn Jeffers, being the part of land firstly herein described, on lands of the National Housing Corporation, on other lands of the same Samuel Drayton and on a road 16 feet wide or however else the same may abut and bound." 3.05 p.m.

This, Sir, would cure the defect that is obvious in this Resolution.

I beg to move that these words be there added.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN:
Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have the opportunity to second this amendment because, had it not been necessary, I would not have had the opportunity, not being in the Island yesterday, to say thank you to the Government for proposing to acquire these two small parcels of land which will make it possible for a bus service to operate between Gall Hill and Green Hill Drive which is part of the Silver Hill development. This is just another one of the necessary amenities which Government is providing for the

densely populated areas of Gall Hill and Silver Hill. We have already now a co-operative supermarket in a building provided by Government. We have a very beautiful Day Nursery which will shortly be open, I am sure. We have in addition now public telephones and postal services in the area. We hope for some improvement to the playing field area and then, perhaps, a Community Centre, and the Gall Hill and Silver Hill districts will be well served.

There is, however, one aspect of this development which will take place after the lands have been acquired to which I should like to draw attention. It is that within these housing areas, and I am sure that they are not just the two that happen to be in my constituency, we have good roads and straight roads, and some of our people, and not necessarily the youngsters, like to use these roads as speed tracks that you might find at Bushy Park. Needless to say in the housing areas there are a lot of small children playing outside the houses, and it would be quite impossible for anybody to keep those children off these roads. I hope that some means can be found whereby people can be discouraged from using these roads - as speedways. I realise and appreciate that it is very difficult to time cars which are driving through housing areas, but I do sincerely hope that we can devise some means of controlling the speed of vehicles in these areas, otherwise I fear that fatalities must occur when people drive rather recklessly through these densely populated areas. I thank the Government again for proposing to make it possible for this bus service to commence, and I beg to second the amendment to the Resolution

The question that those words be there added to the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Resolution, as amended, do now pass.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:
I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Speaker, this concludes Government Business for today's Sitting. We could, probably take the two or three questions which are here.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER:
It is now Question Time. I am informed that the answers to Questions Nos. 68, 70 and 84 are ready. Question No. 68 asked by the hon. Member for Christ Church West, who is not now in his place.

Mr. ADAMS:
Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Christ Church West has asked me to ask this Question in his name, with the leave of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER:
Leave is granted.

REGULATIONS re TENANTRIES (CONTROL AND DEVELOPMENT) ACT, 1965

Mr. ADAMS:
Mr. Speaker,

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

1. Is the Minister aware that since the coming into force on the 8th day of June, 1965, of the Tenantries (Control and Development) Act, 1965 (1965-34) no regulations have been made under Section 8 of the Act for fixing the rent of any lot or lots in a tenantry or generally for carrying out the purposes of this Act?

2. Will the Minister state whether it is intended to make such regulations? If so, when?

3. Will the Minister state the reasons for the delay in making Regulations under the Act?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:
Mr. Speaker, the answer to Parliamentary Question No. 68 is as follows

No regulations have been made under the Tenantries (Control and Development) Act since its enactment in 1965. However, the Cabinet has recently approved proposals for such regulations which are in the process of being drafted by the Crown Law Officers.

Mr. ADAMS:
Mr. Speaker, Will the Minister answer the third part of the question? It reads Will the Minister state the reasons for the delay in making Regulations under the Act?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:
Mr. Speaker, some time ago I, as Minister of Home Affairs, set up a Committee under the chairmanship of high-ranking Government Officers to make proposals to be drafted into Regulations under the Act. The Committee was not able to put forward any proposals, and the proposals brought before the House are the proposals made by myself and other Officers in the Ministry.

Mr. SPEAKER:
There is a Question No. 70 standing in the name of the Hon. and Learned Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. ADAMS:
Mr. Speaker, To enquire of the Minister of National Insurance

Is the Minister aware that Barbadian seamen who work on British Registered ships are not covered neither by the National Insurance Scheme in Barbados nor by corresponding legislation in Britain; and if, so will the Minister take the earliest possible steps to work out a reciprocal arrangement with the United Kingdom by means of which Barbadian seamen will be covered against accidents occurring at work, whether their ship is registered in Barbados or in the United Kingdom?

Hon. P. M GREAVES:
Mr. Speaker, the answer to Parliamentary Question No. 70 is as follows

Yes, Sir. The National Insurance and Social Security (Classification) (Amendment) Regulations, 1971, were made to permit the National Insurance Board to enter into arrangements with employers for the insurance of Barbadian seamen under the National Insurance Scheme. However, no arrangements with employers have yet been finalised and the matter is being actively pursued.

Mr. ADAMS:
Mr. Speaker, can the Minister say how soon he expects that an arrangement can be made?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:
I am not in a position to say how soon these arrangements will be made. As I have said, we are not asleep on this matter. The Director of National Insurance is now in the United Kingdom. I presume he is there. He is attending some conference in West Africa, and at the end of that conference he will go to the United Kingdom, and this is one of the matters he will be looking into. I cannot say, Mr. Speaker, how soon these arrangements will be made.

Mr. ADAMS:
Is the Minister aware that many Barbadian seamen recruited in Barbados, who have suffered industrial injuries, on the ship on which they work, have not in fact received any compensation? If so, is the Minister prepared to recommend that the Government make some form of ex gratia payment towards these persons some of whom have lost hands or otherwise been crippled and incapacitated from further work on shore as well as at sea?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:
Mr. Speaker, the Minister is not aware of any such injuries to seamen. However, if such matters are drawn to the attention of the Ministry, I will be very happy to have the matters examined carefully.

Mr. ADAMS:
Does the Minister mean by that last answer that the Government is prepared to make a

recommendation of ex gratia payment?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

I can only say that we will have to examine all the circumstanees when we are aware of any such injury. I cannot commit the Government at this moment, but I can assure the hon. Member that the matter will be given sympathetic consideration. If, in the course of that consideration, it appears to the Government that some award should be made, I have every reason to believe that the Government would do so. 3.15 p.m

Mr. SPEAKER:

Question No. 84 standing in the name of the hon. Member for St. George. The hon. Member is not now in his place.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

The hon. Member is not in his place and I will lay the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 84 asked by the hon. Member for St. George.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 1 be the first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I beg to second that

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

Hon. R. StC. WEEKES:

In supporting the amendment to this Resolution...

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. There is something I want to get absolutely clear. The hon. Member for Christ Church North Central - has he finished his speech? This was carefully gone into at the last meeting as to who is the next person to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I recognise the hon. Member for St. Philip South, being on his feet....

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order, this caused a dispute in the Chamber last time when the Member who got up, seconded an amendment and reserved his right to speak. He moved that the Sitting be suspended. I am questioning whether he can sit at this time when the debate is resumed or whether he can speak or whether he loses his right to speak. When we were continuing Private Members' Business at the last time, the hon. Member rose. At this time, what is the position?

Mr. SPEAKER:

As I understand it, the hon. Member for Christ Church North Central, seconded a motion and reserved his right to speak. I recognised the hon. Member for St. Philip South on his feet and in due course I will allow the Member for Christ Church North Central to continue his speech. No precedents of which I am aware bind me in my remarks. Let the hon. Member continue.

Hon. R. StC. WEEKES:

Mr. Speaker, in supporting the amendment to this Resolution before this House, I do so with a full sense of responsibility, not only as a Member of this House, but also as a Member of the ruling Party which has been given a mandate by the people of this country to run its affairs for three consecutive terms.

Mr. Speaker, you will remember that when the election was held in the year 1971, the people of this country gave the Democratic Labour Party, 18 seats and they gave us the power to run this Government. The Opposition, Sir, was given 6 seats. This proves, Mr. Speaker, that the people at that election rejected the Opposition and it proves beyond a shadow of a doubt the confidence that the people of this country had reposed in this Government. (ASIDE: Do your thing.)

Mr. SPEAKER:
Let the hon. Member for St. James stop interrupting or the Rules of this House will be enforced.

Hon. R. StC. WEEKES:
Mr. Speaker, I am indeed happy to be a Member of this Government and to speak on this amendment; but, Sir, I should like to reply to a query which...

Mr. BOLDEN:
On a point of order, Sir, I would like to refer...

Mr. SPEAKER:
Let the hon. Member for St. Philip South take his seat.

Mr. BOLDEN:
I would like to refer to Standing Order No. 28(1) which says

"A Member may not read his speech, but he may read extracts from books or papers other than newspapers in support of his argument, and may refresh his memory by reference to notes."

Mr. SPEAKER:
The hon. Member is quite entitled to refresh his memory. I do not regard the hon. Member as reading his speech.

Hon. R. StC. WEEKES:
Mr. Speaker, thank you. It does seem to me that there is a question in the.minds of the Opposition which has been worrying them all the time. This question has been answered by the hon. Member for St. Michael South Central not so long ago, but I would like to add something to it, and I am saying this that the Prime Minister having gone on leave at this particular time proves the confidence the Prime Minister has in the Members of his Government. It also proves, Sir, that no man is indispensable. The Prime

Minister in going on leave is proving to the electors of this country that he has eminent people, qualified and efficient Members to run the affairs of this Government. If he for one moment did not have confidence in the ability of his Cabinet, he would not have gone on leave.

When you look, Sir, in the Caribbean and even think about Trinidad and Tobago, Dr Williams seems not to be in a position to leave his country, and therefore, it is not only a credit to the Prime Minister for being able to leave at this particular time, but it is also a credit to the Members of his Cabinet and to his Government and to the people of this country of Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, it does seem to me that the Opposition would like to create panic in the minds of the inhabitants of this country by giving the impression that when the Prime Minister goes on leave this Government cannot function; but let us assume that something happens, which we would never like to see happen to the Prime Minister, is the Opposition so silly as to think that with the qualities and ability of such eminent men, who sit on the front bench of this House and who are Members of this Government that they would not be able to carry on the Government? When we see, when you consider the ability of these men, Mr. Speaker, I am saying that we can carry on efficiently without the presence of the Prime Minister. 3.25 p.m

Let us deal with some of the subjects which the Opposition has spoken about and we will see

Sir, that nonsensical method of approach which they have made in bringing this Resolution to this House. They have been dealing with inflation and the shortage of food in this country. Mr. Speaker, throughout the world, there is the problem of inflation and the problem of a shortage of food. Inflation is a problem which the Leader of the Opposition and his satelites cannot solve.

Mr. Speaker, we read daily of various conferences being held by the experts in this world and they cannot find a solution to the problem of inflation. I can tell you this, Sir; we import something today for $1 and in the next shipment, it costs $1.25. Can hon. Members in the Opposition solve that problem? I say no. Mr. Speaker, to put the record straight and to give an idea of the service which this Government has rendered, I should take you back to the inception of this Government when we were given the mandate to run this country. Mr. Speaker, in those days, there were several thousand people who were unemployed in this country. Since this Government came into power, we introduced through the initiative of the Prime Minister supported by his Cabinet, a crash programme; a crash programme was introduced into this Island and, Mr. Speaker, I am in a position to tell you that thousands of people were employed. Mr. Speaker, this crash programme created employment for thousands of workers in this Island. It is true that you, at that time, were not in this -Island but I must tell you that many workers who

could not afford to have a piece of ham at Christmas, they could purchase hams for themselves and their families. It was the first time in the history of this country, and I make no apology for it, that I can state with confidence that the average poor man in this country had the opportunity of having ham at Christmas for himself and his family.

Mr. Speaker, before that was done, it was not possible for a poor worker to purchase one pound of ham at Christmas. Today those very workers can purchase ham reguarly for themselves and their families. Is this the Government that the Opposition and their satelites are calling on to resign? Mr. Speaker, throughout this world, people are dying from starvation and those who had the opportunity to read the newspapers daily - not only the Advocate-News - must come to the conclusion that we in this Island are in a fortunate position.

Now let us deal with the shortage of rice, Mr. Speaker. I will say that every Island in the Caribbean with the exception of Guyana, which grows rice, has that problem. In Trinidad there is a shortage of rice, and not only rice, there is a shortage of other commodities. Mr. Speaker, in Jamaica there is a shortage of rice and other commodities, and I must say this, Sir, when you read of the number of people dying in Africa and especially in Ethiopia, we must come to the conclusion that we are in a very happy position. Any country which has to depend on other countries for its food must at some time find itself in trouble.

Mr. Speaker, you will remember that I told you and I told this Honourable House that I will go back from the inception of this Government, and Sir, I have statistics here which I know the public would be very interested in and will be glad to hear. 3.35 p.m.

I shall now quote only the figures for Tourism. Mr. Speaker, these are some figures for Tourism which prove beyond the shadow of a doubt what this Government has done; this Government has not got to be ashamed of its record. In 1962 there were 44,258 visitors to this Island and the amount of money spent by these visitors was $18.9 million; in 1963 there were 50,627 visitors and the amount spent was $20.3 million; in 1964 there were 57,625 people and the amount spent was $23.9 million; in 1965 68,418 people visited and the amount spent was $26.1 million; in 1966 79,104 people, $29.1 million spent; in 1968, 115,697 people, $53.9 million spent; in 1969, 134,303 people visited this Island, $56.8 million spent; in 1970, 156,417 visitors, $63 million spent; in 1971, 189,075 people.....

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order, Sir, I fully understand the difficulty which the hon. Member may be under, but I would like if he is going to give figures to this Hon. House that he gives them correctly and in such a way that poor, simple people like myself would be able to understand and record them. If the Minister of

Tourism has not got guts enough to stand up in here and defend his Ministry, then if he has an agent, let the agent give them correctly.

Mr. SPEAKER:
No point of order.

Hon. R. StC. WEEKES:
Mr. Speaker, you can carry a cow to the pond but you cannot make her drink water. It is quite possible that some of us got what we never anticipated and that is why we become such upstarts.

In 1971, 189,075 people, $66 million spent and in 1972,210,349 visitors, $120 million spent. Mr. Speaker, is this the Government that the Opposition would like to impress on the minds of the people, that should resign. This industry which is of vital importance to the economy of this country employs 4,200 people directly and 14,000 people indirectly. These are the figures for Tourism; you will see, Sir, that we started from $18 million and today we are over 600% increase from the inception of this Government. This Government has also been doing all in its power to satisfy the people, and I shall now deal with some more statistics, and the statistics come from the Ministry which I have the honour to serve as Parliamentary Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I shall deal firstly with street lights. When this Government came to power, there were 20,000 street lights; today we have over 50,000 street lights in this Island. Years ago it was not possible for children and wards to travel by night without their parents and guardians; today if you go through this Island, you will notice that children and wards not only travel by themselves but they take time off to enjoy themselves under these street lights. This, Sir, is the Government that the Opposition would like to resign, but resign for whom? If you want to know about those who have called on us to resign, I shall tell you this. Those of us who read newspapers and have been following even their annual conferences would have noticed that we have not heard one word from the majority of the Members who are representatives in this House; we have not heard one word from them at these conferences. That proves that that Party is not the Party which could even take on the mantle from this Government, and therefore to come here in this House and attempt to insult the people, to attempt to fool the people is just trying to make the people believe that they are capable of running this Government.

Mr. Speaker, when one is landing from overseas one can see the beauty of this country from the air; all those improvements and achievements were done under the auspices of this Government. This Government has been doing everything possible to assist the masses of this country. We get crime occasionally, but without these street lights I am sure that the number of crimes would have increased,

and therefore people of this Island owe an allegience to the Members of this Government, and especially to the Hon. Prime Minister for having brought them out of darkness into light. 3.45 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I shall now deal with the water question in this Island.

Mr. SPEAKER:
You have five more minutes.

Hon. R. StC. WEEKES:
Mr. Speaker, I have been asked to give them the figures on the street lights. I said that before this Government came into power there were 20,000 street lights, and during our term of office the number of street lights has been increased by over 200%.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the Waterworks Department, when this Government took over there were 20,000 service connections and today there are around 53,000. All of these things were done in 12 years.

Mr. Speaker, let us think about the Community College, which the Opposition claimed would not have been of any benefit to the community. I am saying here without any fear of contradiction, and I have to commend the Hon. Minister of Education, that it was a link which was missing in education and the Hon. Minister has found it. The Community College is doing all that it possibly can for the children of this country and, therefore, this Government has nothing to be ashamed of. It has a record which will always stand for posterity to read about and to see the progress that this Island has made under the guidance of the Rt. Hon. Errol Barrow who is the Member for St. John and the Prime Minister of this country. To him we, including myself, the people of Barbados are grateful that we have such an eminent, distinguished, honest, sincere and qualified leader. We know that the knowledge and experience which he will gain at the University as a Lecturer will, in the long run, be of inestimable benefit to the community of Barbados. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPRINGER:
Mr. Speaker, motions of "no confidence" are important bits of strategy in the armour of any Opposition Party. Important must be the thing of these "no confidence motions" as well as the importance of these motions. A motion of "no confidence" is never expected to be voted for by the Government majority. The reason is that Government Parties do not fight to win elections and then give

up the purpose for which they fought.

Secondly, no one could expect a Government, or a Party in power, to do something to condemn itself, so that motions of "no confidence" are not expected to be succesful. The very wording of them especially under the Westminster system of Parliament, tells you that they are not expected to win because for the most part they call on the Prime Minister to resign. If they were expected to win, the success of them would be automatic and the resignation of the Prime Minister would be forthcoming. They must be timed carefully and they must be based on certain premises.

Sir, motions of "no confidence" usually come when there is disunity in the Opposition Party as was experienced in the Reply to the Budget Speech when they had great difficulty in getting a seconder for the reply. Motions of "no confidence" might be expected when the leadership of the Party is in question and his qualities are being examined. We recall just a few months previous to this that the leadership of the Opposition Party was being questioned by the Member for St. Peter. Whether justified or not, it is not for me to say, but his qualities were being questioned.

Any student of politics, or any novitiate for that matter, will understand that when the Leader of the Opposition, who is the Shadow Minister for Finance, was not in his seat to reply to the Budget, one would expect a motion of "no confidence", if for no other reason than to give the Leader of the Opposition an opportunity to reply to the Budget Speech. 3.55 p.m.

Notwithstanding that, it is my opinion that the Deputy Leader did a good job in the circumstances despite what our authors might think. Mr. Lawson Bailey is one of those whose greatest success is a succession of failures, who thinks that he knows all about everything on earth from picking a cricket team, to explaining the actions of Prime Ministers of every country, and who knows after about three visits to New York that President Nixon should be impeached long before Congress has taken action. You get this journalist indulging in purely intellectual snobbery - would be intellectual snobbery - because he has not achieved the status which would give him the right or privilege to question the reply of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

I like to defend people like the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, when they have been subjected to the villification that he has been subjected to by that particular journalist. As a matter of fact in the same manner that motions of "no confidence" consolidate and strengthen and bring Opposition parties together, these motions tend to give Government members and their supporters an opportunity to rally so that it is not all one-sided. It is an oppportunity for the entire country to fully examine the performance of the Government which they have chosen and take a good look at the performance of the Opposition.

Another reason, Mr. Speaker, why the Opposition might bring such a motion is because they might feel that an election is in the offing, and there is no better place to cast your nets, so to speak, to gather your boats, there is no better place to launch an election, whether it be a general election or a bye election, than on the floor of the House. You get national coverage when the media picks it up regardless of how flimsy the reports are and how flimsy the evidence of such an election is,

I would warn hon. Members on both sides that when the Leader of the Opposition says that there is going to be a bye-election in the very near future, I believe in the new year, they should take it somewhat seriously because I have had some experience of his sooth-saying and it might not necessarily be a Member on this side who is going to resign. I say that because I recall that at the very last meeting - I am sorry, that he is not in his place to verify it - at the very last meeting of the Public Accounts Committee before the Elections, when he was telephoning a Member, he turned to me smiling and calling me by my first name, said that at the next meeting we would have a different Chairman of this Committee. I in my innocence felt that he meant that the then Prime Minister was going to lose his seat, and that he would have been Prime Minister, so that the now hon. Member for St. Thomas who was then Chairman would have been Prime Minister and the present Prime Minister would have been, under the Constitution, Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. I can only agree with Macbeth where it is said "No man of woman born can murder me."

As it turned out, the Leader of the Opposition lost his seat, and the Chairmanship of that Committee really changed. Regardless of how cryptic his expressions are, they turn out and I think that Members on both sides should pay some credence to them.

Now, Sir, I was not present to hear the charges made against the Government neither have I been in a position to read them except what little there was in the newspaper; but whenever there is a motion of "no confidence" the charges are basically the same. They might be slightly different, but there is a great similarity in the charges. There is always inflation, mismanagement of public affairs, a high cost of living, and inability to control the Civil Service. These are always the charges. As a matter of fact, if there was such a thing as plagiarism for Parliamentarians I believe that every Leader of the Opposition would be guilty of such an offence, because such charges are basically the same especially in a developing country that has no colonial or inter-colonial policy so that the domestic policy is always the same.

There is nothing in the charges, and the charge that the Treasury is empty is not a new charge. I remember hearing this charge by the Leader of the Opposition as far back as May, 1971. The reason

given that year was far different entirely from the one given now. The reason given that year was that the D.L.P. was going to lose the election and they were spending money like it was going out of fashion so that when they took over, there would be nothing in the Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, if there is money in the Treasury and there is no action taking place, there is also a charge. The charge is that you have money in the Treasury and you are not building schools, you are not spending the money on the people; but there is a charge anyhow whether there is money in or out. However, I think that the charge that money is spent to give benefits to the people is the best charge. That is my approach to it. I am not defending it, I am just giving a reason.

In July, Sir, the sugar crop is already reaped. There is no production taking place, and this is one of our main crops. The greater part of the income tax should be in. Tourism is at the lowest part of the season and so normally there is no great tax flow, not only into the Treasury, but into any business; but the Treasury being as you call it, the caretaker of Government spending, would feel it because it is the main stream into which the various tributaries flow, and if the tributaries are dry, naturally the main stream will be dry. There are charges against the Minister of Trade. 4.05 p.m.

Now I want to say this. Traditions die very hard and in Barbados they seem to die much harder. There is a feeling in Barbados that black people are incapable of running anything in which business or trade, is involved; and the reason is traditional. For all the years, people belonging to one ethnic group have been the traditional controllers of business in this country, and any Minister of Trade who happens to be black, his actions are going to be suspect, whether he is right or whether he is wrong, because the tradition is that black people only know about running a meeting turn and until our people are exposed to the ramifications and intracacies of business and get respect from their own people in business, the traditional controllers will always question the intruders. It does not necessarily mean that every decision made by the Minister of Trade is going to be right but what is going to happen and what has been happening is that every decision he makes is going to be questioned because he does not belong to the ethnic group that has been controlling business in this country. We must realize and appreciate that that is one of the problems in this country.

Fifteen years ago, there were some 50 wholesalers in Roebuck Street with a large percentage belonging to the ethnic group that represents the majority in this House. Today all of them have been squeezed out because they have been regarded as intruders, and until we examine that part, we will never truly appreciate the problems which a Minister of Trade in this ethnic group will have.

There has been a call, a big cry, that the entire construction industry fell apart because of the shortage

of cement. Before there was a shortage we were hearing that there was no construction taking place in the country, but a cut back of 25% created a shortage that even an increase after three months, of 10$ cannot rectify. That shortage alone magnified the type of construction that was taking place in the country.

It has always been said that Barbados is a crisis community. You were hearing a couple weeks ago there was no rice, and again I say thanks to the hon. Member for St. Peter; his cries last Tuesday and the report reaching me is that it is not that there was a shortage of rice but there was a stoppage of the marketing of rice in this country. Whether the reason is because yellow rice was coming in and yellow does not mix with white, we have to hand it to the hon. Member for St. Peter at least for creating some action, that we have been hearing that this body had 50 bags and the other person had 6, and rice was in the Police Station; whether the report was true, at least it does not matter, but at least we are led to believe that there was no shortage but there was a stoppage of marketing.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has called on the Government to resign and call an election. Now I know the hon. Member knows as well as I do, the difficulty and the problems and the expense both physical and monetary that are experienced at an election. Election are not call on the whims or fancies of anybody other than the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister has called two elections and has won both, so there is no guarantee that in calling an election they will win. It may only mean that you have called an election but it would not mean that we would not win again. So the change from one party to another is not as simple as that. It is just a little more complicated.

The news media in Barbados - especially the Advocate-News- the Advocate-News has never been a paper of the masses; when it was locally owned it was a Conservative paper, now it is expatriate owned it is basically an advertising paper. It is not a policy paper; so to criticise it now, the reasons would be different, but it has never been a paper of the masses. I cannot say that it represents either the Government or the Opposition. It is just a paper, and it finds itself in a worse position today because it is hamstrung by expatriate ownership. That is what it is hamstrung by, and this, I believe, can be magnified to some extent by the fact that in recent years some of its best journalists have left and there are very few genuinely qualified journalists at the Advocate-News - and to criticise it now the cause would be the same but the reasons would be different.

The Government Information Service gets its share of criticism. The Government Information Service is what its name says - the Government Information Service. That is what it is. 4.15 p.m.

In 1961 the Government Information Service produced a brochure showing the performance of the

Barbados Labour Party, all that they had done whether it was extending the airport, cutting a ribbon, beating down a school door or paving a road. It stated that the Barbados Labour Party was the Government, but how can you support them? What I feel is this, that the Government Information Officer should be a political appointee, and instead of making it this psuedo-political or civil service organisation, make it what it truly is.

The other two bits of news media. Advertising and the agencies are making it difficult for Rediffusion and CBC-TV to function effectively, because a great percentage has to be creamed off and given to advertising agents and reasonable fees cannot be charged for advertising. It is the type of thing that will put a newspaper out of business, too. The Advocate-News is only fortunate that the business people in Barbados were not wise enough to give the Barbados Daily News their business instead of giving it to the Advocate-News, otherwise the Advocate-News would have gone. That is the type of thing we have in Barbados; advertising promotes news, not the other way round.

Mr. Speaker, there is very little more I can add to what I have already said. There are other things in future debates, that I will say, but basically I would like to tell the Leader of the Opposition that elections in this country are not going to be run by shouting or creating a crisis, Barbadians are not going to run to anybody who they think is going to create problems, they are not that type of people. If you go into the sea and shout for help, they will not come and help you, if somebody next door shouts out, the neighbour is not coming out of his house for fear that somebody does something to him but start talking about prosperity and they will cling to you. When the people need a change, you are not going to have to call on the Government to resign, the people will make that change.

Mr. LOWE:

Mr. Speaker, it really was not my intention to enter into this debate on this motion of "no confidence" but after I heard all the accusations which have been made against the Government of which I have the honour to be a Member, I must also contribute my share to supporting this Party. To begin with, let us study the words "no confidence". "No" means that you do not have and "confidence" shows that the people of Barbados have given it to the Democratic Labour Party. Let us be realistic and look at all the accusations which have been made against the Government. Let us see if they can stand any test.

In 1961 the conditions in Barbados were at such a stage that people were walking about this island hungry and with nothing to do, only waiting on the cane blades to be cut, and it was then that they were able only to pay for the food which they had eaten in the previous year. In 1961 the Democratic Labour Party came about and it was then that the people did what they wanted, it was not a "no confidence" motion in the House of Assembly, it was not shouting on the house tops what the Barbados Labour Party was doing, because the hon. Members in this Chamber would remember that in 1956 the same shouting which is being done from that side today was done by the Democratic Labour Party and the result was

that they went out with six and came in with four, but that is no big thing. My humble opinion is when the Opposition brought in a "no confidence motion" ' against the Democratic Labour Party, the "no confidence motion" was against themselves, they had absolutely no confidence in themselves because when you listened to the arguments made in this Chamber you realised that the House was divided, so there is only one way you can get your house back on and even keel and that is to keep the blame away from you and put it on another source, so you chose the Democratic Labour Party.

In a "no confidence motion" the first thing you must have is the people, because when the people have "no confidence" in a Government you can argue that those people will throw it out, they will not wait on the Leader of the Opposition or indeed on the Leader of the Government. It is the electorate who will choose whom they want to form the Government, and you can spend all the money you have or do whatever you like, it is the people who count, therefore I feel that a Party which has been in power for nearly 13 years and now has 18 seats in the House, against an Opposition with 6, has the backing of the electorate at large. If the margin was 14 - 10 I could see the sense in bringing a "no confidence" motion, but the margin is too great.

When I hear people talk about things being hard and saying that they cannot get food, I only have to remember the year 1937 when you had all the food you could think about in Barbados but you had no money with which to buy it. Think now again about 1958 - I was not a Member of this Chamber then - I was a shopkeeper and fortunately when the people started to rebel because they could not get any money to buy food, I was able to assist by sharing all I possessed with my unfortunate brothers and sisters, and when in 1961, I spoke to them about the conditions they had passed through they decided that Lowe must be returned. In 1971 I was hearing that the Barbados Labour Party had my seat, but I do not know what happened because the people in St. George South did not see it that way. I would like the hon. Member to understand that in 1966 I only beat Mr. Miller by 131 votes. 4.25 p.m.

I beat him by 131 votes. I told my opponent at the last election that I was going to beat him by 100. I know that until the people of St. George decide that he must have a seat he can talk and do whatever he likes. Unless he gets on the right side, he will have no seat in St. George. You can tell him that I said that on the floor of this House. They have used all subterfuges to displace me, but I am not afraid. I will always overcome, and the Democratic Labour Party will also overcome this "no confidence" motion.

I have heard of the rice shortage. Is it the first time that rice was short in Barbados? If the elements fail us and we could not produce sufficient sugar cane in order that the workers may get a better share out of it, are we going to quarrel with the Almighty? Rice will come. There is no crisis. We have breadfruits in this Island, and they remain in the tree for 90 days and then fall to the ground. You have no more, but you will still live. You get potatoes within 16 weeks. Do you believe that they will last for a year? Potatoes are perishable and they cannot last very long.

There are certain things that can happen in commerce that I do not like, but since I am unable to control it I will either have to agree with it, or step out. When it comes to the commercial set up in Barbados, no one can fool me. I know that the shopkeeper must always bear the burning of the shoes, because he is the person who takes the burden of the unfortunate masses on his back without any kind of security. When I get my goods from the merchant, it means that I have to give him security whether I give away my goods or not. When the consumer goes to the little shopkeeper and asks him for credit until the end of the week, he will credit him but he may not see him again.

Let us get back to these accusations. From time immemorial you have heard the Opposition accuse the Government in power of corruption. This is nothing new. This is done all over the world in every Parliament because politics is of such a nature that the other side would like an opportunity to form a Government. Therefore there are many things that you will hear on the political platforms and at public meetings that you must allow to pass through your ears. What I have against several hon. Members is that when we come to Parliament after we have fought the battle on the platforms and the people have decided who must govern them, then I think the fight should cease. You should not try to create confusion after that. I hope that the Leader of the Opposition will always remember that his turn will come, and that the same stone he strikes Bob with may rebound and strike him again.

Mr. Speaker, agriculture in this Island is a sore question. The majority of the land in this Island belongs to a certain ethnic group. (Asides.) I say that the majority of arable land in this Island belongs to a certain ethnic group. It is known that since the Government has introduced the diversification of crops some of its land is used for experimental purposes rather than planting food to feed the people. If the hon. Member had said that since the Government is the biggest land-owner in this Island and that it should lead the way in planting sufficient food in order that we would always have seasonal crops it would have been a different matter. My contention is that when certain conditions were removed, they should not apply. 4.35 p.m

You put all these acres in food and then you will also hear from the Opposition benches - well what is Barbados coming to now? - You will hear that it is dictatorship that I have my own land and the Government is telling me what I must do with it. It cuts both ways. Fortunately for the people, they have a Government which does not go one way and not the other. Once a very few were a privileged few. All of us cannot be educationists. All of us cannot be attorneys-at-law, but there is one thing that we can always argue and that is that each and every one of us has commonsense because in many instances when I hear the foolishness which many intellectuals say and do, I am glad that I am not an intellectual.

I say so sometimes because if there is one thing that I like, it is education. I remember sitting in this Chamber and listening to a debate on the Community College. I supported it then, and you know why; because the whole attitude of the educational system was changing in Barbados so that the agricultural workers' children and the domestic servants' children would have the same opportunity as the privileged few; but then I had to disagree because the Community College was not giving the same equal rights. I am hoping that the Minister of Education at some future date will bring down an amendment to the Bill in respect of schools that have Sixth Forms in favour of the Community College. Then the College will be one for Barbadians of all walks of life.

I am saying, Sir, that this "no confidence" motion is nothing. The Democratic Labour Party from its inception started out on a programme, and it is known that no Government in any part of the world is a perfect Government. It is not for the Members of the Opposition to say that the Government is incompetent. It is the people who have elected the Government, who should say that we no longer need you because you are incompetent to carry on our affairs. With these few remarks, I feel that a "no confidence" motion is just a red herring across the trail, that it is nonsense and that it should be voted against by members.

A pause.

Mr. SPEAKER:
The question is.....

Mr. FORDE:
On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER:
I deliberately hesitated in order to give hon. Members a chance to speak.

Mr. FORDE:
Mr. Speaker, I am addressing the Chair and I will not waste time. I will ask whether having regard to the absence of the Leader of the Opposition.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

I can only deal with the situation as I have it before me. Is the hon. Member speaking on a point of order. (Aside Playing for time. That is the point.)

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, a counter motion was moved in reply to a motion of "no confidence" which was moved by the Leader of the Opposition; but so far I have not heard any of the speakers on the Government side speak in favour of the counter motion. The most that can be said is that the hon. Member for St. Philip South took on the duties of the Minister of Tourism in order to tell the House how much money was generated from tourism and the number of persons who visited the country starting from 1961-62.

It is all well and good to read out figures and leave them hanging in mid air because cold figures, in my opinion, make no difference one way or the other to the man in the street. It is the facts which one can draw from the figures which really tell one whether or not the country is progressing. I do not see why the hon. Member for St. Philip South should be usurping the position of the Minister of Tourism who, I do not believe, would have been the fit gentleman to tell the country what tourism is doing. But neither the Member who spoke nor the Member who did not speak can really justify the figures put forward because what lies behind all the figures is how much of the money generated by tourism finds its way back outside the country, and in order to know that you have to make an analysis of the services that are involved in tourism and ask how many of them are owned by Barbadians or companies registered in Barbados, and that will tell you what tourism is giving to the country as regards the net result of the tourist dollar.

What I will say is that with all the money you heard spoken about this afternoon, you still want to see the effects of that money. When he said that in 1972, $120 million were spent in tourism, is he saying that that was spent in this country? The Government's total expenditure for the year was about $140 million. Is he saying that all the other services of this country have only produced $20 million? If the hon. Member had enough sense to look at the Annual Estimates he would have seen that his figures are incorrect.

Hon. R. St.C. WEEKES:

On a point, Mr. Speaker, when we consider the number of people who are employed in the industry - gardeners, maids, waiters, waitresses, taxi drivers and even managerial staff, you will find out where that money has gone. Therefore the remarks of the hon. Member do not make sense.

Mr. BOLDEN:

I would like Your Honour to rule on what the hon. Member has said because what the hon. Member has said has just shown that he is one of those people who are content to have the tourist dollar which degrades the inhabitants of this country and makes expatriates so much greater than the very people who have put him in here. Why does he not say that the Minister responsible has another scheme marked "Private and Confidential" which is now killing the taxi drivers of this country because the big companies, the expatriates that own hotels in this country have decided to run mini buses and take up tourists and carry them around the country.

Mr. Speaker, let one of them get up and deny that a document was not circulated from the Ministry of Tourism by the very Minister and that it boils down to the little man who buys a taxi on hire purchase to feed his family being outside in the cold because the big hotels and the big companies will be owning all the mini buses going to Seawell and collecting all the passengers and the man in the street would be getting nothing. 4.45 p.m.

Let him deny that. Let him deny that at a meeting recently to which he called the taxi drivers he told them not to take notes, only listen, and when one man asked him if he thought he was a fool he said, "all right, I will share around these here; you can read it here." Let him deny that.

One Member spoke this evening about what a "no confidence" motion is about. A "no confidence" motion in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, is a method of bringing before the eyes of the public the situation in which the country finds itself, and nobody can get up and tell you that because there is a world shortage of this and because there is a crisis in the world, that every country must experience the same situation. The reason for electing a Government is for that Government to take care of the people, and if the Opposition brings a motion of "no confidence", it is a method of putting before the people the facts of the condition of the country.

Another Member, Mr. Speaker, said that in 1961 people were walking about starving and could not pay for the food they ate in the previous year. Sir, that same condition exists today. People are walking about hungry; they cannot get food, so whether you have food to buy or money that you cannot spend, the same condition exists and it can only exist by maladministration by those in power. Audi-will show you why. We have an Agricultural Development Corporation here. Only today by chance I met a member of the Board and he told me that the Board is fighting among itself; it does not know whether it should make money or whether it should lose money. They have not got a clear cut policy because the Government has not told them what is the policy of the Agricultural Development Corporation. Well this is the reason why you have a "no confidence" motion, to tell the public; keep it in firmfocus before the eyes of the public that the Government has set no policy.

If we had a land-use policy in this country, Mr. Speaker, no member of the Board of the Agricultural Development Corporation could complain about food shortage today because the Government would know how much land it needs to grow food. That is why we need a "no confidence" vote.

Take the Ministry of Agriculture - and when I heard one Member over there say that a "no confidence" vote is to bring unity in the ranks of the Opposition because when you listen to speeches from the Opposition you can see that they are not pulling together you can see that they are in disarray. Well, all I have to do, Mr. Speaker, is to throw it up in the air and let it fall back down on the very Member; because I can tell you that the Government itself is in disarray. The Government itself cannot agree among its own Members what is going on in the Government. Listen to the ex-Minister of Agriculture on the Ministry of Trade - "anyone who does such a thing is committing robbery with violence." He was not talking about the Opposition. He was talking about part of his own Government. Like yesterday, Mr. Speaker, when you heard a Member come in here with a long speech on agriculture, about Acts amending, and you understand that that fancy speech is not policy, nor is for production. You hear of Agrarian policy one day and the next day you come back and hear the very Government Member tell you that you cannot sacrifice the farmers of this country upon the alter of a price control system which does not give them a proper living. How can you implement an Agrarian policy when the very Government that talks about an Agrarian policy turns around and I criticises the same system whereby the Agrarian policy must fail, because your have not got I proper marketing facilities; and they are saying that a "no confidence" vote is to put confidence in the Opposition because we have no confidence in ourselves. Those are the factors that the Government must look at on that side and then you will know what is a "no confidence" motion.

Mr. Speaker, I hear the Hon. Minister talking about this elaborate Resolution, that the people have confidence in the Prime Minister in the management of this country from 1961 up to now. Sir, I suggest that the Government should generate employment. How many people have the Government employed from 1961 to 1973? It cannot sit down and say there is a world shortage of employment, because when you took over the Government, you pledged to the people that you shall run the country in such a way that the inhabitants will be happy; but how many children have you got pouring out of schools yearly? How many jobs have you found compared with the number of people who come out of school yearly? Where is your policy? You hear Government speeches day after day in which they say one acre of industrial land can provide more jobs than one acre of agricultural land, and yet still how many acres of agricultural land have you turned into industrial land, and how many jobs have you provided upon that one acre of industrial land? Why is it that every farmer in this country is seeking to get rid of his land? It is because of the Government's policy. That is the basic reason why we bring a "no confidence" motion, to let the people see, to let the people know that the Opposition is keeping watch over the Government and telling them that the Government is not performing according to the pledges it gave at election time.

As the last Member who spoke said, you do not call an election at a whim; you do not call it at the

discretion of the Opposition but when the circumstances are such that the people no longer have any confidence in you; when the people begin to cry out and rebel; at least, if you want to save face, at least if you believe in the stability of your own country, if you admit that you have lost the power to rule, then you will call an election, and the time will come when the people outside will change the Government in power. That is the situation we want to bring before you.

We go again back to the hon. Member for St. Philip South. In order to justify what this Government has done, he said in 1961 there were 20,000 water connection services and today there are 53,000; but all I will have to say to him, Mr. Speaker, is what a man said to me on Sunday about the Government in power. 4.55 p.m.

He said he had a friend who went into Hospital with a head injury and all he called for the nurse, he was told to wait, and during all that time he was growing worse. The hon. Member should understand what he is about before he gets up to speak. It is not always wise to read figures which somebody puts in your hand before you understand them. In 1961 you took over the Barbados Labour Party, but previous to that the Barbados Labour Party took over from somebody else, and many of the people in your ranks were members of that Party.

Hon. R. StC. WEEKES:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. Member has said that I read figures I do not know anything about. I resent that kind of statement and I repeat that some of us have got what we did not expect, and we can carry a cow to the pond but we cannot make it drink water.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I see no point of order.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Some of us got what we did not expect but some of us are so ignorant that we do not understand when people are making us a laughing stock.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That kind of thing is quite uncalled for.

Mr. BOLDEN:

You can send a man to school but you cannot make him learn either. If he would only understand that in 1961, 20,000 services were in operation, but how many were in operation in 1940? For every year that we go forward there must be some sort of progression. In 1973 there is a certain number of services which must be carried forward from 1961; in his own association over there, he has Members who were part of the 1956 association on this side. If he was listening he would have heard the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works say that he was in the Opposition in 1954-55 as a Member of the Barbados Labour Party. Let me put it to him in this way, is it not clear that from 1961 onwards the very people whom we are now asking to come back in agriculture found that the Government which took over power had no policy for feeding the people and therefore they cut up the land in small pieces? If more houses are being built, does it not mean more connections to be made? He said that when people are coming from overseas they can see this beautiful country from the air. That is absolutely true. When you are coming in you are flying a few thousand feet in the air, so you see the landscape. I do not want anybody to think that all you see in a country or that all you know of a country is what you are able to see from a bird's eye view, I want them to come down and go into Nelson Street and New Orleans, or in St. Joseph, and best of all I want that side to ask the Member for St. Andrew why he has been asking so many questions within the last two weeks about the dilapidated state of St. Andrew, a constituency won by the Democratic Labour Party in 1961, controlled by the Democratic Labour, Party, asking when they are going to fix the roads and when are the people going to get water and street lights. When he has done this, then he can go back and get into an aeroplane and have another bird's eye view of the country but not while the people down here are starving and looking for somewhere to live and cannot get water to wash their skins. Your Party is in power and those questions are being asked by one of your Members. That is what I want you to ask and then you will find out why the Opposition has brought a motion of "no confidence" against the Government. You need not worry about the motion because as the Prime Minister said, you have 18 seats and we have six and therefore you are going to win by the vote.

As the hon. Member said, the newspaper in this country is caught between two things, appeasing the Government in power before the Government chases it out and the people who supply it with advertisements. If you know Mr. Thomson, he never sides with the Opposition until there is a certainty that the Government is going to change, but the newspaper has to walk on the line which is favourable to the Government otherwise it will close down, so we do not expect to have full coverage of this debate, but Hansard will prove in another few years whether or not the Opposition was right and that will be our publicity when we can stand up and say I told you so.

Mr. SPRINGER:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, if the hon. Member prophesies so often, at some time he has to be right, you cannot be wrong all the time. Even when the dock stops it is right twice in 24 hours.

Mr. BOLDEN:

We do not expect C.B.C. to give us coverage either because this Parliament and Hansard will record what the Hon. Minister for Communications came in here and said that we want CBC to be the BBC or the New York Times. That is when it suits him and when it suits them, but on another occasion he does not even know what is happening at CBC. We do not expect to have any coverage, but what we are doing we want the people to understand because as you walk about you hear that the Government is doing nothing and that things are bad, you cannot get this or that, and they then ask the question what is the Opposition doing. What can the Opposition do? Unless you dome in Parliament you do not know. When the Ministry of Agriculture unilaterally chopped off the 121/2%....

Hon. R. StC. WEEKES:
Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER:
What is this point of order?

Hon. R. StC. WEEKES:
Mr. Speaker, the Opposition should stop the deficit of £300 million in England.

Mr. SPEAKER:
Let the hon. Member take his seat, no point of order.

Hon. R. StC. WEEKES:
They can take the 331/3% and have an emergency.

Mr. SPEAKER:
Let the hon. Member take his seat. We are having too many fraudulent points of order.

Mr. BOLDEN:
Mr. Speaker, there was a policy in agriculture whereby plantations were required to have 121/2% of their total acreage planted in foodstuffs, but that was changed overnight and before it was changed the yam industry was developed. I say this because when the hon. Member who has just gone outside, rises on so many fraudulent points of order and talks about the rice shortage he would not understand that if

rice is one of the staple commodities and there is a rice shortage the effect of a shortage will not be as seriously felt if there is something to replace it. When you have no agricultural policy to begin with, you cut down the acreage which should be planted in foodstuffs and depend on a single commodity which you do not produce but have to depend on some outside producer and then you find that your outside supplier cannot supply you, that is when the situation becomes critical. 5.05 p.m

This could only be so if you have no correct agricultural policy. I will go further to show why the Opposition must harp on these things. Government has no correct agricultural policy. Mr. Speaker, for 4, 5, or 6 years the farmers in this country have spent a lot of money getting the technique and know-how of growing onions. We have come to this Chamber and asked for a subsidy or some sort of assistance for the farmers. Far from getting a subsidy for the farmers, the Government has put levies on the poor farmers. This year the Government has put a $20 per ton levy on fertilisers. The levy was put on things like insecticides and weedicides. Far from giving assistance, the Government has put additional burdens on the farmers. The Government has created a new land tax system without giving consideration to agricultural land in relation to other land. What is the position now?

After the farmers have spent all of this time working on their and, they have recovered less than the percentage which they should recover on their money to make it a profitable occupation. This year for once, Mr. Speaker, the Committee which left Barbados to negotiate under the agricultural protocol of what is called Carifta insisted on a proper price for Barbadian onions. No price has been agreed upon, but let us look at what has happened . Trinidad, our main buyer of onions, has now decided to give the farmers seeds, fertilisers, pesticides, weedicides and technical knowledge free and is hoping to plant over 1,000 acres of onions. That is what the Trinidad Government is doing.

However, a Minister has moved a Resolution complimenting this Government on what it has been doing over the past few years. Do you understand what that means? More trouble in the camp, Mr. Speaker. Let them wait until December and see what is going to happen. These are the things with which we are concerned. These are the things that we want the people outside to know. We want them to know that the Government is mismanaging this country. The Government is not generating employment, and the people are uneasy about the whole situation. We must record, as a responsible Opposition ready to take over, the displeasure of the people outside who have no voice other than at the street corners. We want the Government to appreciate and realise what we are saying today. It is time to pull up stumps and go home. You have had 11 good years, so go home and sit down, and do not spoil things now for all of us.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, I am speaking on the amendment to the Resolution by the Hon. Minister of Education. I can assure him that it is going to be dealt with in no uncertain terms by Members on this side of the

House. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the Resolution brought by the Leader of the Opposition dealt with no confidence in the Government. It reads

"Be it Resolved that this House has no confidence in Her Majesty's Government in Barbados and calls on the Prime Minister to resign or call an early General Election."

The amendment reads as follows:

That the word "no" appearing immediately before the word "confidence" be deleted,

and the words "full and complete" substituted therefore and all the words immediately following the words "Prime Minister" be deleted and the following words substituted therefor "to continue to work for the economic and social progress of Barbados."

Now, if I wanted to hold up the business of this Honourable House I would probably say to discontinue in his office as Prime Minister and call an early General Election. If there was going to be a battle of tactics in this Chamber that is how I would have approached the matter, but I have no time to waste with a silly amendment by an Hon. Minister.

I think you, Mr. Speaker, after a period of two years, must have been awakened with pleasure to hear the Member for St. George South and the Member for St. Michael South East make an appearance in attempting to make a contribution to something of which they are both rusty. They have no knowledge of what is going on: one of them because of his appointment as Chairman of Committees and he carries out the functions of that office in his way, and I have great admiration for him; the other one, the Member for St. Michael South East, has absolutely no interest in Parliament. I would not venture to say in the people, but I would say in Parliament, and his record of attendance should not even qualify him to have the honour of getting up to address this Chamber, so poor an attendance it has been. His empty speech which has absolutely no content and is lacking in thrust was only made because he is rusty and ignorant of what is going on around him. To use his own words, Sir, "A million words does not worth $100." It means absolutely nothing for him to come to Parliament. That is his own feeling.

With regard to the Member for St. Philip South, I will sympathise with him. I think that all of us in

here are rather sympathetic towards him. He has always been a very good parish-pump politician, and one who works hard among his own people. I believe that if he has to contest another election, he would probably give any party who comes up against him a dusty time. I am aware of that, but I think he is not au fait with what is going on around him 5.15 p.m.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, his speech too I shall only look at in passing. Maybe from the records of this House, our children will only observe all the other speakers today as passing. I am going to deal, however, with the amendment as it stands before us, and that is for the Honourable Prime Minister to continue in his office and work for the well being of the people of this country.

I have heard speeches made on the Resolution tabled by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and I have heard attempted answers; but there is one single charge to which, when we were debating that Resolution, not a single reply was made by them to the charge by our side, and that was the charge of corruption.

We have the Auditor General's Report. That will also go on record. We have charged them with failing to manage the country in the way that we as the watch dogs - that is what we the Opposition Members are for, watch dogs of the people's business. We cannot form a quorum. They can form two quorums at one time in two separate Chambers. We cannot do that, but it is not their fault. I do not blame them for that. People can go to bed tonight and get up tomorrow morning and hear that a Government has changed. You can go to bed tonight with all hopes and aspirations of being a Member of Parliament only to get up tomorrow morning and hear that you have been nosed out. All these things can happen, so when we hear comments on the other side that we only have six, I think that the people of this country can still be thankful for the six that they have. At least for the six that we have.

Let us remove, for argument's sake, the Prime Minister from their ranks for a few days. Let us remove the Trade Union boss from their ranks for a few days. Let us remove the Minister of Communications and Works - people refer to him as Minister of Know-All, but it is his business if he keeps abreast of all the things that are going on around him. Let us do this and you will observe that on the other side, taking a few of them out they would be a helpless bunch of hon. gentlemen, helpless to the point that we have seen in here repeatedly when they have withdrawn themselves from debate even with their numbers. This is a charge that can be laid at the feet of the Government for refusing to carrying out the people's business. This is a charge, that the Government will not form a quorum. Let them deny that. That is a hard fact. With 18 seats, the Government must at all times form a quorum, and even with 11 seats it is the duty of any Government to form a quorum, and not depend on the minority group to form a quorum. If they fail to do that, they are to be charged with failing in their duties. That is a legitimate charge, and nobody can deny that.

I have heard, Sir, what I would refer to as a dog-eared speech by the Minister of Education -flowery language - and I may refer to him Sir, as an accident of circumstances.

Mr. SPEAKER:
What does that mean?

Mr. CRAIG:
If it was not he it would have been me. An accident of circumstances is nothing that I would think unparliamentary.

Mr. SPEAKER:
I regard it as such.

Mr. CRAIG:
If you think it offensive, Sir, I will not argue with the Chair. I shall withdraw it, but surely I could not mean it in any offensive way. Maybe it was taken out of context.

There can be a charge against the Government for the shortage of foodstuffs - I am not dealing with those - a shortage of foodstuffs for the community. There can be a charge against the Government for failing to upgrade old age pensioners so that they will be able to buy some of the food when it is around. That is a charge and a specific charge against the Government, Mr. Speaker.

It is a charge that having a labour force of approximately 103,000 people registered under the National Insurance Scheme only 73,000 of them are paying. It proves conclusively that 26,000 people out of the work force are not working.

There can be a charge from the questions which even the former Minister of Agriculture brought in here against his own Ministry that they have failed to carry out a proper agricultural policy. There can be a charge against the Government for school leavers hunting around Bridgetown and cannot find work. That is a legitimate charge, and it is on these charges that the Leader of the Opposition has come to this

House and brought a motion of "no confidence" against the Government.

I am not here to deal with personalities or as to what disunity there is in our Party. We will solve our problem They have their problems. Let them solve their internal disputes. What we are concerned with is the country at large. What we are concerned with, Mr. Speaker, is that it was the Barbados Labour Party which now forms the Opposition in this country that transformed the entire society in Barbados between the 1940s up to the early 1960s, and during their tenure of office not one single person or organisation could have pointed a finger at them and said that they were a corrupt bunch of politicians and the Leader of the House today who sat with the late Sir Grantley Adams can tell you this, that not one single person could accuse them of being corrupt or could accuse them of not pushing ahead with their economic policy.

I would say, Sir, that the country could not wait; the country did not give us a chance to come through the dark days while being oppressed by the capitalists of the country and by a few bluffs, people who were also attacking this Government with all the finance put at their disposal. Those were the problems we had to fight against while we were transforming the economic, social and cultural aspects of the country. That is what the Party has done. No one can deny that they have a good record.

The Minister of Home Affairs himself said in here - and Hansard will bear me out - that had it not been for the Deep Water Harbour, he would not have known what would have happened to the country's economy. It was the work and the vision of the Barbados Labour Party that caused Seawell International Airport to be built so that today you can hear the boast from the Government side that they are now bringing in 90,000 tourists.

We did not wait to have a Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic. It was formerly known as the Technical Institute. We did not wait until the present Government came into power to have a Teachers' Training College. None of this has the present Government done. What they have done is to warm up cold soup, to change the name of the Technical Institute, add a few things on to it and call it a polytechnic, so that the charges from the other side that we did nothing for the economic growth of this country are false. I am positive that the Leader of this House would not stand up and charge that the Opposition, at the time when he was a Member of that Party, did absolutely nothing; but we have charges against the Government. We Have charges of corruption.

I will say that I do not believe that in any other country of the world would you have a Minister's behaviour like that of the former Minister of Agriculture, and your Prime Minister condoning that behaviour which was under his nose. He did not know about it. If he was in touch with the public as a

whole, he must have known this; but it had to take us five or six months after the election for the Auditor General's Report to come out so that the country could be told that we were speaking the truth.

These are the charges which we can bring against them, and for that reason we have got a motion of "no confidence". I have heard the Minister of Education say that it is not a serious motion. These things do not appear serious to some people at times for their particular purpose. Maybe a censure motion against Your Honour might not be taken seriously. This is a serious matter, and when an Opposition Party can bring a motion of "no confidence" putting charges on the Government which are blatant, we on this side would be failing in our duty if we did not bring a motion of "no confidence". 5.25 p.m

Mr. Speaker, I say this; it is an unfortunate situation for the country to be in a crisis. There is a crisis in this country. I will say this; maybe this side is not militant enough. Note carefully, Sir, militant enough, to capitalize on the crisis, because let me make my position quite clear. Had I been in the driver's seat there would be no Prime Minister at any university, you know! He would be around here to see what is going on. He would have to come back. He could not be so rude as to be in Florida and come in here as he did last Saturday night on Carib West. He would have to come in and remain in. I would have him so busy.

If the Government continues at the rate at which it is going, showing complete contempt for this society, treating them like little children and feel that they can go and put in street lights, put in water, surface a road as they did in St. Joseph on the eve of an election, and do as they like, and think that this is prosperity, well, tell them one of these mornings they will get a rude awakening'. You cannot continue at that rate. Young people need jobs. You only have to go along the streets at 11 o'clock in the day and see the boys playing dominoes and road tennis. You have only to go through the Greenfields and you will see out there where there is poverty under the nose of Parliament, and nothing has been done about it. But you can go into Sunset Crest and you will see the meters - the connections - that the hon. Member for St. Philip South just spoke about. They have the connections, yes, in Sunset Crest, in Pine Gardens and in all the sophisticated areas, but go in the Greenfields or take a strole through some of your own villages in St. Philip, and you will not have the audacity to come to Parliament and talk about progress in 1973.....

Hon. R. StG. WEEKES:

On a point of order, Sir. The hon. Member has mentioned the parish which I have the honour to represent, and I am telling him that there are large numbers of people who have water connections during the time we are in office.....

Mr. SPEAKER:
The hon. Member is quite out of order. Let the hon. Member take his seat. No point of order.

Mr. CRAIG:
Right Sir. These are the charges which we have laid against the Government and we are asking the Government to answer these charges, Sir, and failing to answer these charges they stand condemned in the sight of the Opposition. They also stand condemned in the sight of the electorate. Call the election! That is all we ask of you. You stand condemned because of our charges, if you feel that you are not condemned and if you fail to answer our charges, well then, have an election and let the electorate decide it. I am prepared to face them and I am quite sure you are not afraid of the challenge.

Anybody with 18 seats - and we have heard from the other side so often that they will get 24 next time - can go out there and face the electorate, and you know, Mr. Speaker, that your party is now at its lowest ebb. Now they are squeezed morning, noon and night. They have the Union battling day after day with some of these industries in this country, which we know are paying very low wages, and I challenge the Government to look into the entire situation of the wage structure of some of these industries and bring in a Bill for a minimum pay, or upgrade it; put it that way. Let it be realized that $12 or $14 a week cannot feed anybody. I will go to my grave if I have to go. I have a deep feeling of sympathy for the unfortunate senior citizens of this country who tonight must buy a pint and a gill of rice for 26 cents, and corned beef $1.50 per tin. They have to leave out beef and mutton and orange juice and cheese - those are only stated on paper.

I heard the Chairman of Committees in here talking about when he was a shopkeeper people had food but they did not have money. Well since they have money now, and since you created, according to your argument, an incentive for them to have money, it is your duty, and the duty of the Ministry of Trade which we have set up - you know, we are responsible for the Ministerial status in this country - to help. I hope the teenagers do not feel that this is something you all brought about, you know, because the Minister of Communications and Works would recall that he had referred to the now Government offices at Bay Street used by the Prime Minister and by himself, as Adams Castle, to win an election. I also heard another hon. Member on the other side saying that he would not talk about meters at all, when we spoke about meters on that occasion, because we knew what was our water problem and they went to the public and they crucified us, and the people said 'yes' to them. Now I do not hold it against the people. What I hold as a charge against the Government is this, since we have specific charges against them which they have failed to answer, we feel Sir, that they should resign; and, Sir, on these premises I support my colleague, the Leader of the Oppostion. Sir, I will vote against this amendment. 5.35 p.m

In the field of education, I know my colleague on my left will deal with that in the manner in which it should be dealt with. I have looked at this situation as a citizen of Barbados with a sympathetic feeling

towards the people of Barbados, and like many of them saw that it was an unfortunate mistake when they gave the Government so many seats. Time and history will tell, there is always a tomorrow and the same electorate will make the same Member for St. Michael South East, who has just boasted that he has lots of money, come to them on his bended knees one day, and he will realise that money is not all. When that day comes, the people's interest will be more than money to him.

Mr. Speaker, I believe I have made specific charges against the Government, and I have set about to detail them. I have referred to the old age pensioners who with a very low income are unable to buy whatever there is available. That is mismanagement and lack of interest in the people. When it comes to corruption, I think the Member for St. George South said that this is an old time story, but it was not always an old time story, it is an old time story which has gone against them. Not one of them on the other side can get up and accuse us of being corrupt. I think it was Mr. Cox who was once a Minister in this House who was accused by the then Opposition of stealing a hut, but at the time the late Sir Grantley Adams held an enquiry. We charged the former Minister of Agriculture in here for the mishandling of funds at the Housing Authority to the tune of $1 million and the Prime Minister came in here and stood on his feet and defended him. Do not tell me, Mr. Speaker, that one person can walk around saying that he is honest, as the Minister of Communications and Works said earlier in his speech, that nobody can point a finger at him, but he stands condemned in my sight as being with one who has been corrupt. If you are not a bird of that feather, keep away from that bird.

I sincerely hope that Members on the other side in particular the person with the final right of reply, will answer and prove to this Chamber whether there is any evidence which I have brought against the Government as a specific charge today to prove our case, and that is why we have brought a motion of "no confidence". The motion of "no confidence" is like this - if you, Mr. Speaker, erred in your better judgement and made error after error, a Member of this Assembly can bring a motion of no confidence against you, and this is why we brought this motion of no confidence against the Government, because they have blundered repeatedly and have shown no interest in correcting their errors. As far as they are concerned they are saying that they will get 24 seats next time, but let me warn them that the electorate is a strange set of people. The Minister of Finance was in Parliament for some time, he lost his seat in 1956, but he has now ended up as Prime Minister of Barbados. It was the Member for St. Michael West who lost his seat in 1966 and got it back in 1971, so I will warn the Government in a friendly way and in the interest of the people of Barbados to let them know that there is still a degree of love and interest in their hearts for them. You have to face them in the not too distant future, we are asking you to face them now so that you can stand up and prove your mettle. Unless you do that, the replies coming from the other side have nothing in them to answer us.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that we could have carried on this debate without my further participation. However, I believe your concern is like mind when we have to look at the question of our balance of payments and how far you and I happen to know, it has been lagging. I believe that it is for this reason

and this reason alone that you feel that any attempt by any of us to turn people away from the land which has done so much for us in the past is something that we must characterise as wicked in respect of the person or persons concerned. It is for this reason that I believe that we should approach this matter of the amendment seeking full confidence in the prime Minister and in his Government in this light and we on this side of the House charge that this Government, and more so the Prime Minister, has completely ruptured the economy of this country.

We say that by cultivating amongst the labouring class of people a total abhorrence for agricultural pursuits, and especially so by the notorious "no-cane-blade-May-Day-speech" made by the Hon. Prime Minister at King George V Memorial Park to Trade Unionists gathered there, we are charging that arising out of that speech, the minds of the young people of this country were turned completely away from cutting canes at home, because it is known that it was expressed that he cared not if he ever saw another cane blade growing in this country again. We further charge that as a direct result of that speech this country has witnessed from that day forward an increase in the incidence of malicious burning of sugar cane which further ruptured the economy of this country, and as if unabated, we have witnessed the economy of this country go up in smoke year after year.

Mr. Speaker, we further charge the Government that by abolishing Local Government and failing to offer a substitute to take care of the poor and needy and to look after the care of those people who benefited from the Local Government system which obtained in the past, there are now 643 persons who are left to die by the wayside because there is no hope of relief, there is no Government agency, no officer or department to look after the care of these poor people, 5.45 p.m

Mr. Speaker, it cannot be denied, hence we must charge the Government that they have inculcated the spirit of not living up to one's responsibility. As a matter of fact, we prefer to say that this Government by their actions have taught people to shirk their responsibility, and their financial responsibility particularly, because they were the Members of this Government who advised the tenants in the various housing estates that they should not pay rent. This caused the tenants to believe that they were tenants and landlords at one and the same time.

Mr. Speaker, we charge that this Government through selfishness for the most part and throught a lack of policy, has enacted legislation thereby aiding and abetting in the division of agricultural lands for housing development and other purposes without any regard whatsoever as to what was really good for the nation. The total result of all of this has been that several civil servants, or public servants, who are earning modest salaries along with some others have become rich overnight.

We charge, Mr. Speaker, that this Government has failed consistently whenever the opportunity presented itself to absolve itself from appearing culpable for the spate of corruption in business which now seems to be playing this country. We charge, arising out of the words of the Honourable Prime Minister himself, because it is he who told this Honourable House that he had uncovered some cases where there had been attempts at bribing civil servants through business deals in the City of Bridgetown and elsewhere.

We are saying that, through making it appear as thought he were condoning such ill behaviour, there has been a further spread of the situation and all of this has gone unchecked.

Mr. Speaker, we are to charge that while the rich would never suggest, or the poor and hungry would never suggest, that the Prime Minister should not own an aeroplane, we charge that the Prime Minister should cause the Bank or other institution which handled the transaction of the purchase of the aeroplane to publish for public scrutiny all the transactions connected therewith, bearing well in mind that the public is today very much concerned over the fact that millions of dollars of the National Insurance Funds have been placed in banking institutions in this country. This is causing some concern amongst our people.

Mr. Speaker, we are charging that the Government, bearing in mind that there are still victims of the 1970 flood whose claims have not been satisfied, and that there are public workers and Government concerns yet to be attended, the Prime Minister has not seen it possible up to the present to:

(a) disclose to the public the contribution that was made to him by a member of the Royal Family; and

(b) cause an investigation to be made so that the public would know what was the total sum of the money collected from various sources overseas and otherwise and exactly how it was disbursed, so that we can understand how a number of poor people in this country, who made their claims through the right channel, have not yet had their applications processed.

We charge, Mr. Speaker, that, in the light of the rise in the cost of living and the inability of the poor to bear the same, this Government is unmindful of their commitments to the working-class people and persist in increasing these burdens. That is what you will find this Government doing. You will find higher taxation, higher water rates, there is unemployment, there is a scarcity of food and other essential commodities, and there is near starvation at every turn. This Government has never yet explained,

despite the high cost of living in this country, exactly what it cost us when the Clarke & Tucker strike caused the closing down of the Bridgetown Port. Nobody has been told what the closing of the Bridgetown Port for four or five days has cost this country. Nobody in the Government has taken upon himself to explain to us what effect it has had on our cost of living up to this day.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this Government has a duty to explain to the country all of these things as they occur from time to time. We have to realise that the management of the affairs of this country while they must be reposed in the Members of the present Government, they will not be reposed in the hands of the present Government for all time. They must remember that the day of reckoning will come. The day of reckoning means more to them when it comes to the people who are now oppressed more than anybody else.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are charging the Government with - let us call it in the raw - corruption. Let the Government explain how it is that despite a Fire Officer being sent on two trips to Canada to inspect equipment for Fire Services for use at Seawell Airport, knowing the equipment to be purchased was second-hand equipment, they still brought a Resolution to this house asking us to vote money to buy new equipment. They knew that the equipment was from the year 1957. It was, rejected equipment. The Members of the Government knew that it was second-hand equipment which they had sent the Fire Officer to Canada to inspect on two occasions and it was being purchased from friends. I repeat friends very, very close to the top Members of the Cabinet of this country. 5.55 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, it is in the face of all these that they are talking about self confidence in the Government of a country such as this. What kind of self confidence? It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we have approached a situation where some people, because of a job, are prepared to sell something more than their birthright. Self confidence? I am telling you, Mr. Speaker, that the movers of this Resolution about self-confidence are the people who would tell you today that black is white. They know what I mean.

Mr. Speaker, we challenge the Government to explain how it is that cheques issued by the Government, by departments on behalf of Government, to business-places in the City of Bridgetown and elsewhere for services rendered to the Government have not been honoured. These cheques have not been honoured, and I am not speaking in respect of one cheque, I am speaking in respect of a number of departments of Government from which cheques have been bouncing about in the City of Bridgetown when presented to the banks. (Aside: That is not true.)

You can investigate. Mr. Speaker, I am hearing hon. Members saying that what I have just said is not true. I am not obliged to reply to asides at all. I believe they would like to know that certain persons

have been talking to me so that they will see to it that business is withdrawn from these people because they have been talking out the Government's business.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Before I hear the Minister; you referred to one who held the post of Minister of Home Affairs for some time.

Mr. HINDS:

I never made mention of the words "Home Affairs". If you have the record you will see I never made mention of the words "Home Affairs". Throughout my whole debate I have not made mention of the words "Home Affairs".

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Some people's memories are short, Mr. Speaker, The Member specifically said "a former Minister of Home Affairs" and that is why Mr. Speaker, knowing that I was a Minister of Home Affairs, I spoke about it. I am sorry to take up so much time of the House on this but this is important because I have never in my term of office as Minister of Home Affairs, seen anybody by or on behalf of the owners of Trents Plantation and no one from Trents Plantation ever spoke to me.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I will call upon the Reporter at the Table to provide a transcript of the speech of the hon. Member for St. Peter, from the point where he referred to the Minister who had the charge of the office of Town Planning and dealing with Trents Plantation. That part of the speech of the hon. Member for St. Peter I would like as soon as possible.

Mr. ADAMS:

I am speaking as one who has taken no part in it, but I would respectfully point out to all hon. Members that the Minister of Home Affairs.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member really cannot speak because the Reporter is now charged with producing the transcript of the speech of the hon. Member for St. Peter.

Mr. ADAMS:
While he is writing, I wonder if I could try to pour a little calm.....

Mr. SPEAKER:
But at this stage the Reporter has a duty to Parliament.

Mr. ADAMS:
Sir, I do not think he is the Reporter. I was just going to, say the Minister of Home Affairs was not always a Member of this House, and the aggrieved Minister said it was not he who dealt with Trents Plantation.

Mr. SPEAKER:
The Reporter is Mr. Burke and he will get a transcript of the proceedings - that part of the proceedings for this Hon. Chamber. In the meantime, until the report of that part of the speech of the hon. Member for St. Peter is available, the hon. Member may continue his speech; and according to my. reckoning the hon. Member has just five minutes more to complete his speech.

Mr. HINDS:
All right, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we charge that the Government has so mismanaged the affairs of this country (Asides).....

Mr. SPEAKER:
According to the Clerk-at-the-Table, my ruling is that Standing Order No. 28(10) operates to prevent any hon. Member from making allegations against a Minister in his official capacity without giving prior notice of the proposed reference, That is my ruling, and I shall await the transcript of the proceedings of the Chamber to be precise in ordering the deletion of those words which offend Standing Order No. 28(10). In the meantime the hon. Member for St. Peter can continue speaking five minutes longer. 6.15 p.m.

Mr. HINDS:
Mr. Speaker, you tell me I must proceed and I must do so.

Mr. SPEAKER:
Do not make any further similar references.

Mr. HINDS:
According to what is before you, you do not know what I have said, so I must continue because the Minister who perhaps the cap fits got up and said "if the Member means me".

Mr. SPEAKER:
That will be dealt with in due course.

Mr. HINDS:
However, Sir, the point I have to make about the Government's cheques not being honoured by some City banks.....(Hon.

P. M. GREAVES:
That is a lie.) If people present cheques every now and again and the Civil Servants keep asking them not to carry the cheques to the banks before they tell them to, is that the way to pay people for services rendered? We charge that the Government has so mismanaged the affairs, of this country since 1961, and more so during the past three years, that you find Government pensioners - and I want to hear the Minister say now that this is a lie - but the Government pensioners have to go to the Treasury on three different occasions before they can receive their pensions. You can see ex-policemen, provident fund workers, old age pensioners and all these people paying many visits to the Treasury before they can be paid, and in some cases the Government is in arrears for three or four months. Is it a case where the Government has the money in the Treasury but they are dishing it out so sparingly? Our charge is that they do not have the money, and I have given this House an indication of how this Government is running its affairs.

We have to thank the City merchants who supply Government with these various services for holding on and not running them down for the money, so it means that the business people are running the country. The Minister who is presently Acting Minister of Finance will learn something about finance one day and not all about land. The Acting Minister of Finance will want us to believe that all of these business houses are not running the financial affairs of the country, but it is a case where the Hon. Minister knows that Government has not been able to honour it obligations to those merchants who have placed their orders abroad for various commodities, including rice, for the people of this country, because Government should pay them a subsidy but they cannot because there is not one red cent in the

Treasury to meet their commitments to any of these people. That is the truth of the whole situation, and it is nonsense on the part of any Member of the Government to carry on fooling people all the time.

We further charge that this Government, despite the fact that they claim to be socialists and that they want to get the best for the people of this country, has been in office for almost 13 years and has not yet made any effort to gain Barbadian participation in the ownership of any of these foreign banks registered in Bridgetown. Why can we not see Barclays International (Barbados) Limited with the word "Barbados" representing the Barbadian shareholder ownership?

Mr. SPEAKER:
Your time is up.

Mr. HINDS:
Mr. Speaker, I must come to a close if you tell me so, but here we have a Government which started with a crash programme in 1961. Let all these Ministers explain how they started with a crash programme in 1961 and now the country's economy has crashed by 1973. Let them explain this to the country.

Mr. ADAMS:
There appears to be no other hon. Member who wishes to speak, Sir, and I propose to wind up this motion,

Mr. FORDE:
Mr. Speaker, this "no confidence" motion in the Government has been going on for some time and I have listened with great interest to the argument which has been advanced from the Government side that to move a vote of no confidence in a Government is unnecessary, that there is very little point in it, and one of the reasons for this is that the Government has 18 seats and in any event the outcome of the motion in terms of voting is well known. I should like to restate very clearly what I understand to be the purpose and intent of a "no confidence" motion and what is the right of any Member of this House, and particularly the Opposition, in relation to moving motions of this sort in the House.

From time to time it is right that the Opposition should challenge the policies of a Government and force a debate on national issues in the country and to go completely over the whole range of the Government's policy even although the numbers may be against the Opposition. Mr. Speaker, it is

regrettable that perhaps in the western democracies, particularly those patterned on the Westminster models, it has come to be accepted that party politics mean that regardless of whether you are satisfied at the particular time with the performance of your Government you must vote for its policies. It is correct to say that as a result many people look at the "no confidence" motion as no longer having the significance of toppling the Government. I say this is a tragedy because if political allegiance is going to be so firmly fashioned that sometimes we are going to forget our consciences and our individuality sooner or later the only method outside of a five year resignation for removing Governments would be one of force, and I should like to issue the warning to hon. Members that I think it is still time that people can objectively decide when it is reasonable to criticise even their own Government 6.25 p.m

I have been told from time to time when I speak in this House that politics is not a Sunday School game. I think the distinguished Leader of the House likes to tell me that it is not a legal matter. But I still believe that politics has to be based on a very high plane and a very high note, and there is still some room for critical analysis based on one's honest assessment of the performance of a Government or, indeed, of an Opposition at any time. It is for this reason that I regret, I will put it no higher, some of the complacent statements which have come from the Government side on this motion. In Barbados in 1973 we are only being optimistic and euphemistic if we described the economy as in a state of economic tranquility, as the hon. Member for St. Michael North West puts it in his placatory voice. That is really not a fair assessment of what has happened to the economy for two years at all. What has happened is that this economy has completely slowed down, and the level of economic performance and activity is such that there is a rate of growth not of 1% but of less than 1%, and this has been occurring and even the effects of it started before the election time.

History will record that, regardless of what is the verdict of the people of Christ Church South Central, Senator St. John was correct in his assessment of the economy in 1971. He predicted the economic consequences that we are now experiencing in Barbados. The hon. Member for St. Peter made the point in the last paragraph of his speech, but it is quite true that Government has had to restrict public spending both in the major area that one looks for employment at this time of the year and in the Public Works Department. People are still being laid off. A few have been taken back the last week, and they are being laid off again this week because the Government does not have the funds to provide the push in the economy. Let us face that. It is not enough to say that the Government has performed well for the last 10 years, so if something goes wrong now you do not express your dissatisfaction. Indeed, if I were the Government and I had performed well before and things were going badly, then I would have to say so. I would not have waited until a "no confidence" motion was brought before the House to say so. I would take the country into my confidence and say to the country that these are the bald facts. That is one of the indictments that I make against the Government. There is no point in telling it to the nation with placatory statements all the time making the nation believe that everything is all right when it is not all right. I wish the Government would recognise that they are dealing with a people that have had 300 years of representative Government, but who have a high standard of literacy. We must allow Barbadians to feel that they are part and parcel of the Government, and that we can have candid and critical analysis on the radio. This is where CBC has failed. We should be able to have candid, critical and constructive analysis of Government policy on the radio so that the people will recognise that they

are faced with a serious situation.

Make no mistake about it, it is not the Prime Minister, no matter how outstanding some people may think he is, who will eventually pull us out of the morass. It will, eventually, be all of the people of Barbados who will pull us back to where we should be going. Obviously, I think the Prime Minister needs recharging. I am not one of those who are going to argue that the Prime Minister needs to be here. I do not think he could have made the position any better. If what this motion has proved and his absence has proved, it is that he is no wizard; he is no financial genius as everybody thought. He took up an economy that was at the moment getting to take over stage and he had some very good years. But you get two bad years of sugar, regardless of how little we think of sugar, we get tourism that has grown in numbers but not in real economic input, and you find the economy stagnating because it cannot withstand even the pressure from outside of the region. That is what Senator St. John was saying a long time ago. Nobody had listened to him, but he has told the truth and it should be retold again.

I want to submit that one of the ills and one of the failures of this Government is the failure to push productivity in this country. I am not saying that politics does not mean that there should not be an allegiance between the workers' union and the political party. There was a time when the relationship between the Party to which I belong and the workers' union was a happy one. But I want to warn the Government about one thing. The Government is the Government of all the country and not only of a part of a country. When the elections are over, you have to govern everyone of us, and the Government must learn to sit down and grapple with the mettle of the trade union just as they are too often willing to grapple with the mettle of the employers, or at least some of the employers, but they seem to have a fear of talking to the trade union.

I do not want to misrepresent the position because the hon. Member for St. Michael West is not here, and he himself has been one who has been urging this Government to set up an Economic Council of Workers and Employers. Perhaps if his idea had been taken on that point, one would have seen some progress, but in every segment of the economy today you are having a significant increase in wages and no corresponding increase in productivity and this is part of the problems that occur.

We stayed in this House and voted increases for the Public Service ranging from 40% to, I believe, something like 13% and an average of $25%. We did the same for ourselves earlier this year in Parliament, but I have not seen a corresponding percentage in the increase in productivity. The result is, therefore, that we are paying ourselves more than we are producing. As the Hon. Acting Minister of Finance said in another debate today when dealing with National Insurance, the end result of that is not only a low economic growth, but finally a bankrupt position. That is, I think, one of the cardinal problems facing Barbados - the problem of productivity.

I call on the Government to do their homework in this field. I call on the Government seriously to think of a Productivity Council not only in the Government sector, but in the private sector. I heard earlier in a debate that I was characterised as defending vested interest. That is a political jive that, I believe, the majority of my constituents, the poor people from above the hill and below the hill, not the other sector, have conclusively rebutted by their votes for me so overwhelmingly - 75% in one area in the last election. 6.35 p.m.

It does not really bother me that way; but let me say this: I do not believe that the Government knows how to deal with vested interests. Certainly I think that there are some progressive business men and employers who are as much Bajan as anyone of us and who are concerned with the slowing down of this economy. I am not talking about people who carry a party card and who are going to tell you that in here is dark if you say it is dark, when in fact they know that the lights are on, I am talking about people who are genuine, You can talk to some of these business people and tell them that you want restriction for some time on profits. They understand that sort of language, and tell them that you want the guideline in the interest of us all.

Tell them, Sir, that you have to match the benefits being paid out against productivity oh the whole. That is what I am asking the Government to do and to work out a proper incomes policy, a restriction on rents, if necessary, and on dividens if necessary. If we have to tighten our belts, we all must tighten them together. The Government seems to be afraid to deal with this. I have heard the Prime Minister in introducing a Resolution earlier for an increase of public servants' salaries, say that he has begun an economic policy. What is the economic policy? A massive 40% increase in salaries followed by a spiralling in prices.

It is impossible to say in Barbados today that the increases in prices have all been due to inflationary aspects outside. I do not believe that the Leader of the Opposition has had to pick his argument that there has been no imported inflation; but we ourselves are creating an inflationary position in Barbados whenever we put up incomes without matching it to greater productivity.

If we were the Government, we would not be afraid to deal with the employers on this hand or indeed with the Workers' Union on that. If we were the Government, we would have offered the hon. Member for St. Michael West a seat in the Upper House if he wanted it, to represent the Workers' Union and we would have gone ahead with his idea of the Workers' Council. We are big enough to recognise that this must be done. We would have gone ahead with that.

I have talked to many people who voted for the D.L.P. in my constituency, and many of them have said that if they had the opportunity today they would vote differently. It is only a question of people changing as they see things going; but I do not want to be sidetracked into sheer political talk. I really want to try to outline some of what I think are the fundamental problems here. The Government must look at this aspect of the economy now and do not sit down looking for a deus ex machina to come from outside of the City, or outside of the Island or outside of the Universe to put things right, because it is not there.

I would like to talk about the movement of money. It was well known that we were introducing a Central Bank from last year and one of the natural reactions of anybody who has money, be he conservative or socialist - sometimes I find that it is dyed in the wool socialists who are the biggest conservatives when you start to touch their own pockets - is to have the fear that if you are printing your own effigy, particularly in under-developed countries that immediately there is going to be restriction on the transfer and movement of funds and that their money is going to go down.

There is another reaction, Mr. Speaker, more justified. That is the reaction that if you keep on increasing your price level and if you keep on increasing your wages level and you are not producing enough goods and services to sell to counter balance these increases, that eventually you will be faced with devaluation; and the fear of devaluation has had a lot to do with the flight of capital from Barbados.

Before the summer recess of this House in my constituency I made a speech saying that we had to have confidence in the banking system and the monetary system of Barbados. I calculatedly made that speech because I was aware of the movement of large sums of money, legitimately, outside of the country. It has taken a very long time for the Government to act, and it has acted only by pushing up the interest rates on deposits. That is the only monetary or fiscal policy that it has taken so far. At least if it has taken others it should let the country know. If this was the U.K., if this was India, if it was New Zealand, if it was Ceylon and it affected such an important sector of the economy, the Minister of Finance would have come into the House, and laid a proper paper and debated his policy; but part of the failure of this Government, and one that I get very angry about, is the way in which it believes that it governs by the decree of God, by C.B.C. and by a political monopolisation of the radio instead of coming into Parliament and having proper debates so that they can get some proper ideas and keep moving.

I do not believe that the Minister of Finance - either the substantive Minister or the Acting Minister - has yet grappled with the monetary policy here. Merely raising interest rates, is only one-eighth of the solution of the problems. We should start looking at consumer spending, looking at the controls we might put on consumer spending. I was not making a political speech to gain a few votes. I was

seriously concerned at the fact that we were giving no direction to the remaining capital in Barbados so that the money is being siphoned into consumer durables to keep up the Japanese, to keep up the Germans; that we were doing nothing at all to siphon it into the productive segment of our own economy.

The Government has failed in this respect. When I called for it they said it would be unpalatable politically to do this. If you do not do it, in your mid term, you will not have an opportunity to do it at all next term. That is the point. The trouble with this Government is that the smugness of the 18 votes has got the Government so confused that it believes that the mere numbers are enough to keep fooling the people long enough and sometimes in cynicism we say that Barbadians have themselves to blame. They have themselves to blame to some extent because they gave the Government 18 members so that five of the Government members, including front bench Ministers, can be away. The Prime Minister could go and relax as long as he likes. It does not matter how much we talk about what is wrong, the Government will run the country as they want to. But let history judge this that today in Barbados you are not using the right fiscal and monetary methods to correct the economy. You are going to end with a shortfall again unless you are rescued by higher prices for sugar. You will be budgeting for a deficit and you will have to do what you are doing now, cutting back tremendously on public spending, and regretfully the Government has also had to cut back on its welfare policies. It does not take any genius to see this.

If you look at the sort of Resolutions that are coming to the House, there is no real progressive movement of a Government of 18 that is moving forward and taking the strong decisions that it should take. They do not have the money to do it. The Minister cited statistics to show that there is a cash flow through the Inland Revenue Department, something in the region of $23 million, but he did not tell us what are the outstanding liabilities of the Government.

He tells us that next year in the Current Estimates he is going to produce a balance on accounts and that he is going to have a surplus. How is he going to do it? I want to know these things. When people talk about there being no money in the Treasury it is not a question of going down there and finding a few cents. It is saying that at the moment our revenue is not sufficiently balanced out at the end of the year.

After all the criticisms of Dr. Cummins when he was Minister of Finance, he at least had a careful attitude towards budgeting. He might not have been able to implement economic measures that were as outstanding or vote catching as they could be, but he had a sensible attitude towards it.

Sir, I do not want my speech to be completed without talking a bit about our Caribbean relationships,

because I heard the Member for St. Andrew say that the Opposition was blowing hot and cold in its attitude towards CARIFTA and now the Caribbean Economic Community, 6.45 p.m

First let me say that once again when the West Indian politicians pat themselves on the back for envolving a Common Market - something that is their own - they have really done nothing new, no big thing; so once again they are copying almost verbatim, sections of the European Common Market Treaty and trying to adapt and apply it in the region; it is no big thing as far as I am concerned. The Barbados Labour Party has always taken what I consider to be a progressive attitude towards the West Indies. We feel that part of the economic morass of the Caribbean countries today is due to the fact that Caribbean politicians are not leaders in the true sense of the word, that they are not prepared to direct their people into closer economic and political union; they are not prepared to rationalize the political structures, and as result they are paying more per head per Government for the five million people we have than anywhere else in the world. Look at the figures, that form parts of the problem of the whole region. We would have expected the Barbados Government, as one of these Governments that is squeezed in between - it is a midway Government in the Caribbean, it is not big enough and it is not small enough either; it has to learn to survive in this context - and the Caribbean Policy of the Government should be oriented towards reducing the overheads of Governments in the area, towards having to duplicate services, as the Minister of Education has to try his best, for instance, to honour Barbados' commitments but he knows it is hard because he would have preferred a different set of circumstances, and we say that this Government in its Caribbean Policy is not pursuing that line rapidly enough.

Back in the 19th century, if you read Schomberg you will see that we were a greater exporter of goods and services to the Eastern Caribbean than any of our neighbours Today we are being beaten by Jamaica and Trinidad, and very soon Guyana, in the Eastern Caribbean market - (Asides) - 1 hear sotto voce the hon. Member for St. Michael South Central say that our Government did nothing for industrialization. I have not been around in politics as long as the hon. Member for St. Michael South Central, but he was part and parcel in the 1950's to whatever Governments existed when I was still a school boy, and he is criticising himself, so that is a minor point; but he is also not exactly correct; the impetus towards industrialization started under the Labour Party. I am not going to continue on that, Sir. That debate has gone on in here too long, and charge and counter-charge is not what I am, getting at. Let me teach him something if he does not know it. The Common Market position is this: Barbados today should be trying to get back its situation that it had as an economic exporter of great note in the Eastern Caribbean. However, I am not going to be diverted from the point.

The productivity that I talk about is not coming out of the industrial estates in Barbados and you cannot move towards full employment in Barbados when you do not use the shift system to get more people working right throughout the day and sending our exports to Canada and beyond. That is what I am talking about, about being progressive; if the manufacturers, who are occupying at very low rent the industrial estates, are not doing this, then Government must step into the industrial field. Do not side-trap me into historical argument.

You told the people that we in the Barbados Labour Party had no idea and we had no concepts but I believe that on this side in this House and outside this House we have people with as many ideas and as many good intentions of pushing policy, that would have redounded to the economic good of the country, had we been given the chance. Elections are funny things; they are lost and won in six days. Some elections are won on a bolt of cloth as happens in some areas and some of them are won for various other reasons, but the point remains that any analysis of this country must recognize that I do not believe that the Government is driving the economy enough, because I cannot be satisfied with tying up machinery without orienting our people to recognizing the fact that they have to work.

Mr. Speaker, if this Government ever falls, we intend to look at the Caribbean Common Market in a different light. We intend to use the benefits we can get from the present relationships, but we also intend to quicken the pace of development so that we become, main exporters not only in the Caribbean; we could emulate Hong Kong if necessary, and show a net inflow of money coming in in foreign exchange; and we intend further, to move on again towards a political union that is apparently disliked by that party over there.

It is eventually only a regional and sensible rationalized structure of Government that will save the Caribbean people, otherwise we are going to give way to a few people losing their necks in this country.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Government could do a lot more on saying, in overheads in administration, and I am not going to repeat the whole argument I gave yesterday but I think there is still too much waste in the public sector where we can cut out a lot of the dead wood, we could cut out a lot of the time in decision-making, we can reduce the overheads of administration and have a higher standard of productivity. And do not let the private sector believe that they are getting away with it either. There is a lot of high pricing in certain private sectors without corresponding services being rendered. They, too, should be dealt with.

Again, Mr. Speaker, one point - Land. One of the indictments I make against the Government is that their land policy has failed a long time ago. The estates are not producing enough return on the capital invested, and there is no point labelling them as research stations. That is not good enough. It is too high a price to pay, and again I feel the Government has failed in this sector. I cannot have complete confidence in the Government no matter how much I admire the expertise of the Hon. Minister of Education and his debating skill. At this time in Barbados, I believe that a fair vote, if taken in the country, would show that the country really does not have complete confidence in the Government. It may have had it a year and a half ago but I believe that the Government's fear of grappling with difficult

situations has led to the position where that confidence has, not completely, but certainly, to a substantial amount, been undermined; and regardless of whether the vote goes against us or not, I believe the Government must now recognize that if next year it does not change its tune, only the hon. Member for St. Michael South perhaps - I can't refer to you, Mr. Speaker - might see himself back in here next time.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The relevant part of the speech of the hon. Member for St. Peter has now come to hand - that part of speech to which the hon. Member for St. Michael North West objected, and I order the words from "one charge that was not made out against the Government is that one of the Government Minister," etc., down to the last words "at which point the acting Minister intervened" be expunged from the record as being contrary to Section 28(10) of the Standing Orders. 6.55 p.m.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Sitting be suspended for one hour.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I beg to second that.

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

On Resumption:-

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Sitting is now resumed.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, before the Business of the House is entered upon, I think I am in duty bound to draw to Your Honour's attention an incident which occurred within the precincts of this Honourable House, and which I must say, in my humble opinion constitutes an attack upon me as an elected Member in this Honourable House by no other person than the Deputy Clerk, Mr. J. A. Connell, who is presently sitting at the Table. I have given the matter a lot of thought before bringing it to the attention of this House, but it arose out of my request after the Suspension of the Sitting to see the transcript which Your Honour had from the Reporter and which was then at the Clerk's Table. I turned to the Deputy Clerk and asked him to show me the transcript; his action, I must say, was not an action that one could have expected of a Deputy Clerk to any hon. Member of this House. It was most uninviting, but however, I wanted to see the transcript itself and I suffered that bit of indignity at the hands of the Deputy Clerk. After reading the transcript, I turned to the Deputy Clerk, Mr. Connell and asked him these words "Did you advise the Speaker on this?" He made no reply. I said "However, I will not argue with you, I am not looking for a job." When I said that to the Deputy Clerk, there was not another person anywhere who would have heard anything, but I went on. I turned away from the Clerk's Table and I was followed by the Deputy Clerk to the banquet hall, and it was in the banquet hall,..... after the Deputy Clerk had been raising his voice to its extent throughout the building, and I propose, Mr. Speaker, whatever happens in this matter, to prepare an affidavit to place before the Debates Commiteee, the employers of Mr. Connell, the Deputy Clerk, and whatever decision is taken, I will be satisfied.

I am going to prepare an affidavit for that purpose as to exactly what was said, but this is where I must invite Your Honor's attention. It was in the banquet hall when the Deputy Clerk's actions constituted an assault on my person, and I had to walk away as quickly as I could from the banquet hall to save further embarrassment arising out of a situation such as this. Mr. Speaker, whatever is said or whatever is done, I do not expect any support whatsoever from anybody on that side, I am not looking for it, it is not going to happen to them. The Deputy Clerk, in question has got to realise, never mind he might hold the party card of the Democratic Labour Party, that he is a servant of this House and he has to know : that all of us are elected Members and he is a servant of this Hon. House. I do not mind who as a journalist might be his lawyer, he has got to learn and understand...

Mr. SPEAKER:

Mike your point succinctly if you are complaining that one of your privileges has been encroached upon.

Mr. HINDS:

I am saying that if the Deputy Clerk felt annoyed at anything I might have said - and I said nothing more than that I was not arguing with him and that I was not looking for a job...

Mr. SPEAKER:

You are complaining of what you deem to be an assault on your person in the banquet hall. Please make your point succinctly; that is all.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I realize your anxiety on this matter but I feel that I cannot sit without making it abundantly clear that the Deputy Clerk must understand, whether he is a lawyer, barrister or whatever, he has come here to apply for a job, he has got it and he is our servant while he is here, and he has got to learn to treat all hon. Members in here as elected Members of this Honourable House. This is the beginning of the incident.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member has raised a most unfortunate matter, the gravamen of which appears to be what has been an alleged assault on his person in the dining hall. I do not know what transpired and I cannot judge. It is the privilege of all hon. Members within the precincts of this House when the House is sitting to be free from molestations, and it is not clear to me whether an assault was committed or otherwise. That is a matter of privilege, an attack on the person of the hon. Member. The hon. Member has made out a prima facie case of a breach of privilege and I will direct that the matter be sent to the Select Committee on the Privileges of this Chamber for a full investigation and that they report as expeditiously as possible to this Hon. Chamber.

When the Sitting was suspended debate was continuing on...

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I just would like to be certain that you have given careful attention to this. I am not sure which Standing Order we are working under, but I just wonder if there would have to be a motion that the matter be referred to the Committee of Privileges, and I am looking at Standing Order No. 76 Rule 3, and I wonder if in fact the Member who is complaining would not have to make a motion to the effect that the matter be referred to the Committee of Privileges. I am just referring this rule to Your Honour's attention.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Standing Order 76(4) states "There shall be no debate on a motion under paragraph 3 thereof, but if the Speaker decides that a prima facie case has been made out, he shall rule accordingly and refer the matter to the Committee of Privileges." My reference to this matter to the Committed of Privileges was made under Standing Order 76(4); 76(3) would appear to me to be an alternative manner of dealing with

what has arisen as a matter of privilege.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, you have already given your ruling and went on to state that Item No. 1 under Private Members' Business should be continued.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Just let me dispose of this, will you? My own interpretation of Standing Order 76(4) is that the Speaker does have the power to decide that a prima facie case has been made out, and according to what the hon. Member for St. Peter has said, a prima facie case has been made out and therefore I can send the matter to the Select Committee without a motion being made. If I was not so satisfied then I could entertain a motion on the matter, but the matter is now in the hands of the Committee of Privileges for a full investigation of what transpired. 8.10 p.m

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let us revert to Item 1 under Private Members' Business.

RESUMPTION OF CONSIDERATION OF THE

RESOLUTION RE NO CONFIDENCE

IN THE GOVERNMENT

Hon. P. G. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, after several hours of debate over a number of days, it seems to me that this Resolution...

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Let us get this straight. I am quite anxious to hear from the hon. Member, but things have to be done in a proper way. Am I right or wrong in saying that on a previous occasion it was ruled that the next speaker would be the hon. Member for Christ Church North Central immediately after the hon. Member for St. Michael South? On the last occasion that this came up this point was canvassed extensively that once you reserve the right to speak you can take no further part. You reserve the right to speak and you sit down. You either move for a postponement, or you can reserve the right to speak, but once you reserve the right to speak and then go on to move for a postponement that is the beginning of the speech. It is the Leader of the House who said that the hon. Member for Christ Church North Central would speak first next time the matter was dealt with. I have a very clear memory of that.

Mr. SPEAKER:

My ruling on this matter is that the hon. Member for Christ Church North Central has not lost his right to speak, and he may now continue.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, it does my ego good that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is concerned that I should have the right to speak. I really had not thought that I was...

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, I want the hon. Member to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is no point of order!

Hon. P. G. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, at this rate my 30 minutes will be up before I can say anything. It seems to me that, over a number of hours over a number of days, the principal fact which has emerged from this debate is whether or not the factors which have retarded the economic progress of this country to the extent that we have not progressed as rapidly in the past two years as we have in previous years and as we would all have wished. Whether those factors are principally external factors over which the Government of Barbados has no control, or whether, as the Opposition charges, those factors are primarily internal factors over which the Government would have some control, they will have to be taken into consideration. It seems to me that the factors are these the very rapid and seemingly endless rise in prices. If one is to believe what happens elsewhere, and a number of us travel, this is something which is not special to Barbados, It is not something which is exclusive to the Caribbean; it is something which is

almost world wide. Prices go up and up with incomes constantly and regularly chasing them and causing inevitable inflation. This is not something which is solely and specially for Barbados; it is not something which is principally for the Caribbean area; it is something which is a world wide problem and with which even the biggest and most developed countries in the world are wrestling constantly.

The next factor, it would seem to be is whether or not there is a shortage of world food, or whether or not crops have failed. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition told us in no uncertain words that there is no world shortage of food despite famines in various parts of the world, and yet we read in yesterday's Advocate-News, as reported by Reuters, from the Food and Agricultural Organisation Meeting in Rome that an International Expert, a Japanese gentleman, has advised the Food and Agricultural Organisation Meeting in Rome that it may be necessary world wide to institute rationing in both developed countries and underdeveloped countries. (Asides.) That was said because there is a shortage of food. I am not able to say whether or not it is true, and I am only reporting what I have read from the newspaper. I think than an International Expert is more likely to be correct than the Hon. Leader of the Opposition with all due respect, Sir. The third point is the question of interest rates.

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Member is trying to say something, and half-way through - a typical lawyer's trick...

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is no point of order!

Mr. BOLDEN:

What the expert said was that you have to ration the developed countries so that they do not have too much at their tables and waste it so that other countries cannot get any.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is no point of order! The hon. Member is out of order.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, I suppose I should be flattered for using a typical lawyer's trick, but I am not particularly pleased if that is what I am supposed to be using, I would move on to interest rates. Interest rates world wide are at hitherto unknown heights. Even today in the newspapers it has gone up again in London.

Now 13%, 14%, 15% whether it is Government, private individuals or companies, it is definitely a deterrent to any investment at this time. It cannot help but be. Anybody thinking of building a house at this time and having to borrow money, if he has to borrow it at that price he will wait and hope that the interest rates will come down.

There is also another threat which, again, I am sure, is going to be laid at our door as being the fault of the Government if it deters and holds back development. It is, of course, the threat of the shortage of petroleum products in the world. It has not yet reached us. I suppose it will have to come. It depends on how long before the Middle Eastern countries resolve their problems with the rest of the world, but this is hardly anything that we can do something about and we may have to live with it. I hope not. If it happens that we must have petrol rationing, or any other kind of fuel rationing, it will not be solely Barbados that will be rationing. It will not be solely the Caribbean area that will be rationing, but it will be almost a world wide thing, except for those petrol-producing countries themselves. It is in these circumstances that the present development in Barbados has been retarded further than any of us would have wished, but at the same time that is not to say that progress has not been made.

Very soon the Government's Development Programme will be published and will give in detail the plans for development in the next few years. Let us look at some of them as they are already known. We have Airport Development. Now the Airport development and a loan of $10 million (Canadian) from the Canadian Government injected into the economy of Barbados, exactly as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition said the other day, it is equally important to build hotel rooms as it is to fill them so it is equally important to construct airports as it is to have them service the aeroplanes. $10 million (Canadian) is the first loan at a rate of 3%, I understand. Another $5 million (Canadian) will be available to us when the time comes for purchasing equipment. It is expected that construction of this development at Seawell will begin early in 1974. One of the points that I should like to make here is that though this is a Government capital project it is, none the less, very much a money-making project. The Airport makes money besides, obviously, serving the needs of the people and the needs of an expanding tourist industry.

In addition to that, there is a Port development, and the preliminary studies, as I think, are already well known, have already been completed. The plans are in an advanced stage of preparation; they will be very shortly discussing the matter of a loan with the Inter-American Development Bank - the Bank with which the Opposition would have us have no truck whatever - and the possibility of a loan of $5 million (US) to help with a Port Extension Project costing in the region of $15 million of our money. This construction should start early in 1975. Part and parcel of that Port construction would be the Flour Mill which cannot be finalised in its plans until the Port plans themselves are finalised, but that in itself would assist with the animal feed complex. The Prime Minister mentioned something about the Cement Plant the other day. The plans are now well advanced for the Cement Plant. 8.20 p.m.

Construction of that plant should start in 1974 and it should take about 18 months to complete. These are facts of the Development Plan which will be available in much greater detail very shortly. I would like to refer to some of the achievements which have been made in the field of economic progress as regards the Industrial Development Corporation.

In 1972, Sir, seven new factories opened under incentive legislation and they are presently employing 365 people. When these factories are fully operational, the ones that we opened in 1972 they will employ approximately 800 people. In addition to that, in 1972 the existing factories expanded and they provided an extra 265 jobs in manufacturing industries. In 1973, up until the end of September, January to September, there were seven new industries already and during the present start-up period these industries employed approximately 200 people, but by the end of 1974 these factories will employ - the ones which started in the first nine months of this year - approximately 600 people.

Furthermore, Sir, during the present year five existing factories have expanded creating an additional 700 jobs. By the end of this year between 1,000 and 1,200 new jobs will have been created in the manufacturing industry. During that period the Government has invested about $1 million in the development of factories for more manufacturing industries.

I would like now to refer to tourism a little bit. I would like to take up one or two points which were mentioned by the hon. Member for St. Joseph about some mysterious meeting that he referred to at which I was supposed to have told people not to take notes. I wish to say in all honesty, Mr. Speaker, that I have no knowledge of such a meeting and even if there had been such a meeting at which someone had been told not to take notes, I honestly fail to understand the significance of it.

If there are mini buses ordered by large foreign-owned hotels here to put taxis out of business, I am certainly unaware of it, and as far as I know, the Ministry of Communications and Works is also unaware. It was mentioned that there was some secret and confidential memorandum circulated. Yes, Mr. Speaker, there was. I happen to have a copy here and I am willing to make it a document of the House. This is a memorandum which I circulated to, I suppose, approximately 200 taxi drivers, so it could hardly be terribly confidential, but the point of marking "confidential" on the top is simply that it was not for publication in the Press, for example. It was to inform the taxi people, taxi and tour associations, the cooperatives and companies, of the Government's policy with regard to the implementation of a bus or coach service for visitors to this Island and it plainly states contrary to what was said, that the Government has told these people that it is certainly the Government's intention when such a service comes into being that it will be owned and operated by existing transportation companies, cooperatives or associations or whatever they may be - groups of people in the business now.

I would like to refer briefly - I do not think I have to, but before it keeps coming up I would briefly say that money retained from the dollar earned from tourism is a figure of 56 cents at the last reckoning which was done by Professor Doxey of the University of York and the University of the West Indies. I have asked for another survey of this particularly important factor to be done, and I hope that it will not be too long before it is done by one authority or another.

I would like to report again, as I have already reported publicly, that during 1972 an 11% increase in the number of visitors was recorded. An addition of approximately 21,000 people came to Barbados in 1972, and during the first part of this year we are making slightly less than that, one of the reasons being that during the winter season we have no new accommodation and therefore there was little increase that one could make over the previous years. When places are full they are full.

I believe, Sir, that there will be approximately an 11% increase again with probably a 20% or 25% increase in cruise ship passengers this year. Several factors in my estimation point quite optimistically to the future of tourism. The first is that shortly we shall be appointing new staff to the Board of Tourism in New York, Toronto and London, and in addition we shall be opening a very modest office in Caracas and somewhere on the continent of Europe, I would say probably Frankfurt. In addition to that, I hope that this year we shall see the start of some decent convention facilities. Conventions can be a very important factor in tourism, in the tourist business, but at the moment frankly Barbados does not have adequate facilities for many of the meetings that we could attract. The Organisation of American States' kind of meeting, for example, is one that comes to mind, but they have to have, I think, four language translations or at lease one original and three translations. If we are going to attract this kind of meeting we will have to have adequate facilities. I hope, and I am confident that we are soon going to have them.

Mr. Speaker, we are setting out to attract more film companies to come to Barbados to make films in the way that the people who made "The Tamarind Seed" came here for three weeks. They spent approximately $1/2 million while they were here for those three weeks, and this looks like very good business to me. So we are going to make a concerted effort to try to attract film companies here to produce films or parts of films in Barbados, to use some of our local talent and perhaps also some of the expertise which these top class people have in professional ways of all kinds, may rub off on some of our local aspiring actors, actresses and technicians.

In addition to that, we shall of course be watching very carefully the question of inclusive tour charters. Inclusive tour charters are going to play an increasingly important role in the development of tourism, but there is something of which we have to be very wary. The problem primarily is that the small man can very easily get hurt and we have to be sure to protect the small man to the extent that we

possibly can. I mean the small hotel, not in any deprecatory way, I just mean the fellow with 25, 30 or 40 rooms. The problem is not one only for Barbados. Again it is a Caribbean problem. It is a problem particularly, because these small apartments are usually the ones which are locally owned and if we are not very cautious about what we do, unless we advise them, they may get hurt. I say that most sincerely, and I also say that I fear that the small hotels generally are not in for a very good time in the future.

I regret, Sir, that none of our Trade Union Members are here this evening, but I shall hope to pass on to them that we should keep in mind the tremendous difficulties which face the small hotels of this country and in the Caribbean in the years ahead. They have got pressures of all kinds from all different sources and they are in very great difficulties. They cannot withstand too much more pressure in the way of additional costings otherwise some of them unfortunately, may not survive.

However, Mr. Speaker, tourism is only a part of the overall development of this country, and the hon. Member for St. Joseph reminds me frequently that we should be using more local food. I agree with him entirely. I have always advocated that. (Asides.) No, even from the time that I had a small hotel, local food was served frequently as even Members on the Other Side, I am sure, would acknowledge. What we have done is this: Through the co-operation of the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Trade, we have established a kind of Standing Committee which is convened by my Ministry and which comprises representatives of the Agricultural Development Corporation, the Ministry of Agriculture, the Ministry of Trade, and the Barbados Marketing Corporation, the Hotel Association and those owners/representatives of the large hotels, medium hotels, small hotels and the Chefs' Association, which exist in this Island, to find ways and means in which more local food can be used in our hotels and restaurants.

I think sometimes that the problem is lack of communications, and I sincerely hope that this move will help to eliminate some of the lack of communications.

I will refer briefly to the Caribbean Tourism Centre which will be located in Barbados. I think that it is something of a compliment to us that it is to be placed here. There are more than 20 Governments interested in this project and who I hope will be financially supporting it. This can serve to do a great deal of study for tourism not only in Barbados, not only in the Caribbean, but again in the world - the ecological, sociological, developmental, environmental, all of these kinds of problems which are involved in the development of a succesful tourist industry. 8.30 p.m.

All in all, Mr. Speaker, it is my feeling that this amendment would be agreed to and it is my feeling also that it would be the wish of the vast majority of the people of this country that the amendment as

proposed by the hon. Member would be, what they would agree to.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I do not see anybody else rise, so I am just advising hon. Members that I now intend to exercise my right of final reply.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I just want to have this clear, Mr. Speaker. The motion was moved initially by the Leader of the Opposition and there is an amending motion before the House now. So, the reply to what? I want it to be clear now.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I quite understand what the hon. Member is replying to.

Mr. ADAMS:

If the hon. Member wants me to speak now on the amendment and then speak again, I will do that, but it is well known that when an amendment to a motion of "no confidence" is made, that if the amendment is carried there is no more original motion; and it is common place again, a Parliamentary practice that you are not going to allow the Leader of the Opposition to seek to speak on the amendment and then speak again on the motion. If the hon. Member is rising to give me two speeches, well let him give me two speeches, because if there is one thing that is sure it is this there is nothing in the Rules about the mover of an amendment having a right of reply on the motion. So I myself want the situation to be clear, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member is exercising his right of final Reply.

Mr. ADAMS:

I am not suggesting that it ends the speeches though. As I understand it, when the mover of the motion of "no confidence" makes his reply, it is replied to and there is no new debate then, Sir. That is all I am trying to make clear.

Now Mr. Speaker, I am going to reply. I am going to deal with the speeches which we have heard in here in answer to the Opposition's charges on the motion of "no confidence", and I am going to deal with them seriatim in so far as they deserve consideration. I will deal with the hon. Member for St. Michael South Central who is nervously pacing the House waiting to reply to me.

Now the first person to speak after the Opposition spoke - because there is very little I can say on the speeches made by hon. Members on my left. Those speeches I commend to the House. They were full of good sense. They were speeches which dealt with the points the Opposition has been dealing with cogently and intelligently. They are speeches which the people of Barbados are looking at. They are speeches indeed in which they are looking to us to show our mettle as an alternative Government. But for now, I am taking up the position of a fighting Opposition.

The first speech made from the Government benches was made by the former Minister of Agriculture who after many vicissitudes has once again resumed the backbenches. The burden of his speech was that most of my speech referred to events which took place after July 1973 when the motion was tabled. And I believe the former Minister of Agriculture so far returned to the days of school boy logic as to say that if I could show him where the Government had fallen down before July 1973 he might have supported the motion of "no confidence". Well, my speech Sir, was intended to be an up-to-date speech. Members do not want to hear that the Government did badly six months ago when it did worse six weeks ago or six days ago. But if the Member wants to know where the Government had fallen down at the time of the tabling of this motion I can outline some of the things. It had fallen down in respect of the distribution of foodstuffs. We were then giving you warnings before July about likely shortages - shortages which have all too unfortunately come to pass; shortages which are unprecedented in peace time in this country; shortages which Hitler could not produce by the use of U-boats but which one of the most incompetent Ministers ever to sit in a Cabinet in this Island, the Minister of Trade, has managed to produce in a few short months of tenure of office. We warned about that all through the beginning of the year because we could see the direction in which the Ministry of Trade was going and if you want to see other mistakes it made, I am going to come right down to the speech of the hon. Member for St. Philip South when he said the cost of living must go up because today you import something at $1 and next week it is $1.25; but during the period under review, namely the period from September 1971 to July, 1973, there were occasions when the price of foodstuffs overseas fell; in the United States the price of foodstuffs fell all through the last quarter of 1972 but they did not fall in Barbados. Why? Because the Ministry of Trade was not sufficiently on its toes to deal with a situation where there are fluctuating prices. They only look to raise control prices; until recently they never thought of lowering.

Devaluation. In 1967 devaluation was claimed as one of the reasons why things became more expensive in Barbados; but when the American dollar fell as it has fallen on a number of occasions in the last twelve months therefore reducing the costs of our imports, there has been no corresponding fall in the cost of goods imported into this country from the United States and that was long before July. The

shortage of money in the Treasury was noticed in April and May; by July the April bill around Bridgetown in the commercial houses had not been paid; perhaps they had not been paid in October either, and everybody was noticing it; by October there was a lag of four or five months, where payment after one month is normally expected.

The cost of living has been skyrocketing and has skyrocketed with the budget in Barbados, which was before July. The House of Assembly was insulted and the people of this country were not taken into the confidence of the Government in respect of the CARICOM Treaty and that took place before July, although the hon. Member for St. Andrew was kept in the same state of ignorance and darkness as the rest of us - he thought it took place after; the CARICOM Treaty was laid in the House of Assembly on July 4, sometime after a debate in which we were thrust this package of three hundred pages of new tariffs - thrust into our faces without knowing what was the background to it. And we still don't know, because we read in the final document that has been circulated to hon. Members, that Barbados can phase its tariffs out up to 1981; the particular goods upon which tariffs can be phased out - upon which the harmonization of tariffs can be phased - will be found in an Annex and the Annex has been concealed from this House; that is all I can say because it is not to be found in the CARICOM booklet which has been circulated to us. 8.40 p.m.

They are the things which were wrong before July. The economy stagnated in 1971, in 1972 and up to July, 1973. I have the authority of the hon. Member for Christ Church North Central who says that things have been moving a little slowly over the last two years, but that is an English understatement; That is my reply to the hon. Member for St. Andrew.

The hon. Member for St. Lucy. The only phrase he used other than to repeat the arguments of the hon. Member for St. Andrew, the only threat I was able to discern was that the Opposition is not an alternative Government, but the Opposition is not on trial, Mr. Speaker, for out sins the people have chosen us to be the Opposition, the Opposition is not in a position to call an election, we would be glad to call an election and ask the people to choose an alternative Opposition, and that is the answer to the hon. Member for St. Michael South too. There is no motion of "no confidence" against the Opposition, we are here, as the fighters, you have to show that you are worthy of the people's confidence, and that is what we say to the Members on the other side. Only one Member of all of them who spoke has made any effort to show that the Government has done something, and that is the hon. Member for Christ Church North Central. Unfortunately his analysis is so superficial and so lacks depth that I do not believe it would be recorded anywhere as an adequate reason for anyone to have confidence in the Government.

If, as the hon. Member for St. Lucy went to such pains so say, that the Government is confident of an election result, then give us an election and put your money where your mouth is. If he is so sure that

having lost 1,000 votes of Sir Theodore Brancker's majority at the last election in a Democratic year that he will not lose the other 600, let him resign and fight a bye-election if the Prime Minister will not give him a general election. Having achieved a result in which if it was duplicated throughout the Island in terms of swing we would have had 20 seats and the Democratic Labour Party would have had four, having achieved one of the worst results ever achieved by any Democratic Labour Party candidate in any election in Barbados he will still come in the House and say confidently that he is sure of his electoral future, let him put his money where his mouth is.

The hon. Member of the same surname, the Acting Minister of Finance. Strangely enough I think his speech upon reflection - and I am obliged to the hon. Member for Christ Church West for his notes of those parts of the speech which I did not hear - is worthy of a certain respect, because it sought to give information and it is that information which I am going to deal with, but I will have to take issue with him on one point. We know that the building trade is in a recession in Barbados. In my speech I quite carefully emphasised, I thought in terms which would make it clear to anyone, that no step at all should be taken to make building more difficult. Therefore, when you take the principal component of buildings which is cement and double its price you cannot then be heard to say that only one thing in building has gone up, nothing should have gone up at all. The cost of building should have remained as low as possible to encourage building.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

On a point of elucidation, Mr. Speaker, I did not say that only one item in building has gone up, because I know that more than one thing in building have gone up. A lot of fixtures and fittings have gone up, almost everything, so I just want to get the point clear. Cement went up ahead of every other thing, but in fact I was very careful about this.

Mr. ADAMS:

The precise words which the hon. Member used were that the only item affected by CARICOM was cement, I will always give way to him on points of elucidation as long as I do not lose my time, but this is another example, if the hon. Member does not mind my saying so now I am in a calmer mood, of his catching at petty-fogging things. I was conceding to him the maximum level at which I thought his argument could exist, but if he emphasises that other things have gone up it makes my point, not his. He says that only one thing has gone up through CARICOM, but other things have gone up, and it is not 22% either because 22% may have been imposed as a result of CARICOM on the price of cement.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to rise again on a point of elucidation, but I want to make it clear that I did not say that as a result of CARICOM this has gone up. As a matter of fact, I took the other point that as a result of CARICOM it should have been cheaper, and I made the point that we were getting 90% of our

cement from the CARIFTA area, Trinidad 75% and Jamaica 15%, and it landed in Barbados free of duty. I was at pains to point out that because of the fact that we were getting 90% of our cement from this area it should not have made our cement any more expensive.

Mr. ADAMS:

Sir, I did not want to make this a debate upon the understanding of the hon. Member for St. Michael North West but he seems to be insisting on it. The fact that cement is landed cheaply in Barbados does not mean that it is cheap. Cement which costs $4.00 in Jamaica landed duty free in Barbados is going to cost $4.00 plus freight, but you might be able to get cement from Venezuela for $1.50 and pay 100% duty and it will still land cheaper in Barbados. I do not want to make this any further debate upon the economic understanding of the Minister of Lands, and I very much hope that all these points of eludication will not erode my time.

I spoke as well as I could on the entire question of the financial policy on the rates of interest and so on. I do not want to return to it at great length, because no other hon. Member has seen fit to deal with it. Hon. Members reading the newspapers on the interest rate in London at the rate of 131/2% and the whole variety of rates - they change, some may be as high as 15%, London may be in a position where day to day money is actually cheaper than three months' money, and which shows a very distorted economy indeed - I could just as well say that in the United States the rate which corresponds with 131/2% in London corresponds with 101/2% in Barbados is only .81/2%. Rates of interest vary in countries much more than one realises, and the reason why these rates are varying at the present time has to do with the fact that it is not only the rate of interest which governs both the liquidity preference of holders of moveable money and the place where they wish to invest it. Some people do not want their money in the United States, many Americans put it elsewhere. If the rate of interest in the United States was raised, perhaps they would send it back home, but there was a very interesting equation last year.

You have to be very careful where you are sending your money, it is no use sending it to a place where the rate of interest is 151/2% but the rate of inflation is 20%, ttherefore when you get your money back at the end of the year despite the interest it is still worth less than at the beginning. The United States had one of the most favourable ratios during 1972 of prime lending rates to inflation, they had a low inflation rate last year, lower than the prime lending rate, something that could not be said last year of many European countries, yet the money is in the European countries because the people for one reason or another in the United States hesitated about bringing their money back home. There are many factors that could be gone into, the House of Assembly may not be the place for abstruse finanical discussions of this sort, but I would have expected a Minister of Finance to show some understanding that these factors and these problems exist. The hon. Member for Christ Church West has made a most sound and cogent point on the reason why there has been a flight of capital from Barbados, but he did not develop the point. The relevance of the point to this argument is that high rates of interest alone will not keep money in Barbados. It is said that the flight of capital has been in the order of $200 million this year, I do not know how accurate these figures could be. A few years ago I remember Mr. Douglas Lynch

making an estimate that the amount of money held outside Barbados by Barbadians was $75 million. This was six or seven years ago, there is more money in Barbados now and $200 million is not an impossible figure, but we cannot judge this because we are never given these figures. I believe that a part of the reason why this money is held outside is exactly the fear of devaluation which was mentioned, and if the rate of interest was 20% you might not keep it there, exchange control would keep it there. (Hon. P. M. GREAVES: What exchange control?) Sir, I cannot keep on that argument, the spokesman for finance sitting down on the Government benches asked sotte voce what exchange control, but I merely have to repeat that that is said to complete my argument on that matter. When money runs away from a country you have to do whatever you can to keep it there. If Barbados thinks that it can be one of the few countries in the world without exchange control, well Barbados would have to think so while this Government is in power; that is all I can say.

We have urged that the whole Government's financial policy has been in the direction of too much consumer credit, now this very evening there is a release that last year, from march, 1972 to March 1973, no less than $11 million was lent out by the commercial banks in Bridgetown to Barbadians to buy motor cars and another $5 million for other consumer products, and the whole amount lent out for house building is only $7 million. This appears in the report of the Eastern Caribbean Currency Authority. What kind of Government is it that has its priorities such that it will allow its commercial banking system and indeed finance its commercial banking system - spending the National Insurance Funds - to lend out $16 million for consumer goods while lending out only $7 million for house building, agricultural development and the like? 8.50 p.m.

This $16 million ultimately is going into the pockets, I have repeated over and over again, of the motor car workers in Coventry, in Oxford, in Yokohama and in Nagasaki, but it is not going into the pockets of Barbadians.

The Hon. Acting Minister of Finance did say something about the Auditor General's Report on housing. I am trying to keep off that subject. I think the Hon. Minister invited hon. Members to look to me and I would confirm some of his theses in respect to the Auditor General's Report on the Housing Authority's infelicities. One of his theses that I certainly cannot confirm is the statement which on an earlier occasion he made in the House that it was quite all right to give out contracts for building houses without a tender because the Labour Party used to do it. (Asides.) Is the Minister saying he never said so. I would not worry with that, Sir, (Asides).

Mr. SPEAKER:
Order!

Mr. ADAMS:

You never said it was all right, but you said the Labour Party used to do it. Well that, in fact, was misleading the House because there has never been a contract for building houses under the Labour Party. The first Housing Authority contract was the one to which the Auditor General referred. There could never have been anything the Labour Party did without a tender. (Asides.)

Mr. SPEAKER:

Order! There are too many asides! Members not addressing the Chair must maintain silence!

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I also want to deal with this talk about no money in the Treasury. I am amused by it, Sir. I gave a Press Conference that lasted over an hour. When I was asked something about there being no money in the Treasury, I gave an illustration known to me of certain people not getting their salary. The Government Broadcasting Station, CBC., highlighted that and that alone of the entire Press Conference, as far as I recall it. No money in the Treasury now has gone around Barbados. I am not ashamed of the phrase, Sir. The phrase- was first used by the Prime Minister in the 1961 Election campaign. It is a phrase that has an honourable history, although it may have been used by me with a little more truth - at least by those who questioned me.

Mr. Speaker, the Acting Minister of Finance must not conceal, or attempt, by any series of Press Conferences or Press Releases, to conceal that the Consolidated Fund in Barbados is in deficit; has been in deficit for a number of years, and gets further into deficit every year. The Auditor General's most recent Report on the deficit in the Consolidated Fund contains these words:

"The total deficit was met from other funds under the direct control and in the custody of the Accountant General."I do not know what are these other funds that the Accountant General has. At the time of this Report they had to make up a deficit in the Consolidated Fund of $9 million. Now that necessarily means that since the Consolidated Fund is what we refer to as the Treasury then there is no money in the Treasury. There may be money in X funds, Y funds and Z funds, or trust funds of one sort or another, which were being used to make up the Consolidated Fund. These are matters of records. (Asides.) I am the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, Mr. Speaker, and what funds are being used to make up the deficit will, in the fullness of time, be reported to the House of Assembly. (Asides.) But I am not going to be encouraged by any Minister, even if he is a former Attorney General, into breaking the law by revealing any evidence that is given at a private committee of this House.

The Government has a number of bank accounts. I believe it will be found that all those which can be related to what people speak of as the Treasury are in overdraft. (Asides.) Sir, the Acting Minister of Finance says that that is always the case. All of the Government accounts are in overdraft. Is he surprised when people say that there is no money in the Treasury? If the Government bank accounts are always overdrawn, is he surprised? I am going to put down a question, Sir, in which the Government would have to reveal the true state of its bank balances, the Consolidated Fund, and all other Funds under its control. The Public Accounts Committee can only deal with published records, and we want to get things up to date. Did I hear the figure of $18 million deficit in the Consolidated funds? I am anxious to be corrected, Sir. I am ignorant in this matter, because we are never told. Nobody ever comes in here and lays his cards on the Table frankly.

The next speech was made by the hon. Member for St. Michael South. I was very disappointed in the Minister of Education. The Minister of Education has always been a first-class technician. I believe that he is thoroughly informed in all technical aspects of education, and if there is one reform he can immediately propose to his Ministry it is the temporary abolition of the post of Chief Techinical Officer, as far as I can see, because he is just as well informed as any Technical Officer. So well informed that he is buried in his information and cannot reach the height of Ministerial administration which, to me, suggests, a little imagination and initiative. I am extremely disappointed to find from a Minister whose contributions to debates on the technical side we have all come to respect, some of us unwillingly, could make a speech in which he seems to think that the Opposition was on trial instead of the Government, and could only repeat that all of our inflation is imported from abroad.

Mr. Speaker, if that were so, you would expect to find that Barbados' pattern of rising prices and inflation followed very closely upon that of its principal trading partners. How is it, therefore, that food prices rose only 7% in the United States in 1972, but 12% in Barbados? How is it when inflation is imported here it is always imported with something extra on top? That is what has to be asked. It was only two years ago, I think, that the Economic Survey pointed out that of all countries that reported, only West Germany had a higher rate of inflation than Barbados. That is an argument worthy of the two hon. Members to the right and left of the Minister of Education and not of the Minister of Education himself. I do not want to be told that. We are dealing in percentages now. The Minister of Education, in my opinion, is too sanguine of the Government's inability, and he accepts too readily that the Government can do nothing about rising prices and inflation.

Mr. SPEAKER:
Five more minutes.

Mr. ADAMS:
Thank you, Sir. We must not be prisoners of our circumstances. Revolutionary economic policies

have revolutionised many countries, and I wish I had more time to expatiate on them. There are countries where prices are not going up very much at the present time. Examine the statistics of Portugal and Spain. Nobody may want the political system of Portugal which keeps prices stable at the price of economic stagnation and a population fall. Nobody may wish that, but there are provisions. Inflation is the answer for unemployment. A steady inflation in a developed economy controls unemployment. In Barbados we have both, and that is the argument against inflation.

With regard to the hon. Member for St. Philip South, his arguments went from 1961 to 1971, and I do not think they need be paid any further attention than to say that my argument starts in 1971.

The hon. Member for St. Michael South East. I like his speech very much indeed. We have not heard from him for a very long time; he was as fluent as ever, and I only wish that that speech could have been made without the personal reference and from our side, because it was a speech designed, to my mind, or cast more in an Opposition mould than a Government mould. What he is saying is that the Government of Barbados, like many other Governments, misgovern and, therefore, motions of no confidence follow along traditional patterns. I was very pleased with that speech, Sir.

I am quite unable to say anything about the speech of the hon. Member for St. George South. I could not find any points to reply to in it. 9 p.m.

The speech of the Minister of Tourism - the Minister of Tourism tried to give facts, and tried to deal with the facts. He seemed to think that eight I.D.C. factories in 1972 can take care of a situation such as that outlined by the hon. Member for St. James where there are 103,000 persons on the books of National Insurance and only 77,000 of them are paying regularly. I do not think so. That is all I can say. His speech was more suited to a Queen Speech debate, if he does not mind my saying so, than a debate of this sort.

The hon. Member had some interesting things to say including the fact that small hotels are in for a difficult time. I take that to be an attack on the Barbados Workers' Union which will be dealt with in the fullness of time. The hon. Member for St. Michael South Central, I take it, is going to speak at some stage after me, he has not contributed to the debate in particular but sat down and told us that he is against democracy and that the Opposition should be locked up. He has sat down...

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I said that if the type of rumours the Opposition was spreading to wreck this country had been done in certain African countries, they would be behind bars. The Opposition is trying to wreck the economy, to stop investments by rumours that the Treasury is broken and things like that. That is what I said.

Mr. SPEAKER:
The Hon. Member has now said it, I was not aware that the hon. Member had spoken.

Mr. ADAMS:
I gave way to the hon. Member. The hon. Member might foam at the mouth and repeat all the arguments that the reactionary conservatives of Britain who are his political meteors, whether he realises it or not, have always said about radical politicians, and that the right wing, racist reactionaries of the U.S.A. say about the radical black liberals or democratic politicians. He can repeat all the fascist arguments that there must never be an Opposition and that the true state of the economy must never be revealed. It is unpatriotic, and if you do it, you should be in goal. What I know is that there are a lot of things you may say and do. We may hold similar views to you, but we do not extend to him the same hands of uncharity, the uncharity which he seems to extend to us - blood and fire - evidently he thinks that blood and fire are marks of leadership. Let him hearken to the number of voices on his side of Parliament who seek the ear of the Opposition or the Leader of the Opposition and ask us what it is that we are offering him etc., etc. Let him say what he does.

I heard him praise two of his political opponents last Tuesday, the Prime Minister and Sir Grantley Adams. He can do that as much as he likes. His credit is so hopelessly spent in the Party of which he is an ostensible Member that no amount of abuse, no amount of cliches dragged up from the dregs of God knows what conservative waste basket can ever restore it.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:
Mr. Speaker, Sir, if you do not protect me, I am going to protect myself.

Mr. SPEAKER:
What is the hon. Member on?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:
I will not sit here and hear him accuse me, impute improper motives, accusing me and saying that the

Prime Minister is my enemy. What more can he do? He is saying that my credit is so spent. It is very improper. Are you going to say that I cannot protect myself? He is breaking every Rule of the House. This is worse than abuse now, and if I do not get protection, I will take it; and if you, Mr. Speaker who must enforce the Rules of this House and must protect Members, do not protect me, I will not be sitting down here and be abused by the Leader of the Opposition. If you do not protect me, I will protect myself and walk outside.

Mr. SPEAKER:
I perceived nothing out of order. The time is up.

Mr. ADAMS:
I was just about to draw to Your Honour's attention the time that he abused the Prime Minister, on the occasion of the Budget Speech last year, in here.

Hon. P. M GREAVES:
Mr. Speaker, I am speaking on the amendment. I have a right to speak on the amendment, and I am going to speak on it.

Mr. ADAMS:
I am going to have to make another speech then.

Mr. SPEAKER:
Two hon. Members should not be on their feet at the same time.

Hon. P. M GREAVES:
Mr. Speaker, when this House last debated this motion.....

Mr. MOTTLEY:
Mr. Speaker, OB a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Two hon. Members cannot be on their feet at the same time. I understood the Leader of the Opposition to have exercise his right of final reply, that is his reply to the Debate and therefore he has made his final speech. There exists the right to speak on the motion or the amendment as they choose to.

Mr. ADAMS:

Let me make it clear. I have not spoken on the amendment. I have only spoken on my motion.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, may I ask what is my right to speak having regard to the fact that I made one speech?

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is not really a point of privilege.

Mr. FORDE:

Will Your Honour tell me if it is a point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER:

The matter has not arisen.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, I did not hear the last part of Your Honour's ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The matter was entirely hypothetical.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I mean, Sir, that you said that the Leader of the Opposition had exercised his right of final reply to the debate and that there was one speaker entitled to speak on behalf of the Government. I did not hear your

ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER:
That was very unfortunate. Let the hon Member take his seat.

Hon. P. M GREAVES:
Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding according to the procedure that when an amendment is moved to a motion that amendment is disposed of first. If it is not disposed of, then you come back to the original motion. I rise because we have not yet disposed of the amendment because there has been no vote. I rise to exercise my right to speak on the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER:
After this matter is disposed of, the original motion can be reverted to.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:
Mr. Speaker, in making this contribution on the amendment, what I am in fact going to do is to refer to certain statements made during the course of the debate. I will speak briefly because, search as I might, I can find little of substance on which I can make any meaningful comment.

The whole gravamen of the charges made by almost all hon. Members of the Opposition who have spoken, Mr. Speaker, centre on the allegations of little or no money in the Treasury. Speaker after speaker on the other side rose and attempted to make this point. It is a point that I dealt with when I made my contribution on the substantive motion earlieir in the debate. The hon. Member for St. Thomas, the Leader of the Opposition, was quite wrong when he stated that I said that collections from Income Tax were $23 million. I said in fact that they were in excess of $28 million. 9.10 p.m

So far, from the 1st April, 1973, to the end of September, 1973, it was $28 million. However, Mr. Speaker, I do not consider that at very important or strong point. I was at pains during the course of my debate, Mr. Speaker, to point out that there are times during a year, particularly those months, when no great collection is made of income tax, or on motor Vehicles or on land tax. These are only done about three or four months in the year; apart from your PAYE system there are times outside of those months when the financial position of the Treasury changes and Treasury Bills are used to finance the expenditures of Government on those occasions. The position has not changed. I stand here tonight, Mr. Speaker, to deny categorically that any cheques issued by the Government of Barbados have not been

honoured by the cominercial banks. Not a single cheque issued by the Government of Barbados has been dishonoured by the commercial banks; not a single cheque. And I go further. I was at pains - it seems that people cannot understand or have not got the capacity to understand, but - I was at pains to point out last time that moneys are paid out of the Treasury when claims are made on the Treasury, and that because of institutional weaknesses, perhaps, but weaknesses anyhow in our accounting procedures, the Treasury is not notified that there are certain claims existing in respect of private individuals. To give an example, Mr. Speaker. Only yesterday the only claims to be made by a private source on the Treasury, was one claim. One claim only for $350,000 and that was paid. A check with the Accountant General shows clearly that there were no claims on the Treasury from any other source whatsoever. Now I want to make this clear, that this does not mean that there were private sources, companies or firms that did not have outstanding debts with the Government; this does not mean that, but because of the system under which we are operating and labouring - there is something wrong with the system; because of the accounting system the Treasury is not notified and if the Treasury is not notified the Treasury cannot pay. It is as simple as that. So I want to deny categorically that any cheques at all on the Treasury have been dishonoured. I made my speech last time on the state of the Treasury; it remains the same. I will repeat almost word for word on the points which I made then, and the situation remains unchanged.

Now there is one point made by the hon. Member for Christ Church West and the hon. Member for St. Thomas, Leader of the Opposition; the Leader of the Opposition attempted to elaborate, but then, when I attempted to press him, he retracted. I refer to the question of the movement of money in and out of Barbados, and the hon. Member for Christ Church West has been at pains to point out that because of the type of issue of our own currency - some people seem to be afraid of our currency; I do not know if it is our currency or the spectre of the image that appears on our currency - but, Mr. Speaker, it was the hon. Member for St. Thomas who went on to make this point, - I do not know if he understands the point he has been making, fully - it is that a control on deposit rates is not the only solution to money moving out of Barbados. I am in agreement with this, Mr. Speaker, but the hon. Member went on to state something further. He said he is a believer in freedom and that in fact what we do require is exchange control, and it is on this point that I really want to take him up further to know if he really understands what he is saying, because, Mr. Speaker, we have exchange controls on every foreign currency except sterling - on ever currency exchange except sterling - so what in effect the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is now saying that we should impose sterling control, but the hon. Member does not understand that Barbados cannot do this unilaterally - although the Bank of England has imposed control on outflows of sterling from the United Kingdom we are not in a position, Mr. Speaker, to do this - and I believe the Hon. Leader of the Oppostition understands what I am saying. We are not in a position to impose any sterling control at this stage. That is the point, Mr. Speaker, that I want to make. 9.20p.m.

I want to say this, in the execution of my public duties, I have always been exceedingly careful. There was a time when I was Minister of Home Affairs that it was said of me that it was more difficult to see me than it was to see the Prime Minister. I was very careful about this because I did not want any accusations to be levelled against me and therefore I was very careful not to see people alone or very often not to see them at all. The hon. Member for St. Peter has generated a lot of heat out of an incident

which occurred and of which he has complained. I think my indignation must also be justifiable in the light of the way in which I have been pursuing my work to have such accusations made. They have been expunged from the record, and I do not want to allude to them further, but I thought that I should make this final point.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of getting into this debate at all but it pleased the Leader of the Opposition to attack me as he liked. This is symptomatic of the Barbadian society. Because his father was Sir Grantley Adams and my father was a school master, he seems to think that he has a God-given right to lead Barbados, and anybody not born in his so-called social state, he likes to sneer at them in this Hon. Chamber. You find this throughout the whole of Barbadian society.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, the hon. Member is imputing improper motives to me when he says that I attacked him because his father was a school master and that I sneer at people in this Chamber, and I call on him to withdraw it.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The point of order is well made, but I would like to make the point that too many personal remarks are being made and I regard it as being childish that one honourable Member has made a point which is regarded as a political punch and that it is returned by another Member as another political punch for complaints to be made. When Members address their minds to the subject matter then there will not be all these points of order. Let hon. Members stick to the subject matter, deal with the principles and not refer to hon. Members' ancestry, social standing whatever that might be, or else. Let the hon. Member continue to debate on a high level.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, I have not made any personal reference to the hon. Member and he has accused me of sneering at people in the Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The matter has already been dealt with. This is perhaps one of the advantages of having a Speaker who is also an elected Member.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

The Leader of the Opposition seems to think that because he has reached the position of Leader of the Opposition without making any basic contribution to the Barbadian society that he can bring in a motion like this and that he has a God-given right because of his ancestry to call for the Government to resign so that he can be made Prime Minister of Barbados. This is symptomatic of his type in this Barbadian society, that because of birth, he suddenly likes to sneer at poor people or people of lower social standing than he, either at their education or otherwise.

Mr. ADAMS:

He is going too far, Sir, he is imputing improper motives to me to say that I sneer at anybody.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member deems the word "sneer" as being offensive; will the hon. Member please withdraw it?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I withdraw the word "sneer" but I will say that he speaks disparagingly of Barbadian people in his tone of superiority, but he will not do it to me and get away with it, get that straight now and forever more. So insatiable is his desire for power that he is now trying to salvage a responsibility which he has already shirked. Here is the Leader of the Opposition, cooling out in the United States, not having any sense of responsibility, not writing to the Minister of Finance to ask him when he would be introducing his Budget Speech. He could have respectfully said that he proposed to go to the United States at a particular time and that if the Prime Minister could kindly give him an indication of the time when he was introducing his Budget Speech, and he could have decided not to go at that time. This Leader of the Opposition who can got to the United States, visit cities and cool out instead of acting in a responsible way to the poor people, is asking the people to hand over the Government to him, but to do what? When the time came, you were put in the fire, tested, weighed in the scales and found absolutely wanting.

I had no intention to speak but in your reply you involved me. So ungracious is he that a genuine tribute is paid to his father for a contribution made that he could never make, to the Barbadian society and he says that my credit is spent, and that I can praise two enemies in one breath, his dear departed father and the Prime Minister. When you can get a remark like that coming from a person like the Leader of the Opposition, that a tribute to his own father cannot be appreciated by him, when common decency by a Member of the Government.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

Will the hon. Member withdraw "common decency"?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:
I did not finish the sentence, you did not let me develop it.

Mr. SPEAKER:
Will the hon. Member withdraw it?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:
I withdraw it, but when common decency and courtesy demand that I pay to his father a tribute in another debate he is now using it - although I have not taken part in the debate, I was sitting quietly and making a few remarks to the Members of the Opposition - he is now taking it that I am praising two enemies, his father and the honourable Prime Minister.

Mr. ADAMS:
On a point of order, I would not break the rules of the House by imputing improper motives to the hon. Member, I said two political enemies; there is a difference

Hon. F. G. SMITH:
What could be worse, Mr. Speaker? I am a Cabinet Minister in the Government of the Honourable Prime Minister, with collective responsibility, does his remark not impute to me treachery, disloyalty, a man who stabs people in the back, a scorpion or a snake in the grass? Are you going to tell me that I am going to sit down here and allow his type, who has made no contribution to this Barbadian country in any real terms whatsoever, to impute to me that I am a snake in the grass to my Honourable Prime Minister in whose Government I have the great honour to serve? You do not know whom you are dealing with. 9.30 p.m.

This is only a salvage motion by the Leader of the Opposition. This is typical of the Opposition - spreading unfounded rumours. The type of unfounded rumours that they spread in this country about the Treasury and about the economy could only come front a bunch of people who are very unconcerned and lacking in interest of the economic development of their country. They are prepared to spread rumours abroad and to let rumours go abroad on no evidence at all, that this country is bankrupt; it is running to ruin; there is no future in the country, and so on. Can their type of proganda allegation - I am posing a rhetorical question - If those questions sure asked by people of any kind in Barbados, are those

the questions or the actions of patriotic men and women?

Mr. BOLDEN:
Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member....

Mr. SPEAKER:
On what has the hon. Member risen?

Mr. BOLDEN:
Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member is saying that we are unpatriotic.

Mr. SPEAKER:
The hon. Member has been asked to withdraw that, and he went on to make strictures which I do not regard as out of order.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:
This country, Mr. Speaker, belongs to all of us. A Government is a Government of all the people, but one's desire for power must not be so insatiable, or so consuming, that one is prepared to destroy one's country on the altar to satisfy one's personal lust for power.

Mr. FORDE:
Mr. Speaker, to suggest that Members by exercising their democratic right of speech and criticism in here are destroying their country to satisfy the lust for power is an improper motive. This is not a Sunday School. If the hon. Member is so riled that he has lost his normal calm and correctness of debate, then he should try to recover it. I do not believe that anybody on that side has any more love for his country than anybody else on this side. This childish habit of carrying on in that manner is wrong, Sir,

Mr. SPEAKER:
I thought the remarks would have passed over the heads of the hon. Members on the opposite side.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, this motion calls on the government to resign. I have heard from all of them. I have heard from the Leader of the Opposition that if they went to the country tomorrow that some swing would give them 20 and give us 4. Their motion is about power. Their motion shows their desire before 1976 to have a scramble at power. Well, it does not work so. What worries me as a Barbadian and one interested in my country is that, in a period of grave international monetary problems and international world shortages, - if they in the Opposition read at all, and I see them with the Economist over there - they must know what happens in England, what happens in West Germany. I have seen them with the Time Magazine, and I have seen them with the Times. If they read them and do not keep them for prestige purposes, they must be conversant with what is happening in, the international world of which Barbados is not a separate Island existing in a vacuum. We are part of the international scene, and if they read they will realise that every single developing country today in the world is having its problems of inflation, unemployment and shortages.

Therefore, one would expect even in England, when there is an emergency, Heath is responsible, but Mr. Harold Wilson does not bring a Motion of No Confidence against Mr. Heath. He knows that the Middle East crisis is causing a problem. He knows that at this time with an income and wages policy, the international situation must create on any nation, developed or underdeveloped, and moreso an underdeveloped nation, cases of stress, of shortages, or balance of payments, of unemployment, especially in the countries to the North, the shortages in coal and heating fuel. Even in big developed countries that talk about the equivalent of billions of dollars in our currency, the shortages and unemployment are great.

For an Opposition to chose this time, when the country is endeavouring with all the power at its command in the near future to get the economy moving, to shout from the hilltops that the Treasury is empty and that nothing is happening indicating to foreign investors and international lending organisations that Barbados is a bad bet, is certainly not the character of responsible people. I draw the line when it comes to my own, my native land. There are questions of fighting. In boxing there are rules. The game of politics has its rules, but regrettably this desire for power is causing trouble. Instead of having the Marquis of Queensbury rules, you are using Japanese, catch-as-catch-can and so on. That is the game you are playing. You are giving a blow any part of the body to get power. This motion has evidence of an insatiable desire for power.

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Hon. Ex-Attorney General understands that politics means power?

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is no point of order! That is irrelevant.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

That is why I am saying that this motion is all about power. What also worries me, Mr. Speaker, is that the poor unfortunate people of Barbados who have had it so good for all of these years, who for the first time in 11 years, through no fault of the Government and because of the international situation..... (Asides). The answer is quite simple. If you are importing from abroad, you cannot lay down the price/There is no magic in our cost of living. You are trying to fool the people. You are trying to tell the people that in a crisis, which the world is passing through, a little temporary inconvenience means that a Government is now.....

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order!

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, you have not yet heard me.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Please make your point.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, if that is the attitude you are going to adopt towards me....

Mr. SPEAKER:

A fraudulent point of order is a breach of the Standing Orders. All hon. Members including the hon. Member will know that. It is a point of interruption.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I cannot speak much longer, because this motion has no merits. Nobody would vote for this on this side. (Asides.) It is not a question of conscience. You do not hand over a country to people who are incompetent, to people who cannot run it, or to people who were rejected two years ago. How can you hand over a country to certain people when the people themselves, in an overwhelming manner, gave the Government the right to abolish them? 9.40 p.m.

All I would say is that some of the speeches you make on democracy, some of the allegations you make, if they were made in Jamaica, Kenya, Zambia or Malawi, you know where you would be. I think I have said enough. I did not intend to get into it at all, but if the Leader of the Opposition thinks now or as long as I have the honour to be in here that I am afraid of him or that he is going to abuse me in this House, he has got another "thought" coming. So let him put it in his pipe and smoke it now, and remember that I can walk out, the people can kick me out. I do not have to be in this House. I will not stand for the superior middle class snobbery that he goes on with.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is uncalled for,

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I have listened to this debate and I must say that we have reached the stage when everything has been said. I must say that I admire to some extent the political astuteness of the Leader of the Opposition in that he brought this motion at the time that he did. I must say that he may be the coming Prime Minister because of the political shrewdness which he demonstrated here in the last few months. The fact is, Sir, that he is still Chairman of the Barbados Labour Party and Leader of the Opposition in Parliament. In this debate, he has made some very good points even though some of his members were not prepared to come out of their shell and make some contribution with the exception of the hon. Member for Christ Church West.

The Hon. and Learned Leader of the Opposition spoke on the cost of living. He spoke on the construction industry, on inflation, the Government Information Service, Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation, and the Board of the Caribbean Development Corporation. Some of these comments have not been properly answered but will be answered in due course. He spoke of Civil Aviation, and I think that that has been answered to some extent. He spoke of the new Airport in St. Lucy and so on. On unemployment, he said that the Prime Minister spoke about full employment in 1976. He said that the Government is unable to meet its financial commitments. He arid others said that.

Let me say this: each and every Member of Parliament, each and every Minister, each and every member of the Public Service receives his salary each month so it cannot be so bad for us. It is not a personal experience as if you did not get paid. Each arid every Member of Parliament, the Parliamentary Secretary and the Public Service are paid each month. But statements were made from time to time which would cause people outside of Barbados, outside of the Caribbean and people in the U.S.A. and Canada and the United Kingdom to feel that this country is bankrupt, that there is no money in the Treasury and that it is a wrong place in which to invest their money because they will lose the amount and everything will be going into bankruptcy shortly. These are things that have been said. Since this "no confidence" motion was moved in Here there are cases where certain investors who were coming in and who had made certain preliminary arrangements have not galled back and there are people who have been frustrated. All that sort of thing has been happening over the last few weeks, and people outside of Parliament who do not follow politics carefully do not realise that it is a political trick, political intrigue. It is just wasting the time of the House and the money of the taxpayers, while Members wine and drink.....

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Speaker, I do not often like to get up on points, but the innuendo of the remarks of the Leader of the House about sitting down to wine and drink, which I do not do in the Dining Room.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order.

Mr. FORDE:

It is the right of any Member to move a "no confidence" motion and when the Government gets so annoyed about a matter that is constitutionally important....

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member is out of order.

Mr. FORDE:

I will abide by your ruling.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

All that I am saying is that a great disservice has been done. They should know better. A very great

disservice to Barbados has been done by this "no confidence" nonsense.

As far as the food situation is concerned, there is a world-wide shortage. We do not plant rice here. I do not see why Barbadians cannot eat yams and eddoes and other ground provisions as they did before. There has been a lot of talk because there has been a shortage of rice, but the Government subsidises rice to the tune of $1 million in order to keep rice at 26 cents per pound, that money which could be spent on roads, tenantry roads and subsidiary roads. The ' Government spent over $1 million on subsidising rice this year, and then they walk in here and use this kind of argument in order to regain their already lost status in the society.

The Leader of the Opposition being as shrewd as he is, has to do something to retrieve his lost ground when he was in the U.S.A. He is clever. He is still Chairman of the Barbados Labour Party and still the one earmarked for Prime Minister, just in case it may mean another ten years or more. I do not care to go through all this. I do not have the energy to waste on this nonsense. 9.50 p.m.

This motion of "no confidence" is just a means of trying to fool people outside, but the people outside are no longer backward; they are alert and they know. What happens in here cannot bring you any votes because a little handful of your followers in here cannot convert the large masses of the electorate outside, and this sort of exercise is a futile and hopeless sort of thing which would get you all nowhere. To anyone who thinks that they are getting the Government, I say, our Prime Minister would soon be back, reinvigorated, and with new ideas to lead this country again for another ten or fifteen or more years, I do not care to exert myself, Sir. I have things here that are very relevant and I have information here to prove or disprove the things which were said. I have information here which I think should go down on record. Improvement in social conditions can be identified with social development. Such improvement can be identified in the areas of education, health and housing. Well, we all know the Minister of Education has done a wonderful job. We have free secondary education, we have free university education, we have the school meals service, the subsidised bus fares - the bus fares are just ten cents and this is being revised - and we have everything; there is very little room for improvement there, I can tell you. There is very little or no room for improvement on the educational front. The only way it can be improved is by closing down the Cave Hill Campus; when they go on strike next time, we can improve by closing them down for a year.

On health - our Minister of Health is pursuing a good policy and we will soon have everything, including sanitation, on a very sound and proper basis. I do not need to elaborate on that because the Ministers have spoken on that on several occasions and have dealt with the topics adequately.

On housing, we are doing a good job within the limit of our resources. There is a vast improvement in the area of housing.

On social security, we have dealt with that today, and population, I will not touch on that, that is being dealt with adequately.

I will probably deal with a matter with which hon. Members are not so conversant. The Gross Domestic Product at factual cost by industrial origin measured at current prices, increased from $119.8 million in 1960 to $257.0 million in 1972. (Asides) I have to read from this. These are facts; I am not talking stupidness.

The average annual rate of growth of the G.D.P. at current prices was just approximately 8.4% per annum, there being a number of changes in sectoral contributions to the GDP between 1960 and 1972. Anyhow, this is in answer, to show the growth of the economy, how it stands, but I do not have to read it all.

As fair as foreign trade is concerned, between 1960 and 1971, total imports grew by an average annual rate of 10.5% from $83.3 million to $243.7 million while total exports increased by 7.1% annually from $35.0 to $53.2 million.

The United Kingdom continued to be our major trading.....

Mr. BOLDEN:
Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member.....

Mr. SPEAKER:
On what is the hon. Member rising?

Mr. BOLDEN:
On a point of information, Sir. He has just read some figures which I did not hear very well, Sir.....

Mr. SPEAKER:
That is improper. You are out of order.

Mr. BOLDEN:
On a point of privilege, Sir. Before he passes the point, would he tell us what is the differential gap between the two now, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER:
The hon. Member must sit down. Don't let us be ludicrous now.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Speaker, the United Kingdom received 61.5% of the Island's total export in 1960 and by 1971 the population had fallen to 34.9, and over the decade the United States of America supplied an increasing portion of the Island's imports; 18% in 1971 as compared with 13% in 1960. The USA also received an increasing share in our total exports, 10.7% in 1971 as compared with 2.9% in 1960.

As far as the cultural side is concerned, the Government gives grants in order to assist the Arts Council. So whether it is on a social, political, economic or cultural basis, the Government is helping and everything is moving forward. What is worrying the hon. Members on the other side is simply, this, Mr. Speaker, that for the very first time in the history of Barbados, - unlike when Sir Grantley Adams of revered memory did what he did for years and helped to build the Progressive League and the Labour Party and sacrificed a lot in doing it; I am saying this, Sir Grantley Adams was not a man who

valued money; he was like Ghandi. Like Ghandi he drank goat milk and lived on practically nothing. He forgot that we are not all Ghandis - whereas Sir Grantley Adams was a Ghandi as such, each and every one of us today are not Ghandis any longer.

So for the first time, Mr. Speaker, we have a Ministerial system in which I have the honour of serving, in the experimental system in 1946, 1948 as a quasi-Minister of Agriculture, Fisheries, Law and public works. I served as a quasi-Minister in 1946-48 under Sir Grantley Adams, as a quasi-Minister without a drop of gasolene or without a lunch or anything. We worked for nothing then and nothing meant nothing

right away down the line.....

Mr. SPEAKER:
What has that got to do with what is before the House?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Let me just complete, Sir. I am making a point. I served with Sir, Grantley Adams as Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries for a small amount but today there is money in politics. Today a Ministerial job carries a good salary, and today each and every one in here and outside, who are politically minded would like to be a Minister because there is money in politics today, especially on the Ministerial bench. 10.00 p.m.

You cannot all be Ministers together, unless you want a one Party State, but if you want to come over with us now, I will select two or three right away. You have ability over there, but you cannot send the country forward on a unilateral basis. Thank you, Sir.

The question that the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:

NOES:
Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Hon. F. G. SMITH, Hon. P. G. MORGAN, Mr. W. R. LOWE, Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND and Hon. R. StC. WEEKES - 9.

AYES:
Mr. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Mr. W. C. B. HINDS, Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, Mr. H. deB. FORDE, and Mr. C. L. BOLDEN - 6.

The question that the words proposed to be inserted stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

AYES; Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Hon. F. G. SMITH, Hon. P. G. MORGAN, Mr. W. R. LOWE, Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND and Hon. R. StC. WEEKES - 9.

NOES:

Mr. L. S. CRIAG, Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Mr. W. C. B. HINDS, Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, Mr. H. deB. FORDE, and Mr. C. L. BOLDEN - 6.

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

AYES:

Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Hon. F. G. SMITH, Hon. P. G. MORGAN, Mr. W. R. LOWE, Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND and Hon. R. StC. WEEKES - 9.

NOES:

Mr. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. J. M G. M. ADAMS, Mr. W. C. B. HINDS, Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, Mr. H. deB. FORDE and Mr. C. L. BOLDEN - 6.

The question that the original motion do now pass was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows: 10.10 p.m.

NOES; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. P. M GREAVES; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. F. G. SMITH; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND and Hon. R. StC. WEEKES - 9.

AYES:

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS; Mr. L. S. CRAIG; Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY; Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; Mr. H. deB. FORDE; and Mr. C. L. BOLDEN - 6.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Speaker, this concludes the business of the day.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, the 4th December, 1973, at twelve o'clock noon.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:
I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly. 10,15 p.m.