

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, 23rd October, 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. StC. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees); Mr. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; His Honour C A. E. HOPPIN, (Deputy Speaker); Hon. P. G. MORGAN, C.B.E., (Minister of Tourism, Information and Public Relations); Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND; (Acting Minister of Health and Welfare); Hon. A. MORRISON, (Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology); Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., M.A., (Econ.), (Minister of Education, Youth Affairs, Community Development and Sport) and Mr. E. E. GREAVES, B.A., Ed.M

Prayers were read.

COMPOSITION OF COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

Mr. SPEAKER:

Before the Business of the House begins, there is a little matter which needs to be regularised. The Committee of Privileges, it has been observed, has only 6 members including myself as Chairman. According to Standing Order 59(3), there should be 6 members plus Mr. Speaker as Chairman comprising the Committee of Privileges. I would take this opportunity, in view of the fact that there is a matter concerning the privileges of this House pending before the House, to have the Leader of the House increase the Committee by one. (Interruption.)

Before you do that, Sir, I shall ask the Marshal to ascertain the source of that noise and have it stopped. Even though the worker might be on his legitimate business, the Business of the House cannot be interrupted - we have the noise of the air conditioners plus the banging from outside.

(Mr. BOLDEN entered the Chamber and took his seat.)

Hon. P. G. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a word on that. I cannot hear what you are saying because of a feed back coming from over here. It is a double sounding thing. There seems to be an amplification coming from this side, and I cannot hear what you are saying.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Why is it necessary to have this amplification? Please discontinue the use of it. All we want you to do is to have the speeches taperecorded, Mr. Armstrong, and to have ourselves heard. Why is it ntcessairy to use these amplifiers? Mr. Brancker, please see what is technically wrong over there.

(At this stage, Mr. Brancker approached the Speaker's Chair.)

I am told that these amplifiers were installed only yesterday. Could we see how the accoustics of this Chamber work for the time being? I guess they have been installed to see how the acoustic properties of the House can be improved, but it is very inconvenient.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, I am also getting a feed back at this end of the table. I have commented before about the method of carrying out repairs or dealing with the amplification of sound in this Chamber. Any person who has got basic elementary knowledge regarding this sort of equipment would know that they have installed the wrong equipment in here. What should have been put there is a plain deck with a monitoring system from which the operator alone can hear and no feed back comes into the Chamber. You cannot install ordinary domestic taperecorders that you would buy for your house in an area like this. It goes to show that they are not following the procedure laid down by the Government. If they had to change the amplifiers, then the technical officers should have been called in and Parliament should have been notified of the matter so that the members who would be affected primarily would have some say in what is going on. Here it is Parliament is meeting today and you have this sort of thing going on. I think it is interrupting the proceedings as it stands.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I give the undertaking that this sort of thing will not happen again.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, this is a very deplorable state of affairs in that this matter is one which falls under the control of the Debates Committee. I think this is due to the breakdown which took place last week, and I suppose this is an attempt to remedy the situation. Be that as it may, it has happened at a time when the House is sitting and it is a very bad state of affairs. I join with the members who have expressed their disapproval.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I can assure you that this equipment was installed completely and utterly without my knowledge. I can agree that it must have been installed in order to remedy what took place last week, but it is not proving very successful.

Mr. BOLDEN Mr. Speaker, it seems to have happened at a very opportune moment. Even before the Business of the House begins, I should like to draw to your attention who controls this Parliament the very, very late arrival of all Parliamentary papers which I have received. I can only speak on my part. I never received papers until well after twelve o'clock yesterday when I returned to my office. I was told that the bearer said that the papers were received here some time over the week end. Now with a 5-day week in existence, Mr. Speaker, and papers coming into one's Chambers at twelve o'clock yesterday, it is practically impossible for us to know what are in the papers so that we can participate in the debates. This is a situation which, in my opinion, should not be allowed to continue.

I am going to ask the Leader of the House to look into this matter and adjourn those matters which we have to debate today, because I am sure I heard of other members who received their papers last night. This is not a good state of affairs. You have papers which were laid in the House last Tuesday placed in our hands on Monday to be discussed in Parliament on Tuesday. That cannot, in my humble opinion, be fair to any Parliamentarian whether he is a Government back bencher, a Member of the Opposition, or you, Mr. Speaker, whom I believe stand in the same position as a non-Minister of the Government. I would like the Speaker of the House to look at this matter carefully, and I am going to suggest most earnestly that we postpone debate on those matters which were laid in this Chamber last week. I am sure that none of us has had a chance to look at any of these papers.

Mr. CRAIG:

Sir, let me join in this protest. I would even like to go a step further. I am one of the persons who received my papers about 7.30 last night. The House was on recess for 10 long weeks. Last Tuesday we drew to the attention of the Government the fact that after a recess of 10 weeks they had nothing on the Order Paper apart from one item which had been left over.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, Sir. The hon. Member is persisting in making one mistake over and over again. There could have been no other matter on the Agenda. Things have to be put on the Order Paper in here, and not from Government Headquarters or from the Cabinet. It is necessary to introduce things in the House of Assembly. There is no use complaining that only one item was on the Order Paper, because only one item was left over.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is not really a point of order.

Mr. CRAIG:

If you will allow me to develop my point, it is due to bad management of the Government. I think the people of Barbados are treated with disrespect when you can send out Order Papers to be discussed in Parliament, which have been received by the Clerk of the House some time on Friday - my colleague has said that it is a 5-day week and no postal arrangements have been made - and then you have the Deputy Marshal of the House running around like a little messenger boy delivering papers. If we adjourn on Tuesday and papers are received by the Clerk of the House on Friday, what has happened to the Police who used to take around the papers? It was the customary practice to send out papers by the Police. Last night when I arrived at my home I found papers regarding the people's business to be discussed in this House today.

Mr. Speaker, Members on that side will get up in the Chamber and say that they have 18 seats. They are not affecting me, but they are affecting the entire public. We cannot make any proper contribution to these matters, in the circumstances, because we cannot get together in time to discuss certain matters, You have your Planning Unit at your disposal as well as all the planning that you have to do well in advance, and, as my colleague has said, even your own back benchers cannot come in here and make a worthwhile contribution through the inefficiency of the Government. 12.15 p.m.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Acting Prime Minister is a person who can understand. He is a reasonable man. I join the formal protest with my colleague in having these documents dealt with today. Wednesday, surely, but you cannot do them today. There is a Resolution for the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board. People are being held up with the payment of their money; but seeking to deal with these papers today is disrespect for the people of this country. It is bad when a Government gets into power and decides that it can do things at this level.

It is not a credit to the Leader of the House, and it is not a credit to you, Mr. Speaker. I have heard Mr. Speaker make a complaint over the indecent haste with which papers have been brought down and laid on the Table of the House for members to discuss; and I am asking and beseeching the Leader of the House not to continue today with the matters we have before us. I know that the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board is full of trouble. If the people do not get their money there is trouble on your hands. I will subscribe to doing that, but I am not prepared to do any other matter during the course of the day.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is an old complaint - the question of the distribution of Order Papers in general. It is very regrettable. I agree with the hon. Member that important matters should not be dealt with on this basis, if the papers were only received last night. I would suggest that we can probably suspend the relevant Standing Order - Standing Order No. 6 - and proceed with the Resolution dealing with the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board, then with Private Members' Business, and at a later stage when Members, being seasoned politicians, have had a chance to study the papers, one or two other items of

business could be dealt with.

I agree that Members should be given an ample opportunity to study the various Resolutions and Bills. If I can compromise, we can deal with the Resolution for \$720,459 in order to provide.....

Mr. CRAIG:

I just want to have something clarified. You said that you would suspend die relevant Standing Order No. 6, Will that be done at this stage?

Mr. SPEAKER:

Obviously not. He is making a suggestion.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I am trying to be reasonable. As the hon. Member has said, I always try to be reasonable. I am trying to do what I think is reasonable and right. So, if you do the Resolution for \$720,000 odd for the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board at this stage - Hon. Members are aware of what are the implications. He has been attacking over here on that score. Instead of working a five day week, in order to do a better job and give better satisfaction to the public generally, workmen of this Board are now working on Saturdays and even on Sundays. It is not a question of backpay, but of providing money to meet these contingencies and also to meet arrears of interim pay increases.

The programme I have suggested would be to do that Resolution and then Private Members' Business, and later on before we rise it might be possible to do two or three more Resolutions.

In the event that hon. Members are not prepared to go along with that, we will come back here tomorrow at 12 o'clock. We are paid to do the taxpayers' business and we will have to come back, and what we cannot get through with today will have to be done tomorrow starting at 12 o'clock.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I think that the attitude of the Leader of the House is the wrong one. How in the name of justice can he expect that Members on this side who received their papers too late or did not receive them in due time can do their work today? What he should worry himself about is what was responsible

for members receiving their papers at the late hour at which they received them. Has the Leader of the House addressed his mind to this to see if he can remove the circumstances which have brought about such a situation? That is our first concern.

The point is this: if the Leader of the House is now suggesting that we begin with one particular item with respect to the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board because he is afraid of the Sanitation and Cemeteries workers - that is what it means - or he is afraid of offending the Trade Union and is prepared to do that particular Resolution - What I am saying is that if you sure going to enter on one now, and you agree the papers were not received on time, why suggest that Members will have to deal with them whether they received them this morning, yesterday morning, the morning before or the night after or whatever it is? Does it mean that they have 18 members and will do them and that we in the Opposition will have to be at the mercy of the Government whether or not we get papers in time?

I am not concerned with who brought the papers. They were duly brought, so much that all the papers due to be delivered were delivered. It is a question of the time of delivery. What we are concerned about today is that I do not think it is decent on the part of the Leader of the House to be telling us that if we do not do this business now, we will have to come back tomorrow at 9 o'clock or 10 o'clock.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, who said 9 o'clock or 10 o'clock? That is a misrepresentation. I said midday.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, when I said that the hon. Member said 9 or 10 o'clock, I was not trying to be specific about what he said as regards time. I was concerned with his attitude and approach to the problem. For my part, if the House was summoned for 5 o'clock tomorrow morning, to do the people's business, I would be here at least five minutes to five o'clock. Whatever time it is summoned, I will try to be here; what I do not like is that matters of this nature, money Resolutions for the service of the country should be dealt with in this manner.

Some Members, I believe, have not had the time to do their homework. I do my own and am not responsible for any other Member who has not been able to do his. I am always prepared to do the people's business; but I share the view of other Members that it is not fair or reasonable or just to serve a bundle of papers on us at such a late hour and expect us to come next day at such short notice and do justice to ourselves and our constituents in such circumstances.

The Leader of the House must adopt an entirely different attitude. I appreciate the fact that he is coming to the end of his tether and these are the things that you look for. 12.25 p.m.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, let us all be very clear. These are all matters which would stretch into very far ranging debate. The question of making an amendment to the Underground Water Control Act is not as simple as the Leader of the House thinks, and all of us who are interested in agriculture are interested in water supply. It is not a question of coming back tomorrow at 12 o'clock; ideas have to be pooled and put together for the benefit of the entire country.

Mr. Speaker, when papers are delivered at 12 o'clock to people who are employed other than having to come to Parliament that does not help us whatsoever. It is not justice to anybody including the back benchers. We have come in here and have said before that when notices are given of papers, the Members on this side should be given a copy of the documents at that time in order that we may know what is going on. As it is now we only sit down here and hear a Bill introduced and we do not see it, so how can we know what it is all about? We have already asked that the procedure be looked into. What should be done is this; the Leader of the House should get Members of the Debates Committee together and work out a procedure and come back to the House and say "we have decided to do this". It is not anything to us if you don't do it today. If you do not do it today, it is no use saying you will come back tomorrow and do the people's business. None of us are shirking from doing the people's business. What I would suggest is this; I would suggest that the Leader of the House suspend the Sitting for a few minutes, and call together the Members of the Debates Committee and go into the matter now....

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member should realize that the composition of the Debates Committee is of Members from both Houses, so that suggestion is not practical.

Mr. BOLDEN:

It is practical in that there are Members on this side who are on the Debates Committee, and it is here where the action begins. Over on this side we have on the Debates Committee the hon. Member for St. Peter. You all could get together and work out a compromise and let us know what is going to happen. We have said before now that when you come down with a First Reading, you should provide us with copies of what is being dealt with. It is not a question of saying we are going to come back and do it."

Hon. R StC. WEEKES:

Mr. Speaker, I wfl like to refer to the point made by the hon. Member for St. Joseph in regard to his saying that when a Bill is read a First Time he does not know what it is about; he said that when a Bill is being read a First Time in this House he does not know what is in the Bill.....

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order. I wonder what the Minister is going to say. I do not understand the Hon. Minister.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

This is the last time I will hear you.

Hon. R. StC. WEEKES; Mr. Speaker, the point I am making is that when a Bill is read a First Time, none of us know what is in it beside the person who is reading it, so I associate myself with what the hon. Member has been saying when he said that when the hon. Member introduced a Bill last time he did not know anything about what was in it.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN:

M. Speaker, in this matter I must confess that I find myself in sympathy with the Opposition. I do not see how we can all understand what a Bill is about unless some copy is given of what is being dealt with, and I would suggest at this stage that some agreement be reached. I will suggest that time be given for Private Members' Business to be dealt with and during that time the Hon. Leader of the House could consult with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and see if they could find a way to work this out.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Is that the decision?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, as a compromise, I think the Deputy Leader of the Opposition will agree. He intimated, and apparently he understands my way of thinking - I will suggest, and, I agree with him when he said that we could do the Resolution for the \$720,000. We could do that and then go on to Private Members' Business and during that time we could become conversant with the views on that matter. If we do not arrive at any decision we will have to come back tomorrow.

Mr. SPEAKER:

As it stands now, matters have to be regularised.

ADDITION OF MR. A. DaC. EDWARDS TO COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Hon. Member for St. Andrew be added to the present Committee of Privileges in order that the Committee be properly constituted. The Committee will then comprise Mr. Speaker and other Members of the House as already appointed, and the Hon. Member for St. Andrew.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

I beg to second that.

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

DOCUMENTS LAID

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Agreement establishing the Caribbean Investment Corporation.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Rate of Interest Order, 1973. 12.35p.m.

GOVERNMENT NOTICE

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

M. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$32,800 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. 22, which form" die Schedule to the Resolution.

NOTICE OF QUESTIONS

M. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following questions

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

Is the Minister aware that the road at Lakes, St. Andrew is in a bad state of repair?

Is the Minister also aware that this road is very narrow and ought to be widened with proper verges constructed to avoid the breaking away of the edges of the road?

If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, will the Minister state how soon he proposes taking action to ameliorate this situation?

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

Is the Minister aware that residents of Lakes, Farrell's Road, Belleplaine, Walkers and Shorey's Village have deposited money for almost three years with the Telephone Company for the installation of telephones in their homes?

Is the Minister also aware that some of these deposits have been refunded and that some are still outstanding?

If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, would the Minister investigate the reasons for the failure of the Telephone Company to install these telephones, and use his good office to find out how soon, if at all, these people will be able to have their telephones installed?

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

Is the Minister aware that the residents of Grecia's Road, Corbin's Village, St. Andrew have for quite some time now, been asking for a water main without any success?

If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, will the Minister take immediate action to see that a water supply is provided for these said residents?

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

Is the Minister aware that there is a small village in the Parish of St. Andrew called Cleland Tenantry?

Is the Minister also aware that this village is serviced by a road which is not macadamised?

Is the Minister also aware that residents in this village in the rainy season find it difficult to get in and out of the village because of the bad condition of the road?

If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, would the Minister state what action he proposes to take to improve the living standards of the above-mentioned residents?

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

Is the Minister aware that the question of street lighting for the residents of Triopath via Friendship and Foothill via Cane Garden in the parish of St. Andrew has been discussed with the appropriate Utility Company since 1971?

And is the Minister aware that to this date no positive action has been taken in respect of the installing of the street lights in these areas?

If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, would the Minister state what action, if any, is proposed, to supply these two areas with street lighting as has been done in respect of several areas in other parishes since the initiation of the extended street lighting programme?

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

Is the Minister aware that there is a world shortage of animal protein diet?

Is the Minister also aware that several young animals are being slaughtered at the Abattoir of the B.M.C., which could very well be kept and reared to maturity and bred to increase the animal population of this country?

If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, would the Minister consider:

(a) the establishment of a feed lot or feed lots for the rearing of these animals?

(b) the provision of a fund under the Livestock Development Programme so that these animals may be purchased when the owners find it expedient to sell them?

(c) rearing these animals to maturity and selling them either by auction or otherwise to farmers who are interested in the expansion of the Livestock Development Programme, and the male animals to butchers for slaughter and distribution of the said animal protein to local consumers?

Mr. Speaker, there are two other questions which I have sent to the Clerk of the Chamber, and I am asking for leave to give notice of them later in the day's sitting since it is my understanding that there are a few amendments to be made to such questions.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Question standing in the name of the hon. Member for St. Lucy.

Mr. GREAVES:

To enquire of the Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology

Is the Minister aware that there has within recent weeks been an enormous increase in the price of fishing equipment including fishing gear, fishing boat engines and spare parts?

And is the Minister aware of the many hardships which this is causing among fishermen and boat owners alike?

Can the Minister state the reasons for this sudden increase in the price of the abovementioned items?

And can the Minister state what action he proposes to take to ensure that these hardships are relieved so that an important part of the economic life of this country is not strangled?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day begin I think we should suspend the relevant Standing Orders.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I believe you are anticipating the Leader of the House.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER No. 6

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Order No. 6 be suspended for the remainder of the Day's Sitting.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN:

I beg to second that.

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Resolution to grant the sum of \$720,459 be the first Order of the Day.

Hon. A. MORRISON:

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. G. L. EASTMOND, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair. The House went into Committee of Supply. Mr. LOWE took the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1973-74 No. 20

A Resolution for the sum of \$720,459 was called.

Hon. G. L. EASTMDND:

Mr. Chairman, in introducing this Resolution I would like to say that during the month of May, 1973 arrears of interim pay were due to the sanitation workers, and those arrears amounted to \$223,841 which was paid from 1st April, 1972 to 31st March, 1973. During the same month the Barbados Workers' Union made negotiations with the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board for a five-day week for the workers, and in making new negotiations it meant that more money was needed for overtime pay. 12.45 p.m.

The arrears of overtime pay amounted to \$915,000, and this was for the period 1st April, 1973 - 31st August, 1973. In the meantime, the sanitary conditions of this Island worsened because of the 5-day week, and the Board have had to ask for more money to enable the sanitation workers to work on Saturdays from August until December. This called for an increase of \$100,000 from 1st October, 1973 to 31st December, 1973. There was also an increase in travelling allowances which amounted to \$10,932.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to give a breakdown of this money which also includes additional expenditure for revised wages at a basic rate. That amount is \$290,686. We are now asking for a total

amount of \$720,459 to relieve the sanitation workers.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, my first duty is to thank the Hon. Acting Minister of Health for passing to me what I may call an advanced copy of her breakdown of this Sanitation and Cemeteries Board subvention before the debate had been entered upon. I feel that, in doing so, she has adopted an attitude which, if even substantive Ministers were to follow from time to time, would help us in our debates very considerably, and I wish to compliment her for the step she has taken.

Mr. Chairman with regard to the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board, if I were feeling around for words to describe the whole system those words came from the mouth of the Acting Minister who told us that conditions worsened because of the 5-day week. We take it that she means the work of scavenging and the consequent possibilities that it could have caused to the health of the nation and so on.

Mr. Chairman, it is stark wickedness having to bring this Resolution before this Honourable House at this time. It is, in my view, a total disregard for the taxpayers of this country. It is merely because the Government is afraid to offend the Barbados Workers Union even when, in offending the Union, they are doing so in the interests of the entire community, that we find ourselves here being asked to vote \$720,459 this afternoon. It is not right; it is not just. What kind of Government have we, if the Government is going to act in such a manner? It is not a case where the Government is prepared to have all of its workers, who are doing the same type of work as the workers at the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board, on the same 40-hour basis and pay them time-and-a-half, double time, and so on, as has been agreed upon.

Mr. Chairman, you have people in our public markets who are doing work similar to the work done by the scavengers. What consideration has ever been given to those workers? We are asking the Government and the Barbados Workers' Union not to make fish of one and fowl of the other. If bread is good for one, then let everybody get some of it. That is the way we feel about it. We must say that the action taken by the Minister of Health is a matter of collective responsibility under the Cabinet system.

Out of this \$720,459, I see that \$100,000 is estimated for overtime wages for workers at the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board. There is an increase in the travelling allowances in the sum of \$10,932, and \$95,000 for arrears of overtime. These three sums of money should be paid out of the salaries of the Ministers. The Ministers should be called upon to make some special arrangement for paying this money out of their pockets. I am serious about this.

With regard to the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board, I would say that it is the clumsiest body of Dems-supporters I can think of. You have people on that Board who are saying, "We are Dems, you know." That is their only contribution to anything done by the Board. The people in the Barbados Workers' Union are Dems. The members of the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board are Dems. The position is that the taxpayers of this country find themselves sandwiched between two bodies of Dems.

I have said in here already that I have absolutely nothing against the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board or any other Board employing workers on a 40-hour-a-week basis, but I will get up in arms against any Board that allows itself, for any reason whatsoever, to be drawn into a situation, in a place like Barbados, where it had to sign an agreement with anybody for a 40-hour week from Monday to Friday. It is short-sightedness on the part of the members of the Board to allow themselves to be drawn into this sort of thing. 12.55 p.m.

If they wanted to be decent with the whole exercise, if the Government happens to be their friends, God look in mercy! They could relieve their friends from all of this. They could talk with the workers and explain the situation, and they could overcome it. They could save the country from all of this.

How can we, Mr. Chairman, expect to continue for the rest of our lives with a situation like this? I am telling you now that I am not fighting against the workers. I want to see the workers employed. I am not concerned about whether the moment they put down their brooms, after working 40 hours, another gang starts for another 40 hours once the streets are kept clean. I am not concerned about this. Saturday is a normal working day. I agree with setting aside Sunday as one day of rest. I think, that I am right in saying, and I believe that even the Government knows that in spite of what they have put in these notes - I think that they are somewhat misleading. I believe that the Union has slipped up on this point, because I believe I am right in saying that a public holiday is an ordinary day still for some of these Sanitation and Cemeteries Board workers and not as some of the Government people seem to believe that it really is.

Mr. Chairman, what we are saying is this: we want to see the Government get out of this. It is upsetting the whole community, and as the Minister tells us, conditions have worsened. We see it for

ourselves. You can imagine for yourself the City of Bridgetown, and the houses of the poor people cheek and jowl and you find some of the sanitation bins are even stuck on to some of the people's houses so to speak. You should be cleaning these bins mornings and evenings. The Board is planning to reduce the number of trips that the cleaners are making. You cannot do it in some vicinities. Perhaps in some of the more sophisticated areas, in some of these built-up areas, where people have their own conveniences they could look to disposing their own refuse and help save the country from some of the mess that is now growing up all around us.

Mr. Chairman, I think that I am right in saying that the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board has some equipment to take into the alley ways and do a quick clean-up of bottles and some of the heaps and mounds and removing them. What has become of this equipment? Why is it that the Board is not prepared to use the equipment that was bought to clean up the place? Is it because the Trade Union says that it should not use this equipment? If the Government cannot deal effectively with the problem because it is bargaining with the Trade Union, the Government should give up the running of this country to the Trade Union. Do it officially. Let the Trade Union run this country for them.

They cannot come and tell us that we must be satisfied with having to pay extra on Saturdays in a poor country. You are hearing that Barbados is this poor country and you have to be borrowing from here and there and depending on this and that; and people are dying, starving and naked. They cannot get work. Everything, Mr. Chairman is restricted by way of taxation, income tax, property tax, consumption tax and whatever it is. More and more taxation is being put on the people, and for what? To take the same money and throw it away on the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board for an inefficient manner of running the affairs of scavenging?

The Government can easily liquidate the Board. If there is no employer there can hardly be any employee. The Attorney General can advise them on the indebtedness of the Government to these workers. The Government can then give out scavenging to someone on contract' for a limited period and let the people who take over the work employ these workers on entirely different conditions that are more acceptable to a country like Barbados.

The Union has taken the Government for a ride. I am asking the Union on behalf of the poor people of this country to relieve the Government of this stranglehold. The people cannot hear it any longer. You are paying more money and getting less work done. How can this be? The Chairman of the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board appeared on television some time ago. He tells you that the supervisors are not doing their job. I am telling you now that the next morning the supervisor should have been appointed Chairman of the Board and the Chairman fired. It shows that the Minister of Health is not doing his work. If the Chairman finds that the supervisors were not doing their jobs, it was his duty to report them to the proper authorities, but not to go on television and tell the public that they were not doing their

work and to come next morning and work with those same people. He should have been dismissed, and one of these supervisors put in his place and shown how this scavenging could be done for at least two thirds of what it now costs.

I believe that all of us are concerned, Sir, about this state of affairs. I do not believe that anybody wants to deny the workers their opportunity to work, but what we want to say is this: we want when the workers work 40 hours a week that they give us work for the money that they are receiving. That is what we want to see; but we do not want to see this situation, where on Saturdays and now we see on Sundays, that provision has been made to call them out.

What we should not lose sight of, is the fact that this amount of money which we are being asked to expend only carries us to 31st December this year. It does not carry us to the 31st March next year. How are we going to be able to cope with this situation? We must come back during December or earlier to make provision as to how we are going to carry on unless the Government and the Trade Union come together and make some arrangement as to how they are going to deal with this situation.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I believe that the way is now being made clear for the Trade Union and the Government to sit down as brothers in arms and counsel one with the other and to see what solution can be found, and what we can do to solve this problem for the benefit of all of us.

We are reaching very dangerous proportions and I wish to assure the Hon. Minister that we on this side are not opposing the voting of this money as such. What we have to look at in particular is the inefficiency of the Board as such. The Minister has fallen down somewhere along the line and the Government as a whole has had a long marriage of convenience with the Trade Union, which is preventing it or hindering it in some way from carrying out its duties and functions efficiently on behalf of the country as a whole. 1.05 p.m.

These are the things, Mr. Chairman, that I would like to see attended to in as short a time as possible because it means a lot to us. I must now wind up.

Mr. Chairman, there is an overtime of \$100,000 due under this plan. Sir, I believe that a plan could be found where we would have an entirely new gang for this work. If we find a gang to do this Saturday work then we could do it for less than this \$100,000. This is what I would bring to the Minister's attention.

Hon. A. MORRISON:

Mr. Chairman, I did not want to get into this debate but I would like to point out this with regard to the introduction of the five day week. I would imagine that if you are going to operate a five day week - 40 hour week - this would help create unemployment. This is what it would do, and I do not like the idea; I am opposed to this idea of paying overtime rates when there are people in Barbados who can also do the same job. We should be able to operate some kind of system whereby more people would be able to get a dollar bill. We now have a situation whereby people draw overtime rate and they are more or less justified by the Union's demands in having a little access to overtime rates. I do not think that a Government can sit back and allow one set of people to draw overtime rates and leave the condition of the streets as they are because I have been very much embarrassed by the amount of garbage all over the place. We are fast becoming a dirty country - in the City and in the suburbs.

Mr. Chairman, we do not mind paying the money but I am saying that more people should be involved in getting a livelihood and making a living in this country. I do not believe in the payment of overtime rates at this stage of our development.

Mr. E. E. GREAVES:

Mr. Chairman, I do not think I can allow this debate to go on without making some comments or observations on what has been said here both in the introduction of this Resolution and in the speech made by the hon. Member for St. Peter. One of the first things that I would like to say is that we find it extremely difficult to follow in any kind of logical form any speech which the hon. Member for St. Peter makes, in that he starts off on one premise and then the conclusion is entirely different from the point on which he started off.....

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, it depends on the ability of the person who is listening, to appreciate what I am saying.

Mr. E. E. GREAVES:

Mr. Chairman, I thank the hon. Member very much. This is evidence of the illogical kind of argument that we get from the hon. member for St. Peter. From the remarks made by the hon. Member for St. Peter at the outset of his speech in connection with the bringing of this Resolution to this House, if I can understand what the hon. Member meant, the only conclusion to which I could come is that the hon. Member was totally opposed to this Resolution. He talked about the total disregard for the taxpayers in this country. His talk today seems to be inconsistent with the position he took up earlier this year with

regard to money Resolutions coming to this House. At that time he was concerned with getting all that he felt was for him and in seeing to it that he was getting a just reward for what he is doing as a Member of this House. Now a proper wage has been arrived at as well as proper conditions of employment, the hon. Member is raising his voice as it were objecting.....

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, On a point of order, I never spoke against the employment of workers. My only point was the question of a five day week being introduced...

Mr. E. E. GREAVES:

Mr. Chairman, it is just like the monkey - the higher the monkey climbs, we know what we see. He does not even realise that the five day week is included in conditions of employment. I do not know whether he understands what is contained in conditions of employment, but I would like to explain this; that the forty-hour week was agreed on during discussions which were held and as a result of which the Resolution is brought, and I would like to say also that I am obviously supporting this Resolution because it is something which was long overdue. 1.15 p.m.

The Union has written on more than one occasion to the Ministry pressing them to get this matter finalised, because we were dissatisfied with the delay which was being encountered even after it was agreed ultimately before the Chief Labour Officer, who is appointed by the Government to ameliorate and conciliate in these matters, and at a meeting between the Board and the Union under the Chairmanship of the Chief Labour Officer it was agreed that the five day week, Monday to Friday, would be implemented. I would like to point out that this five day week, Monday to Friday, does not mean that work will not be done on Saturdays and Sundays, it simply means that any work done on Saturday and Sunday would have to be paid for at overtime rates. The Member for St. Peter made mention of the fact that this is a kind of situation which cannot be accepted in Barbados, or perhaps is something which is not good for the country. He might have read what ELC wrote yesterday about the seven day week in India, but I think what one has to bear in mind is that you have a situation where workers in other categories are enjoying this five day week, Monday to Friday, and the Union believes that workers should be entitled, wherever possible, to weekends off. As a matter of fact, I think it is in keeping with the ILO Convention on this, that is, the Convention does not specifically state this but it does suggest that wherever the five day week is achieved efforts should be made to get the weekend off, that is, Saturday and Sunday.

The point we are making is that we have the situation where workers in other sectors are enjoying the five day week, Monday to Friday, and if they are required on other day then they have to be paid overtime rates, and we do not see this as a backward step. We are interested in the dignity of workers and we feel that wherever possible we should try to upgrade the workers from the point of view of their

conditions of employment and their wages, and at the same time give workers a feeling of belonging in the community, and I think that the respect of workers is something which we should never forget. It seems however that the Member for St. Peter would want to forget this. He made mention of the fact that the Barbados Workers' Union can relieve their friends, and I think he referred to the friends of the Barbados Workers' Union as the Government. What I want to inform the hon. Member, and anybody else for that matter who might be thinking along those lines, is that when the Union sets out to negotiate for workers, the only friends it has are the workers it represents. When we go to negotiate we do not negotiate on the basis of friendship, we negotiate on the basis of getting what we consider the best for the workers; the question of friendship does not arise.

I would like to put the hon. Member's mind at rest. It seems as if he thinks that the Barbados Workers' Union is interested in taking over the Government or running this country. I want to set his mind, and maybe the minds of other people, at ease and say that we are not interested in taking over the running of this Government, what we are interested in is seeing that the workers in this country get a proper deal, and this is what we are doing in this country. It is rather strange that the hon. Member for St. Peter would in his speech attempt to isolate the workers from the community as such in that here it is he is talking about the workers, as it were, holding the community up to ransom, but I think one of the vital points he is losing sight of is that the workers are also part of the community, and it is difficult to understand their holding themselves up to ransom.

Mention was also made about liquidating the Board and re-employing the workers under new conditions of employment. I think this is the kind of approach which the hon. Member would adopt if he ever had the power to deal with these things, and I am sure that to implement a policy of this nature would be asking for a lot of trouble. I think that it should also be noted that when this agreement was reached between the Union and the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board - if my memory serves me correctly - the hon. Member for St. James was a member of that Board, and I have not heard of him resigning from the Board. If they were so opposed to this agreement I believe the principle which the hon. Member for St. James should have followed would have been to resign from the Board, but this did not happen, I understood that the Board fired him. (Mr. CRAIG: Why do you not sit down, you foolish idiot?)

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

There are too many asides. The next time I will ask you to leave, you must always speak in undertones when another Member is addressing the Chair. The hon. Member may proceed.

Mr. GREAVES:

Mr. Chairman, on the question of conditions worsening because of the implementation of the five day week, I think we have to take this matter in as broad a perspective as possible. People have been

adopting the wrong approach and have been looking for people whom they consider to be defenceless to pounce upon them in order to, as it were, attempt to solve the problems there are in sanitation. I do not think that one can deny that there are problems, but I think that where people have attempted to identify the problems, they have been looking in the wrong places, and I would suggest that one of the major problems facing this country with regard to sanitation is the fact that people have got into the bad habit of depositing litter all over the place and at any time they feel like depositing it. I think that this is something which must be put in the proper perspective, because you have a situation where - and I have seen this for myself - about two or three minutes after the truck has passed, litter is put back there, and it looks as if nothing has been done. I think we have to implement measures which would educate people as to how to deposit litter, the times at which this should be done, and to reorganise the methods of collection from the point of view of ensuring that the trucks pass at a specific time and that it is known when the trucks are going to pass. My analysis of the situation is that it is not at all the result of the implementation of the five day week, because even when the workers were working on a seven day week basis there was still litter. I would like to challenge any Member of the Opposition to tell this House here today that when the workers were working longer hours there were not still a number of complaints about the large amount of litter which was left on the street. It is because people have extremely bad habits about the way they treat their litter, so I think we have to get this situation in the right perspective, and I would hope that the Ministry would be looking into this with a view to ensuring that proper methods are adopted and to ensure that people are educated as to how to dispose of litter, that the trucks will be coming and at what time, and that they will implement and institute a proper system of collection from the point of view of having the garbage properly stored. 1.25 p.m

We hope that, as soon as this Resolution is passed today, the workers will receive the money due to them. I have referred to this matter earlier on which the Union had written to the Board on numerous occasions, and we hope that the workers will receive the money very soon.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Chairman, Section 4 of the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board Act places on the Board various obligations, and I want to remind this Committee of the functions which the Board should carry out.

4.(1)The functions of the Board shall be-

(a) to remove house rubbish and other rubbish from any premises;

(b) to sweep, cleanse and water streets;

(c) to provide and maintain in a sanitary condition suitable places, buildings and appliances for the deposit or destruction of refuse and rubbish;

(d) to provide and maintain public baths and public sanitary conveniences;

(e) to provide and maintain cemeteries, burial grounds and crematoria.

I think that, perhaps, with the exception of the fifth of those functions that the country at large, regardless of their political or trade union affiliation, must agree that the Board have fallen down and they continue to fall down in performing their functions properly.

I believe that what is regrettable about Barbados in the 1970s is the failure of people to grapple with problems because of the various fears in this country. In this case it is the fear of alienation of other persons for political or other reasons. I am not satisfied that the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board is carrying out either of the provisions of the Act or is doing a proper job in this country, nor am I satisfied that the employees of the Board - and this includes from the Supervisors down - are giving of their best in this situation.

Finally, I am totally dissatisfied with the attitude of the public at large towards the question of the health standards in this country. I am also dissatisfied with the attitude of people in authority to answer these problems. I am deeply disappointed with the Hon. Member for St. Lucy who should only in the last two minutes of his speech advert to some of the substantive problems that will arise. I know that he has a trade union interest to represent, but we must be mindful in Barbados that our narrow parochial interest is not leading us to betraying the full interest of the public at large. Certainly there should be a strong case for an increase in wages for workers be they sanitation workers, Parliamentarians, or anybody else. Some of the increases granted in Parliament were higher than the increases granted to the sanitation workers, and far be it from me to criticise the collective agreement on this basis.

Sir, when one is implementing an agreement one must be sensible, and it would be far from honest on my part for me to confess to any happiness about the implementation of a 5-day week from Monday to Friday. The effect of the agreement is to have an increase higher than 25% - not that this might be bad - since you have introduced an element of time-and-a-half, double time, and so on, on various days.

I believe the comment made by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture - and this is my first time to congratulate him on ascending so rapidly - was a worthwhile one. If you are going to accept a 5-day week completely from Monday to Friday, then you must look for another means of dealing with normal time over the week-end and expanding employment opportunities, or say to the Union: "Let us be sensible." There are certain categories of persons, who will never work a 5-day week in essential services. Suppose every doctor, nurse, or policeman, insisted on the implementation of the 5-day week from Monday to Friday and overtime rates on Sundays and Bank Holidays. You would have inflation in a spiralling economy. I am not bothered about whether this is reported from the platforms or not because I think, eventually, it is a test of one's honesty, and it would be far from honest on my part for me to confess to any happiness about the implementation of this matter. The Board were ridiculously incompetent in accepting this situation, and the Government were scared in bowing to it simply because they are afraid of Frank. That is the name of this calypso that we should have. They are afraid of Frank, and this is very bad for a country like Barbados.

I agree that there is a close association between the present political party as there was once between the Opposition and the Trade Union, but certainly we must be careful that our associations do not lead us into the situation where we cannot grapple with a problem when it arises. Now, I want to speak specifically about my constituency and the dirtiness and slime that I am finding there. This is not dirtiness and slime because people are not putting their refuse out on time, but it is dirtiness and slime arising from the fact that the collections of refuse are not being carried out properly. I toured my constituency on Sunday for one and a half hours, and I found litter all the way through Harts Gap, Dayrells' Road and Forde's Road. The Public Bath was unclean for months. I am told that there was a cut-back in work, That is not satisfactory for a place like Barbados.

Sir, at Christmas I have had to telephone the hon. Member for St. George North and beg him to use his good office and his former knowledge of the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board to give relief to poor people - not people in the Hastings District - in the King's Village area who were unable to enjoy their Christmas Day dinner because of the stench in the area. It does not matter to which Party you belong; it does not matter whether you are running for a seat now or never again, you cannot be complacent about this situation.

Sir, I have the greatest respect for the hon. Member for St. Lucy, but I think that he, too, must try to educate the people whom he represents because the categories of workers today are very wide. They range from the highest civil servant down to the lowest worker. You must educate them that they have a duty to themselves. After all, a Government can only be run by taxing the people themselves, and we are getting into the danger of taking from the community at large thinking we are satisfying a few people and failing to satisfy the community at large. I want, however, to join him on one plea that it is time that

the Government introduce in this country very severe penalties for the indiscriminate spreading of litter in Barbados. I should like to see a strong anti-litter Bill which is enforced stringently. It is time that the Government look at the whole question of reforming the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board so that Members can make their decisions without looking over their shoulders. 1.35 p.m.

I believe that you had a very good Chairman from your constituency, but because of the pressures of politics, he was ousted without so much as a few hours' notice and was replaced by another gentleman. As a result there has been worse chaos. People should be treated properly and not as the hon. Member for St. George has been treated.

I appeal to the Government which has been in power for twelve years now that it should feel sufficiently confident in itself not to look at Boards and Chairmanships in the narrow concept of whether the people will carry out certain policies. Barbados has a limited amount of money anyhow, and with the best intention it contains people who are prepared to get very far for political reasons and who do not have ability. Let us get people with the ability to operate and operate properly. Let us not be dictated solely by political considerations.

I am saying that the situation has deteriorated. Regardless of what memories we may have of the City Council, and what we may try to say against the former Mayor of Bridgetown, I think we will agree that he maintained harmonious relations with the Union and looked after the interest of the workers and at the same time managed to keep the City relatively clean and better than it is today,

If you want to check, walk around Tudor Street or stand by Harrisons and smell the stench coming from those gutters. Do we really want our country to be known as a country of bad smells? Is it satisfactory for a country that is advancing? Why is it now that when the country is in control by its own people, including the working class people or sons of the working class people and a black majority we should accept less high standards than we used to accept before?

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the hon. Member for St. Lucy will believe me when I tell him that I am as much interested in raising the standard of living of the poor class of people in this country as he or anyone else in the Union; but I will not at any time stand by and keep silent where agreements are being implemented without a proper assessment of the total effect on the community at large; because it is not a question of, as he said, the higher he climbs, the more the monkey shows his tail, but cutting your noses to spoil our features.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, the question raised at this time is a far bigger problem than just sanitation. It raises in my mind the question of whether or not this country is going to accept a five-day week purely and simply because the leading members of the Trade Union of this country belong to the Government Party and because they are insisting on a five-day week operating from Monday to Friday. That is what is involved,

I would like to tell the Hon. Minister when she gets up to answer to tell me whether or not a Government employee or an employee of the Board wrote a letter to the Trade Union accepting a Monday to Friday five-day week without consultations with the Board, and whether or not the Board has taken action against that employee or told the Union that it is not our action and therefore we are not settling on these terms. That is what the Minister has got to tell the country and the Board must be also responsible, because, in my opinion, we have reached a situation where this country seems to be contented to accept the principles of fully developed countries when we are an under-developed country.

Any implementations, any putting into effect, any working of a five-day week, Mr. Chairman, must be one which increases the potential of employment rather than decreases it, because we have to look at the effects of this five-day week. We have children being turned out from schools every year. Those children have to be employed otherwise we are going to find ourselves in the position of Trinidad. They are going to be radical. They will take to the hills in St. Joseph and St. Andrew, if you allow the Union to impose a five-day week upon you.

Are we in this country sufficiently strong financially to adopt a second shift which will work over the week-end? The Union must face the problem but if you say you want a five-day week from Monday to Friday what are you going to do with the nurses at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the policemen of the Royal Barbados Police Force, the people at the Waterworks and the people at the Barbados Light and Power Company?

We have come here and we have talked about the people at the Port. You talk about developing the country, about increasing employment in this country, and yet you go into the Port and they tell you that they shut down at 4 o'clock in the evening. The Customs Department tell you that they close their cash registers at a quarter to three. Call the Treasury Building any morning before a quarter past nine. I called there and this is the answer I got: "This is only the janitor speaking. What you called so early for?" My learned friend tells me that they do not take money after 2.30 p.m. The problem is whether the Union has faced up to the responsibility that it should have in the implications of a five-day week. I would have thought that any five-day week implication would mean that you create more employment.

I have come into Parliament before and asked for the scrapping of the Shops Act. If the Broad Street stores want to open 24 hours a day, the Union should come to Parliament and say pass a sound labour law and give inspectors the right to walk into any institution employing labour and demand a labour book and see who clocked in at what time and what time they should leave, and if they are still on the premises, let there be heavy fines for employer and employee. Increase the number of people working.

I know that the Union will go on the platform and abuse me. Instead of doing what I have suggested just now, they say that the Swan Street employees must only work so many hours. You get children walking about. Every time a vacancy occurs, you get 200 people applying for the job. Practically every store in New York is opening 24 hours a day, and little Barbados that prides itself on being a tourist country is shut down. Read the newspapers and you will see "300 tourists arrive at Dead City". I want the newspapers to continue the story and say that 300 tourists arrived at a dirty City with rats running about all over Broad Street, and let us see how the Union will answer that.

Mr. Chairman, there are certain problems facing this country, and the Government is not facing up to these problems. In Sweden and Denmark the question of disposing of rubbish in an economic process, not one of finding holes to dump it in. 1.45 p.m.

I would suggest that we investigate this whole idea and produce in this country a system of disposing of rubbish in such a way that you can work on it and make such changes to it that it can be turned back into the soil where it would become useful. As it is now, all they are doing with it is dumping it in holes. Why cannot we find a profitable way of disposing of the rubbish. There are many ways in which it can be worked on and by which it would become valuable. What has to be done is this; I think the Union has got to sit down with the Government and see what can be done. The position is that today you will see people light their rubbish heaps at night and if no care is taken you will hear that people's houses are burnt down as a result of their trying to get rid of rubbish.

The next point is, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Member for St. Andrew last year came to me in this House and spoke to me regarding the \$40,000 Resolution of which notice was given and which was intended to bring about an investigation into those two diseases - Brucellosis and Leptospirosis - in this country. Mr. Chairman, it is known that rats move from warehouses into the fields and the disease is then transmitted to the cows and other animals which eat the feed. We agreed with the Minister at that time to let the Resolution go through because we know and we understand the danger of the disease to the dairy industry and to the cattle industry in this country.

Can you tell me that the Government is operating in the best interest of the community when on one hand you spend money to create a lab to control Brucellosis and Leptospirosis and on the other hand you allow the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board to operate in such a manner that you breed rats daily by the build-up of rubbish in the country. Those are the questions that I would like to hear the Minister answer. If you want to protect the country in its entirety the first action is to see that when you spend money on one hand, how you are going to eliminate the effects of the recurrence of the disease on the other hand.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I say that the Government has to sit down and look at its overall policy because a bad sanitation programme does not only affect the cattle industry; it also affects the tourist industry of this country, and I have stood up in this Parliament and heard Members on that side speak about rats biting people in the Hospital when the Barbados Labour Party was in power. Ask them what is the result and would be the result of the rat infestation as caused from a bad sanitation policy.

Let us think about the public now. I heard the hon. Kfember for St. Lucy talking about people in Barbados who have a bad policy about rubbish. What is a bad policy about rubbish? Mr. Chairman, it is human nature that if I have rubbish to put out, I am going to put it out. I am not going to keep it in my house to smell stink in at me when I can put it outside. I am going to see that I get rid of it anyhow. That is human nature. But I would like to ask the Government, why should they publish in the Official Gazette - I have one stuck up in my office for the election purposes - in the Official Gazette you are telling me that in St. Joseph a stuff cart is going to pass to collect rubbish only once a week. So you mean I only cook once a week. I only have rubbish to dispose of once a week. Ask the Government how many rubbish bins they have at the side of the roads. If they want to adopt developed countries' practice, they must put the necessary rubbish containers alongside the road and then they must let the lorries pass by every day to take up the rubbish. I was in New York three week-ends ago and on Sunday mornings the department vans passed and cleared the rubbish from outside, in covered bins. Ask the Government how many bins they have provided. Had it not been for Roberts Manufacturing Company who give the bins to the Jaycees and other people, ask the Government how many bins they have provided; and the Union has to get this straight. It is no use getting and talking about "we represent the people" because the very people that belong to the Union are the very people who live in St. Lucy, St. Joseph and Bridgetown, and when disease starts and the tourist industry has come to nought, all of us are going to suffer - Union members and all. So that is what we have to understand, Mr. Chairman.

I agree with my colleague on this side that we need a strong anti-litter Bill but it is no use having a strong anti-litter Bill unless you provide the necessary receptacles for taking the litter, and when you have a strong anti-litter Bill you cannot expect people to drive around with litter in their pockets not knowing where to dispose of litter, The Sanitation and Cemeteries Board can go into Land's End and see how it floats on the water. If you do not provide suitable receptacles to take the litter, how are you going to penalise people? What are the Government's plan in this respect? Where must people put their litter? If you say, "Put your litter out on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays," you must be sure that something

is going to pass along on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays to remove the litter.

I have spoken to the hon. Member for St. George North; I had to call him and ask him to send a lorry to clear the litter stretching all along the Crane Coast and he said he had to speak to the man in charge, and when the men came they said "Skipper, the lorry broke down and we were not even to pass this way today but we remember that we have you and a few hotels around here." Mr. Chairman, I do not want special treatment, because fortunately I have a little gully below me that I can put my litter in but I think of the other people who have nowhere to dispose of their litter.

Mr. Chairman, just let us think about the rats that can be seen at night. Let the Union member for St. Lucy start from Broad Street any night after 10 o'clock; let him start say, from Crumpton Street corner and he will see when the nights are dark how many big rats are running across the road; and it is unfair to the Ministry of Agriculture to come in here and ask for money, it is unfair to the plantation owners and it is unfair to all of us who constantly have to buy rat bait at 35 cents per pound. The Government does not give us free rat bait. It is unfair for us to try to control rats in one section of Government when the Ministry of Health is itself breeding rats. 1.55 p.m.

That is what we mean, the breeding of rats by the Ministry of Health. Mr. Chairman, I understand also the problems of the men in removing rubbish. Every workman deserves his pay, you do not carry prestige to the supermarkets so if the workmen work they must be paid, but I think it is time that everybody in this country understands that every workman has a responsibility to the country. If he is prepared to work from Monday to Monday that is what he is prepared to give to the country, but we must also see that he regulates his working time in such a way that he receives suitable remuneration for the period he has worked. We must also see that he develops the opportunities for those who would like to work but cannot get work to do and he must not place any restraints on the possibilities of the young people who are looking for work by the implementation of a system whereby only those who are now employed will be employed and Bridgetown becomes a dead city.

I would very much like to see the Government look at the whole operation of business in this country. They should come to Parliament - next week if possible - and scrap the Shops Act and implement strong labour laws. My view is that a man should not work more than five hours overtime per week, because there is enough labour in this country that can utilise the extra hours. I would like to see sanitation spread over the entire island seven days a week, but if one man works this weekend somebody else should work the next weekend, because we are all entitled to our period of recreation. If you are Catholic and you want Sundays off you are entitled to Sundays off; if you are Seventh Day Adventists and you want Saturdays off you are entitled to Saturdays off, but that does not mean that nothing should happen over the weekend in this country. We have a long way to go, we are now struggling for survival in the world and it is up to Parliament and Government to give people an opportunity to put this country

on a level footing. I would think that the Union should look at its own policy and ask itself if it is really catering to the young leaving school who want to work. We are running ourselves into the problem that even the Government employees cannot give Government the necessary hours they should work because they have to take time out in the morning to shop, to go to the dentist or anywhere else, but if we had a policy where people would be working 24 hours a day these things would resolve themselves.

The Government must not in any circumstances find itself with its back against the wall because it is supported by the Trade Union. If it calls for a break in Government let the Government be bold enough to say that they represent everyone, including the Trade Union, and let us get the country on a level footing. We are running into problems which should be remedied quickly if we do not want everybody to die.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Chairman, I never had any plans to join this debate for two reasons. I was a member of the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board and it would not be kind for me to criticise the Board on which I was sitting, I tried my best to do what I could to straighten them out but I found many difficulties which led to my calling on the Minister of Health to resign. I had the courage of my convictions as a member of the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board to move a Resolution calling on the Minister to resign, and I will never attend any Board meeting until this is so; that is why I am no longer a member of the Board. I would challenge the member for St. Lucy at this stage - because it is all right to come in here and get under this roof and talk nonsense - but I would challenge him now to step behind the door and whisper to me that I was fired from the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board and I would break his neck and we would all go into the law courts. They have not got a clue as to what is going on, but he wishes to say something, he is given 15 minutes and he says absolutely nothing within that 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, why should we be wasting our time today with a Third XI team. In the absence of the member for St. Michael West we have the member for St. Lucy attempting to put a case on something which he knows absolutely nothing about, but let me remind him that the same Sanitation workers did not want to hear anything from him either, they told him that he did not know what was going on and that they would not listen to him. The whole problem with the Board as I see it, and as a former member of the Board, is one of money. This brings us right back to the Government as a whole, they have no money and if they have no money the Sanitation Board cannot possibly have any. In the Estimates for 1973-74 you have \$2,323,000 voted for the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board, which is a very important Board in this country, but they have always tried as I have observed to reduce sanitation to absolutely nothing. You have on the Board a bundle of dead wood people who turn up for meetings, sleep for five minutes, report for five minutes that they are going to sleep and then draw their money at the end of the month. I have often condemned these Boards and said that whether or not you are in support of a political party it is the bounden duty of a Government, in the interest of a society, to put the best type of people on Boards so that proper contributions can be made.

There is a gentleman called Mr. Lawson Weekes who is Chairman for the St. Michael West group of which the General Secretary of the Trade Union is the Leaden Can you imagine him bargaining for the Board against the General Secretary of the Union? He starts first as Caesar asking Caesar what to do. The Trade Union is not to be blamed in this instance for implementing this system, it was Mr. Weekes who carried on the business and dictated a letter from the Board to the Trade Union and the Trade Union agreed to it, but it was the Minister himself who disagreed and he and the Cabinet had a noise over it and I told him if he was man enough he should resign because he did not agree with this policy. How can you have essential services such as sanitation, electricity, hospital services, the police, the warders at Glendairy and the nurses at the Mental Hospital all working five days a week Monday to Friday? This is not too difficult to imagine because they might say that if the sanitation workers can work for a five day week, Monday to Friday, they are also entitled to it, but I wonder where they would get the money to pay them. 2.05 p.m.

I want to know from where they will get the money. They cannot take the money from the National Insurance Department again. A lot has been said about the trucks, supervisors and so on. if the conditions where the clerical staff have to work are deplorable, then how can you expect them to carry out thek functions properly? When you had Mr. Taylor there he was another so-called Chairman. He would cut your throat for the Prime Minister. He had the audacity to take out his "passport" at a Board meeting and show it to everybody. When you have that type of individual serving on a Board and he is blind to the bad policies and of mismanagement of the Government, then what do you expect?

I am happy to know that the Board has taken a decision to re-employ Mr. Sharpe in order to assist this country in its present sanitary policies. I thought that, when Mr. Sharpe had resigned, they would have found a place for him on the Board to guide them. They have not done that, but they get the Kings from St. Peter and a Mr. Brathwaite and a Mr. Weekes who are Chairmen of the Party Group as well as Justices of the Peace. They do not have to know anything about holding a broom or keeping a bath clean. One only has to be a Chairman of a Party Group and one will be allowed to serve on the Board. That is the problem confronting the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board. You go there and you will find Mr. Weekes with a big book in his hand, telling you how much he knows about the law, and Mr. Brathwaite tries to talk more than Mr. Weekes. They expected me, as a member of the Opposition, to set the fire, I used to sit down with them on that Board and cool out, but it is not my nature to cool out.

Sir, I am asking the Government to pay greater attention to the sanitation of this country. If you go through Sunset Crest, Discovery Bay, and other sophisticated areas, you will find them clean, but if you go to Greenwich Village, Sion Hill, Paynes Bay, and so on, where poor people live, you will find garbage all over the place while the trucks are stationed at "Folkeston", St. James. You cannot criticise the supervisors because they work hand in hand with the workers. They are in a similar position to the workers at Highways and Transport. If you send them to do a job, the checker will check them out and

go back home. I should like to salute the Board once more for re-employing Mr. Sharpe. (Asides.) Mr. Speaker, I do not want to waste time with that thkd division team over there. I hope the Leader of the House will appreciate the fact that we are not speaking against the Trade Union or the workers, as we know it is going to be misinterpreted. The hon. member for St. Lucy says something about if we ever got into power. We are thinking about the statement, "How long is too long." He has tried to twist the argument by saying that we are against the workers. It was the great Sir Grantley Adams who decided to form the Barbados Workers Union, but whenever you find a Trade Union and the Government working hand in hand you will get a collision at some time. We know that this must happen sooner or later, because the Government cannot at all times bow to the wishes of the Union.

Sir, we are told that the Union has the men and the Government has the money, but one of these days something will happen which will bring things to a head. I ask the Leader of the House not to treat the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board as a third-class Board. It is a very important Board, and the sum of \$2 million is not enough for them to carry out their functions.

I beg to move that Mr. Chairman, do now report progress, and ask for leave to sit again.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended for one hour.

Hon. A. MORRISON:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. Mr. SPEAKER suspended the Sitting accordingly. 2.15 p.m.

On- Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Sitting is resumed. When the Sitting was suspended, the House was in Committee of Supply, and to that it now reverts.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply. Mr. LOWE took the Chair.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Chairman, at the time when progress was reported, I had almost reached the end of my contribution on the Resolution before the House. I do not think that I have very much more to say; I will strongly urge, lest the Leader of the House may not have taken note, that it is my strong belief that the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board should not be treated as a third-class Board. It is a Board which has the power to make recommendations and to assist with the health of the country, and I think as a Barbadian that all of us would be quite happy to see the whole situation pertaining to the Board rectified.

If this Resolution can do anything to assist the Board I am quite sure that it was made clear during the day in the debate on this Resolution that it has the blessings of the Opposition.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND:

Mr. Chairman, in winding up this debate, - (Aside so soon? The hon. Member was on).....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I am in the Chair and any hon. Member must first catch my eye.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND:

Many salient points were brought to my attention as regards the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board and several derogatory remarks were made as regards the Government and the Ministers. I am not one who likes to talk for the sake of talking, but I think it is time that the people of Barbados know the facts as they should be told.

The position as it stands, Mr. Chairman, is that the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board is one that can administer and should manage its own affairs. I use the word "should". That Board makes negotiations with the Barbados Workers' Union. The hon. Member for St. Joseph asked me a question which was suitably replied to by the hon. member for St. James who is a member of the Board. Maybe he is or was, but that does not concern me. (ASIDE: That must concern you. You are the Acting Minister.)

This is proof of the type of conduct that goes on in this House. I think that the people of Barbados should come to their senses and realise the type of persons they vote for. If they want their money spent wisely to get the people's business done, this is not the type of person they should have. If you are going to have all kinds of derogatory remarks thrown at other Members, it is not fair. (ASIDE: Tell me about the letter.) Mr. Chairman, with regard to the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board, my Minister and I were told that a small committee had accepted the Union's proposals. These proposals were accepted before the Minister could even state what he wanted or what he thought would have been right. As a matter of fact, I do not think that members of the Board would have taken any word from the Minister about what he thought or that he had the power to tell them what they should have done as regards negotiations. The Board had the power and they went ahead and decided what they wanted.

The Minister was most annoyed and he thought that the Board was most inadequate and should have been dismissed. (ASIDE: He should have fired all, including that member there.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I am not going to tolerate this type of behaviour from hon. Members.

Mr. BOLDEN:

My apologies, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND:

Further negotiations were sought with the Barbados Workers' Union, and the Ministry sent some of its representatives, top level civil servants, to have discussions with the Union. Mr. Chairman, I would like to state that these executive officers who were representing the Minister and the Ministry did not even have time to have a say because the Board members, especially the Chairman of the Board - this is what we were told - told the Union Leader that he accepted the five-day week.

Mr. Chairman, I want to state here that this Government has been saddled with a constitution from previous years of having Statutory Boards. The time has come when this Government must look at these Statutory Boards and ask itself if these people sitting on them are truly fit to sit on these Boards and to administer the affairs of these Boards. (Cheers.)

My observation is that in this little Barbados there is a power game being played not only by members of Statutory Boards, but by people in Government who are put in certain places and who sometimes turn back and give us some lashes which we did not even expect, because some of these people think that they have a certain amount of power in their hands and they do not want to hear anything even from the Cabinet or the Prime Minister or the poor Minister; but they take everything into their own hands and then they unload the responsibility on the Minister. Everything then falls on the Minister and on all Cabinet members.

Mr. Chairman, when the Board accepted a five-day week, there was nothing for the Cabinet to do. The decision was final. What do hon. Members expect the Government to do now? It would have to come to this Honourable House and ask for the money requested. (ASIDES) I would like hon. Members over there to understand that when they are speaking I do not interrupt them. I am doing the Government's business and the people's business. I do not know what they are doing over there, but I know what I am doing. (Aside: I am trying to help you.) I do not want any assistance. Mr. Chairman, I have been told that we have to ask Parliament for \$100,000 in overtime. I am just a simple, ordinary woman who used to be a business-woman, and I would think that any person negotiating with the Union, would think, in the first place, that a Union is necessary, but in the second place, could not accept all the demands as they are put to him

I would think that the workers would have been better off with higher wages where they could get, when they retired, increased pensions on these wages rather than a few workers getting overtime. I put forward the question if I could speak to the workers, if I could say anything to them and I was told that the Board employed the workers. I would have thought that anyone with a little commonsense could have told these workers that instead of fighting for overtime they could have fought for substantial wages so that when they retired, their families would have something to look forward to.

A lot of people are blaming the Government for the five-day week. They did not intend to shut down the Island with a five-day week. It is a

seven-day week but the idea is that people must work 40 hours a week under this system. 3.25 p.m.

What has happened to this rotation system? Do you mean to tell me that the people do not have the foresight whereby they can honestly say that money must be spent properly? After all, overtime is not the answer; that could never be the answer.....

Mr. BOLDEN:

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

This is the last time I will speak to the hon. Member for St. Joseph.

Mr. BOLDEN:

But Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order to say that.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Take your seat. There is nothing to be on a point of order about.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND:

I will continue, Mr. Chairman. Sir, it is about time that the people of Barbados realize the Government's position as it stands. The Government's position as it stands is that this Government, from the time it has been in power - and I have always looked at it and admired it from the time it has been in power - has been to look after the interest of the people, and, in looking after the interest of the people it has happened that the same people whose interest the Government has been looking after, have been pulling the Government down as rapidly as possible. Mr. Chairman, if the responsibility lies with the Ministers, it is time that the Ministers forget all about Boards and take their full responsibility and their slaps when they come to them, but how can a Minister be responsible when he cannot tell a Board "You are fired." A Minister does not have the power. A Minister is expected to work day and night but when it

conies to the Statutory Boards they have all the power - they have everything.

Now getting to another point, Mr. Chairman. The Member for St. James said - he talked about the money that is given to them. When we come in here with Estimates, these Estimates are approved not only by us.....

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Sir, I would like to get the record straight. The Acting Minister stated that the Minister does not have the power to fire the Board, May I draw to her attention section 6 of the Schedule, "The Minister may by instrument in writing at any time revoke the appointment of the Chairman or any member if he thinks it expedient so to do." It is as simple as that, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND:

Mr. Chairman, I do not see his point of order; I really do not see it. The Minister may have the power to fire the Board but the Minister does not have the power to tell the Board and the hon. Member as one of its members that the agreement they made with the Union was null and void. It had to go and it is still going through, and this is what we are getting licks for now, but the hon. Member is one of the same members.....

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of elucidation. Just let me help the Hon. Acting Jvfnister with this, I was never a member of the Committee that negotiated with the Union. I am trying to assist her. Let me show the Acting Minister where she is going wrong. I was not a member of the Committee that negotiated with the Union. It was a Committee set up by the Board; the Committee never reported to the Board therefore the Board did not make any agreement with the Union. The Union was committed because the Committee of the Board committed the Union.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND:

As far as I am concerned, that is nothing, because I never said he was a member of the Committee. I have not even called the names of the members of the Committee; so I do not know what he is driving at.

Mr. Chairman, as regards the money being insufficient, anyone of them over there has a say when the Estimates come through, but I would like to say.....

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order and elucidation, Mr. Chairman. The hon. Minister must not make a statement which reflects unfavourably on Members on this side because under the Constitution no Member on this side can increase a Government vote or even move a Resolution which saddles the Government with the expenditure of money. We are only here to see how the Government is going to spend its money. So the Hon. Acting Minister must not try to get away by throwing this on our side. We are the Opposition.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Point made.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND:

The hon. Member stood in here and talked about the Government spending a lot of money and of the Treasury being empty, and making a lot of foolish remarks and giving the people a lot to say, and yet saying that the money is not sufficient. Why doesn't he look at his bookkeeping and see that he gets proper management? Proper management is necessary.

Mr. Chairman, the next thing I want to say in closing is that we have some very public-spirited people in Barbados. There are some Barbadians who just do not care, and who if they belong to the other side, think they must push the Government down, but we are all Barbadians; and I want to commend the Jaycees and the Lions and other service clubs who come to our rescue and who often offer to give us help. Mr. Chairman, the Board could have been doing its homework over the period of years; the Board could have made recommendations to the Minister. It has a right to make its plans for years ahead and say "We need more trucks, we need this, we need that;" but no, they sit down and wait for the public to say "We will soon be having an epidemic." Mr. Chairman, I offered last year to go out personally and supervise certain sanitation problems that they had and look at some areas. I offered to get the assistance of the inspectors and see what I could do before this problem arose, and all I was told was "Oh, I don't get enough money for travelling allowance, and I do not get this and I do not get that." All they were saying was that they were not satisfied with what they were getting. 3.35 p.m.

All they have in their minds is that this Government has 18 seats and they have only 6, and they are inciting people to do things they should not do.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister is insinuating that there are only six of us on this side and that we are inciting people to do things they should not do. We take exception to it and ask that it be withdrawn.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

It is not unparliamentary. The Minister may proceed.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND:

Thank you, Sir. The next point I want to draw to your attention and to the attention of the public is that we have had requests from the Parks and Beaches Commission, which has been doing good work in Barbados, to sit down and talk to members of the Board and some of the members refused even to come to some of the meetings. The public is not aware of all the things that are happening, but in this little Barbados there is too much selfishness, most of the people are thinking about themselves and their self-aggrandisement instead of thinking about the country. Those over there are thinking about their salaries and are worried to such an extent that they say that there is no money in the Treasury, but I am not concerned with that, everybody over here can do without money, but let them prove that there is no money in the Treasury. I will tell them this, that they cannot take away this Government, never ever.

Mr. Chairman, I think I have said enough, because if I continue perhaps the Leader of the House may not get through with his business. I would like to wind up by saying that my Ministry is seriously taking a look at the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board, and we are coming to this House very soon with new laws to deal with the sanitation problem in this country. I want to say a word of warning to the six members over there, that all the insults and the low remarks they throw over here at us will never move us.

Mr. FORDE:

On a point of order, I do not usually interrupt, and I probably would not interrupt the Acting Minister when she is making her first major speech, but with respect and speaking for myself I must say that I have never thrown any insults over there because it would be unparliamentary to do so, and I would ask the Minister to withdraw that.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND:

It is said that as long as you associate with people everything rubs off from one to the other.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Chairman, there have been no insults and I do not expect that you would sit in that Chair and say nothing if this was the case. There may have been stringent criticisms of Government policy and of the Board, but insulting language would be unparliamentary.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I agree and Standing Order 28(5) states that it shall be out of order to use offensive and insulting language about Members of the House, therefore I would prohibit any type of insulting language from either side of the House.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND:

Mr. Chairman, as I said before, Government is taking a serious look at the problem and I am sure that the people of Barbados will benefit from what we have in mind, because we have often thought of the repercussions and we know that with the problems as they stand now they do not look very well for the Ministry of Health, but as I have said before there were certain underlying factors which caused these problems, and we will make sure that we put our house in order. This Government is made up of human beings just like other human beings anywhere else, and anybody can make a mistake but as far as mistakes go I am not here to judge or to say who is right or who is wrong, but I feel that the time has come when the Sanitation Board should put its house in order. At any time they can come to the Minister or to me and we will be quite willing to help them. If they need more money to buy equipment and we can assist we will do so, but apart from that they have often had generous offers from service clubs throughout the country and from what I know some of those offers have not been taken up which means that the people had to come back to the Ministry and make the offers to us. Mr. Chairman, I thank you for listening to me.

The question that the Resolution for \$720,459 do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND, the Resolution was read a first time, second time, and agreed to respectively.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the undertaking which I gave at the commencement of this Sitting, we will now revert to the motion moved by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition in connection with "No Confidence" in the Government, on the understanding that at a certain stage we will be dealing with at least some of the Resolutions which we have here to be dealt with. Ample time has now elapsed for Members to be aware of at least the straightforward ones, but I have had discussions with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and we have agreed upon those with which we will deal today.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I would prefer you to move a motion that Private Members' Business be now taken.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Private Members' Business be now taken.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTNOND:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 3.45 p.m.

**PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS RESOLUTION RE NO CONFIDENCE IN THE
GOVERNMENT**

Mr. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, I crave the indulgence of this House to speak on the Motion moved by the hon. Member for St. Thomas and Leader of the Opposition. It is a Motion asking that the House resolve that there is no confidence in Her Majesty's Government in Barbados and calling on the Prime Minister to resign or call an early General Election.

Mr. Speaker, the mover of the Motion was at pains to point out that it was tabled on the 10th July, 1973. Now, there would have had to be some reason for tabling it on that date, and I am setting about

this afternoon to destroy all of the arguments put forward by the mover of this Resolution, since most of what he has said did not refer to anything which took place before the 10th July this year but to subsequent events.

Sir, the hon. Member talked about the Prime Minister abandoning the country "with its economy in its present state." I wonder, Mr. Speaker, in what state could the Prime Minister have left the country? If not in its present state, perhaps, the hon. Member may have some supernatural powers through which - if he had been the Prime Minister - to leave the country in some future state rather than leaving it in its present state. The hon. Member spoke about public discontent, lack of management, lack of efficiency, etc., but in his Resolution he has called for either the resignation of the Prime Minister or an early General Election.

Mr. Speaker, Members of the Opposition have accepted and supported the hon. Member's stand on this Resolution, but as I go down and I continue to address you, Sir, I will be pointing out where, in supporting or in attempting to support the hon. Member in this Resolution, they themselves have been destroying the feeble effort made by the hon. Member to justify his Resolution. What is amazing, Mr. Speaker, is that it would seem that, in calling for the resignation of the Prime Minister, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition would be satisfied to work with the Members of this Honourable Chamber under the leadership of someone else. In other words, the Leader of the Opposition, whilst calling for the resignation, made all sorts of charges and non-charges. He made charges of corruption on the part of Members of the Government, yet he did not call for the resignation of the Government. He merely called for the resignation of the Prime Minister, and I take his action to mean that he was willing to work with the corrupt group that he has been talking about. He has not levelled any charge of corruption against the Prime Minister, because he wanted to be the Prime Minister of the corrupt group.

Mr. Speaker, my Party has chosen to deal with this matter in the absence of the Prime Minister because we are satisfied that we are 100% behind him; we are capable of representing him in his absence; he is confident that we are capable of so doing, and that is why he has allowed us to deal with it in his absence. Quite frankly, I do not see any need for this Resolution. The Hon. Leader of the House has not said anything to justify it. As I have said earlier, and I want to emphasise upon it, this Resolution was tabled on the 10th July. The hon. Member accused the Prime Minister of running away from the country leaving it in its present state. I want to say that the hon. Member must have been a prophet because only a prophet on the 10th July would have been able to foretell that the Prime Minister would have been leaving the country on some date in October.

Now, on the 10th July the Resolution was tabled; it was discussed in October, and the Prime Minister left the country in October. The fact that the Prime Minister left the country in October was the highlight of the arguments proposed by the Hon. Mover of the Resolution. I believe he is a prophet. I say that

because I believe that the Prime Minister would not have placed that type of confidence in the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to advise him as early as July that he was leaving the country in October, or at any time; yet, he has brought a Motion of No Confidence in the Government, It was tabled on the 10th July and little has been said about what preceded the 10th July, or what has caused the hon. Member to bring this Resolution. He has based his arguments purely and simply on matters that took place subsequent to the 10th July, 1973.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to strengthen what I have said by saying that the hon. Member has attacked the Acting Minister of Finance because he refuted some statement made by him at a Press Conference. Now, this statement was made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition subsequent to the 10th July. The hon. Member, who is now the Acting Minister of Finance, replied to it subsequent to the 10th July. Where is the relevance of that argument, Mr. Speaker, to the Resolution introduced in this Chamber on the 10th July? 3.55 p.m.

The hon. Member made much hullabaloo about the Chaguaramas Treaty. When was it signed? who knew what would be the effects of the Chaguaramas Treaty? Again I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the hon; Member would have had to be a prophet to have been able to foretell or foresee the effects of the Chaguaramas Treaty on the 10th July, 1973. What is the relevance of the Chaguaramas Treaty to the Resolution tabled on that date? The truth of the matter is that the hon. Member was only fishing. He had absolutely nothing to talk about, and because he did not do his homework he comes here and talks on a Resolution and bases his argument on a Resolution tabled on 10th July which would have been arguments for a Resolution tabled yesterday.

The hon. Member strengthened my point when he said that the Prime Minister left a sinking ship. When did the Prime Minister leave a sinking ship? The Prime Minister left this country in October. The Resolution - I cannot help frequently emphasising the point that it was tabled before then - and what I am saying is that there is no case put forward by the Opposition or by the Leader of the Opposition to support the motion which is before the House, and I propose later in my address to move an amendment to the Resolution.

The hon. Member for St. Thomas, and the Leader of the Opposition, based part of his argument for the resignation of the Prime Minister on the fact that an Hon. Minister had resigned. Now, what has that got to do with a Resolution tabled on the 10th of July? Certainly a Government Minister would not have had the sort of confidence in the Leader of the Opposition to have divulged his intention to the Leader of the Opposition before the 10th July; and I daresay that at no time would have an Hon. Minister had any confidence in the Leader of the Opposition to divulge any of his personal business to that hon. Member. So, again, that argument raised by the hon. Member is irrelevant to the Resolution.

What is ironical about the whole situation is that the hon. Member spoke of corruption, but he has not called on the Government to get rid of corruption or to resign because of corruption; but he calls on the Prime Minister to resign and he calls on the Prime Minister or the Government to call a new general election. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon. Member knows that if there is a new general election they will not have one seat. He knows that the same corrupt people that he is talking about will be elected. We will be bringing more with us. He himself who just fluked his seat would not be able to get in at a general election. He will not be fighting the type of competition next time that he had last time even if I had to leave St. Andrew and run against him. This, I suppose, will be a feather in the cap of the hon. Member for Christ Church West because we will have somebody capable of leading an Opposition.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, as I said, is no leader at all- I will prove that. He talked about a slump in the construction industry since 1969, and in his ramblings he mentioned that it is all right to bring in tourists but what is important is the building of hotels. The hon. Member for the City and the hon. Member for St. James seemed to have had different directions from the directions of: the 'Leader of the Opposition; because whereas the Leader of the Opposition advocated the construction of more hotels, the hon. Member for St. James and the hon. Member for the City said that you cannot pin your hopes on the tourist industry because the tourist industry was there at the discretion of the Prime Minister of Canada and the President of the U.S.A., and that the day that they said that money was not to leave Canada and money was not to leave the U.S.A., the tourist industry in Barbados would be destroyed.

Here you have two hon. Members on that side, the hon. Member for St. James and the hon. Member for the City completely contradicting what was advocated by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition who is supposed to lead his Party and who is supposed to establish strategy and policy for that Party. Yet, they are saying that they are the alternative Government. With what policy? With variations in policy? With one sector being contradictory to another sector?

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we cannot accept that talk about resigning by Members on the other side. I will give the hon. Member the assurance that if they had come in here and established a case for the resignation of the Prime Minister, and had built up their case on the infelicities of the Prime Minister prior to the introduction of this Resolution, I would promise them my support.

The hon. Member talked about economic expansion and the policy he would adopt for economic expansion. It is clear from what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has said and from what the other hon. Members of his Party said, that there is no clearly defined policy in that Party on economic expansion; because the hon. Member for St. James has one idea about economic expansion and the hon. Member

for the City has another idea and the Leader of that Party, if it is a Party, has a different idea about economic expansion. Let them do their homework before they come .in here to mislead this country.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, on those grounds we must reject the arguments which the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues have put forward on the question of economic expansion, because there is no unanimity amongst them as far as the policy on economic expansion is concerned.

One of the highlights of the address of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was what he said about the extent of the cost of living. I would like to quote. He said: "The Government is encouraging all of this by a blind adherence to an economic treaty which is proving incapable of binding the West Indies together in the way that those who gave support to it expected."

If the hon. member was referring to the Treaty of Chaguaramas, over there in 1965 when Barbados was seeking independence they opposed Barbados going it alone, and they talked about Federation, and Mr. Speaker, the ultimate aim of a Federation was the establishment of a Caribbean Common Market.
4.05 p.m.

Yet we hear argument from the other side in criticism of the establishment of Caricom. The difference between the members on the other side and those on this side is that they started the wrong side and we started the right side. They started talking about a political federation. We said that an economic association was more feasible for the area first and let a political federation come after.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you something. This argument of theirs has no relevance to the Resolution because the hon. Member would not have known unless he was a prophet, when he tabled this Resolution, what would have been the effects of Caricom. My submission is that what he has said is totally irrelevant to the Resolution and cannot be supported.

Mr. SPEAKER:

You have six more minutes.

Mr. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Sir, the hon. Member came in here and talked about the Prime Minister's statement about political

bandits. When was this statement made? Before he introduced the Resolution or after? He talked about the failure of the news media to give proper coverage - that they have a responsible person just talking for talk sake. A person tabling a very serious Resolution in this House and not having the facts to support the Resolution cannot be taken seriously by the Press. If the Press thought he was serious about what he was saying the Press would give him the adequate coverage that he deserved, but he criticises the Press because he had nothing to say, and because he had nothing to say the Press published nothing. As I said, he would not have known the effects of Caricom when he tabled his Resolution. If he wanted to give the type of address which he gave, what the hon. Member should have done was to withdraw the Resolution which he introduced in here on the 10th July and introduce another Resolution. That is what he should have done if he wanted to talk about what happened subsequent to the 10th July.....

Mr. CRAIG:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

On what point is the hon. Member rising?

Mr. CRAIG:

Just this, Sir. I would be very grateful if the hon. Member would, in his speech, also refer to the Auditor General's report of.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I did not want to interrupt the hon. Member but since he has been interrupted I would.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

On what point are you rising?

Mr. ADAMS:

I am rising on two points of explanation, Sir, because I have been misrepresented. First of all the Caribbean Community Treaty was signed on the 4th July just before I introduced my Resolution and the Accord was reached in Georgetown in April; and, I did not say that the Press did not report any particular speech I made. I said they did not report the activities of the Barbados Labour Party.

Mr. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

The hon. Member's speech was based on the fact that he had not been given any information from Caricom.....

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I was not present in this House at the time of the debate on Caricom

Mr. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I am talking about the Party. He is to be held responsible for any acts of his Party and what they said is equally what he said, How can he get away from that?

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, we said it was not laid, so I do not see that the hon. member knows what he is saying.

Mr. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, since there are so many interruptions I would like to take this opportunity to make an amendment to this Resolution and my amendment reads as follows "Be it resolved that this House congratulates Her Majesty's Government in Barbados for the constructive work done since it came into office in 1961 and wishes the Government continued success."

I will now speak on the amendment and I hope I will be given the same two hours as the Leader of the Opposition was-given.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

As far as I know, no notice was given of that amendment. It is a counter-motion.

Mr. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

It is an amendment to the motion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER:

It is a counter-motion. The terminology is confusing.

Mr. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, very well. I can speak on my counter motion. Can I?

Mr. SPEAKER:

Carry on.

Mr. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I have made this counter-motion because those members of the Opposition who have spoken have not established a case for anything they have said.....

Mr. CRAIG:

On a point of Order, Mr. Speaker. Is he speaking on the counter motion or die Resolution, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER:

He is speaking on the motion he has just brought before the House.

Mr. CRAIG:

Without giving notice in writing, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER:

Take your seat.

Mr. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, in accordance with section 22(1) (a) "Where under any Standing Order of the practice of the House notice is required, such notice shall be given when the House is sitting by being handed in at the table or when the House is not sitting, by.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

I will consult the Clerk to see if any notice was handed in. I have had no intimation of any notice. 4.15p.m.

I am trying to consult the Clerk to see when this notice was handed in.

Mr. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker,.....

Mr. CRAIG:

Notice has to given in writing in two days' time, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Two Members cannot be on their feet at the same time. I am in a position to be advised that no notice was given, at least no notice has been brought to my attention. I have had no due notice.

Mr. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, in accordance with section 22(l)(a), I have handed in the Resolution to the Clerk at the Table. The rule reads as follows

"(a) when the House is sitting, by being handed in at the Table,....."

Mr. SPEAKER:

I do not regard that as being due notice, and in any case all notices should be seen by the Speaker. You have two more minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, I will make the best use of them. The hon. member for the City spoke about the lack of housing policy, that no new houses have been built by Government, and the hon. Member for St. Peter on this very Resolution stated that whilst the Government was building new houses the people were offered the houses at a price which they could not reach, so the whole party system over there is bad. They must organise themselves, they must do their homework and come in here with unanimity if they are to establish a front to give the people of this country the impression that they are an alternative Government. The Leader of the Opposition said that they are there to oppose and this is exactly what they are doing, opposing whether something is good or bad. They now come to oppose for the sake of opposing the good which has been done by this Government for the people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for St. James has criticised the Civil Servants for associating themselves with this Party.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Your time is up but you may finish the point you are making now

Mr. EDWARDS:

He criticised the Civil Servants for associating themselves with the Democratic Labour Party but he has not criticised the Civil Servants for associating themselves with the Barbados Labour Party.

Mr. CRAIG; On a point of elucidation, Sir, I know he is not feeling well today but I said that I will never support any party which encourages Civil Servants to be part and parcel of a political party because Civil Servants should serve the Government of the day.

Mr. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, in the light of what the hon. Member has said, perhaps he would want to say what he is going to do with the Civil Servants who support his party. That party has been trying to denying the citizens of this country their constitutional rights when they oppose the fact that members of the Civil Service are active members of the Democratic Labour Party, when the Constitution gives every citizen the right of association and freedom of speech. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I cannot continue any further

because they would have to walk out.

Mr. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, in speaking on this motion of no confidence I would like to make the point that I think the object of any motion of no confidence is to seek to defeat the Government on the floor of the House, and therefore clearly the Opposition which is moving this no confidence motion must demonstrate that it has the capacity to take over the Government and the running of this country. I think what we have seen in this Hon. Chamber since 1971 would demonstrate that the Opposition does not have the capacity to run the country. I think that one of the things which is noticeable amongst the Opposition is the kind of in-fighting and the kind of bickering which is going on in the group. As a matter of fact, I think that the electorate would, if and when given any opportunity, wipe off the Opposition. I think it is clear that the electorate regards the Opposition not as an alternative Government but possibly as a group of jokers.

I would like to refer to some of the points which have been made by some of the Members of the Opposition in their support of this motion of no confidence. I think one of the first points I would like to take is one which the member for St. Andrew took where the Leader of the Opposition spoke about blind adherence to Caricom and Carifta which has led to the high cost of housing. I want to examine this statement for what it is worth and to draw the attention to the Hon. House to the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party which under the section dealing with External Relations and Inter Caribbean Relations states: "The Party re-affirms its belief that the Caribbean territories will never fulfil their true role in the world, nor their people achieve their true economic, social and political destiny until there is established adequate machinery to deal with common problems and to handle economic and political development on a regional basis. In the implementation of the above, the Party pledges that it will continue to support and to enhance any regional association and institutions of which it is already a member and in particular CARIFTA."

I think, Mr. Speaker, what we have listened to from the Leader of the Opposition in particular is a complete somersault which I believe only the Leader of the Opposition and the Members of the Opposition are capable of doing when faced with serious issues like this. I think the statement clearly demonstrates the ambages in the Opposition and the Manifesto and all the statements which have emanated from the Leader of the Opposition when he was introducing this debate. I think that what one must take into consideration is that when one is talking in terms of regional economic groupings one must weigh the situation and must look at the balance sheet which there must necessarily be. 4.25 p.m.

In short, I think that what I am saying is that one has to look at the entire picture over a period of time. In any original grouping, it is true that there will be a time when there will be losses when situations might appear to worsen and when, indeed, the cost of certain items will go up, but I think that one has to square this with the long-term situation. I believe that any original grouping - Carifta or Caricom is not a

short-term institution or a short-term idea, but it is a situation which will enable the people of the Caribbean in the long run to benefit from this new development. It will give an opportunity to the people in the Caribbean to give expression to whatsoever know-how they have, to come together, to develop the economies of the respective countries for the benefit of the people in the region. I think this is extremely important.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I think that one has to look even deeper at Carifta, Caricom, or whatever name you desire to call this economic grouping, to see what is its significance for the people. We have to see it not merely in terms of the economic or material gains, which will come, but one has to look at it from the point of view of the social, cultural and, indeed, the historic gains which will result from a grouping of this nature. I think that one of the things which the Opposition of this country cannot accuse the Government of is being lukewarm to their position, or commitments to Caricom and to Caribbean economic integration. The Government has pursued an unswerving line in this matter. We realise the benefits which can accrue to the people in the area and, indeed, to the people of this country and we are pursuing in this matter in an unswerving way.

Another point, Mr. Speaker, to which I should like to refer is that there must be some reality brought to bear on the situation, and when one hears the fulminations of the Leader of the Opposition on the whole question of the state of finances, the monetary situation, interest rates, and so on, one must bear in mind that Barbados, like most of the other countries in the world, is caught up in an international monetary upheaval. There is no point in saying that we can do our own thing here and ensure that interest rates do not rise, or that we can be in complete control of our monetary and financial situation. This seems to me to be impossible. We are a part of the international monetary situation and, regardless of what the Opposition and other people may say, whatever happens in the international money markets will affect Barbados. I think that small countries are affected to a greater extent by the kind of buffeting that is going around than the larger countries. That is the point which must be realised. In this respect, one must also examine the kind of influence and effect which the operations of the multi-national corporations have on the entire situation. We are caught up in this situation. We have to be realistic in our approach to the problems which confront us, and people have to be told the truth.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that if the Opposition were the Government they would have been faced with the same problem. They would find it difficult to chart out a course of their own because of the nature of the problem which confronts us. This is not a problem peculiar to Barbados. Allied to all of the problems which I have outlined on the international scene, I think we must also refer to the kind of internal problems which we have. We have elements within the society who are known to attempt to sell this country short through certain practices in which they have been indulging. If one listened to the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition one could observe the uncertainty and the grouping with which he was proceeding, because he did not want to commit himself on any particular issue. One must realise the type of problem with which we are confronted.

Another point to which I should like to refer is that we sat here last week and heard the hon. Member for St. James refer to the Government Party as a party of bandits, or he referred to the bandits in the Government Party.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Which words he had to withdraw.

Mr. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, I think that the , words he had to withdraw, if my memory serves me correctly, were those he used when he referred to the Prime Minister as a bandit. What was not withdrawn is when he referred to the Members of the Government Party as bandits, and I should like to refer to that. I would just invite him to look around when he is sitting on the Opposition benches, and I am sure he would get a clear indication of what he is talking about.

Mr. SPEAKER:

He is not recorded as having said so.

Mr. GREAVES:

If you were to check the records you will see the position. I have noted it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FORDE:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It does not matter what the hon. Member for St. James might have said, but I would submit that it is unparliamentary for the hon. Member to say that, in using the word "bandits", he should look around when he is talking and he would see what he is talking about. Either it is an inept way of saying that people sitting to the left and right of the hon. Member are bandits - regardless of whether it comes from the hon. Member for St. Lucy or the hon. Member for St. James, it is unparliamentary as Your Honour has ruled. I do not think we should prolong unparliamentary language by being insulting by implication. The hon. Member really is too strong in argument to resort to such a frivolous attitude.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I really cannot remember having allowed that. If I did that it must have been done most inadvertently,

but I appeal to the hon. Member for St. Lucy not to continue to debate in terms of banditry but to continue to debate on the level at which he is capable of debating. 4.35 p.m.

Mr. GREAVES:

The reference was made in passing, and I think that the records could straighten it out. When statements like these are allowed to go unnoticed, they will be taken as accepted. I do not accept that kind of name, Mr. Speaker, and so I will move on.

Mr. SPEAKER:

You must stop there. Having made the remark which I asked you to withdraw, you must withdraw the remarks actually used. I am not going back to the records of last week. I am telling the hon. Member to withdraw the words used and then the Reporter will expunge the words used. Even if the words were spoken last week, two wrongs do not make a right.

Mr. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, can I get the exact words you are talking about?

Mr. SPEAKER:

You said that the hon. Member referred to your side as being a party of bandits. You said that the hon. Member should look around when he is sitting on the Opposition Benches and he would get a clear indication of what he is talking about.

Mr. GREAVES:

I withdraw all the remarks that you want me to withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER:

In relation to bandits on the other side.

Mr. GREAVES:

I withdraw the remarks. Mr. SPEAKER Thank you.

Mr. GREAVES:

You see, Sir, we have to be more than careful with the kind of people that we are dealing with. Are those unparliamentary words, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER:

Carry on.

Mr. GREAVES:

I mean that the fact that the hon. Member for St. James should go to that level is a clear indication of the level of the debate which they were carrying on on this question. What I intend to do this afternoon is to show that we are in a situation where we are at the mercy of what is happening in the international, political, economic and monetary situation. We are at the whims and fancies, as it were, of the operations of multi-national corporations. I think that that is what I have been attempting to demonstrate.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, we must adopt a realistic approach to these problems. It is something on which we have to put our heads together and attempt to find some of the solutions or the best solution. In the final analysis the solutions to the monetary problem? which confront us are going to rest really on the international situation if and when it settles down. It seems to me that the gravamen of the arguments which the Opposition has put forward does not hold in this case. As a matter of fact, I recall that the Leader of the Opposition stated that the Government was involved in high spending and this kind of thing; and yet we have a situation where some of those Members are calling on the Government to spend more money on housing and to spend more money in a number of other areas. Again, these remarks seem to me to be inconsistent. At the same time that they are accusing the Government of being involved in high spending, I do not see how they can call on the Government to spend more money in other areas.

I know that there are other areas in which more money has to be spent, and this Party has demonstrated and committed itself to spending money in those areas. I think that we must, as I said in the earlier stages, look at the total picture of the situation we are involved in, and it must be seen in this particular light.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have had the privilege or the misfortune from the time that the debate on this Resolution, that is now before this Chamber opened, to have listened to a lot of verbiage, hot air and the emotionalism which was generated on this Resolution which is in effect a refurbished Resolution of one

that was attempted to be moved on the Leader of the Opposition by his own Party Members a week or two before this Resolution was given notice of in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, as a lawyer you will know that there is such a thing as vicarious liability. This is a vicarious charge against the Government of Barbados that there is no confidence in the Government and that we should resign. What is a fact is that they had no confidence in their own Leader, but this trick was pulled out of the bag and brought to this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, the whole world is affected by turbulence in the international monetary situation. That is nothing new. It has been going for the past six or seven years, and it has now caught up with us. In 1967 the United Kingdom had to devalue its currency, and in 1972 it put its currency to float and in that same year allowed sterling reserves to go up, using sterling as reserve currency. This is what was done by the British Government. In the U.S.A. the country of the almighty dollar, they reversed the situation, and in December, 1971, the United States Government put its dollar to float which was in effect revaluing the dollar and that has since turned out to have been a revaluation downwards because it did not hold its strength against other currencies and it was no more than six months after, that the United States had to turn and once more revalue its dollar, So, we had two situations of the world's monetary giants at that time revaluing and then; floating and then devaluing currency.

As things stand at this moment, the strongest currencies in the world's money market are Deutsch marks and the Japanese yen, Last year the Deutsch mark was put to float. The Japanese have been trying to resist, but they have had to revalue their currency. There is hardly any currency in the western world which has been untouched within the past two years. There has been a general revaluation or floating or devaluation, and that is the situation that we face today. The whole world is affected by economic inflation, and it has now caught up with us, or we have caught up with it.

At this moment we are in a period of comparative economic tranquility. This is not the first time. We were in this period in 1956 and 1957 when they on that side were telling the people that we were incompetent in running our affairs. They were trying to tell the world that we in Barbados were not competent to run our own affairs. I am not worried about the wild statements of people on that side that we cannot run our own affairs or statements about the Shipping and Trading Company or that we are not competent. I am not worried about those statements. 4.45 p.m.

I am not worried because, not only do I not have faith or confidence in what they are saying, but I know that the people of Barbados have no faith nor confidence in what they are saying. Look at them on that side and you can see how much faith and confidence the people of this country had in them two

years ago. I have no good reason to believe that the people in the outside world have any greater faith or confidence in them than the people of Barbados have, so I am not worried about these statements that the Opposition put up from time to time. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that they do not understand public financing. They come in here and they say the Treasury is empty, there is no money to do this or that.

Sir, they refer to the fact that two copyists were not paid their salaries at the end of September. Some other statements were made similarly about teachers. Mr. Speaker, whether we are at a high-water mark in our public finances or whether we are in a low water mark in our finances, this situation is nothing new. It does not matter what is the condition of the Treasury, It does not matter how much in the black the Treasury is, The fact is that there is some time or another that the people of this country, whether it be the merchants or other persons, may have a claim against the Treasury and whether the Treasury has money or not is irrelevant, but the claim is still there; and, the reason is a very simple reason. The reason is an accounting one. I firmly believe that our accounting system should be looked at again, but it may not be the system. It may be the person or persons working that system.

Sir, we employ accountants in our various departments and from time to time it is the duty of the accountant to inform the Accountant General that X amount of money is owing to such and such a person, whoever it may be. Month after month and sometimes for years, Mr. Speaker - and this is known to them - sometimes for years money is owing by a department to some commercial firm, and what has happened is that that department has not yet got around to informing the Treasury that that money is due and owing; and this is the situation that we have found ourselves in.

Let us look, Mr. Speaker, at the cash flow of the Treasury and, I want to compare it with say, the past two years. This gives some idea of the condition of the Treasury. First of all I will take Inland Revenue. I will give the two major departments of Government. I will not give the others. For the first six months of the Financial Year 1971-72 the Inland Revenue receipts were in excess of \$25 million. In 1972-73 Inland Revenue receipts were less than \$25 million but were in excess of \$24 million. In other words it was down by about \$1 million. For this financial year 1973-74 so far, the first six months this year the Inland Revenue receipts are very nearly \$30 million - they are in excess of \$29 million. They are, in other words, \$5 million up on last year's receipts for the comparable period. That is the Inland Revenue Department.

Mr. Speaker, let us look at Customs and Excise - the receipts. I am referring to Customs and Excise receipts. In 1971-72, during the first six months of the financial year, slightly in excess of \$18 million. 1972-73 slightly in excess of \$19 million. 1973-74, way in excess of \$23 million - again over \$4 million up in this department.

Mr. Speaker, this gives an idea of the amount of money that the Government has been dealing with. I have not given other revenue earning departments, but, these are the major ones; and this gives an indication of the kind of money that the Government has been dealing with over the past six months as compared with the first six months of 1971-72 and 1972-73 financial years. The position is very simply this, Mr. Speaker. The peak of Government's receipts would be probably around April. There are some months in the year that we have good receipts. There is April, June, September, October and November. The cash position of the Treasury varies from month to month. Almost every month the Government has to use Treasury Bills in order to finance the expenditure and its goods and services. The point I am making here is this, Mr. Speaker, that if we pay over \$5 million every month for goods and services - salaries and wages and so on - it may not be every month that there is \$5 million at that time in the Treasury because those months may be the periods when the collections are not at their peak and therefore we have to bridge that period; and, we have to bridge that period at that time, Mr. Speaker, by floating Treasury Bills. This is the situation which we are in at this time.

I have to explain the position a little further, Mr. Speaker. We have the capital Estimates and we have the current Estimates. This year we have budgeted for \$120 million or thereabout, of capital Estimates and about \$41 million or so for current Estimates. There are few countries in the world, Mr. Speaker, that can afford to finance their capital expenditure out of their current receipts. 4.55 p.m.

Barbados has been doing this to some extent with a great measure of success but this is not the way it should be done, the capital projects are projects for all time and the people should pay for them. The way to finance capital expenditure is to raise loans, but we have not been doing this because we have been in the fortunate position to be able to manage our financial affairs well. Our financial affairs have been so sound and efficient that we have been able to do this from our current funds because everybody who should benefit is benefiting. For the amount of infrastructural work the Government is providing, they should pay for it, not only for this generation but for those to come.

The Leader of the Opposition spent some considerable time - I am sorry he is not in his seat - attempting to show that I agreed with some statement which I would like to call ridiculous showing that the civil servants were not paid, but we acted on completely different lines. Any time you find me agreeing with the Leader of the Opposition, I should have my head examined. The Leader of the Opposition made a ridiculous assertion to the Press that some Civil Servants were not paid, or to put it the other way, he stated that the Treasury was empty. He then sought to put in evidence of this alleged fact something relating to the fact that two persons were not paid. I said that these persons were not paid but for completely, different reasons from what the Leader of the Opposition wanted to advance. The reasons he wanted to advance were that there was no money in the Treasury - I am glad to see that the hon. Member has now taken his place - I was saying that they were not paid, not because there was no money in the Treasury as he wanted to say, so I cannot agree with him but they were not paid for some accounting reasons peculiar perhaps to the Registration Office. That was the reason why they were not

paid. The vouchers were ready on that afternoon to pay them, so do not tell me I am supporting his arguments because that is absolutely untrue. I could never support those ridiculous arguments.

Mr. Speaker, that is not the only criticism which was made. One Member said on the floor of the House that I told persons who were interested in purchasing houses that they had to pay \$7,500 in cash. That is absolutely untrue, I have never told any person in this House or out of this House; that they have to pay \$7,500 in cash for one of those houses.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of elucidation. Hon. P. M. GREAVES I am not giving way.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member is refusing to give way on your point of elucidation.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. Minister has stated that a Member said during the course of his speech that he had told persons who wanted to buy houses that they had to pay \$7,500 in cash and that that was untrue.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, I challenge the hon. Member to produce any evidence whatsoever in this House, in his house or in anybody else's of any statement to that effect made by me.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, will you give me permission to produce the evidence in half an hour's time?

Hon. P. M GRAVES:

The hon. Member can produce his evidence at any time at all, and I am prepared to deal with him when that time comes.

Among what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition called the burden of his charges against this Government was the high cost of living and inflation, and he used words to the effect that the blind adherence to the Caribbean Economic Community was in large measure responsible for the increase in the cost of housing in Barbados which he said had risen by 42 points. I do not understand what the hon. Member is saying about blind adherence to Caricom; there is only one item affected by Caricom as regards housing and that is cement, and that should not be the case. Our traditional market for cement was Trinidad, and to some extent Jamaica, and Caricom should have made cement costs lower, not higher. Caricom should have made cement cheaper, not more expensive, because it meant that cement landed in Barbados would have been free of duty. Trinidad supplies 75% and Jamaica 15% on our Market. On the overall the cost of cement should have been cheaper and therefore the total cost of housing correspondingly cheaper, but we found ourselves at that very moment in an impossible situation where the cement was concerned. 5.05 p.m.

Caricom or no Caricom, the price of cement would have gone up. I think it was controlled at \$4.50 and \$5.10 per bag. Caricom, in effect, should have been helping the housing situation in Barbados. Despite Caricom, the cost of housing is escalating. We have inflation in housing, but that has nothing to do with the Caribbean Economic Community. Most of the inputs that go into housing come from outside the Caribbean area. We are in an inflationary situation with regard to housing for reasons that we are not in a position to control. This sort of thing is taking place in other developed countries in the world.

Mr. Speaker, only yesterday morning I received the High Commissioner of Canada to Barbados, and he stated that in Canada inflation is running on a very high percentage, and what is bad about it is that Canada is not in a position to do anything about it. We import into this country the inflation that we have. We do not live apart from the world. We do not live on Mars, We are a part of this world, and the whole world is in turmoil because of inflation.

Mr. Speaker, this whole situation of high cost of living as well as inflation was debated in the Jamaica Parliament. When the Prime Minister of Jamaica was explaining the position of the Honourable House and pointing out how the whole world was in turmoil with regard to inflation, one Member shouted out: "O God, Jamaica smashed up the world!"

N4r. Speaker, we are in a position that we have been able to do in this country for the world what other

world leaders cannot do for themselves. (Asides.) Perhaps we can solve world problems right here in Barbados. With regard to housing in this country, Mr. Speaker, we were told by the Leader of the Opposition that after 1955 and 1956 there was a deficit in the demand for housing. That I do not deny; the more of one thing you get the more you will require. Right here in Barbados at this moment, Mr. Speaker, we have been providing housing. This year we are providing housing for the lower middle income group, which was never provided for by the other side. The middle income group was never provided for by them. They tried a self-help scheme which was a complete failure, and the Housing Authority had to go in and finish the houses. Today we have provided houses for sale to people at all levels. We have provided houses for the low-income level, the middle income level, and the lower middle-income level.

Mr. Speaker, on Thursday afternoon I will be opening one of the timber houses that we have constructed at Eden Lodge. Tomorrow I will instruct the National Housing Corporation to send to each and every Member on that side an invitation to come and see on Thursday afternoon at five o'clock what we are doing for housing in this country. For fear that you may not find the place, it is to the west of Bim Beverage Factory. In other words, you go up Green Hill and enter it by way of the Farm Road. (Asides.) Do not mind the houses behind the cemetery. You will take a left turn obliquely opposite Bim Beverage Factory and you will see what we are doing for housing in this country.

As far as the cost of living is concerned, it cannot be said that we are idle; We know that costs are rising, but it cannot be said that in this country we are unmindful of the fact that costs have been rising.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Five minutes more.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, there is a wide range of ... (Asides.) I do not want to talk about you yet. I will talk about you next time. (Asides.) You should have been in here during the Estimates.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Order! You are to ignore the asides.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

They are worthy of being ignored, Mr. Speaker, I will just show the wide range of goods which have

been controlled in order to help contain the cost of living in this country mutton, pork, sausages, Corned Beef, Sardines, beef, bacon, flour, rice, macaroni, biscuits, Cream of Wheat, Quaker Oats, Lard, margarine, Evaporated Milk, Condensed Milk, butter, edible oils, laundry soap, animal and poultry feeds, gasoline, kerosene oil, cement, onions, potatoes, salted fish, and so on. These are some of the items that have been controlled in Barbados. These items have been controlled primarily for the purpose of containing the cost of living in Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, in this country we have been operating on a principle of the transfer of earnings and the repatriation of capital to foreign countries. We do this because we think we are in need of foreign investment to aid future development and the growth of the nation. Since January, 1973 there have been 7 new industries that were assisted by fiscal concessions or factory space, and, with these new industries together with three other industries we expect to find additional employment for 900 persons in this country, and yet they say that we have been doing nothing for the development of this country.

Mr. Speaker, in 1969, which was regarded as the high water mark of the development in Barbados, there were only 10 new industries, but the Leader of the Opposition says that for the development of this country we need cheap money. I do not know from where we are to get this cheap- money. The only source of supply of cheap money that I can think of is the Inter-American Development Bank that they would take us out of. They have said publicly that they would take us out of it if they were to get control of the Government, and that is the only source of cheap money that I know about. Mr. Speaker, they said that in this Chamber and outside. In other words, they would take us out of the only source of cheap money - 2% money. At this moment we are being provided with money for the Community College, and we are going to be provided with money for the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic - 2% money. Where on earth are we going to get this kind of money from? They are going to cut us off from this market by taking us out.

I do believe, Mr. Speaker, that the time is not far off when we will have to tighten consumer spending and allow the money to go to the productive sector. Barbados has an available foreign structure. We have always been exporting a lot less than we imported. Other countries would have had to do something about this. In New Zealand they have cut expenditure; there are credit restrictions, and a number of things have been done in an effort to solve this problem, 5.15 p.m.

We in Barbados have to examine our own problems very carefully. Mr. Speaker, I believe that there is something wrong with the Rules of this Chamber where a Member has to sit in silence and listen to Members misrepresenting or telling complete untruths. I had to sit through this last Tuesday afternoon when the Leader of the Opposition attributed ridiculous statements to the Prime Minister: about I want more blood and fire. He also said that the Prime Minister had stated that inflation was good for the economy. What he said was that it was not necessarily good for the economy. The Leader of the

Opposition said that I said that although we had to pay more money, we got more out of it. I have the release made at the time when the interest rates were allowed to float. I will make it a document of the House. It reads as follows-

"The Acting Minister of Finance, Hon. Philip Greaves, announced yesterday that he was lifting the restriction on the bank deposit rate which at the moment is a maximum of 8%, and allowing the rate to float. The Minister took this action under the Rate of Interest Act, 1970 which came into effect by proclamation on Monday this week, October, 8.

The Minister said that this was being done in the hope that equilibrium will be restored in the balance between the demand for and the supply of loanable funds. He pointed out that with international deposits and lending rates running at record levels, the existence of the large differential between rates in Barbados and those abroad made it difficult to attract and retain funds which tend to follow higher interest rates. This has resulted, the Minister said, in a shortage of funds for local lending which has affected development in important sectors of the local economy.

The Central Bank will be closely monitoring the movement of interest rates and will be reporting to Government on a daily basis. The Acting Minister of Finance and Planning would like to make it clear that if, in his view, rates of interest rise to levels which appear likely to inhibit economic development and or to impose hardships on the borrowing public, he will not hesitate to invoke the powers conferred on him by relevant statute to prescribe a fair and equitable rate of interest.

The old Usury Act, which has now been superseded, limited the maximum rate of interest to 8% and although most of the major financial institutions were exempted from this prescribed rate for lending purposes, the general effect of the Act was to time the rate which commercial banks could offer non-exempted depositors to 8%."

This document I now lay on the Table of the House. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I will wind up briefly. The Resolution before the Chamber at this time as tabled by the Leader of the Opposition and supported by hon. Members on that side is not convincing and it is without conviction. If I were the Prime Minister - clearly they on that side have a death wish - I would call an election and completely eliminate the Barbados Labour Party from politics in Barbados.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the Resolution which this House is debating is in these terms -

"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."

Mr. Speaker, Resolutions of "No Confidence" are moved at times when there is some grave or great failing on the part of a Minister to carry out his statutory duties for when there has been some failing in a Government department or when Ministers collectively have failed to do something which they should have done or did not do those things which they should have done. Such motions therefore are not moved lightly, and one has got to be very serious when making such motions.

There is also the element of urgency connected with such motions; and they should not be put on the Order Paper and then left for a period of time because by their very nature they are dealing with a grave situation calling for grave remedial action.

I am putting it to you, Mr. Speaker, and to this House, that this Resolution was not moved with the seriousness it should imply, and that there is no grave failing on the part of any Minister or Ministers collectively to carry out their responsibility or to influence the affairs of this country over which they have control.

No such urgency is indicated because this Resolution was placed on the Order Paper -notice of this Resolution was given on the 10th July, 1973 and in spite of the opportunity provided by this Chamber for the Resolution to be debated, this Resolution which should have been an urgent Resolution if it was moved in seriousness, we are now at the 23rd October and the time the Resolution is being debated is last week and this week.

I am saying in all seriousness to this House therefore that it cannot take the terms of this Resolution seriously because it was not moved seriously. It was moved in a sense of political opportunism, in a sense in which the Opposition believes that they can rake up disparate and different ideas, rumours, suggestions and innuendoes and somehow put these together in a Resolution hoping thereby to cause some type of consternation and disarray in the ranks of this Government; but their plans, their stratagems and their devices will not succeed in this House because on this side we have a united Party, (Laughter) working for the good of this country within the framework of the resources that are available to the Government (Cheers) and within the framework of those factors over which it is humanly possible

for the Cabinet to have control.

The fact, Mr. Speaker, that the Members of the Opposition jumped from point to point and from no point to no point, the fact that they were unable to marshal any evidence in support of the contention that this House has no confidence in the Government and hence we should resign, is testimony to the fact that they have very little to say apart from the political opportunism of getting the Resolution on the Order Paper for the sake of dangling some inchoate position before the public.

What are the arguments that have been advanced? The hon. Member for St. Michael North-West has dealt with this in a very able manner. They speak of the increased cost of living as if this is the only country in which the cost of living has increased and as if it is not a world-wide problem. There is no country in the world today which does not face the problem of rising costs. This is a world-wide problem and the world is going through an economic situation the likes of which have not been seen previously. We are perhaps too involved in the current situation to realise the economic situation which not Barbados alone, but the world is going through.

Mr. Speaker, to get up in this Chamber and suggest that this is something which a wicked Government is doing is high irresponsibility. It shows and demonstrates that the Opposition cannot be considered as an alternative Government in this country because during all of their ramblings in this Resolution they have not put forward any particular policy or proposal which they would adopt in these present circumstances or situations in order to deal with the particular situation which they claim this country is experiencing at the moment. 5.25 p.m.

They have, as I have said earlier, pulled together a number of runups, statements and innuendoes when in fact what this country is looking for is a serious analysis of the problems facing this country and a constructive - not destructive or partisan - proposal or set of policy proposals whereby the country can be advanced. Let us look at the situation. Let me deal first of all with some of those points - or non-points - which are supposed to have been brought to prove the case. Let me deal with those about education. I take these merely in the sense of being minor points of the main argument. They claim that teachers have not been paid during the months of July and August because the Treasury was empty. To the best of the information available to me, that is not true. There may have been instances in which teachers were not paid but this had nothing to do with whether the Treasury was empty or the Treasury was full.

What I am trying to point out, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that you can take a situation in which you bring a half truth or a part truth and try to use that particular statement in such a way as to draw a conclusion

when the particular statement or combination of statements are not capable of drawing such a conclusion - statements you are not capable of drawing such a conclusion from. Now there are some teachers who are acting teachers and they may apply to go overseas for leave and we have been having problems with teachers who go abroad on leave who are paid during the month of August - the vacation period - and they do not return at the beginning of a term and hence the Government is faced with a problem of regaining the money which should have been in the Treasury. What I am saying is that according to the procedures which are applied in these circumstances, the salaries of such teachers are withheld until they report at the beginning of the next term, if they are required. So the situation has nothing at all to do with an empty Treasury. I merely stress this because I think that in public affairs, we should speak with all integrity and all honesty and not draw conclusions from situations when the conclusions cannot be drawn. If the Treasury is empty bring the evidence in support of the statement or claim but do not make statements to bring such a conclusion which cannot in fact be proven.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are some Barbadians who do make a contribution to the development of this country. I will include the Member for Christ Church and the Member for St. Thomas. There are other hon. Members in this hon. Chamber, they were not Barbados scholars and they make a significant contribution - I am speaking of those on this side - they make a significant contribution to the quality of life in this country, and there are others in all walks of life in this country who have not obtained a Barbados scholarship but who are making a contribution to the development of this country. Of course, I am including you, Mr. Deputy Speaker; you preside with, dignity.

Now, Sir, there was a talk about the Prime Minister going and leaving a sinking ship. The Prime Minister has been involved in this Government for the past twelve years. Any person working that time would have accumulated leave which he is entitled to, and, vacation leave is an accepted part of the industrial work-a-day situation. So there is nothing wrong with a Member of the Government, whether holding political or other office, taking leave which in a normal course of events might have been his by entitlement.

Then another Member said that we should build more houses, and yet another said that we need better sanitation service, without realizing that each particular service that the Government runs must cost money. There is no service that is going to be provided without the Government spending money on that particular service and there must be Government spending in these areas. 5.35p.m.

The real problem, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is this, that they thought they could put together and string together a number of arguments to support a case. They say the Treasury is empty and when we searched around for the evidence they could produce, it is not there. They speak about the rising cost of living, which is true, but they have not said how the situation could be dealt with. This Resolution has not been presented with any seriousness to deal with a position or situation in this country, all the

arguments advanced have been yoked together - I cannot even say with any consistency - but yoked by violence and political opportunism with the hope that they could create confusion when in their terminology they believe there is a ship out here without a rudder and that somebody is funning away from a debate or discussion. That is not the case, and with your permission, Sir, and the permission of the House I will turn this debate in the line and direction which it should go, because this side of. the House is not running away from anything, They were rejected by the people at the last election and they have not demonstrated that they are capable of any confidence in order to run the affairs of this country. Let me warn them that whenever the bye-election, which they are dreaming up comes up, the people of this country will treat them in the same way they were treated on the last occasion.

Let us get this debate, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on the lines it should go. This Government has brought this country since 1961 up to the point it has reached today and in all sectors of the economy remarkable signs of progress and advancement can be seen, if today there is a world economic situation in which all currencies have had to adjust in order to meet a totally new economic situation, this is not an argument for calling on the Government to resign, it is an argument for calling on the Government to take such measures as to deal with a particular situation many of the factors of which are outside the control of the Government. This is not: a situation in which you call for a resignation, it is a situation in which you express confidence in the Government for the work it has done in the past, and for calling on the Government to continue those efforts so that the people of this country can continue to enjoy the progress and the standards of living which they have expected and to increase and improve upon those standards. Therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with your permission I beg to move that the following amendments be made to the Resolution before us

That the word "no" before the word "confidence" be deleted and the words "full and complete" should be substituted therefor. I am also asking that all the words "to resign or call an early general election" immediately following the words "Prime Minister" be deleted and the words "continue to work for the economic and social progress of Barbados" substituted therefor.

The Resolution therefore would read, if the amendments are accepted by this Hon. Chamber, as follows:

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House has "full and complete" confidence in Her Majesty's Government in Barbados, and calls on the Prime Minister to continue to work for the economic and social progress of Barbados."

Hon. P. G. MORGAN:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to second the motion that the amendments be made to the Resolution, and in so doing I would like to confess that I usually like to listen to the speeches of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, even though I am going to,.....

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, I presume that proper notice of these amendments have been given.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Two members are on their feet.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to second the motion that the amendments be made to the Resolution and I beg to reserve the right to speak on the matter. I beg, also, to move that further consideration of this Resolution be now postponed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. FORDE:

On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with respect, we cannot dispose of two things together.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I did not hear the hon. Member.

Mr. FORDE:

As I understand it, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was raising a point and in the cross talk apparently you did not hear. He wanted to know whether notice of the amendments were given.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

There is no need for notice of the amendments to be given, it is quite in order.

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, let us get the procedure perfectly straight, you cannot put two Resolutions before the House at one and the same time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, Sin,.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Two Members are on their feet. May I hear the Leader of the House?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

If the hon. Member was in here long enough he would know that at the end of the-speech you put the amendment to the Resolution first.

Mr. BOLDEN:

With all due respect to the Leader, you cannot do that, you cannot put the question that further consideration be postponed and then come back to do the amendments.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

All that the hon. Member for Christ Church North Central did was to second the motion, nobody asked that the motion be put at that stage. He then asked at that point that further consideration of the motion be postponed, there are not two motions before the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I am in agreement with that and that is what I heard.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it was my understanding that we were going to work in this House at least until six o'clock on Private Members' Business, but it is obvious that the Government having last week failed

to reply at that time, having spent a week being advised by the Civil Servants and having failed to bring forth anything other than forcing the hon. Member for St. Michael South who is usually a very silent speaker to shout and to conclude - as Sir Donald Jackson once said - that the Government spoke for such a long time and said so little, is now running away from having a conclusive reply being given to them this afternoon on a motion which they are saying had been delayed. 5.45 p.m.

I refer to the hon. Member for St. Michael South. I am sorry, Sir. Government are now running away from having a conclusive reply being given to them this afternoon on a motion which they are saying has been delayed - a motion which they have delayed to bring amendments to until this afternoon, and while we are prepared to deal with their amendments now, they would not give us the opportunity to do so. They do not want us to wind up the debate. We do not need any more consideration of this. I can deal with the full confidence that the hon. Member for St. Michael South wants to place in this Government. I can also deal with those amendments right-away without having notice of it. I can proceed to reply to all of the arguments about cash flows in which you produce a few figures and do not even talk about liabilities. What is the Government frightened of, if we have no arguments? Why delay consideration now? We asked them earlier to set aside time to deal with this debate on the no confidence motion. Now we come to deal with it this afternoon the Government are afraid, Sir. I can understand their techniques. The Government wants to put out a full reply on the radio, and I will bet you that in future Private Members' time will be limited.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am aware that the Standing Orders are under scrutiny, but I am not aware of any provision for reducing Private Members' time.

Mr. FORDE:

I will bet you that we will probably be having an adjournment for two weeks, and we will never get back to dealing with this matter. You saw the techniques, Sir. The Ministers were looking at me and they wanted to know when I was going to speak. The hon. Member for Christ Church North Central has never stood up so straight since he left the Air Force or the Army, Sir, in order to shut me out for the afternoon. Sir, the Opposition could be reduced to 6, but each one of the 6 is capable of taking on all 17. You are in the Chair, Sir, and we cannot take on you. I would ask the Government not to postpone this measure. You only have to deal with myself followed by the Leader of the Opposition in reply. Let us deal with the Resolution now. What are you scared of? You say that you have the numbers and we have the arguments. Why should further consideration be postponed again?

Sir, last week they begged for time to go home and do their home work. We hear so much about people not doing their home work, but they have not been doing their home work despite the fact that the Resolution was here since July. They asked for time to go and think about it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Are you addressing the Chair?

Mr. FORDE:

I am addressing the Chair, Sir. The Government asked for time to prepare their home work. They had a week in which to do it.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The Government did not ask for any time last week to prepare any home work for today.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the hon. Member has completed his speech, I will,.....

Mr. HINDS rose-Mr. FORDE rose --

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Three hon. Members are on their feet! I think the hon. Member gave way on a point of order.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let us get it quite clear. As I understand the Hon. Leader of the House and Acting Prime Minister last week, he said that Government wanted to consider the points made. I would understand that in common parlance the Government wanted time to go home and do their home work on the points made.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, Sir, The hon. Member is not quoting me correctly.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. The Leader of the House did not say that he wanted copies of the speeches. If he said so, it would prove that the Members on that side of the House can get copies of Hansard immediately after we have debated something in here and nobody else can get them. That would have to be explained to the public. He actually said that they wanted to consider the points made by the Opposition so that they could make a serious reply.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I will refer to the notes which we have made hi here. All of these are my notes. I have taken copious notes.

Mr. FORDE:

The hon. Member has not acquired his name as "Rommel" without some skill. In whatever way the argument may be closed, the fact remains that last week the Government was not prepared to go on with the Resolution. They sat down and allowed five Members of the Opposition to speak, and then they spoke. What manner of debate do they want to carry on? Five of you speak; then five of us would speak, and then the matter would end there. That is not a debate, Sir. I would have expected that Ministers would have been rising when their portfolios were being dealt with at first and replying on those points, but they did not have the argument. Now they have come back here with the most feeble of arguments but, and they are not prepared to have them debated today. What does the Government want more time for? Let us deal with the Resolution now. Let us also deal with the amendments.

Sir, since we are only six and nobody has any confidence in us, according to some hon. Members, then they do not have to postpone consideration of the Resolution. We know that you will use your numbers, but allow the people outside to have the force of argument once and for all, and not your monopolising the radio tonight as you want to do now as a good excuse. The people are aware of the fact that you will use the propaganda of CBC tonight to try to refute the charges, and then you will get a mini report in fixture of the remainder of this debate. Let us get it quite straight. That technique is as old as anything, Sir. I appeal to the Government to let us proceed with the Resolution. Let us finish with it and deal with the amendments now. It is this sort of political attitude that will not do any good in this country. When we talk about integrity, "expediency" is the word in this case.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think it is time for us to try to get the record straight. There is proper before this Honourable House a substantive motion moved by the hon. Member for St. Thomas. There are also amendments which have been moved by another Member and seconded by the Hon. Minister of Tourism. Now, the Minister of Tourism said that he had risen to second the amendments and was

reserving his right to speak later. You will agree, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Minister of Tourism on reserving his right to speak later was then entitled to speak on the substantive motion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

On the amendments.

Mr. HINDS:

No, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

On the amendments that he seconded.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, he rose to second the amendments and he can only speak to that. As soon as he says that he reserves his right to speak later, what I am submitting is that he cannot be heard on any other matter. He must take his seat. That is the point, Sir. 5.55 p.m

Since he says that he reserves his right to speak later on the amendments he must automatically give way. He will have to rise again if he wants to put any other motion before the House, and it is not proper for him to rise to second amendments, reserve his right to speak and continue to speak on something that is not relevant. The moment that he reserves his right to speak, he must take his seat.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

He moved that further consideration be postponed. That is what I heard. He did not continue to speak on the amendments or anything else.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what I am saying is that the moment that the Minister reserves his right to speak, that was the end. No other word could be entertained from him. He reserves his right to speak. He cannot do that and go on to speak on something else. Suppose that he had moved the postponement of consideration of this item. He could not have gone on to speak on any other item. It brought what he had to say at that moment to an end.

Hon. C. E. TALMA; Mr. Deputy Speaker, while agreeing to some extent with the hon. Member who has just spoken, the fact is that the Hon. Minister of Tourism did not make a motion. He just seconded it. He made one motion that consideration of this Resolution be postponed.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, the point has really just got home to me that the motion before the House must be out of order. It is significant for this reason if the Member wishes to speak later in the debate he could reserve his right; but when he moves the postponement of the item by moving that further consideration be postponed his speech is the instant speech before the House and so in a sense, he has made two contradictory motions.

If he wants to postpone consideration he must move postponement of consideration and he will then be the person speaking and he must speak first next time. If he does not want to speak first next time he can reserve his right to speak at whatever stage during the debate that he wishes to speak. Now we do not know at what stage he will speak on the debate. Anyone who moves that further consideration of the debate be postponed is moving the postponement of his own speech. A man cannot do that and then say that he is reserving his right to choose his point of speaking. I do not know if he will be the first speaker when we come back or later in the evening.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I am of the opinion that the Hon. Minister of Tourism who has not yet spoken on the motion by the Leader of the Opposition has the right to two speeches. He has not spoken yet.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Deputy Speaker,.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Just a moment. Mr. BOLDEN Mr. Deputy Speaker,.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was speaking and I gave way on a point of order and now every one else is

jumping up. The position is that the Hon. Minister of Tourism seconded the motion for amending the Resolution and then he moved that further consideration be postponed and he reserved the right to continue his speech, so, he has to speak first. The burden is on him to speak first. That is my interpretation and that is my understanding from the time I have been in here He has reserved the right to continue his speech and he has the right to continue.

Mr. HINDS rose.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I am not giving way. I am replying to the hon. Member for Christ Church West. The hon. Member makes a good speech every time he gets up. He is gifted that way, but this is not the Law Courts; this is Parliament. You cannot determine the strategy of the Government. We have to have our Members seated when this comes to the vote. We do not want an 8 to 6 vote, but a 14 to 6 or 18 to 6 when we adjourn for two weeks. It is a question of politics in getting over the Government's side. We arrange our business to suit ourselves, and not for the convenience of the Opposition.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe that the hon. Member has spoken on the motion. The motion was that further consideration be postponed. What we have before the Chamber now is an amended motion. This is what is before the Chamber at this stage. If when the amended motion is disposed of and the amendments are not in order we then revert to the substantive motion and it is then that the Member for Christ Church North Central will have the right to speak again. He has the right to speak now on the amended motion, and I want to make the point that it does not mean that he has the right to speak forever after. That is what hon. Members are trying to advance here, that the hon. Member for Christ Church North Central should not be heard after reserving his right to speak on these amendments.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the matter is very simple. Some Members might want to confuse it, but the matter is simple. Any Member has at any time the right to make a motion. That is the whole crux of the matter. Any Member has the right to make a procedural motion. That is what the hon. Member did. He reserves the right to speak on this motion. It does not necessarily mean that he has to speak first next time. As a Member of this House he is making a procedural motion which he has the right to do at any stage and at any time. He is moving that further consideration of this Resolution be postponed which was duly seconded. 6.05 p.m.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in this particular case.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I would like to know what the hon. Member is speaking on.

Mr. HINDS:

On the motion, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

What motion? I am not here as a figure head. If you are speaking on a point of order say so, but you have already spoken,

Mr. HINDS:

In this particular case I have already spoken on the substantive motion with amendments having been moved. I have the right to speak on the amendments. Anybody who has not yet spoken on the substantive motion has lost all right to speak on the motion and can only speak now on the amendments. That is the point I want to get put straight.

Mr. Deputy Speaker left the Chair and Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker,.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

Are you speaking again?

Mr. BOLDEN:

Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER:

What are you speaking on?

Mr. BOLDEN:

I am speaking on the motion that further consideration be postponed.

Mr. SPEAKER:

What motion is that?

Mr. BOLDEN:

On the motion, Mr. Speaker, as moved by the hon. Member for Christ Church North Central that further consideration be postponed.

Mr. SPEAKER:

All right; go ahead.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, the Government last week found themselves in a corner when at the last minute they tried to get away from facing us with a Reply. When we said last week Mr. Speaker, that it was unfair and unjust that the Government with all the Members available to them are 'not prepared to come in here and debate the motion which was moved, we heard all sorts of excuses. They wanted time to come together and deal with it in an effective manner, and all sorts of excuses they made. Seven days and seven hights it took them to prepare a reply to what we said. When we today complained about receiving papers only yesterday, the Minister got up and said.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. We wanted time to study the notes.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, it took the hon. Leader of the House seven days and seven nights to study the notes, and they want us to come in here and debate something off hand without having papers in proper time to study what is to be debated. Is the Government saying that six of us in the Opposition are more capable of debating the people's business than the 18 of them over there? They had to listen to Joe Brome last week in order to make a reply, and now again too?.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. For the benefit of the hon. Member; at the time we adjourned last week we only had eight Members present.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order.

Mr. BOLDEN:

And, Mr. Speaker, the eight over there could not handle five over here? There are now eleven of them. Do they want another adjournment to get more time to prepare an answer? The Government with eleven members are not able to answer, but must have more time? Mr. Speaker, you have got to rule; you have to look and see where justice lies. The hon. Member for Christ Church North Central is reserving his right to speak. Can't he speak now? The only time I have heard him speak in this Chamber is when anyone mentions a big hotel like Sandy Lane. The only time I have ever heard him get up and talk is when somebody mentions a big hotel, but now he is to get out speeches first before he can speak. Those are the people who say they are capable of running the Government. Let them get up and answer now. Five last week from this side ran eight of them. Five of us are now running eleven of them. I am challenging them now to continue with the debate. 6.15 pm.

The question that further consideration of this Resolution be now postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House as follows:

AYES:

Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. A. MORRISON, Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Hon. G. L. EASTMOND, Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Hon. P. G. MORGAN, Mr. HOPPIN, Mr. LOWE, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. GREAVES and Hon. R. St.C. WEEKES - 11.

NOES:

Mr. ADAMS, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. FORDE, Mr. HINDS and Mr. BOLDER - 5.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now resumed.

Hon. A. MORRISON:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I am asking for leave for the hon. Member for St. Andrew to ask a question.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am quite prepared to grant leave at the end of the day, not now.

Mr. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, when the time for asking questions came I indicated that I was asking for leave to ask two further questions.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Leave is granted but at the end of the day.

Mr. EDWARDS:

The point I am making is that I have to leave.

Mr. SPEAKER:

With the indulgence of the House I will permit you to ask your question now.

Mr. EDWARDS:

Thank you, Sir. To enquire of the appropriate Minister

Is the Minister aware that

(1) the swine industry in Barbados is currently experiencing difficulty?

(2) there are people who now keep pigs that have no intention of continuing to keep them in future because of the uneconomic feasibility of pig rearing?

(3) if the current trend continues, in a short while, there will be a serious shortage of pigs in Barbados?

In the light of the above, would the Minister make a statement (a) on the proposed establishment of the Pork Processing Plant?

(b) what action he proposes to take to purchase from keepers of female pigs, small and great, the excess piglets which they now have in their possession, construct feed lots in the several District Agricultural Stations as holding areas for the female piglets with a view to selling them or their offspring to would-be pig keepers when the climate for keeping pigs becomes better?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the first Resolution is for the sum of \$90,000 and I am proposing, in accordance with the

agreement reached with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and with the undertaking given that we will deal with at least four Resolutions,.....

Mr. CRAIG:

If the Hon. Leader will give way, there was no agreement reached between the Leader of the House and me. He said he would like to dispose of a few Resolutions which appear to be straightforward, I would like him to indicate what Resolutions he proposes to do, but I had absolutely no undertaking from him nor did we have any agreement.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I meant that by so-called intimation.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Two hon. Members are on their feet.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I intimated that he and I were to get together, but there are certain things which are straightforward which I take it he will agree to do; that is all I am saying.

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order, let us get the procedure straight. Would the Leader agree that the House should go into Committee of Supply to deal with certain Resolutions?

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, when we came in here, we protested about the late arrival of our papers. The Leader of the House said he thought he would have done the Resolution which related to the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board, then he would go into Private Members' Business and probably do some more later. I believe that we on this side pointed out that we could not be studying these papers at the same time we were debating something else, but when the Leader of the House says that things are straightforward he

should say to whom they are straightforward. He admitted that it was not fair to us to get papers late, the hon. Member for Christ Church North Central agreed it was not fair, he has not consulted anybody and he just cannot get up and tell the House that these are straightforward matters. At least I would have thought there would have been some consultation and agreement on what we are going to do, but do not tell us he is going to do this and tell us we must accept it. 6.25 p.m

How does he know what my principles are and how I stand in relation to this? This could not be straightforward. If everything is straightforward we might as well remain at home and let you do things by decree. Is he saying that it is tantamount to a one-party State? He said earlier in the day that they do things to suit themselves. At least, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you are sitting there, and as long as there is democracy in Parliament some sort of consultation or agreement will have to take place, You cannot do things so. You have the numbers, but you cannot do things so.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is here. If he will agree to do the first three Resolutions, then I will.....

(Asides.) If you do not agree, then you will have to come back tomorrow.

Mr. CRAIG:

On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Hon. Leader of the House is on his feet,

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I am merely seeking some sort of agreement with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. If the hon. Member is prepared to do the first three Resolutions, then we would not have to come back tomorrow. If, on the other hand, hon. Members are contending that we had only agreed to do one Resolution, it must be remembered that we agreed to do one in the first instance, but I said that at a certain stage we would deal with as many as possible of the others which were left over. You are now saying that you are not going to deal with more than one.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, that is what the Leader of the House said, but he also said that he would, have consultations with me in the absence of the Leader of the Opposition. I have heard absolutely nothing from him; therefore, how can he now say that the Resolutions are straightforward and we can proceed with them? There are several money Resolutions and you know, Mr. Speaker, that money Resolutions are far reaching in debate. What may be straightforward for them obviously may not be straightforward for us. He cannot dictate what is straightforward for us. We cannot consider them this evening, Sir. There is a Resolution for \$90,000 for the Labour College. There is also another Resolution for the Commissioner of Police and the Chief Immigration Officer. I am sure you will have a debate here this afternoon on all of these matters. I would ask the Leader of the House to let us come back tomorrow and do these Resolutions. My colleagues and I would not object to that.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, speaking on this matter on behalf of the Opposition, it seems that from 1971 - I regret that what I am going to say is going to be an indictment on the present Leader of the House - very little attention has been paid to the absolute burning necessity of getting parliamentary papers to hon. Members on time. As it happened, Sir, and this may be my own error, I did not know that there was a meeting of the House today until I heard the hon. Member for St. Joseph speaking of it only on Sunday. I said then that we had not received our papers, and he pointed out the same thing to me. My papers arrived at 10.05 a.m. yesterday.

Sir, I deplore, as much as any other hon. Member, the fact that week after week we have to come into the House of Assembly and say this. All of us, I am sure, would much rather be engaged on the matter of debating the substance of Resolutions based upon a knowledge which can only be obtained by proper study of them beforehand in good time. The Government has had a no confidence motion against them on the Order Paper since July, and yet they can ask for a week, or two weeks, or some specified period of postponement to deal with it.

Mr. Speaker, the Opposition is presented and confronted, and the Private Members generally, for I speak not only, I believe, for Members on this side, but I must of necessity be speaking for the Private Members on the other side of the House, too, are expected to deal with many matters at the shortest possible notice. This was not always done in this manner. It is disgraceful it should be done in this manner at all. The time of the House will be wasted and will continue to be wasted unless Parliamentary papers are circulated with expedition. I do not, and I very much hope I will never again see this or any other House of Assembly anticipate a situation where such a document as the Customs (Amendment) Act with all of these pages will be presented, thrust under your nose, and dealt with in all its stages in one day. I hope that will never happen again, but that is only a larger symptom of a disease to which this Parliament has been exceptionally prone.

Sir, we cannot deal with the matters before the House today. There is one item of which I am exceptionally well informed, as it happens, which is the vote of money for the Chief Immigration Officer's costs. I am better informed, I dare say, about that than anybody on the other side. I would not be taking part in that debate anyhow. Even in a matter like that, the fact that one Member of the Opposition knows something about it, or one Private Member on the other side knows something about it, cannot destroy a principle, I have an interest in that going through today, but I would unhesitatingly say that it should not be discussed today, because I am sure- that hon. Members might have something to say about the Commissioner of Police and the Chief Immigration Officer,

Sir, there is also a Resolution here for Government House. We have seen the Governor-General exercising a discretion in politics in a political matter. Perhaps, that might be something considered and thought worthy of debate in the House. There might very well be persons who would seek this opportunity to make certain observations. I have selected those two Resolutions from the ones that look straightforward. Even Resolutions that look straightforward to the Leader of the House may not be so straightforward when they come to be discussed.

Another very important point is the fact that nothing prolongs debate more than ignorance. I am using ignorance in the highest possible sense of not entirely knowing what the matter is about. If you give a Member a day to find out something, it may cut his speech on it to five minutes. That is better than having to speak on it, then obtaining information about it and having to speak on it again. I am appealing to the hon. Member not to come back tomorrow, but to put off these matters until the next ordinary meeting in the House of Assembly next week when the Opposition and Private Members can come and deal with them. We have already waited many months. If you have postponed a motion of no confidence which you have already started, then I do not see how you can refuse to postpone for seven days or so the debate on Resolutions that have not yet been commenced. It is excessively tedious for us every week to have to come in here and appeal for time. We should not be placed in the position of having to appeal for time. The time should be given to us by the Cabinet Office or whatever Department is now dealing with Parliamentary Affairs and by the officers of the House.

Sir, during the speeches on the no confidence motion last week, I heard someone saying how much better things were done in the days when a different sort of person was in the House of Assembly. Let us not show ourselves any more backward in efficiency than in those days. We seem to be moving backwards in terms of the arrangements of business in this House. There is no need for it, there is no reason for it, and I am submitting to you, Sir, that the rights of the minority in this House need a positive act of protection by you - a ruling that you will not entertain these short-notice matters. A lot of Members seem to think that once we are given the Notice Paper that that will solve our problems of knowing what is coming up, but the Notice Paper merely refers to the number of the forthcoming Resolutions and it does not even tell you which Head of the Estimates it seeks to supplement. 6.35 p.m.

The Notice Paper which I studied last week was of no assistance to me, and I am asking on this occasion - I cannot move the Adjournment because I am not a Minister - I am asking on this occasion that the Adjournment be moved until next Tuesday to give us a respite to enable our parliamentary duties to be dealt with in a proper manner.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

The hon. Member was just attempting to lay the blame for the late delivery of these papers on one person and one person alone. It was the business of the Clerks employed by the Debates Committee of which the Leader of the Opposition is a Member. He is criticising his own Committee.

Mr. ADAMS:

The Debates Committee does not circulate documents.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is not a point of order.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, it is not fair to call the Clerks of the House into the debate at this stage. We are making a man look as if he is incapable of doing his job. Let the Debates Committee meet and decide on this matter. Do not blame the Clerks at the Table. They are human beings. It is blatantly unfair to the Clerks at the Table. You are not playing the game right.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I do not circulate papers. (Mr. BOLDEN Do not blame the Clerks.) You should stick up for your Clerks.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

There was ample time to get these papers, and Members still said they only got them yesterday. I am asking for a postponement and the hon. Member gets up on his high horse.

Mr. BOLDEN:

I object to the Hon. Leader of the House saying that I get up on my high horse. He must not accuse me and point at me. All that I am saying is that the Clerks have no right of reply. He does not do it to other Civil Servants.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education is going away tomorrow. If we could come back and deal with the first two.....(Asides.) next Tuesday at 12 o'clock.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until next Tuesday, 30th October, 1973 at 12 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 at 6.40 p.m.