

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 21 st May, 19 74

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); Mr., R.St.C. WEEKS, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J. P., (Chairman of Committees); Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; His Honour C. A.E. HOPPIN, (Deputy Speaker); Mr. L. S. CRAIG; Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY; Mr. C. L. BOLDEN, LL.B; Hon. F. G. SMITH, Q.C.C., B.A. (Minister of Communications and Works); Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND; Hon. A. MORRISON, (Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology); and Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B. A., M. A. (Econ.), (Minister of Education, Youth Affairs, Community Development and Sport).

Prayers were read.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Minutes of this Honourable House for Tuesday the 7th May r 1974 and Friday the 10th May, 1974 are before you for confirmation. If there are no alterations or additions or amendments, the Minutes will be confirmed. (Pause) There bei no alterations or additions or amendments, the Minutes are hereby duly confirmed.

PAPERS PRESENTEI)

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following-

(1) The Statement showing Money Order Transactions through the Crown Agents for Oversea Governments for the months of November and December 1973 and January 1974.

(2) The Statement showing sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of Money Orders for the months of November and December 1973 and January 1974.

FOUR WEEKS' LEAVE OF ABSENCE GRANTED TO HON. P. M. GREAVES

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the hon. Member For St. Michael North West be granted four weeks' leave of absence from attendance from the Honourable the House of Assembly with effect from 4th June, 1974.

Hon. A. MORRISON:

I beg to second that.

The Question was put and resolved in the Affirmative without division.

FOUR WEEKS' LEAVE OF ABSENCE GRANTED TO HON. C.E. TALMA

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, on my own behalf I beg to move that I be granted four weeks' leave of absence from attendance from the Honourable the House of Assembly with effect from the 11th June, 1974.

Hon .A MORRISON:

I beg to second that.

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

HON. F. G. SMITH GRANTED TWO AND ONE HALF MONTHS¹ LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that I be granted two and a half months' leave of absence with effect from 31st May, to the middle of August, part of it on official business and part of it is for holiday with my family -holiday which I have not had since 1958.

Hon. L. E. SANOIFORD:

I beg to second that.

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

REPLIES TO PARLIAMENTARY QUESTIONS

Hon. A. MORRISON:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to inform you that the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 149 and the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 173, asked by the hon. Member for St. Joseph are now ready.

Also, Mr. Speaker, the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 178 asked by the hon. Member for St. Lucy is now ready.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to inform you that the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 253 asked by the hon. Member for St. Joseph is now ready.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICE

Mr. SPEAKER:

There was a notice of a Motion to be given by the hon. Member for St. James. Is the hon. Member ready?

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker

WHEREAS the cost of electricity in Barbados has skyrocketed in recent months;

AND WHEREAS the Government-appointed Public Utilities Board has fixed new rates substantially above those previously prevailing, especially to domestic consumers, without objection from the Government;

AND WHEREAS the Public Utilities Board has also permitted even greater increases, firstly to commercial and now to domestic users under a fuel adjustment Clause;

AND WHEREAS the iniquitous Fuel Adjustment charge is almost as much as the fixed and Energy Charges to be paid by the consumer, thus causing electric bills to be increased by 65% and upwards;

AND WHEREAS these exorbitant unjustifiable and unreasonable charges have caused the already high cost of living for Barbadians to rise to unmanageable heights;

AND WHEREAS there is an urgent need to keep a close check on all companies who enjoy monopolies in Barbados to see that they do not use these monopolies to the detriment of people of Barbados;

AND WHEREAS there is also very urgent need to check inflation in the economy and prevent it from remaining at an unmanageable level;

AND WHEREAS the Barbados Light and Power Company in its recent application for an increase in rates stated that the new generating machinery it sought to install would use a fuel costing less than one half what was then being paid, but the price of electricity is still going up:

AND WHEREAS the very great increases in the cost of electricity are contributing to increases in the cost; of living and to the present inflation;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE House call on the Government forthwith to file a complaint under the Public Utilities Act to the existing electricity rates and to any new charges proposed of as a result of the fuel adjustment clause and to take all such action as necessary to bring down the cost of electricity to the people.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

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

Hon. A. MORRISON:

I beg to second that.

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

ORDER NO. 1

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I am asking for leave to deal with Order No. 1 on the Order Paper under Government Business which stands in the name of the Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance. It is to move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Tenancies (Control and Development) Act, 1965. The hon. Member is unavoidably absent owing to illness.

Mr. SPEAKER:

There being no objection, leave is hereby granted.

THE BILL TO AMEND TENANCIES (CONTROL AND DEVELOPMENT) ACT, 1965

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, as the Objects and Reasons set out-

This Bill would amend the Tenancies (Control and Development) Act, 1965 (Act 1965-34) in order to-

(a) provide for contiguous parcels of land owned by the same person to be regarded as one area;

(b) provide for a tenantry to continue to be a tenantry until released by the Minister; and

(c) permit an increase of rent by 20 per centum.

12.15p.m.

This Tenancies (Control and Development) Act, 1965, was amended in 1971 when the definition read:

"Is an area of land other than land vested in or leased to the Crown into more than five lots for the purpose of being let to tenants as sites for chattel houses used or intended to be used as dwellings."

In cases where the owner of contiguous parcels of land does not have more than five tenants on any one parcel, but when taken together is substantially more than five, in such cases it is uncertain how the Courts will find, and, in order to offer some protection to these tenants, both the Ministry and the Cabinet considered that the Act should be amended to provide that contiguous parcels of land owned by the same person should be regarded as one area for the purpose of classification as a tenantry and the Act should be amended accordingly. This is one of the amendments which avoid confusion in the Courts when dealing with this particular matter. The Courts are in a very awkward position when they have to interpret the Act.

Mr. Speaker, Section 7 of the Act provides that after the 8th June, 1965, the rent exigible by an owner or lessee in respect of any lot in a tenantry shall be the rent at which it was let at that date, and no increase shall be made in the rent payable in respect of that lot except in the manner and in accordance with Regulations made under Section 8 of this Act.

It is provided under subsection (2) of this Act that applications should be made to the Magistrate exercising jurisdiction in the Magisterial District in which the tenantry is situated.

Mr. Speaker, no Regulation have yet been laid under the Tenancies (Control and Development) Act, 1965, but I am now hoping to ask for leave at a later stage of this Sitting to lay these Regulations here today so that the Act would be workable and the law would be more easily enforced.

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

Hon. A. MORRISON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, this Bill coming at this time, is ill-conceived and ill-timed because one of the provisions is to allow landlords to increase rent paid by people who live on tenancies by 4 blanket 20 per cent. It has come at a time when this country is facing an economic crisis entirely due to the mismanagement of the Democratic Labour Party's Government. It has come at a time when the Government appears to be totally incapable or impotent to deal with the constant rise in the cost of living. It has come at a time when the people of Barbados are being asked to pay more for services such as water, light, telephone, etc. Anyway, I do not want to deal with the telephone now, because this Bill relates, as the original Bill

relates, to the waking-class people -people in the low income brackets, old aged pensioners and others who are feeling the pinch of the economic crisis which confronts this country.

Mr. Speaker, we find that the government is totally incompetent even to face-up to the crisis that is now in this country. One of the things which fascinates me in this country is that someone can go overseas to lecture in economics while the economics of this country are in a state of confusion. What we find at the moment is that you are saying to the landlord: "You are entitled to increase your rent by 20 per cent, " but at the same time, you are not placing on the landlords any duty to ensure that they provide proper services on these tenancies.

Hon. C. E. TALMA; On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I made it my duty to ask for leave to lay the Regulations at a later stage.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is not a point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, we find that eight years after the original Bill was passed, an attempt is now being made to provide Regulations for increasing the rent on tenancies. As far as I am aware, until I heard the statement made by the Leader of the House, no Regulations were ever made under this Act. I was not here when the amendment was dealt with. In 1971 I said that the Housing Authority was not exempted from the Act. I was told that I was talking nonsense at the time, but immediately, after the Elections had taken place, the Act was amended to exempt land owned by the Crown. If it is the intention of the Government to bring in Regulations stating this, it seems rather strange that, you are going to implement in legislation something stating that as from 1st June, 1974 the landlords can increase rent in this manner. I would have thought that the proper thing to do would be to proceed by way of Regulations, but the Regulations referred to today seem to be an afterthought to what was presented to the House last week. (Asides) ; 12.25 p.m.

In fact, I am reminded that during the Estimates no Regulations were then made because you cannot pass legislation which says that as from 1st June you can increase rents by 20%. I would have expected that what would have been set up would be a sort of Rent Tribunal so that if any landlord wanted to increase rents, he would have to apply to that Tribunal showing and justifying his reasons for asking for an increase in rents, not merely for the Government to sit back and say that landlords can have a 20% increase in rents. It is not fair to the working class people of this country because it is not going to affect areas like Sunset Crest or Regency Park; it will affect tenancies in and around Bridgetown and the rural areas. This is a Government that says it has the interests of the working class people at heart, and yet they are going to sit back and grant a 20% increase to land lords. We cannot look at this 20% increase in a vacuum and say that it is not much money. The 20% has to be looked at in the context of the steady rising cost of living in this country, in the steady rising cost of services. Electricity has gone up. We were told in the Budget that water is going up, and now land rent is going up, and at the same time you get the cost of living going up so that with this increase upon the poor people of this country, the value of the dollar is diminishing rapidly.

Sir, I cannot in the circumstances feel that this legislation is justifiable at this stage. I heard talk about regulations. I heard Government Notices for the day and I have not heard anything about

Regulations.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, the Regulations were not signed, otherwise they would have been sent down.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is no point of order. The hon. Member must know what is a point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

That just shows the total incompetence of the Government to bring down Regulations that are not signed. They are totally incompetent to handle even a simple matter like Regulations; so we get this steady decline in Government in this country. That is what we are witnessing. What is needed is not the provision of landlord legislation giving people a 20% increase, but a tribunal set up where people would have to justify the increases they are asking for in the same way that the Public Utilities are called upon to justify the increases when they want increases, because what is going to happen in this case is that a man is going to put up his rent 20%, but what guarantee has the tenant that when he is paying this increased rent, the services required such as water and electricity which are necessities will now be provided for him when this Bill goes through? For this reason I cannot in the circumstances agree to this legislation.

The other question in Section 3 which gives the Minister power to decontrol a tenantry raises various objections. I would have thought that the purpose of this legislation was to protect the tenants. In this country you have some very unscrupulous landlords, and where you have a tenantry that is marginal with barely six tenants, you can get a landlord who is prepared to buy out one tenant or two and then you only have four tenants, and for that reason this should not be in here in this manner. The time is ripe when there ; should be a tribunal to review the whole question of rents in this country. This section can create a hardship where people can be bought out, and the landlord can go to the Minister. You cannot tell who the Minister may be, and the Minister will certify that it is no longer a tenantry. I do not believe any Minister should have that power. I do not think it is right because it opens itself to abuse. If you are a card bearing member of the Democratic Labour Party you can get your land decontrolled, and if you are not a card bearing member, you can be dishonest enough to become a card bearing member to get your land decontrolled; so this system of putting this power in the hands of the Minister opens itself to serious abuse, and it is for this reason that I object to this legislation.

Hon. B. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest to what the hon. Member for Bridgetown has said, but let me first of all clear the air on one or two problems. I do not care who is in power in Barbados, this question of bringing down the cost of living, which is a good political bandwagon, will, during this economic and international world inflation situation, be used as a political catch-phrase to fool people all the time. As long as Barbados is forced to import, then you are subject to international considerations over which you have no control. If freight rates go up, if the price of fuel goes up, this occurs, and if you read any international economic magazine you will find that this question of inflation and this question of the cost of living is a constant problem even with the industrialised nations. The Government of Canada has just had to call an election because the Opposition says that the Canadian Prime Minister and his Government in their Budget have; done nothing or introduced no measures to tackle the inflation

problem. The American Opposition is claiming that President Nixon has done nothing; the German Opposition is claiming this also. This is the cry of all Opposition Governments throughout the entire world, so that I am not particularly worried about this. All I am worried about is that a country like Barbados, that has to import, must always face this problem of a high cost of living, if you bring meat from New Zealand, butter or other foods from New Zealand, commodities from France, Italy and Japan and freight rates go up and the workers in all the Islands have to be paid higher wages because their countries are suffering from inflation, then the end product in Barbados is that people will have to pay a higher price. This is an international problem. It sounds good to fool people, and for pressure groups to march around, but I defy the Opposition if they were in power at this time of an international monetary and food shortage situation, to solve the problem. 12.35p.m.

There are other areas in which I agree that something could be done.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. Member deal with the subject?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I am dealing with the subject, but this was a point raised by the hon. Member for the City. He is saying that a Government has imposed an increase on rents at a time when the other burdens of telephones, light and power and so on are pressing the people. Let me say first, Mr. Speaker, that this piece of legislation introduced by the Democratic Labour Party was one of the greatest pieces of legislation introduced in this country, and it was important because in a community like Barbados where you had a Located Labours Act where people who did not work on the plantation - you do not see it as often now, - had to move their houses on Sunday mornings and they had to give people rum and corned beef to help them put them back up. To some extent, the Government is doing this to enable people because of the shortage of land to remain and not be thrown off land by some tenantry owners. This Government has made a significant contribution not to the land owner but it has given the working classes of the community a security they did not have before, and I think the Opposition, if they are honest, will admit that this piece of tenantry control legislation by this Government would enable people to live on land who would be running helter-skelter throughout the whole of Barbados in order to find land to rent.

Apart from the Government Housing Schemes and the Government buying land to house people, the mere fact that the private landlords, who had more than five tenants were unable to chase people off the land makes this Bill one of the greatest pieces of legislation that has ever gone on the Statute Book of this country. I say that without fear of contradiction, and anybody who is interested in the working classes must admit that preventing people having more than five tenants from throwing them off the land is one of the greatest piece of social legislation which was introduced in this country. Since this Act was implemented in 1965, the Govenmment, aware of the fact that the freezing of rents prevented tenantry owners from developing the tenancies, have gone into countless tenancies and put in water, roads and lights. This is the policy of this Government. (Mr. HINDS: Which tenancies?) If any Member of the Opposition Wants to know the private tenancies, I can mention Hall's Road, Delamere Land, tenancies in St. George, St. Philip and Christ Church where the Government has put in water and lights. We have done it every year because the Government is aware that the freezing of the rents to the tenants has not permitted the landlords, if they were so minded, to put in these facilities for the people.

It is the Government's avowed policy to put in tenantry roads and fix private tenantry roads in all areas subject to funds being available. As soon as money is available there is no tenantry road in which the Government is not prepared to put in lights, telephones and water. Let us face facts, Mr. Speaker, politics is a question of power and I think the time has come in Barbados -and I have said this in this Honourable House already - when we must not any longer fool the working classes that they can go on for evermore not shouldering their responsibilities. I am the first to accept that in the present international monetary and world situation the working classes of this country, of Europe and of the developing nations are finding it extremely difficult to eke out an existence. I agree with that, but just as the price has escalated for the working classes in terms of subsistence and living it has escalated for Governments in providing drugs, hospitals, schools and the myriad other social services that are necessary for running a Government. God knows that the working classes of this country must be experiencing difficulty in this international situation to exist. I concede that, but it is not easy, Mr. Speaker, you know it and I know it, that in the present international situation the working classes and the Trade Unions must be having to knock their Heads together to create a situation in which workers can exist.

Let us face facts. The Government only gets its money from the people of the country, so, if for the Government, the cost of providing the services has escalated, it has to find the money, so do not let us run around and say that the Government is wicked because the Government has got to find the money to meet the needs which have been created in a world in which there is chaos, in which oil is king and in which mankind gone mad, and this thing about brotherly love means absolutely nothing in this "dog eat dog" world. I will concede that the Government has been at fault for not passing Regulations under the 1965 Act by which landlord tenantry owners could have got an increase. I cannot call from 1965 to 1974 an oversight, these Regulations which are to be laid should have been laid soon after the Bill was passed. The Government should get the Regulations on the Statue Book, so you have to be fair to all members of the community. There is no sense in saying that because black people rent from people who may be of a different colour or ethnic group, in tenancies that we can get up in this Honourable House and say that this is murderous to black people. The tenantry owner has to pay increased taxes. Land tax has gone up, other needs and demands for the tenantry owners have gone up, so how can a responsible citizen get up in this Honourable House today and say that rents which have been frozen since 1965 and are to go up by a mere 20%, where people are now paying \$1.0.0, \$2.00 and \$3.00, can we honestly fool people that this is wrong? I can shout like anybody else and say that you are pressing the working classes, but I have reached the point where survival in power must not take precedence over telling the people the truth. I know the cost of living must be making inroads into the salaries of the working classes, but I could not get up in this Honourable House and say that a Bill which has frozen rents in tenancies since 1965 and which on the first of July is giving landlords who had to pay increased land taxes a 20% increase is an oppressing bit of legislation. People have argued it is not high enough, but you must be fair to people, who when they inherited it, found themselves paying additional tax but are not in a position to raise land rents? 12.45p.m.

How much do the people in the tenancies pay? Either one dollar, two dollars, three dollars or four dollars. Divide it by 20 per cent from 1965 because the Regulations were not made, which was a virtual freezing of rates in tenancies.

I know that a lot of people tried to get around it and a lot of working class people had to pay because the landlords browbeated them into paying an increase. It was a case of ignorance of the law, and not a question of the law permitting it, but some landlords have browbeated them because they were not

conscious of the legislation, and some people have paid more by the month, by the quarter or by the year.

I agree with that, but let us be honest; let us face facts and do not let us make political capital out of it. The taxes on land have gone up in tenancies by 1 per cent on a valuation by the Valuation Department and they are entitled to some increase. Therefore what is 20 per cent on one dollar or two dollars or three dollars with land values what they are today ?

I know what I would do, I would freeze the development of land for 10 years in this country. Be that as it may, you have to be fair to the tenancy owners who have to pay more land tax. To the Member for the City, it is obviously a good political gimmick. I know that it is political. I know that anything I say that the working class should not pay is going to get me votes; but I am not prepared to get votes on a question of what is social justice, not only to the working classes but to people who, whether they inherited it, bought it or stole it, find themselves in the possession of tenancies.

Therefore, 20 per cent from the 1st June is not an unreasonable imposition taking into account the Land Tax Bill which places on the owners of tenancies an additional burden. Do not let us go into the merits of the Land tax Bill. Let us accept the fact that that bill has placed on the owners of tenancies an additional imposition.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, some people are paying between one dollar and five dollars. You will agree that there may be other ways of doing it, but I do not think anybody can honestly argue that a 20 per cent increase on tenancies which have been frozen virtually, except for those who have got around it, is an unreasonable imposition.

Are we saying that when you are paying more for gas, more for telephones, more for animal feed, when you are paying more for rice, potatoes, rice and eddoes that you will tell a section of our community, poor or rich - I do not know who own tenancies - that because of the other extraneous increases in the cost of living that their rents must be frozen for evermore?

I have conceded that the working class people every day are finding it extremely difficult to exist. It is not a situation created by the Government. It is an international situation, and I do not see how we can get up in the House, because it sounds good politically, and tell tenancy owners who have had their rents frozen from 1965 that they must continue to have their rents frozen until the cows come home.

I cannot be a party to that, whether I get elected or not. We are caught up in an inflationary situation where, for the Government and for the individual, the cost of existence is bewildering and stunning.

The Member for the City quarrels about this question of two contiguous pieces of land. He knows and I know that if you have eight tenants on your land you cannot move them and you cannot increase their rents. They have asked questions. I can show you the Order Paper where the Opposition asked when is the Minister going to make Regulations under this particular Bill. Am I to assume that the Opposition were asking for these Regulations to allow landlords to increase the rents?

You know, Sir, and I know, that if a landlord has seven people on his land and he can bribe three of them to get off either by giving them money or by some other form of Inducement to get off, he can get

off all seven. That is what has been happening in Barbados, and all that the Government is saying is that two pieces of land close together must be considered one area.

The Minister is not asking for any power. The Minister would like to know in a land scarce, land hungry community, where land is being bought by the doctor, the lawyer and the Indians as a status symbol, he wants to know that the workers are not being dispossessed by land owners who ingratiate themselves with two or three tenants and then throw all seven off. Is that unreasonable for a Government which introduced legislation to give the workers some degree of security? This is what the Minister is asking for. He does not want any special super powers, because he knows, and I know and you know that landlords have been cajoling one or two of their friends on a tenantry to leave and then everybody on that tenantry gets notice to depart, since under the law four tenants do not constitute a tenantry. In the absence of capital gains taxation, and where people are speculating right and left, they used this means to get people off, make a big fortune out of the sale, the Revenue does not get a penny and they get away with murder.

I want to assure the Member for the City that the Minister does not want any party or political benefit. There is nothing wrong with a 20 per cent increase at this stage. I think that Members know that there are some people in this country who, with the increase in land tax, are still paying \$1.00, \$1.50 or \$2.00 etc. An increase of 20 per cent is I repeat, not an unreasonable imposition.

I concede and I say that in the general context of the cost of living and the inflationary trend which is an international situation that a penny for the working class man to find today is like finding a dollar 20 years ago.

Sometimes, Sir, I wonder how in the name of God some people are living, not only in Barbados, but throughout the world. Take a man with \$40 or \$50, when one potato cost 40 cents. I am shocked. As I have said, it is not a situation created by this Government, and that is why I can speak so frankly; because we, as an importing country, with agriculture not playing its main role in the economy of Barbados, are caught up in a situation where I am prepared to concede that I sit down some nights and wonder how in the name of God are the working classes of this country surviving. (ASIDE: Resign.) I am not resigning. The working classes throughout the world are in the same position because of the inflationary trend. In America unemployment is increasing. As a matter of fact, in the industrialised countries, there are certain politicians who insist that the way to fight inflation is to create more unemployment. I think that the Member for St. Michael West and the Member for St. Lucy will support me that this is the way of thinking, that the philosophy of some Governments is to create more unemployment with the idea that if you are not working, it is better than if you are working for a little thing and it cannot stretch. Powell insisted that you should create more unemployment. In America the unemployment rate fluctuates. I am no economist. 12.55 p.m.

It must be realized that Barbados is being caught up in an international inflationary spiral which is like a tornado which can suck the people in and destroy their entire standard of living.

I want the hon. Member for the City to understand that I am as concerned about this as he is. I am concerned about the imposition of a farthing on the working classes in this country because I know that the farthing is causing him pain to bear, but I am still fair that I will not allow my love of the workingclasses to cut across my sense of justice of what is fair to the citizens of Barbados, be they rich

or be they poor. We know what they have borne since 1965 and how the increased cost of living is affecting not only the land owner, whether the land is only support or not - a man may have a piece of land and may use the rent from his tenants as his only means of support. To say that what this Government is doing at this stage is unreasonable by the Government is not fair and it can only result - whether they are in power or we are in power, Mr. Speaker - it can only result in fooling people. They are not more concerned than we are, Mr. Speaker. I feel strongly on this. I know that the increase in water rates, light and power, telephone, and even the ordinary purchases of commodities day by day must be hard on the working classes, not only to them but to me and you, and their salaries and wages are being eroded not by Government consent but by an international situation over which we have no control.

Take Jamaica for instance. Jamaica is now using its natural non-renewable resources to get more money from the bauxite. Today there is a vicious circle and the position is that the rich are getting richer and the poor poorer. We in Barbados are a small community and are unfortunately importing most of our commodities and any increase whether it is in house rent, electricity or what have you, must place a greater burden on the workingclass people who do not own their land.

There can be a political argument that this is an oppressive act against the workingclass people. There could be argument that this should not come now. The Members over there who are four lawyers out of six, if they are honest, they will tell this Honourable House how many cases since 1965 there are in which they have appeared in the courts either for landlords or tenants, either for or against increases in rents, and they know it could not be done because no Regulations were made.

Mr. Speaker, not only has this freezing affected big land owners like those who won Carrington's Village and Delamere Land but the small land owners too, and you will agree with me Mr. Speaker, that with this light increase by the Government of 20%, eventually up goes the inflationary rate. This piece of legislation, however great a burden it may place on the workingclass, I see it as a reasonable piece of legislation and what we should endeavour to do is, not to come in here to make political capital out of it, but we should explain to the people that this is a result of a general trend over which this Government has no control.

Mr. WEEKES:

Mr. Speaker, when I was elected as a Member of this Honourable House in the year 1961 I realized that I was sent here by the workingclass people of this country. Consequently it is my duty coming from among them, to represent them at all times; but, Sir, we must face facts some time or other in our lives.

When one considers, Mr. Speaker, the value of land approximately ten years ago and the present value of land today, he will observe that it has gone up by 300 or 400% - the value of land. Mr. Speaker with inflation throughout the world, the various banks in this Island are offering as high as 10% interest on money which is invested and when one considers the value of say, approximately one acre of land today and the amount of money which it is worth, he will find out that the 20% which will become law under this legislation is not exorbitant. 1.05 p.m.

Let us assume, Sir, that a tenant was paying 50 cents per week. He will now be called upon to pay 60cents per week. There are 52 weeks in a year, so he will have to pay \$5.20 more per year. We must realise that the landlord cannot sell his own land because he has tenants on the land. If the landlord could

sell his land and invest the money in the bank, he would receive greater dividends.

As you know, Sir, we must get money to run this country. Any Government will have to get money to run a country. When we consider that the taxation on land has increased, then we must come to the conclusion that an increase of 20% is not beyond the workers of this country to pay. The Barbados Workers' Union has just been able to get for agricultural workers an increase of 40%. No one should get up and criticise the Government for allowing the landlord to increase his rent by 20% because he cannot sell his land. I have no doubt that the average worker will be satisfied in mind to pay the additional amount.

Mr. Speaker, this Governemnt has done a lot for people on tenantries. The Government has given them water, roads and light. I am speaking for you and me, Sir. We can vouch that in our constituencies there are places, which never had water, roads nor light before, they have these amenities nowadays. It is true that there are a large number of districts where these amenities are not available, but we must also consider the resources of the country and realise that we can only do a limited number of things annually.

Mr. Speaker, I have pleasure in supporting this piece of legislation. I am prepared to go to my constituents and explain all aspects of the matter to them. Realising that the cost of everything has gone up, we cannot victimise the landlord who, at this particular time, would prefer to sell his land and put the money in the bank where he can receive a greater amount than the amount which he receives from his tenants. I defy any person, with the exception of the Government detractors, with the exception of those who have a thirst for power, with the exception of those who try to mislead the public, to say that a 20% increase should not be given to the landlord at this particular moment, especially when it is known and recognised that approximately ten or eleven years ago, the landlord could not demand an increase on his rent.

Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in giving this Bill my wholehearted support. I am willing to put my political future at stake in supporting this Bill.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Speaker, this legislation which we are considering today relates to a very brief amendment to the Tenantries Bill, 1965. I thing, at the outset, we should make it quite clear that the Opposition has never queried the social implications of legislation such as this and, indeed, had we been in power in 1965, we would have brought forth a better Bill than the one which has been on the Statute Book of this country for the last eight or nine years. If Members would take the trouble to read the debate on that Bill at the time they will see that the point was made and has since be made by Members of the Opposition then in Parliament and by others who subsequently came to Parliament and are no longer here that the Bill was brought into Parliament rather hastily, very badly drafted and without any effort being made to put right many of the ills which we find confronting the tenants in this Island.

Mr. Speaker, I recall that Senator St. John in particular as well as the present Leader of the Opposition put forward concrete suggestions for the improvement of this legislation and recommended several years ago that all tenantries, not merely a tenantry of four or five, should be turned into statutory leases where there was certainty of tenure for at least a period of 25 years with options to convert into freehold ownership allowing the rent which was being paid to count towards the eventual purchase of the

freehold. That was a positive recommendation by the Barbados Labour Party, which none of us on this side need be ashamed of and which we still strenuously recommend to this country as a means of dealing with land ownership in Barbados and as a means of eradicating the social implications on existing tenancies. 1.15 p.m.

Not only has this Government seen fit for nine years to ignore this suggestion, but the Government has today through its Minister of

Communications and Works admitted its own ineptitude for failing to bring forth legislation some nine years ago to deal with Regulations under the Act. I make bold to say today, Mr. Speaker, that the Government has not up to now done any proper review of this legislation. It is not aware of the number of tenants there are on house-spots, their incomes, nor their ability to own the lots. In short, no adequate survey has been done despite the presence of this legislation. I am not one who subscribes to piecemeal legislation that is not properly thought out; I believe that if Government has an Act that has proper social implications as this Act definitely has, it should be seeking to improve on those implications where they are of great advantage, and it should be seeking to remove any inequities which exist in such legislation. It is because of this that I asked, for instance, Mr. Speaker, why no Regulations had been passed. That question remained unanswered on the Order Paper on this House for almost a year. I am amazed that it takes the Government sometimes more than a year to answer a Parliamentary Question - and I must comment on that - and it is because of this that speaking in this House on similar amendments I took the strongest objection on behalf of the Barbados Labour Party to the amendment which exempted Government Statutory Corporations and the Government from the provisions of this legislation. I do not believe that the Government should be allowed to get away today with an amendment which increases rents by 20% - and I am not commenting on whether this is equitable or not in circumstances where Government had exempted itself from the provisions of this Act, and has seen fit to raise rents in Christ Church, in the constituency which adjoins mine, by upwards of 300 per cent in some instances. Now this happened, not whether these people could pay or not or whether it was justified. To me that manner of dealing with legislation is discriminatory, I could never subscribe to the view that the Crown must at all times be above the law, and I will comment here that when that amendment was being passed, the Hon. Minister of Information who was representing the constituency was absent. It is not only in "posh areas" like Worthing View that these large increases have taken place. They have also taken place where people of lower income brackets reside on Government lands. So Government exempted itself first, went ahead and did an increase at the same time not providing the legislation to permit other landlords to have any increase, at the same time raising the land tax in this country, and therefore discriminating further against some of its citizens. That is not only ineptitude, but it is not good Government, and I believe that a Government must be fair to all of its citizens. It has to redress balances but it has to redress these balances in a sensible manner, and when you find that it has taken Government nine years before it can review its legislation, something must be wrong with the Government.

Even today, Mr. Speaker, this Act is still unworkable. Professor Marshall has submitted to the Government a critique of the Act showing that it is legally inept, and it makes a nonsense of the whole law of Landlord and Tenant. It permits a landlord to terminate a tenancy by a notice to quit and at the same time not having the right to eject, and creates "a legal limbo" that could never have existed with anybody who knew anything about fundamental jurisprudence. He has suggested to this Government that this Act should be withdrawn and there should be a proper consolidated statute on similar lines to those you find in the Australian states and other forward thinking areas which would allow tenants to

move from the social stigma of the tenantry into being proper owners of land.

Now why hasn't the Government taken those suggestions? They are not lacking in suggestions, but they are either too busy or they are not sufficiently concerned, or like most things in Barbados, we live with it and we accept it as good. Those of us who have had to work this legislation, and many of us who are attorneys-at-law have had to appear both against tenants and for tenants, have been surprised at the number of loopholes that exist in this Act, and the legislation today seeks to remedy one, but it does not. The amendments in Section 2 are again inefficient amendments, and obviously were drawn in a bit of a hurry, and I am appealing to Government that instead of doing this piecemeal amendment to think out a proper Landlord and Tenant Act.

But I would not pass this part of it unless I dealt with a fundamental question, that is, the concept of tenantry. The Government is the biggest single land owner in Barbados. The Government has inherited itself the land of the plantation tenancies. Government has taken over sufficient land that it could have used the Sugar Industry Rehabilitation Fund that it has been using, properly to remove some of the stigma and the insecurity that surround these tenants. It has not done so up to now. Instead what do we find? We find Government allowing the Agricultural Development Corporation to sell off lands to private individuals who are members of the Democratic Labour Party to sell up in Graeme Hall at \$2.00 and \$1.50 per square foot, and not providing properly for other tenants that are suffering and cannot get on the lands. I will be specific and refer to the area of land owned by Mr. Bernstein, Mr. Moses and their cohorts, and you cannot mention these things because the country does not seem to be interested. If the Government had its sights right, it could have sold Graeme Hall area and it would have been helping tenants to own their own land and prevent them from being ejected in the manner they are being ejected. This has not happened. The Government cannot set any example to any landlord in this country when it comes to this matter, because it is not itself setting the lead, and it is not dealing with its own plantation tenancies properly, and the sooner it gets up and has a fundamental Land Use Policy in Barbados, the better in order to remove some of these inequities. When I mention that in the House I was cried down by the Hon. Prime Minister, but he did not know I would search the Registry to find out how much the deal was done for. It is not good enough that a Cabinet should sit down and allow tenants to suffer in some ways where it is withholding its power to make land available and does not do so. 1.25 p.m.

I am going to deal with another bad effect of this Act. One of the bad effects of this Act is that since there were no provisions for increasing rents to tenants, landlords have not done anything about putting in roads and water because they were saying that they were not getting a fair return for the monies or lands they have invested. As a result, the Treasury has had to meet it from its pocket, it has only done a limited number of the tenantry roads and as a constituent of the Hon. Minister, I can say that he looks after his constituents well but he is not looking after mine well, nor that of the Member for St. Michael South, whose constituency adjoins mine, because we have some of the worst instances of a lack of roads in areas like Britton's Hill, across Bennetts, Rockley New Road and Worthing View, and this Government cannot do anything for them, but they can do something for the Bernsteins and the Moses, who are members of the Democratic Labour Party, in preference to the others. It is about that I quarrel. I do not mind what labels they put on me during election time, when I come in here and talk I will make my position absolutely clear and it is very clear on this matter, that so far as tenancies are concerned, there should be no more tenancies in this country. The time has come for this Government to take over the tenancies, buy out the lands and give the tenants security of tenure and allow them over a period of time to pay for the ownership of their house plots. That is a higher priority than rewarding party

members. When I leave this House or leave politics for good, all of what I will say will be ipse dixit. I have called on this Government to take over Bennetts but that was ignored. They would not do anything about Worthing View but we get piecemeal legislation from time to time.

I want to talk a bit about the statutory discrimination in this legislation. I believe that Government over the last few years has not treated landlords right and as a result the landlords have not treated the tenants right, because if you are going to keep this legislation as it is, you should have come on with the Regulations, you should have laid down strict terms under which landlords should increase their rents and make them show some consequential benefits to the tenants for the increase in rents. This has not happened and I think you are not treating a segment of your community correctly. The Government should repeal the amending Act which exempted all the statutory corporations and the Crown from the provisions of this legislation, and the Government should give this House an undertaking, Mr. Speaker, that it intends in future to review the legislation in order to work towards the eradication of the tenantry situation which exists in this Island. I do not feel any shame when I learn from other people and I cited the positive ideas put forward by Senator St. John and the Leader of the Opposition, and I would also like to refer to the numerous occasions that I have heard, both since I have been in this House and before I came into this House, the hon. Member for St. Michael West speak on the concept of tenantry, particularly the plantation tenantry, and he has positively been belabouring the idea of moving from the tenantry and all I can get from Government are very nice words. I have come to recognise this as a Government of beautiful words. Do not tell me that from 1961 to 1974 there has been no real positive action dealing with the problem of leasehold ownership.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I should like to make reference to the necessity to look at the control of rents in general and not simply the rents of house spots. I am talking about the rents of agricultural land. If you want to increase production in a country you have to look to see whether agricultural land is giving a proper return, whether it is being leased at a proper rent so that the person who is working it would have some incentive to make it produce, and I will also speak about furnished and unfurnished houses. Anybody who has some social conscience, regardless of the political label which is heaped on his head, must be concerned about this situation continuing to exist in Barbados in 1974. Rather than taking the welfare funds sometimes and using them on sortie project, I believe that it is in this area that the welfare funds should be deployed in the years to come for the betterment of the conditions under which essentially working class people live. There is a category of persons misusing this legislation, and there are some people who have very valuable land have seaside houses in different areas of this country, live in their own houses and are benefiting from this legislation to prevent genuine development from taking place. I think legislation should deal with this because it is deficient in this respect. If it was intended to protect a genuine tenant it can hardly be allowed to be a measure under which a person who is not really a tenant hides and holds up proper development in the country as a whole. That is another reason why I urge the Government to look at this legislation as soon as possible in a proper way instead of coming with piecemeal measures that do not meet the full circumstances today.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, there is one point I want to raise on this particular Bill, and that deals specifically with the amendment of a section of Rules and Regulations which have never been laid in this House or which even up to this point have still not been laid. 135 p.m..

I have spoken on many occasions about the Leader of the House coming to this Chamber and asking

that certain things be done in all its stages when the entire House is unaware of what is going on. I am contending now that to pass this Act to amend something which has not yet been approved by this House is illegal and has no efficacy. It is misleading, not only to the public at large, but to the Members of this House because they will be joining in amending something which they do not know of.

It is time that this Government realises that it is bad legislation, bad practice and against the system of Government which we cherish so dearly. When the Minister of Communications and Works says that politics is about power, he is guilty of misleading the entire nation because he is condoning the wickedness of the Government in bringing legislation to the House asking the House to amend something when you do not know what you are amending.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order. We are amending the principal Act, the Tenancies (Control and Development) Act, 1965, and the honourable Member is confusing the Act with Regulations.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, if you look at section 3 of the Bill, you will see that it refers to Regulations made under section 8 of the Act, Regulations that have not been made. What Regulations are you going to amend when no Regulations have been made under section 8?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

The honourable Member is trying to confuse everything. We are amending an Act and not Regulations.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to argue with the Leader of the House. I do not think that he knows what is going on. Section 3(7) (1) says that the rent exigible by an owner or lessee immediately before the 1st June, 1974 in respect of any lot in a tenancy may, with effect from that date or any date thereafter, be increased by an amount not exceeding 20 per centum thereof but no further increase may be made in the rent payable after the date on which it was increased by 20 per centum in respect of that lot except in the manner and in accordance with Regulations made under section 8 of this Act.

How can you decide something based on Regulations which have not been made? The Minister of Communications and Works spoke about Government having the interest of the worker at heart. If he would only take the time to look into his own political policy, he will see that when he comes here and says that it is unfair to increase rents at this time he cannot claim any kudos for the Government, if he looks at the rents which the Government charges — \$15.00 instead of \$10.00 - \$12.00 per quarter, that is 50 per cent. \$12.00 instead of \$7.00 - \$9.00 per quarter is 33 per cent minimum. \$10.00 instead of \$5.00 - \$6.00 per quarter is 70 - 100 per cent. \$8.00 instead of \$3.00 - \$4.00 is 100 - 120 per cent, and \$6.00 instead of \$1.00 - \$2.00 is 300 per cent increase.

That is their own law that they have passed exempting the Government. This whole system was brought about by the Land Tax Act. We are saying that there is no proper land use policy. We said that land should be valued according to its use and according to the benefits you get out of the land.

Do not talk about international inflation. That is the very reason why the Canadian Government is

down today, if you had any sympathy for the working class people, you would have admitted that you made a mistake as regards land tax.

If you admit that the landlord who has a piece of land and has tenants, is looking at it as a means of economy, you cannot say that you are studying the man who is evicted today. Look back at your own manifestos. From the time I came in here in 1971 the Minister said that we had a thriving agricultural policy. When I asked in 1971 that the Government take over these tenancies and give the tenants the right to own their own land, and let the Government credit the rents to the tenants so that they would have the potential right to become owners of their own property, the Government said they could not do it.

The Minister said he only had \$60, 000 to do roads and water. I know of a case where a woman is paying four times the value in tax that she recovers from rents. Why not admit that the Land Tax Act is the cause of this?

The Government has to provide certain social benefits for the inhabitants, and there are various funds coming out of sugar. When we who are representatives of country constituencies ask that the Government do something for the country districts, they talk about Hall's Road. It is clear that the Government intends to do everything between St. Michael and Christ Church where they have 14 seats.

The honourable Member for St. Philip will tell you all the problems facing that parish when it comes to roads. We are talking about bringing down the cost of living. The Government is in power and it is for them to bring down policies which would show that they are at least trying to control the cost of living.

I remember when I was at District "C" that the Minister of Housing came here and said that he had issued a warning about anyone putting a person in court for rents. If a man does not pay his rent, all that the landlord has to say is that he wants the piece of land for his own use and put you off.

The Act is unworkable. It freezes the sale of land. The National Housing Corporation cannot find enough land to accommodate tenants looking for house spots today. The Government is talking about having to import butter and cheese from Canada and New Zealand. The Minister talks about inflation, if he had a policy, we would not be in this position today. 1.45p.m.

We must object to any increase. We will object. We talk about social justice, and you have to treat everybody with a certain amount of equality. You cannot discriminate. What we say is, the Government should have set the pattern themselves. If the Government knew that it would be hard on tenants to increase their rents — they did not increase theirs yesterday; they are not seeking to increase theirs today. They increased theirs a year ago.

The Right Honourable Prime Minister came in here during the Estimates and he talked about the people in this country not getting justice. We did not even know that these rules are supposed to be made by the Cabinet but now we hear the Leader of the House come in here and say that the rules are made but they were not signed. Now this is what we call the inefficiency of Government and I will contend that any amendment is faulty, because, Mr. Speaker, what is 20% increase? If you read Section 3(1) of this Act carefully, what does the 20% increase relate to? The moment this is passed, every landlord will then get the licence to increase by 20% or whatever figure they feel like. That is the whole point.

What you are going to do Mr. Speaker, is involve 90% of the tenants in this country who are not on land which this Act is supposed to cover, to find themselves with legal expenses. That is what is going to happen, because you have no guide lines by any rules and therefore any landlord can take any figure he feels profitable and give an increase on that, and you are going to involve every landlord and tenant in court action in this and it is simply because the Government has not been taking time to look at the legislation which they are bringing down to this House. They come in at the last minute — and I want some of the Reporters like Glyne Murray who writes in the paper Sunday after Sunday about what the Opposition is doing, to try and understand Parliamentary procedures and stop writing foolishness and understand what is happening. Then he will understand what the Opposition speaks about and why we act in the way we act. I would like to hear what they are going to say about increased rates and about the Regulations that have not yet come before the House of Assembly. That is what I would like to hear about because I contend that it is unfair and unjust to amend something — because we have complained about this before, but you are amending and passing things which the House has never, seen. And I would wish that you, Mr. Speaker, would exercise your authority to make the Government understand that they cannot deal with things which have not yet come to the Chamber.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, I am surprised to hear that this amendment has generated this heat because it is an amendment to an Act that this Government passed in 1965 and all that I have heard today reinforces my view that if the original Act had not been passed, what would have been the position of these poor tenants, because it is out of this that the Act was passed.

Now I agree with the honourable Member for Christ Church West that in any Tenantry Act in Barbados, you can have a lot of amendments. When he was speaking, my mind went back to the period ten years ago — ten years ago the honourable Member was advising the Union and it is amazing how these things recoil, that, when the Union was involved in a matter like this, for which the Union put forward a proposal that was to act as an underpin to this sort of recasting of the old plantations system, it was amazing that the honourable Member who was advising the Union did not at that time see to it that he had a social function far greater than any legal or financial position that he had to perform ...

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of explanation. The honourable Member has probably forgotten. I have never advised this Union — never advised the Union on any matter concerning tenantries other than in respect of the ownership of a bit of land that the Union had in Roebuck Street.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, I have not said yet what he had to advise the Union on specifically. Why should he anticipate what I was going to say? Since he has anticipated that, I can tell him that it was wider than a bit of land. It was dealing with the whole tenets of the sugar industry; but the honourable Member could not see the distinction then, that the Union had a greater function to play in dealing with the sugar industry as a whole and not a tenantry.

The reason why I say that, is, it is all well to say today that he would like to see the tenantries owned and he would like to see a law whereby all the tenantries were taken over. This was put forward as a protection. You cannot ask Barbados to buy Barbados from itself. No person, who is talking in terms of

real economic sensor is going to tell you to buy over Barbados from itself but if you are going to talk in terms of the tenancies in Barbados, you do not worry to talk about the tenancies in the metropolitan area or the tenancies in the suburban area. If you really know anything about the tenancies in Barbados, you have to talk about the plantations tenancies. That is where the land resides. The land does not reside in the places that you are talking about. Barbados has over 600 villages and they are adjacent to all of the plantations, but this party that he now belongs to, propped up the plantation system and is still propping up the plantation system, some of them acting as front men for the plantation people.

It is all right to get in here and say that you do not want people to sell land. What are you talking about the freezing of the sale of land for? We are not talking about selling land, because, I can say that as a result of the honourable Member, in 1964 when the Union itself said that we wanted to see these workers with money to be able to get land, the hon. Member can remember that he drew up the original papers that were a success

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Speaker, I wish the honourable Member would stop mis-representing me both in and out of this House. For the umpteenth time I would say that the honourable Member was being advised by me for a particular matter, but I have never drawn up any papers. I will not have that go down as historical rectitude. I have never drawn up any papers.

Mr. WALCOTT:

You drew up papers

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

If the hon. Member would give way, Sir. Inasmuch as the Standing Orders have not been suspended, I beg to move that I be permitted to lay the Regulations; I refer to the Tenancies (Control and Development) Regulations, 1974. I

Mr. SPEAKER:

The honourable Member is out of order because we are still discussing the Second Reading of this Bill. The honourable Member is out of order. It cannot be done like that. We are in the midst of the Second Reading of the Tenancies Bill. Will the honourable Member take his seat? It must be done, but certainly not this way.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, the honourable Member said that I misrepresented him. I will say this I am so right. The only successful libel case I ever had was the one that the honourable Member drew up the papers for, so I do not know if he wants to deny that

Mr. SPEAKER:

This is not relevant The relationship between yourself and the honourable Member is not relevant in this matter. 1.55p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT:

You allowed the hon. Member to say that I was misrepresenting him. I only want to say that you allowed him to anticipate me. I may not be relevant, but he cannot say that I misrepresented him. There

is no point in saying that you want to see a Tenancies Act. The Union has bought land and we can testify to it. We have bought land at a rate where the people who live on it do not pay any rent. Land can be sold at \$2, 500 an acre. You can pay \$20, 000 for a portion of land that people live on. We have to pay \$100 per annum for land tax.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER:

It being two o'clock, this Sitting is now suspended until 2.45 p.m.

On resumption

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Sitting is now resumed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, before proceeding to Question Time, I beg to move that I be permitted to lay the Tenancies and Development) Regulations, 1974.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND:

I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That seems to be an irregular procedure. When Regulations are to be laid, you simply lay them. Permission is granted.

PAPERS PRESENTED

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Tenancies (Control and Development) Regulations, 1974.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, this is a very extraordinary procedure. In view of the fact that these Regulations relate to an Act under discussion, we ought not to deal with them. Prior to the Suspension of the Sitting, we were dealing with the Act.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I see nothing extraordinary about it at all.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, you have not allowed me to finish what I am saying.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Carry on. I do not know on what you are speaking, of course.

Mr. BOLDEN:

I am speaking on the question of laying certain Regulations,

Mr. SPEAKER:

There is nothing on which to speak. He is just laying Regulations, and he has been given permission to do so.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, the moment he has asked for permission to do so, then I am entitled to say something on it.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have granted him that permission.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICE

RESOLUTION RE RURAL PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT IN BARBADOS

Mr. GREAVES:

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

WHEREAS the social, cultural and economic life in rural areas is of paramount importance to the development of any nation;

AND WHEREAS all available evidence suggests that the above is not a priority in Government planning;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House views with deep concern the lack of rural planning and Development in Barbados and calls on the Government to give urgent consideration to a meaningful programme of social, economic and cultural development in the rural communities.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER:

It is now Question Time. I am informed that the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 149 asked by the honourable Member for St. Joseph is now ready, but I do not see the Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology in his place.

The Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 253 asked by the honourable Member for St. Joseph is ready.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I want to draw to your attention that at the last Sitting of the House, I informed you that the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 189 was ready, and I am asking leave to give the Reply today.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Leave is granted. Question No. 253 asked by the honourable Member for St. Joseph.

QUESTION RE THE HIGHWAY AND BUS STOPS IN ST. GEORGE

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister Is the Minister aware 1. That the highway which passes through Watts' Village in the Parish of Saint George is botoded by high walls on both sides. 2. That there are two bus stops on either side of the said highway within the same area. 3. That the bus stops are so placed that they create a danger for intending passengers awaiting buses while other traffic is using the same highway. 4. That at least two (2) persons have lost their lives and several persons injured in this area, by being crushed against the said high walls by motor vehicles using this highway. 5. That at least one of the bus stops is so placed in relation to a curve that intending passengers have to stand on the opposite side of the road to see approaching buses and then have to cross the highway to reach the bus stop -thus creating a potential hazard to life and vehicular traffic. In view of the above Would the Minister 1. Cause lay-byes to be created in the walls in this highway in the areas where the bus stops are located. 2. Make the said bus stops "Compulsory stops" so as to facilitate intending passengers?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, the Reply to the question is as follows

1. Yes, Sir.

2. Yes, Sir.

3. Yes, Sir.

4. Between March, 1967, and March 1974, one fatal accident and eight others involving injury to persons were reported.

5. Yes, Sir.

6. Consideration is being given to the provision of bus lay-byes and making the bus stops compulsory.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, would the Minister state how soon these lay-byes will be created in the area?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister has given instructions that this is a matter of priority, but at the same time negotiations with the landowners on both sides of the particular sites will have to be made. The land is of coral formation, and the Minister intends to make the present bus stop compulsory stops.

Within the shortest possible time. Instructions have gone out to the appropriate technical officers to look after the matter. The Minister will be pursuing the matter vigorously because he drives through that

area several times a week and is aware of the nature of the danger of the particular spot.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Question No. 189 asked by the honourable Member for St. Peter.

QUESTION RE THE ALL SAINTS' BOYS' SCHOOL

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Minister of Education, Youth Affairs, Community Development and Sports. Is the Minister aware that the grounds of All Saints Boys' School, St. Peter would require considerable preparation if the children are to participate in outdoor games? 2. Will the Minister take early steps to have some work done on the school grounds so as to encourage the children and others to engage in such outdoor activities as well prepared grounds would permit?

Hon. L. E. SANDOFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the Reply to Question No. 189 is as follows

Consideration is being given to the needs of the All Saints' Boys' School for improved playground facilities. Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister tell us if any activity beyond the giving of consideration, will ever take place in this respect? 2.50 p.m.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the answer to that is "yes".

Mr. HINDS:

Since the answer is "yes, can the Minister tell us how soon?

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the consideration referred to has already started and I expect that within the next four weeks further consultations and consideration will take place on the matter of providing or meeting the needs of this particular school for improved playgrounds.

Hon. L. E. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Communications and Works is prepared to answer Questions Nos. 149 and 173 on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture.

QUESTION RE FODDER GRASSES IN THE COUNTRY

Mr. SPEAKER:

Parliamentary Question No. 149 stands in the name of the honourable Member for St. Joseph.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows To enquire of the appropriate Minister Is the Minister aware that with the increase in the number of farm animals in the country there will be a heavy demand

for feeding matter? (b) Is the Minister aware that Alfalfa is one of the richest grasses in food value for livestock? Would the Minister state (a) what steps are being taken by the Government to improve and increase the fodder grasses in the country? (b) Have any trials been carried out on Alfalfa grasses, if so what are the results of these trials?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, the reply is as follows —

"1. (a) Yes, Sir. (b) Yes, Sir.

2. (a) Extensive research is being undertaken into Pangola and other grasses, including seven from Australia and ten from Trinidad & Tobago. Nine tropical legumes are also being studied.

(b) Experiments are being conducted on two Persian varieties of Alfalfa, and one each from the United States of America, Uruguay and India. However, these experiments are not yet sufficiently advanced to report on their potential for Barbados."

Mr. BOLDEN:

Will the Minister state where these are being carried out?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, trials are being carried out at various Government Experimental Stations in the country.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Will the Minister state the names of the grasses on which trials are being carried out?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

The Minister is not in a position to state the names of the grasses by their scientific names, but the Minister is satisfied that these grasses, apart from their scientific names, are being experimented on.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Will the Minister give the figures of yield per acre which have been recovered in respect of Alfalfa?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

As the Minister said in his Reply, experiments are not sufficiently developed to give the honourable Member the final results of the experiment, but as soon as the experiments have reached the point where the results are known, the honourable Member will be informed of the experimental results of these grasses.

Mr. HINDS:

Can the Minister tell us if the Jerusalem Agricultural Station in St. Peter is one of the stations referred to as having these experiments carried out?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

The Minister will investigate and let the honourable Member know, but he suspects that this is not one of the stations where the experiments are being carried out.

Mr. CRAIG:

The Minister indicated in his Reply that it was being done at all the Agricultural Experimental Stations. On this occasion he said he will have to investigate in relation to the station at Jerusalem.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The honourable Member is out of order. That is not a supplementary.

QUESTION RE THE CHANNEL AT TENT BAY, ST. JOSEPH

Mr. SPEAKER:

Parliamentary Question No. 173 stands in the name of the hon. Member for St. Joseph.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows —

To enquire of the appropriate Minister: Is the Minister aware that there is a channel in the sea immediately off the coast at Tent Bay, St. Joseph which creates dangerous conditions for fishermen who try to go off to the fishing grounds between November and February each year thus causing many of them not to put to sea? Will the Minister cause investigations to be carried out in the area to establish what remedial action can be taken, and then carry out the recommendation?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows —

"No, Sir. Consequently, no action is contemplated."

Mr. BOLDEN:

Would the Minister state whether or not the Minister of Home Affairs said that the Government was aware of this channel during the last Estimates?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

The Minister of Agriculture is not aware of what the Minister of Home Affairs mentioned. The Minister has investigated the Question asked by the honourable Member for St. Joseph and has advised that no complaints have been made with respect to the channel mentioned by the honourable Member.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Would the Minister state what investigations have been carried out and who carried them out?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

The Fisheries Officer of the Ministry of Agriculture, Science and Technology carried out the investigations and advised the Minister that no complaints have been received from the fishermen of the area as to any problem with respect to this particular channel.

Mr. BOLDEN:

When were the investigations carried out?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

The investigations were carried out immediately after the Question was asked by the honourable Member for St. Joseph in order to give as speedy a Reply as possible to the Question so asked.

QUESTION RE SPRING HALL ESTATES

Mr. SPEAKER:

Parliamentary Question No. 178 stands in the name of the honourable Member for St. Lucy.

Mr. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, the Question reads as follows —

To enquire of the appropriate Minister: Is the Minister aware that the residents in the Airy Hill, Lammings and surrounding areas are desperately in need of a playing field and Community Centre? That there is a cane field north of Lammings Housing Area which poses a serious threat of fire to the wooden houses in the area? Would the Minister tell this Honourable House whether or not Government intends acquiring this land to provide the necessary recreational facilities for the area?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows—

"1. Yes, Sir.

2. It is proposed to use the Spring Hall Group of estates as the locale for a Rural Development Programme. Among other things, this Programme will provide those people who possess a sound agricultural background or a commitment to agriculture with viable holdings under secure titles."

Mr. GREAVES:

I wonder if the Minister can give us some indication as to when this development as envisaged will take place.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

This will be done as soon as possible in view of the fact that the Government of Barbados has obtained a loan from the Caribbean Development Bank of \$1.3 million for the pursuit of the development of this project.

Mr. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to know whether the Minister can give us some specific indication of the system which is going to be applied relative to the cutting up of the land to give to small farmers.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

There is a comprehensive development for this particular area. At this point it is not a question of cutting up. It is going to be one of Government's agricultural developments not only to improve

agricultural, but stimulate interest in agriculture, and persuade young people to return to the land. 3.00 p.m.

Mr. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, can the Minister state whether for these estates there is provision made for the construction of an airport?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

A particular area of this particular development has been designated for the possible development of a second airport in case anything occurs or any unfortunate or untoward accident happens to the existing airport.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, would the Minister state the cost at which it was purchased and if the people who worked there received their severance pay?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

If the honourable Member would give separate notice of this particular Question the facts and the particular information could be obtained. On the file there is no evidence, since it was dealing with this particular Question, of the particular cost or whether they have been paid severance pay. I would require some notice of that Question to give the honourable Member for St. James accurate and proper information; I would not like to mislead this House.

Mr. CRAIG:

I would like to thank the doctor very much.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister can tell us if there are any tenants on this land, and if so, what consideration has been given by Government to those persons who have been occupying those lands for a number of years to acquire the sites?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

The Minister cannot state whether there are any tenants but the Minister can assure the honourable Member that if there are any persons entitled to benefits under the Laws of Barbados, the Government will certainly safeguard not only the tenancies but make sure that all who are entitled to Severance Pay or any form of benefit get those benefits.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Would the Minister state the total number of acres involved in this estate?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

The number of acres by estates is as follows The Spring Hall group of plantations comprises approximately 1, 542 acres of land of which 1, 171 acres are arable and 371 acres are non-arable. The arable lands of the estates are as follows Spring Hall 570, Friendship (including the group) 422 and The Hope 175.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Would the Minister state whether or not the proposed airport will involve any of the arable lands?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

As at present constructed, the airport will involve none of the arable land.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Would the Minister state the proposed length of the runway proposed for this area?

Mr. SPEAKER:

Not a proper Supplementary.

Mr. ADAMS:

Is the Minister aware that the land reserved for the airport comprises 75 acres of comparatively flat land? Is he saying that the airport will not take up any of the arable land?

Mr. SPEAKER:

Not a proper Supplementary?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

The Minister is saying that if the airport is developed, it may be necessary to use some of the non-arable land in the general planning of the airport as happens anywhere. Government cannot say at this point that no arable land will be used when the airport is developed.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Would the Minister state whether any of the non-arable land is vested in any of the Corporations?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

As I understand it, all the land is vested in the Agricultural Development Corporation.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Would the Minister give the House the undertaking that the non-arable land will not be sold without the permission of this Chamber?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Under the Laws of Barbados, no land in Barbados can be alienated, leased or exchanged without the approval of Parliament.

Mr. BOLDEN:

With all due respect, Sir,

Mr. SPEAKER:

The honourable Member has asked three Supplementaries.

Mr. BOLDEN:

You have disallowed it, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I regard that as being one of your three Questions.

Mr. BOLDEN:

That something which is not, is.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Do not strgue, that is my interpretation. You are quite out of order, you have had your three Supplementary Questions.

Mr. ADAMS:

Is the Minister aware that contrary to his last statement, lands sold to the ADC are not subject to approval by Parliament?

Mr. SPEAKER:

Hardly a proper Supplementary. Question Time is now ended.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, are we working by this clock?

Mr. SPEAKER:

All Supplementary Questions have come to an end.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

With all due respect, Sir, when I was asking a Question, another honourable Member asked his.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The honourable Member had taken his seat and there was no one rising. Question Time is now ended.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Question Time be extended for a further 15 minutes.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I beg to second that.

The Question was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:

NOES:

Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND, Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Messrs. W. R. LOWE, F. L. WALCOTT, E. E. GREAVES, R. St. C. WEEKES and His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN - 8.

AYES:

Messrs. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, L. S. CRAIG, E. D. MOTTLEY, W. C. B. HINDS and C. L. BOLDEN - 5.

ABSENTION:

Hon. F. G. SMITH - 1. 3.10 p.m.

MR. F. L. WALCOTT GRANTED LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to ask for leave of absence from attendance at the Honourable House of Assembly until 30th June, 1974.

There being no objection leave was granted. PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. ADAMS:

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

Mr. CRAIG:

I beg to second that.

The Question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division,

THE MARRIAGE BILL, 1972.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, this Bill was introduced as a private Bill which was referred to a Select Committee. It was introduced in December, 1971. As the Report of the Select Committee will show, Members of the Committee were given the assurance that the Government would soon be introducing a Marriage Act which would embrace the provisions of this Bill. However, more than a year has passed and the Government has not taken such steps to introduce such a Marriage Bill. I will now move that this Bill be recommitted to the same Select Committee to which it was previously committed and that a further three months given for the Bill to remain on the Order Paper.

Mr. CRAIG:

I beg to second that.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I would like the House to know that the Cabinet has discussed a comprehensive Marriage Bill which has gone back to the draftsman for the final touches. We would hope to bring it down very soon, particularly now that the Leader of the Opposition has brought it to the attention of the House.

Mr. ADAMS:

If I may reply, Sir, if I had to depend only on the Hon. Minister for the assurance that the Bill would be brought down soon, I would be happy. I do not believe, however, that it is his responsibility to bring it to the House.

I may admire the honourable Member's sincerity to bring the law up to date, but we have waited for probably a year and a half since this promise has been made and no action has been taken. I want to know if the Leader of the House can give us a specific period within three months of the time when the Select Committee will have ended its discussions that we will have this Marriage Bill.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I rise merely to confirm what the Hon. Minister has said. This matter is being worked on. I do not think that there will be any objection to sending this back to the Select Committee.

The Question that the Marriage Bill, 1972 be again recommitted to the said Select Committee was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

**RESOLUTION RE THE PUBLIC ENQUIRY
ON THE PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF
THE SEWERAGE PLANT AT EMMERTON**

LANE, BRIDGETOWN, St. MICHAEL

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 11 be the next Order under Private Members' Business.

Mr. CRAIG:

I beg to second that.

The Question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division,

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Order stands in the name of the honourable Member for the City of Bridgetown.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I have completed my Reply on this Resolution.

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

NOES:

Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND, Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Hon. F. G. SMITH, Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES, His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN, Mr. E. E. GREAVES, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT and Mr. W. R. LOWE - 9.

AYES:

Mr. W. C. B. HINDS, Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, Mr. L. S. CRAIG and Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS - 4.

RESOLUTION RE THE SEVERANCE PAYMENT

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 15 be the next Order of the Day under Private Member's Business.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER:

The instant Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable Member for St. Lucy and it is to move the passing of a Resolution requesting the House to take the necessary action to ensure that severed workers receive their money due to them without further delay.

Mr. E. E. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is one which deals with Severance Payment and specifically deals with workers who were employed at two factories which were closed down at the end of the sugar crop in 1973. The Resolution mentions only Fairfield Factory, but you, ' Sir, as representative of the parish of St. Philip will remember that people whom the factory put out of work have not yet received their Severance Payment.

My concern in this is a national one. I feel that any worker who has been severed as a result of the place where he used to work being closed down, should get his severance payment. As you are aware, there is a Severance Payment Act which makes provision for the payment of any worker who has been severed.

The whole philosophy behind severance payment is to ensure that the workers, who are put out of work as a result of the closing of a factory or redundancy, are compensated for their years of service. The situation today is that people have been severed for almost a year now. It was sometime in January, 1973 that these factories were closed, and up to this day, the 21st May, 1974, these people have not yet received their severance payment.

I am sure, Sir, that you are aware of the tremendous burdens caused to families when they have to face up to this change in their lives, because most of the workers severed are the bread winners of their families, and these people are put in a situation that they cannot provide for their families, and thus you can imagine the hardships imposed on these families. I am sure, Sir, that you have had requests from some of these people to approach the relevant people to get this matter settled.

If my memory serves me correctly, the Severance Payment Act makes provision that the workers who are severed should be paid by the employer in the first instance. The situation which exists at present is that while the employers agree that they have to pay the money which is due and owing, they are adopting the attitude that they will not pay out unless they are assured that they will get back their refunds from the National Insurance Board which looks after the administration of the severance payment funds. 3.20 p.m .

I myself have made numerous enquiries week after week at the office of the Sugar Producers'

Federation because that Federation is in charge of all the sugar factories in the island; I made enquiries and they told me that they want to be assured from the National Insurance Board when they pay out this money to the workers who are severed, that they would get back whatever percentage there is under the Severance Payment Act.

I do not feel that in this day and age people should be placed in a situation where they have to be waiting for a such a long time before they can be compensated, and compensated in a way which is provided under the law, and compensated for the period of service which they have contributed to the particular enterprise, it is scandalous that people have to wait such long periods before they are paid, and this Resolution seeks to highlight this particular problem, to ensure that the people who have been waiting for such a long time get their money, and it is to ensure that when situations like this take place, that this situation is not repeated. This is something that we are serious about and it seems to me as if there is too much of a callous approach to this problem when it comes to dealing with the workers and a more urgent approach should be adopted towards this problem.

This Resolution calls for statutory provision to ensure that if severance payment that is due and owing to a worker is not paid within two months after it is due, that 8% interest per annum be added to the amount due and owing. I believe that this is something which ought to be incorporated into the Act in spite of what some employers might say, because they might regard this as an additional imposition on them but at the same time what one has got to take into consideration is the fact that these people have been deprived of the means and the wherewithal to earn a living, and to have the added burden placed on them where they have to wait such long periods, I think that some additional compensation should be made to these people, and that is why I am making this proposal in this Resolution that statutory provision be included in the Severance Payment Act so that if money is due to them after two months period, interest would begin to accrue to the amount. I believe it would not be difficult to have this incorporated into the Severance Payment Act, and I believe that every effort should be made by the Government to ensure that this is included in the Act as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I consider that it is very important that employers should recognise that when workers are deprived of earning their living in this manner, that the workers should be compensated, and as I indicated, one of the main points in this Resolution is to highlight the difficulty which the people who were working at Fairfield Factory encountered, and to ensure that they get their compensation as urgently and as quickly as possible because the workers and their families have had to go without any kind of income for some period. It should also be remembered that people who have put in 25 and 30 years at a factory have given the best of their work in the factory and in these circumstances it is no mean task to ask a person who has reached 55 years of age to go and start looking for a job — a job that would bring them the kind of salary or wage that they were getting before, because such a salary or wage would be hard to come by and that is why I feel that it is absolutely necessary and important that every effort should be made to ensure that these people are adequately paid, and if it so happens that the National Insurance Board can do nothing to assist in getting this matter expedited I would implore the Minister to get this done as quickly as possible because it has been an extremely long time that these workers have been waiting, and I feel that this should be looked after as quickly as possible.

One of the difficulties I understand that has been facing this matter relates to the age of some people who, according to the Severance Payment Act may be excluded — this is because of how the Severance Payment Act was incorporated — and that is why I included another Resolution relative to the age limit,

and I am sure that that will come up for consideration at another Sitting of the House, but I feel that this matter should be gone into as soon as possible and I hope that we would have some quick action with this and that the people would not have to wait very long before they get what is theirs, and that this matter would be settled as soon as possible. 3.30 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the motion. I feel that this Resolution seeks to bring to the attention of the Minister and the Government a matter that, I am sure everybody will agree, should be attended to as expeditiously as possible. I do not make any excuse. I am a Member of the National Insurance Board that is responsible for the payment of rebates to employers who have made severance payments, and I do not make any apology for saying that the National Insurance Board should make it possible to pay the rebates. In the first instance, the employer has to make the payment, unless he defaults. What I should like to point out is that the system of allocation is a little bit faulty, in my view. I have stated that already. This is a system where all employers pay the same rate, and it is not a normal contingency like illness. It is a position which an employer will take, himself or herself, and we should not have a flat payment. By that I mean that I would pay for a maid I have at home, who is not in industrial employment, and in industries we are going to be called upon to pay a colossal sum of money for industries. That money is being paid by you or by me on behalf of maids and such people who are not working in industries.

Now, I feel that to be a wastage situation. An insurance company, in normal circumstances, would not have given you an insurance claim like this. Even though death comes to us normally, an insurance company does work out death on the normal basis because it may come to us at 40, 50 or 55. The insurance company will work it out on a mathematical and actuarial basis. I find that this system is a little bit faulty because it is over weighted in so far as industries are concerned. For instance Spring Hall Factory, Fair Field Factory and other factories will be called upon to pay hundreds of thousands of dollars to these people out of a fund where they are paying the same sort of deduction and the same calculation is made for everybody. In my view that sort of thing should be amended, and I hope that the time will come when there should be a review. Earlier I made a statement that the workers pay, but this was an error on my part. No portion should be taken out from the workers.

Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned some of the important things, but the problem is that there is a colossal ignorance in the public media. I have no apology to make for the public media. These are important issues, but the people in the industry do not know anything about them. The only way that some people will understand what is happening is when somebody goes down Broad Street and sees workers with placards in their hands indicating that they have not been paid at Fair Field Factory and they have come to Bridgetown to demonstrate. The people working at the newspapers and on the radios do not study these things.

Of course, the Act is not an easy one to understand. It is a very complicated Act. I believe that it is a paradise for Lawyers and Attorneys-at-Law, but I do not believe that they like it because they feel that they have to work too hard on it in order to get a fee. You have to do a lot of research, and I believe that this Act has more cross references than any other Act on the Statute Book. It was copied from four different things that were passed for four different reasons.

I do not think it is fair to our workers. What I do not understand, Mr. Speaker, is that, when a poor

man or woman is entitled to money in Barbados, so much has to be done with the money. Some people cannot find it. Some people say that they have to search through some of the papers of the people who were employed and so on. On the other hand, you have people working in some of these places and if anything happens to them provision is being made to take care of them, because in Barbados there is nothing illegal for a company to make provision for any of the executives at the top if they have to give them a golden "handshake", and it does not prevent them from being qualified for any other benefit. But when the poor man comes to get a benefit like this, he has to wait for a long time. I agree with the hon. Member that to ask a poor man, who loses his job at the age of 58 or 60, to wait for a long time to get his money is not good enough. At that age he is not going to get a job easily, and he has to wait for two years sometimes. He runs into debt, and sometimes he, . does not know how much he is going to get. When he receives the money he may find himself in a deficit position, because he may think that because he was working for thirty or forty years he is going to get a lot more money than he had received.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the Government, or the Ministry concerned, should undertake to make this matter more understandable to the workers, and these undue delays should be cut out so that they may receive their money at the earliest possible opportunity.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I shall not be very long. I have, certainly, in my time as a Minister, experienced the problems of workers in this country who have to get, as the hon. Member for St. Michael West has said, something that they are entitled to after thirty or forty years of hard work, and then they run into problems which should have been solved long before they left their occupations. In the Ministry of Communications and Works you will find people who are entitled to pensions and gratuities. The authorities and government agencies will know that they are retiring when they reach the retirement age, but sometimes it will take them over a year before they can process the few dollars to which these poor people are entitled, after years and years of toil.

I should just like to appeal to the hon. Member for St. Lucy and to suggest that, now that he has been supported by his colleague, the hon. Member for St. Michael West, and has aired his views, I do not think that the Government, or this House, could be unsympathetic to the need to pay workers as quickly as possible those amounts to which they are entitled either under a Government Pension Scheme, or a Casual Employees Pension Scheme, or any scheme which entitles them to some benefit. I would suggest to the hon. Member for St. Lucy that although it is a Resolution in this Honourable Chamber where he can voice his views — the House is a forum in which any grievance of any citizen should be aired — I think he should appreciate that the same Resolution could have been more properly addressed to the Minister of Labour in the form of a question to the effect: "Is the Minister aware that persons who are entitled to severance payment receive their money long after the appropriate time and will the Minister take steps to amend the law and so on." I do not see in this Resolution how much the House itself can do.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member is not wrong in drawing to this Parliament the problems of the delays in paying severance payment to workers who are entitled to it under the new Severance Payment Act. 3.40 p.m.

I think the hon. Member for St. Michael West knows the history of this particular Act, and the

circumstances under which it was enacted, and I think he would realise that a novel piece of legislation would have called for research which would not have enabled it to be put on the Statute Book at the right time in order to meet the needs of the country. I think he will understand that it did have imperfections which I do not think any lawyer would deny. To him it was not novel because he had negotiations with employers including the question of severance payment as a matter of collective bargaining, but to put it into law for lawyers not having his experience in the Trade Union field did create a certain degree of legal manoeuvring and legal expression which was quite novel. I share his views. It is not an easy piece of legislation either to understand or to interpret, but I do appeal to him to understand that it was an attempt to bring benefits to the workers which he had been securing through collective bargaining, but the Government was prepared to make these benefits wider in their scope and in their intent. The hon. Member for St. Lucy and his colleague have expressed a feeling which this House shares because I see it in the Ministry of Communications and Works. The personnel section of the Ministry knows that John Brown is going to be 60 years in February and the officers either wait until the last minute or they do not get his record and process it, and then John Brown comes in to me nine months after he is entitled and should have had his pittance because he has to exist. I think the House shares the view of the hon. Member for St. Lucy that any entitlement whether it is pension, gratuity, severance pay, whatever form it takes, to any worker who has given of his days to an enterprise or to Government must be paid with a minimum of delay and to the maximum of his entitlement. I would appeal to the honourable Member for St. Lucy now that he has voiced his dissatisfaction which we all share on both sides of the House to withdraw the Resolution rather than put it to the vote because this House cannot but agree that any entitlement to a worker should be paid promptly and without causing the degree of hardship which I know hundreds of workers in this country experience because of the delays of the Civil Servants by private employers in meeting their legal or Trade Union agreement commitments. The hon. Member might better have directed a question to the Minister responsible for the administration of this piece of legislation asking whether the Minister for National Insurance was aware that severance payments have not been paid, that people are going months without their entitlement and would the Minister take immediate steps to remedy the situation. It is really not a matter entirely for the House except to support him. It is a matter which I would say should be directed specifically to the Minister of Labour drawing to his attention that the workers of this country who are entitled to certain benefits are not getting those benefits until after too long a period, and I think he should have directed his attention to the Minister responsible for the administration of this piece of legislation, and not only to the Minister of Labour but to the Prime Minister's Office which is responsible for establishments and paying Government Workers' pensions and so on. I think he would get more mileage if his question was directed to the Minister of Labour in this particular respect, and I would appeal to him to withdraw the Resolution rather than to push it to a vote. We all share his concern for the workers, and I can imagine how the honourable Member for St. Lucy must be badgered by workers coming to the Workers' Union building every day. The General Secretary is usually out negotiating and they probably go to the Senior Assistant Secretary. I can see the honourable Member for St. Lucy in this Resolution expressing his personal concern for the workers who in their hundreds rush to him from St. Lucy, St. Philip or wherever a factory is closed, and since the House supports his views, I would ask him not to press this Resolution to the vote, because I do not see the House can do very much about it. Now that he has expressed his views which are supported by his colleagues, I think he should be gracious enough to withdraw the Resolution because the House cannot do very much about it.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, unlike my colleague, I can well understand the hon. Member for St. Lucy being a

backbencher of the Government Party and being a leading Trade Unionist coming to this House with this Resolution because the House as presently constituted dare not vote against it. If the honourable Member had come with a question, it would not be fulfilling the role which the Resolution would fulfil, and as a young Member with a constituency to serve, he is justified in coming with a Resolution like this which will go down in his name and redound for future occasions when he may need the support of his constituents, In any case, this Resolution shows the genuineness of the honourable Member and his ability to do constructive work.

On the question of the 8% interest, I am not in a position to support that at this particular point, and it is for that reason, although I may be striking an awkward note that I am going to move that further consideration be now postponed bearing in mind always that the Resolution in its entirety has been put forth. Although the question of an 8% interest on late payment after two months have expired is a good principle and applies to any money going to Government, any money owed to workers should bear interest also. I personally approve but I am not in a position to deal with it today.

I beg to move that further consideration be now postponed, and I can assure the hon. Member that he deserves the congratulations of the entire House in pinpointing this matter which is working a hardship on many old people who have worked from the cradle to the grave and have to be kept waiting for their severance payment. The same thing applies to people under the Provident Fund. I think of coopers who have worked for 30 or 40 years and who according to the Regulations are not included under the Provident Fund, and I am seeing that the Regulations are being amended to include coopers.

I beg to move that further consideration be now postponed.

Hon. Mrs. EASTMOND:

I beg to second that. 3.50 p.m.

Mr. ADAMS:

Sir, while the Government is considering the different matters embraced in this Resolution, I want to ask the Government to consider a legal point arising under the Severance Pay (Sugar Factories) Act and its relationship to the Provident Fund.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Are you going to continue with a speech or shall we dispense with this matter of whether further consideration should be now postponed?

Mr. ADAMS:

I am speaking on the motion, Sir, but what I said was that while consideration is being given to the several matters embraced in this Resolution, could consideration also be given to the counter action upon the consideration of a situation under which somebody can draw under one fund and not be allowed to draw under another. I believe the hon. Member for St. Michael West can look at the language and give a layman's commonsense opinion which in the long run is going to be proved to be what the Attorneys-at-law are going to say eventually, and this is what should be looked at. I would wish that the Leader of the House had made the same speech about young Members trying to make points in a Resolution that cannot be made upon a question. Upon the last occasion when the Member for St. Michael South Central attacked an Opposition Member and led all other hon. Members to vote against

something which would have meant development for a certain part of the Island, I am glad that the Leader of the House has become convinced that what we did then was right, and I very much regret that he followed the hon. Member for St. Michael South Central and voted against it. Commonsense tells you the Opposition is not going to fight against an M.P. who is doing something for his constituents, we only wish we could be given something when we are asking for ours.

The Question that further consideration of the Resolution be now postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Are there any more Items under Private's Members' Business?

Mr. ADAMS:

I beg to move that Order No. 10 be the next Order of the Day.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I beg to second that.

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

WITHDRAWAL OF RESOLUTION RE THE COMMITTAL OF THE STANDING ORDERS TO THE STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE FOR AMENDMENT WHERE NECESSARY

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I now beg for leave to withdraw this Resolution as the Standing Orders Committee is already considering the several Standing Orders concerned.

Mr. SPEAKER:

There being no objection, leave is hereby granted.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 5 be the next Order of the Day.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I beg to second that.

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

THE MOTOR VEHICLE AND ROAD TRAFFIC (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1973

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that, pursuant to Standing Order 62(6), the House now recommit this Bill to a Committee of the whole House. Three months have passed, Sir.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I beg to second that.

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

Mr. ADAMS:

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

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I beg to second that.

The Question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division,

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill. Mr. LOWE took the Chair.

Clause 1 was called.

Mr. ADAMS:

I beg to move that Clause 1 stand part. Clause 1 says "This Act may be cited as the Motor Vehicle and Road Traffic (Amendment) Act, 1973." I would sincerely hope and trust that no hon. Member would find anything contentious in that clause, once he has supported the giving of a Second Reading to the Bill and the approval in principle of the several matters recited in the Objects and Reasons, and I would very much hope we could pass it in its totality.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I beg to second that. 4.00 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

In moving that further consideration of Clause 1 be now postponed, the fact is that we are not prepared at this stage to go into Committee on the Bill.

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order, Sir. Are we discussing Clause 1 of the Bill? The Minister is saying that they are not prepared to do something. Clause 1 has been called, and as far as I know the rules of this House, we are dealing with Clause , 1.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to move that further consideration of Clause 1 be now postponed.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, I have sat here and heard the Member for Christ Church West attack the Government on bringing down piecemeal legislation. The Member for St. Joseph has joined in that attack. This piece of legislation now before the House is piecemeal legislation. Manslaughter and Road Traffic Offences

are not the only....

Mr. MOTTLEY:

On a point of order. The Hon. Minister cannot at this stage be going into the principle of the Bill. As a former Attorney-General he should know better.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I am opposing this because it is a piecemeal amendment to the Road Traffic Law. There are other sections in the Regulations where the fines bear no relation to modern day money values. I agree that this should be postponed for the Government to bring down a comprehensive amendment to deal with the matter.

Mr. BOLDEN:

The Hon. Minister begged us not to proceed with this Bill because he promise us that a new Bill would come down. He went so far as to say that he would put one of his officers on a year's leave to write a new Traffic Act.

This morning, he said here that politics is power. He is in charge of Road Traffic matters and he cannot produce a Bill. The only reason that he is opposing it, is because it was not he who introduced it. Let him vote against it Clause by Clause because the moment the Government votes against it, they cannot bring in similar legislation dealing with Road Traffic until this Session is over.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Chairman, there are certain points of principle involved. The hon. Member for St. Michael South Central has made a Second Reading speech, contrary to the spirit and content of the Bill. I would like to point out that the Objects and Reasons of the Bill contain the words "pending the introduction by the Government of a comprehensive new Road Traffic Act, this Bill seeks to amend the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act 1937-16 to increase the penalties for inconsiderate, careless, drunken and dangerous driving".

I believe that the hon. Member is opposed to any Member of the Opposition being able to initiate legislation and get it passed through the House. I have observed this trend in all of his speeches on Private Members' Bill, and therefore I do not accept his explanation. His only reason for opposing that this Bill be proceeded with is the fact that he does not want Members of the Opposition to have the opportunity of sharing in the Parliamentary Process which the Constitution gives to us.

If the hon. Member wants to take away from Members of the Opposition the right to introduce legislation, let him introduce such Bills. In the meantime, all of us will resist any pressure from him. This pressure was posed even before he came into this House. Everyone will remember the matter of the Magistrates' (Jurisdiction and Proceedure) Act, 1956 and the Supreme Court of Judicature Act. There has been no reform for five years, and it has been five years since he has blocked that Act.

He objected because I did not put in the Schedule in many Acts as the Jamaicans put in their Act. He has opposed us on many occasions. He has raised the argument that the Government is bringing down a new Road Traffic Act; but we have been hearing that even before he returned to Barbados to become the first Attorney-General under the Independence Constitution.

Since Major Ronald Stoute was Commissioner of Police there was a Road Traffic Act knocking about and I believe that the Chief Justice threw it out on very sound grounds. On earlier occasions in this House, I have restated the fact that I have spoken to the Chief Justice and to the Puisne Judges. I have discussed this Bill with the Attorney-General and the Chief Justice and they gave general support to it.

It is not that I believe that it is necessary for a Member of the Opposition to seek the Attorney-General's fiat before introducing legislation, but since this is something which I know affects judges who have to sentence people at the Criminal Assizes and which also affects Magistrates, I thought that I would consult those persons.

I did that over a year ago, and the House has approved this Bill in principle. The Minister now wants further consideration to be postponed. Today is not an unreasonable day. We have come to let the people's business go on. Since this matter was raised, a number of Assizes have passed and judges have questioned how a man who may be guilty of dangerous driving faces no greater penalty than for illegal parking in Bridgetown.

This Bill seeks to give greater discretion to the persons concerned. The Government cannot bring down a comprehensive Road Traffic Act which will satisfy the judges, the magistrates, the police etc. When Private Members of the House bring down such a Bill they are not seeking to do anyone any mischief.

The correspondence which I have had on this Bill has not been favourable to me. Members of the public will not give one more vote for Tom Adams or anyone else because of this Bill; but I think it is needed for the good administration of justice. 4.10 p.m.

The Minister of Communications and Works is failing in his duty even more when somebody tries to help communications in this country and he acts as he does.

I hope that by the next time we have the opportunity to do Private Members' Business, the Cabinet would consider these matters. I am asking the Minister to give us the assurance that at the next Sitting of the House this matter would be dealt with. If the Minister can give us the assurance that on the next occasion he will be dealing with this matter, we will give him that short time to get ahead with it.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out, as the Honourable Leader of the Opposition said, that in this case what is important is the question of quantum, and on this, we will have to consult the Cabinet.

Sir, I cannot give the assurance that at the next Sitting that I will be here. It is not likely that at the next Sitting I will be here but I can give the assurance that this will be dealt with before the end of July.

The Question that further consideration of Clause 1 be now postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative the House dividing as follows: —

AYES:

Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. F. G. SMITH; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Mr. F. L. WALCOTT; His

Honour N. G. A. MAXWELL; His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN; Mr. E. E. GREAVES; Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES; Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS and Mr. L. S. CRAIG - 10.

NOES:

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY; Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; and Mr. C. L. BOLDEN - 3.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.
(ASIDES)

Mr. C. L. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, I object. Have you declared Private Members' Business over? I am asking a question on procedure, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Will you take your seat? I am waiting on the Leader who is in charge of this Bill.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and— ask for leave to sit again on this Bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am beginning to wonder, Sir, hearing the Leader of the House get up when he is not in charge of a Bill, to move that you report progress, and hearing other experts say that you cannot stop in the middle of a Bill, I am beginning to wonder if I have been in the House for eight years or if I have been behind a looking glass. I have so often heard a debate on a Resolution or an item in a Resolution interrupted by a dilatory motion of progress, far less a Bill, that I really would not like to believe that the procedure was wrong throughout and I wish to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

If it is out of order, well I will accept Your Honour's ruling, and unlike hon. Members on the other side when something has been drawn to their attention that has gone wrong I will even be prepared to read the rule and stand corrected and withdraw my motion, if it is outside the rules.

Mr. HINDS:

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. 4.20 p.m.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No, 13 be the next Order of the Day.

Mr. CRAIG:

I beg to second that.

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

**RESOLUTION RE AN ALL PARTY COMMITTEE TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS ON
THE DRESS FOR MEMBERS AND OFFICERS OF PARLIAMENT**

Mr. SPEAKER:

Item No. 13 is the instant Order of the Day and it stands in the name of the hon. Member for the City of Bridgetown. It is to move the passing of a Resolution requesting the Honourable the House of Assembly to set up an all party Committee to make recommendations on the dress for Members and Officers of Parliament. If there are no more speakers, I will put the motion to the House.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I have completed my Reply.

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

Mr. SPEAKER:

Will the hon. Member indicate the composition of this Committee.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, on this side, I beg to move that the hon. Members for the City of Bridgetown and St. Peter be Members of the all party Committee on dress.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the hon. Member for St. Michael North West, the Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance, the hon. Member for St. Michael West....

Mr. WALCOTT:

I decline.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Are you serious, or are you just fooling around?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

No. I am serious, Sir. The hon. Member for St. Philip South...

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have three names the honourable Member for St. Michael North West, the honourable Member for St. Michael West, and the honourable member for St. Philip South.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

The honourable Member for St. Michael West has declined.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the hon. Member for St. Michael North East, Parliamentary Secretary

to the Ministry of Health and Welfare, and the Minister of Home Affairs, the hon. Member for St. Michael South West, and myself under your Chairmanship, Sir, be Members of the All Party Committee.

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

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 6 be the next Order of the Day under Private Members's Business.

Mr. CRAIG:

I beg to second that.

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

RESOLUTION RE THE APPOINTMENT OF AN ALL PARTY COMMITTEE TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE BROADCAST OF DEBATES

Mr. SPEAKER:

Order No. 6 is the instant Order of the Day. It stands in the name of the honourable Member for the City of Bridgetown, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution that the House appoint an all party Committee to make recommendations on the broadcast of Debates in the House of Assembly and Party Political Broadcast in general.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

On what are you rising?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, this matter was discussed already.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Carry on.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution that the House appoint an all party Committee to make recommendations on the broadcast of Debates in the House of Assembly and Party Political Broadcast in general is one which, at this stage in our Debates, I certainly cannot support.

As far as the second part of the Resolution is concerned, I think up to now that we have had a reasonable understanding between the parties as to the amount of political broadcast which should be allowed to members of the party. I, personally, have never heard of any dispute, or quarrel, between the two parties as to the broadcast that took place in the last election. I think the Hon. Leader of the

Opposition will agree that the political broadcast had nothing to do with the election which he lost. We have to agree that any party which is the Government in power at any particular time must certainly have either one more broadcast, or additional broadcasts, in contradistinction to the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, in this House I have heard a lot of reasons given for the 1971 massacre, but I have never heard that the fact that the Government had one broadcast more than the Opposition was the reason advanced. I certainly do not see the need for an all party Committee to discuss that aspect of the Resolution.

On the question of making recommendations for broadcasting the Debates of this House, let me be perfectly frank. I am no paragon of virtue. Perhaps, I may be considered as one of the bad-behaved boys in this Parliament, but I do not think that from my 21½ years in this Chamber we have reached that point in Parliament, and I think this is supported by you, Mr. Speaker. On April 5, you mentioned in this Honourable Chamber in a Statement, which is in the records of this House, that you were not satisfied that hon. Members were conducting themselves at all times in a manner befitting the dignity of this House. You went further and exhorted us in the coming post-Budget session to measure up to the high ideas which you said, and quite rightly so, were required of members. 4.30 p.m.

I am more concerned with reading reports and other matters which are for the benefit of the economic improvement of Barbados, and once I have spoken in here I have not got the time. When an election is on, I go back to Hansard to see what I did say, but I am not supporting this Resolution because I am not satisfied in my own mind that in this House we do not hurl slanderous insults at each other and make accusations of each other which under the guise of privilege in this House will be piped into the homes of every person in this Island, libellous as they are, false as they are, atrocious as they are, and therefore under the cloak of privilege in this House if we agree to broadcasting debates of this Chamber, we can create in this country the type of political assassination and insidious destruction of people's reputations because some hon. Member can say I am a thief, a rogue and a vagabond.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, surely what the hon. Member is saying is suggesting that Your Honour will not use the powers under the Standing Orders given to Your Honour to have all improper remarks expunged from the records. It is not suggested that you broadcast the debates live. It is only a matter of commonsense that Your Honour would order the expunging from the records any such matter just as Your Honour orders the removal from the printed debate. It is outside the Rules to say that this will go on because this is challenging Your Honour's conduct in presiding over the House.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

With great respect to you, Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of challenging Your Honour's rulings. All I am saying is that the Resolution does not deal with whether it should be live, dead, or a broadcast three or four weeks after, and I can only assume that the whole purpose of this Resolution is, as on Budget Day and the Reply by the Leader of the Opposition, that John Public should have an opportunity to have the debates piped live into his home through television, radio or whatever form. I am saying to you, Mr. Speaker, that you will have more work to do to cut out certain expressions. You will get a Watergate because if I say John Brown is a thief, or if I say that the Leader of the Opposition is a "horse swapper" and you say "cut that out", you have to go through the debates and do a "White House sort of erasing" in order to broadcast it later on. I can only assume that what we are endeavouring to do and what you have

tried to do is to get Members of the House to conduct themselves in such a way that we would not make false accusations and libellous statements, but while doing the people's business we would discuss it in such a statesmanlike way at such a high standard that whether the debate is live or not live Mr. John Citizen in St. Andrew or St. Philip can hear how we are dealing with his money and his affairs.

There are one or two matters which I have my reservations on, but I am probably one of the offenders because I have been ordered to leave this House and quite rightly, but I have listened here to loud asides and other matters and I am perhaps stretching it, but as far as I am concerned, there is no animosity. I am in politics until the people kick me out, and when they do that, I will go, do my legal business, live, and eat. But what I am saying is that we are tempted in the heat of debate to make accusations, we are apt to make a statement in making a point against the Government, that some woman died because so and so, we are apt to repeat rumours under the cloak of privilege, we are apt to ask Parliamentary Questions without any foundation in fact because a constituent comes to me and says "do you know so and so", and I come into Parliament since we have not got the machinery to test the allegations, we have our eyes on the electorate and we have to voice the feelings and grievances of people, and I repeat the rumour. Consequently we can only have these debates broadcast if we are going to ask Parliamentary Questions based on our personal investigation of the facts, and we are only going to make allegations of the Government's negligence and mistakes based on our personal investigation of the facts, because let us face facts, Mr. Speaker, whether you like it or not, we live in a rumour mongering society in Barbados. If I say you are a gentleman, Mr. Speaker, it is never repeated, but if I say you are a rogue, St. Andrew will hear it before I have finished. We live in a society where people are prepared to believe the worst about each and everyone of us. We live in a small community where because of your background, people think you are unentitled to reach certain heights. We live in a society where rumour is accepted more readily than the truth and where because they knew you as the son of a poor worker, they seem to think in this community because they were middleclass that you have no right to certain privileges and preference as a working class person's son. This is still so in 1974 and part of our policy, and until we ourselves as Parliamentarians lift the standard of our discussions to the point where we are only prepared to act on what we are satisfied as responsible persons is the truth, the whole truth after investigations, to allow television or radio to pipe into the homes of this country strange, vicious allegations against each other for political advantages, can destroy the whole image of Parliament. We can destroy the political careers and reputations of each and every one of us, and at the same time, we will not enlighten the people whom these debates are entitled to enlighten, but we will create in them a distrust based on no facts at all except that one Member over there or one Member over here shouted at the other Member that he carried away something or robbed an old woman or did do something.

I am not in favour of this Resolution after my 21/2 years' experience in this Parliament. I may be in favour of it when I am satisfied, myself included, that we have reached the stage of political representation where we are only prepared to conduct the people's business in a dignified, straightforward, and truthful, and statesmanlike manner, and not endeavour to gain political advantage by making political accusations, false or true or libellous under the cloak of privilege of this Parliament. You know, Sir, that under the present law, in this Parliament I can say anything and no Member over there can sue me for libel. They can say anything and I cannot sue them for libel. I do not say that that issues a licence to libel each other, but you can see, as I said, Mr. Speaker.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member can continue on the next occasion. Private Members Time has expired.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Resumption of Second Reading of the Tenancies (Control and Development) Bill, 1974.

Mr. SPEAKER:

It is now Government Business. When the Second Reading of the Tenancies (Control and Development) Bill was being discussed, the hon. Member for St. Michael West was on his feet. The hon. Member has twenty-three more minutes.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, I was at the point of showing the distinction between tenancies because during the debate, there was this idea that a tenancy was a tenancy if you dealt with a legal area, but I am looking at it from a sociological point of view. Barbados is a plantation economy and the whole

background of the Barbadian society and land tenure was rooted in the plantation system, so it meant that after emancipation of the slaves the whole land tenure system kept people in tenancies near to plantations. I am very glad to hear that some of the people in the University are going into the villages to study the impact of slavery, and what extent it has on this community. 4.40 p.m.

In a community where the Crown never really had any land, land became a very important commodity and everybody tried to get a bit of it, but the point I want to make is that you cannot view this in the light of just a man getting a freehold on land, you have to look at the tenancy in the light of what the Act was originally passed for. Those of us who have been in public life for some time, will remember that after the big swing in 1951, all the Plantations took it upon themselves to eject people, and this started since 1948, that whenever the cane cutters and sugar workers started to organise, they ejected them and therefore it meant that we did not have land to put them on and this came about. You did not have the same situation in town, in the suburban areas, because they were not living on plantation lands, they were not living on large lots of land where the pressure of the plantation people held them down, but if you lived in small tenancies, the owners of those lands regarded them as more lucrative and it was a question of getting money. I feel it is the social side that we have to watch, and anything to do with tenancies must be watched with the plantation system,

I was very pleased to hear the Member for Christ Church West. Perhaps if he thought that way ten years ago, he would not have been on that side now. He would very well remember what happened ten years ago and the country was not ready for this social change which would have meant that the sugar workers would not have been in a position to cause this change. What the Union has done, he can remember. We just had another situation where money has come to the workers, and we have spent \$250, 000 on land in St. Philip. We went there to show why this building is necessary and four or seven people were living on the land for which we paid \$10, 000. They cannot make any use of the land, but it cost us \$10, 000. One man came to me in December and paid me \$2.86, but we are paying \$100. If we gave him the land he would have to pay more in taxes, but because the Union is a social organisation, he can live there. If we were a developer of land, it would cost us \$240, 000. If you have \$250., 000, you can put it in a bank to get interest or you can invest it, but nobody is going to get it at the rate of \$2.86, so people have to understand these things. I agree with the hon. Member because I know that he knows

that we believe in rural development. We had a conference here some weeks ago and we said that the whole area should be redeveloped. There should be rural development, so you are not looking at it with the idea of just putting up a house, you have to prevent the drift into the towns because if not you are going to get people drifting into St. Michael and the problems which arise from people pressing into congested areas. We feel that land use, land tenure and land, output are all very important in Barbados and that is why we in the Union say that we would like to see the Government take a stand on getting these plantations sold out. You cannot ask Barbadians to buy over the land from themselves, if the Government intends to spend the money on the Gross National Product, you would be buying all the houses again from the people in Barbados. People are living on lands already that if the plantations owned them, it would be a matter of debt.

There is no point of putting a tenantry under a plantation, that is where you have to have a committee, because you cannot have tenantry to tenantry and land to land. The plantation can afford it because a plantation is worked for other purposes. At one time, this was a subsidiary the plantation did not worry about, but now they realise it is land they can get money for. I am not suggesting confiscation, what we are suggesting is that you bring people in, and I would like to see long leases granted to people so that in the name of the State, — the State did not have then to give a person a freehold, — the State will own the land in perpetuity. The State holds the whole country in trust, so there is no point holding the whole country in trust, but you cannot hold a piece of land in Christ Church or St. Michael because the whole Island is vested in the people who live in Barbados. If you have large areas of land, it will be better for the people. I was looking in the Manifesto of the hon. Member's Party for something about it but they did not say anything about it. They said they would put in roads, but the plantation system is still sacrosanct so far as Barbadians and even the Barbadian politicians are concerned. Land is so precious that if you go to the plantation and say that they have to vest this land in the Crown, what the politicians are afraid of is that the newspapers will stir up a hornet's nest and say you want to carry away the land from the people. The land owners in Barbados are still the few people who own Spring Hall and all the big plantations.

4.50p.m.

While I share to some extent the views of the hon. Member for Christ Church, my feeling is that we have not made the necessary kind of change yet in the movement from the plantation system since our independence. I am afraid that we are still dominated by the plantation economy which operates on the basis that if you get a dollar today you spend it, and look for another dollar the next day.

There is no investment in the land itself so that middle income group people can say that they have a real stake in the community. That is where I agree with the hon. Member for St. Philip South that the Government would find itself in a dangerous position.

The land tax in itself is not burdensome, but what it has revealed is that there are some tenantry rents which are not economic, because they were never meant to be economic. They were meant to be chattel rents. It was the price the plantations gave them so as to enchain them. \$2.86 is now less than the cost of a case of Coca Colas. How can anyone believe that that approximates to anything like a realistic increase? That cannot be a rent. Even in the almshouse, you would be paying more rent, if you had to pay more rent there.

This is a quarter acre of land that costs \$2, 500 an acre. When a person occupies a quarter of an acre you will see what he is occupying. This is a situation that an organisation like the Barbados Workers' Union has to deal with. We know that we cannot ask a private investor to have anyone coming with \$2.86. It would not make sense.

I think that an amendment like this is necessary. I do not think that it is harsh. You get people who quibble today at any kind of increase because it is an increase along with other increases. I would say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that if all the increases in Barbados were like this, we will be living in paradise. After all, 20 per cent on \$2.86 is something like 50 cents., It is really ridiculous and I do not think that we should make people believe that it is exorbitant. A man on a plantation works for \$1.26 an hour. If the plantation had to pay someone to collect 50 cents you will see how much time and money would be spent.

I think that one of the problems which the Government will have to face in relation to this is the price for say, doing a road. When this Act was passed, I think that the plantation owners were working on the policy that people should not be moving their houses from place to place.

We have a Resolution which we have passed, and I understand one has been introduced in here. We would like to see a system of real development taking place in the rural areas of Barbados.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is agreed that land rents became frozen in 1965. We are legislating here today to make provision for a tenantry owner "or a lanctlord to get a 20 per cent increase on his land rents; but what perhaps we are not dealing with is the fact that some of these landlords are also the owners of the houses and when they get a 20 per cent increase for land rent, the house rent will also be going up to 20 per cent, and all because of the housing problem as it presents itself in Barbados today.

Already from the coming into being of the Land Tax Act there have been landlords who took advantage of their tenants and increased their rents. I know a man from the Deacon's Road area, a trade unionist, and he brought to me a copy of the Notice given to him by his landlord who was clever enough not to sign his name to it; but he notified the man that his land rent would be increased by 600 per cent.

This, Sir, gives you an idea of what some of these landlords will do. Much emphasis has been placed on plantation tenancies and the like. Let us look back, Mr. Deputy Speaker, at the conditions under which the tenants of these plantations live. 5 p.m.

You cannot be unmindful of all this. The little track has become charmed by their feet which have become hardened through climbing through the hills to find where they live. They will never know anything about electricity in some of those areas. Their necks have become stiff heading water from long distances and storing it in water barrels. Those are the conditions under which these people live, and I want to tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I am bitterly, bitterly opposed to any plantation owner getting one half cent increase in his rents until he can do something or is prepared to do something to relieve those conditions under which those people have been living for generations. There are still the plantation owners, as in my own constituency, who, when some of these tenants try and — when it is made known to them that where they are presently located, they cannot get water or electricity coming to them, there are some of these managers - because they act as agents for the owners - they refuse to let

those people remove from in the back roads and from the gullies to come to the front to get a spot near to the highway where they can be serviced with water and electricity, because these managers, Mr. Deputy Speaker, feel that they already have those workers tied to the place where they are and they have the shameless boldness and the effrontery to tell these workers who seek to move from the back to come

the front to be serviced, that these spots now are for the newcomers, who will be servicing the estates in years to come.

It is against a background like this that we have to relate all of this, and I must say here and now that the Leader of the House was very instrumental in the bringing into being of the 1965 Tenancies Control and Development Act - very instrumental - because I remember very distinctly that that was about the advent of these multi-national corporations coming into this country; when they wanted to start off in the Welches area in Christ Church and wanted to move out a lot of tenants from there. That is the time when the Wilkinsons and Challenors, the big six - the people who had the money and wanted to launch out - moved out all of these tenants and set up their lumber establishments and what not, in those areas.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have got a situation where, even with this amendment today, the Government does not seem to make any provision or has given any consideration to the licensing or registration of tenancies. We ought to have a register of tenancies; if you are going to have these tenancies we should have a register with full details of these tenancies.

We have heard reference made, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to these smart land owners who find a way of going and buying out a tenant or so and making him feel smart, and then take advantage of the others. This is not good-enough. We must not be a party to any situation which permits that kind of behaviour by landlords on any sort of tenants in this country any longer. I want to say here and now that if there is to be an increase in rent, not a 20%, it ought to be on a sort of sliding scale taking into consideration what has really been done in the particular tenantry lot for these people.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I feel again that the Government has fallen completely down, because you have it that, with the National Housing Corporation, you will find they have more than 500 applications from people who were willing to make down payments on 83 houses that they constructed some time ago. Now Mr. Deputy Speaker, here is an opportunity that the Government has lost in fostering and encouraging the co-operative movement in this country. The Government had it within its hands on an occasion such as this to launch a giant co-operative in housing. It would, Mr. Deputy Speaker, provide an ample opportunity for those owners - members of the co-operative - to take an active part in the management of the areas in which they live. It would remove the tenantry stigma that we have heard so much about today, and each and every owner - member - of the co-operative would then have more than a just cause to be proud of a giant undertaking such as the co-operative movement would afford to each and every one.

It is not necessary for me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to lay any emphasis on the fact that such an opportunity would provide the owners with equity. No need for me to stress this; but what you will find has been that system in Barbados, where we are making provision Here for increasing land rents. We cannot at the same time, Mr. Deputy Speaker, turn our backs on what is taking place in respect of house rents, but this we know, that people who rent lands have always been found to pay their rents better than the people who rent their houses. That has always been the base. 5.10p.m.

Now, you will find, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we are faced with this type of situation because the Government in itself has not embarked on any whole-scale manner in negotiating for lands for the type of development that would bring about the social adjustment that all of us would like to see effected in respect of those who now find themselves the victims of this tenantry system and what not. We believe that the Government has been so neglectful in this respect and even in the National Housing Corporation that, whilst a person can vote at the age of 18, you will find that the National Housing Corporation has not been able to consider, without the permission of the Minister, an application from a young couple at the age of 18. You will find that sort of thing taking place, although they are permitted and expected to assume responsibility at all levels in society at the age of 18. These are things, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this amendment has not taken into consideration. If you are 18, you ought to be able to go to the National Housing Corporation and enter into any sort of agreement with them whatsoever, provided you are able to meet the obligations of your contract or whatever it is that is expected of you. I would urge upon the Government that some consideration should be given to these things if not, we will find that, housing tenants, or tenants who rent plots of land, whether for agricultural purposes or whatever it might be, apart from the increase which the Land Tax Act has caused in some respects, there will still be situations which, undoubtedly, will become unmanageable when pressed upon some of the poor people who will be saddled with having to pay these increases.

With regard to the National Housing Corporation, there are some spots of land that the National Housing Corporation used to charge people \$10, 00 a year for them, and those tenants are now paying \$10.00 a quarter. I have never boasted of being too good at mathematics, but surely, Mr. Deputy Speaker, hon. Members can make their own calculations and see what the position is. Now, there is a great demand for housing and land, or what we call landing schemes. Every Barbadian likes to know that he is the master of his own little plot. With regard to our Housing Schemes, it is out of necessity that people go there for a number of years and die without achieving something in reality. Every Barbadian likes to own his own house, his own plot of land and so on, even if he has to live two feet away from some other person. That is the way in which we have come along, and that is the way in which we are drifting. There is a scarcity of land space and for other economic reasons we have to be huddled together, but a lot of people would like to get away from such conditions.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will find that, whilst the Government has bought Belair in St. George, I understand that already applications have been made from numerous people for plots at Belair. I believe that some of the people at the National Housing Corporation do not know that the Government has bought Belair and it will be put under the control of the National Housing Corporation. That is the situation with which we are faced. It just shows the demand for land and Housing.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. There is no quorum in the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Let the bell be rung.

The bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

HON. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on this occasion I know I have the right to reply.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I do not think the hon. Member has concluded his speech. It was just brought to my attention that there was no quorum in the House. The hon. Member may resume.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the type of housing that the poor people of this country is confronted with is mainly such development as is handled by the National Housing Corporation, but we know that the National Housing Corporation's rentals do not have the investment benefits of ownership. You will recall, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there still hang in the balance those numerous applications accompanied by sums of money paid by some of the present tenants of National Housing Corporation. You will find, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that until this day, despite the fact that these people had been told that all the money they had paid over the years would go towards the purchase price — the people have sold a pig, sheep, goat or whatever they ? could sell in order to carry the balance into National Housing Corporation or its agent, or solicitor, or Attorney-at-Law - but the matter still remains unsettled.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is a matter of considerable regret that, neither the Leader of the House, nor the Defender of the Faith, the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works, who spoke on this matter, took the opportunity to tell us what is the fate of those people who have made this supreme sacrifice in an effort to become the owners of property. You, Mr. Deputy Speaker, know as well as I do that owning a plot of land, owning a small house and the land on which it stands, will become a sort of social anchor in the community life of this country, and our people are proud of this. We are urging upon the Government to re-examine this entire matter. 5.20 p.m.

If you are going to amend the Tenancies Control and Development Act of 1965, it is about time. We have heard much about piecemeal legislation and what not. This is piecemeal legislation. There is so much that is left outside the piling of this Act that needs to be taken into consideration at this present moment that we can do no other, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but to serve notice on the Government that we on this side of the House must vote against this. We want to say that already too much of an injustice has been heaped upon some of these people in these tenancies. I am sure that the hon. Member for Bridgetown must have a certain feeling when he thinks of it in relation to people in Cat's Castle, Emmerton and Chapman Lanes, Pond Side, and while I say something about the situation in the City, I am telling you that there are people in my own constituency in Speightstown proper, Sand Street and certain of these areas who live under such deplorable conditions that if they were told now that the landlord can increase the rents by 20%, it would send these people into the mental hospital.

It might be said, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that you are paying a few cents per week or a quarter, and a 20% is put on that, it is only this or that, but I am telling you that prior to the coming into being of the Land Tenure Act some of these rents were low, but you very well know that some of these landlords, from the day they were presented with the tax bill for increased taxes, went around and these people could not move to go anywhere. Those who had a little house could not move it because they were running from Caesar to Caesar, and what did they do? They grinned and bore it. That is exactly the situation with these poor people. The Government cannot provide housing to accommodate these people. I cannot, Mr. Deputy Speaker, forget the kind of mockery, the kind of "Joe Tudor situation" when the Government went down to Rockless area in St. Peter and pretended that a housing scheme

would be established, well knowing before they left their offices that it was in the zone I area and they had water problems, but the Ministers journeyed with cameramen to St. Peter to give the impression that a housing scheme would be established, and some of the people who have been looking forward to the establishment of that housing scheme have since died, and many more will die. Until the people decide to change this Government I can hardly see that there will be a housing scheme as such to provide low cost housing for the working class people of the parish of St. Peter. I hardly ever think that with all my efforts and the efforts of my Party that you will see a situation brought about to establish low cost housing that the people of the parish of St. Peter can enjoy low rentals like others in other parishes. Nevertheless, they are still living in hope; they are not prepared to lose the faith in spite of this. However, let us ask ourselves this one question: looking at these plantation tenancies, what projection have any of these plantation owners to offer these tenants against these fires and everything?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The hon. Member has five minutes more.

Mr. HINDS:

After the five minutes I will start to wind up.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

You will complete your address in five minutes.

Mr. HINDS:

But you are not counting the time that you sought to direct my attention to the time limit. For instance, refuse collection in these tenancy areas. What is it like I am sure you are in a position to tell it as I would tell it this afternoon. The people in these tenancies are a neglected lot when it comes to certain social amenities. Nobody worries about them. What we want to see the Government order and make provision for is something to help these people to get rid of this refuse that is round them. Let the landlords do something to remove the pit hole system and the old bucket system that they have in these tenancies. We are asking the Government to reconsider this whole matter because there is too much that is left undone for us to come with this bit of piecemeal legislation as we have had before, us, and we are asking the Government to consider in this quest for housing the desire of people to make their sacrifices, to make the downpayment to foster a cooperative movement in housing. Let us see that there is legislation for all tenancies big or small and that there will be a proper record as time goes on so that we will better be able to decide on the development of land, its proper use in relation to the area in which it is and see that something will be done for those people who will remain, because as long as Barbados remains, we will find that there will be tenants to some landlords. If there are tenants we want to know that they get the best type of service that can be obtained anywhere for what rent they pay whether great or small.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On this occasion I do not care, to exercise the right of reply. I think enough has been said on this, and I think my feelings and sentiments on this question of tenancies are sufficiently well known. (ASIDES) Whether or not it is known by any Member of the Opposition, it is known by the public; so like that I will not waste the time of the House on this matter. The points made by the hon. Member for St. Peter have been noted and I will bring them to the attention of the Minister and the Cabinet. There are a few valid points which have been made by other speakers and I have made notes of them. 5.30 p.m.

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

Ayes: Mr. W. R. LOWE, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. F. G. SMITH, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. E. E. GREAVES, Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD and Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES -7.

Noes: Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, Mr. E. S. CRAIG, Mr. W. C.B. HINDS
and Mr. H. deB. FORDE - 5.

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

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

Hon. F. G. SMITH; I beg to second that,

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister of Communications and Works who spoke at length on this Bill this morning can give us any assistance as to whether or not he is aware that the Courts have held that once land has been at any time deemed to be a tenantry, it is considered to be a tenantry for all time, or whether indeed the Department is aware of this.

Mr. FORDE:

Before the Minister replies, this is the section I must characterise as a highly discriminatory section. I do not see the necessity in this legislation to only describe land on which there are five or more houses as being a tenantry road. I strongly feel that once the land is let out for a house spot that a tenant even if he is the sole tenant should have as much security of tenure as the person who is fortunate enough to be on a bit of land with four or five other tenants. I have known that many people who happened to be on land containing less than five lots find it rather difficult to be accommodated as soon as they get a Notice to Quit, and at present many people are not allowing more than five persons to rent lots from them and that is why I am urging the Government seriously to look at a proper revision of the Act so that anybody who has the tenancy of a house spot, would not be discriminated against. They should define "house spot" properly so that people would have some protection in the circumstances. It is a pity that we are dealing with two or more contiguous owners of land rather than dealing with the situation where land is let out as house spots, I would ask Government to get their experts to look at this seriously again and to use someone as skilled in the field of land law as Professor Roy Marshall, and I am sure he would be of some assistance.

I am sure that every hon. Member who represents constituents here would have had representations made to him about one or two tenants having to move because the area of land on which they live is not within the definition of a tenantry. We all try our best to find other spots. Unfortunately the National

Housing Corporation does not move with the speed which is desirable in this community. I have had the experience where in the Rockley area four tenants were given notices to quit and the Minister of Communications and Works made representations on my behalf and on their behalf to the National Housing Corporation, but up to now I am told they cannot get a Surveyor to survey land to put in the roads to accommodate these persons. I believe that if we are going to keep section 2 in the manner in which it is now worded, then the Government should issue an administrative direction to the National Housing Corporation for those persons, who are given Notices to Quit and are on areas not defined as tenancies within the Act, to be given priority treatment for house spots,

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, I share the hon. Member's view because I have in my own constituency people, not in a tenancy at all because they did not get on to the landlord, being given Notices to Quit. It is posing a problem for me in the Britton's Hill area and in other parts of my constituency. What the hon. Member says is true, and the National Housing Corporation has hundreds of people who have been almost thrown off land by the Courts but it was only the mercy of the Plaintiff or Complainant which is keeping them there. I would like to assure the hon. Member for Christ Church West that the National Housing Corporation is at the moment looking at several areas of land within the outskirts of St. Michael to rehouse these people. Because of this Bill, people

are not renting land to tenants and therefore it is a problem with the National Housing Corporation. I know that the Minister of Housing is terribly concerned and has got his officers out looking for land, because you cannot move the people from here up to St. Thomas or St. Joseph where you can have house spots, you have to move them within areas where they can get to work. 5.40 p.m.

The Government is also very concerned about this. It is not the tenancies alone that bother the Government, but also the people who are thrown off land without the alternative of finding suitable house spots to rent. So I do not want the Member for Christ Church West to get the idea that we are only concerned with tenancies. We are also appreciative of the plight of the "land hungry people" in the community and the Government is prepared within the limitations of its available finances to provide areas in which people who have been given Notice to Quit by the Court can be properly resettled.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works, and it is a fact that the Minister of Housing is concerned; but he is chiefly concerned about the problems existing in the National Housing Corporation itself.

I want to say here and now that there is such a problem within the National Housing Corporation that one can hardly understand how they get into motion from day to day. Sometimes you hear it asked if the National Housing Corporation exists anymore. I believe that I am right in saying that an effort has to be made to keep the Chairman in the chair. He is fed-up and disgusted. They have tried to abolish some posts.

You have officers in the Department who are sent out to investigate claims of people, who claim that they have been ejected by the Courts, and you find that there are officers in the National Housing Corporation who, when they go out to interview an applicant, who is a young lady, instead of trying to get things to run smoothly, they advise her not to go into that house with her boyfriend*

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. That is totally irrelevant to the section before the Committee.

Mr. HINDS:

The section makes provision whereby the Minister for Housing can be exposed to corruption or graft. We do not want to see the Minister tempted to do any of these things. I do not want to hear it said, although I have letters before me, that any other Minister will be tempted by the offer of 22 acres of land. Evidence can be borne out that somebody has had to approach a Minister, not in his office but somewhere else or through a friend; because the Leader of the House knows very well how some people operate. The Leader of the House is very familiar with what you would call the modus operandi of some people.

I believe that in the case of this subsection 3(A) the Minister would be one of those people who would tell me that he would not sit on the front bench with any Minister who could be said to be guilty of any such things.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Chairman, I have a very small contribution to make. The Minister will be given power to declare that a tenantry ceases to be a tenantry. I would ask the Government to take note that the Chancery Act has been used for this self same purpose. People have put tenancies through the Court. The hon. Member for St. Lucy may know this.

Sir, they put tenancies through the Court and apply to the Provost Marshal to put houses in the road. When tenants read advertisements that they must file by a certain date, they are too late or they do not know what to do. The whole Tenancies Act can be nullified. I am saying that it is being abused. I am sorry that some members of my profession let themselves in for it — not any Attorney-at-Law sitting in here. I will ask the Government to look at this matter very closely.

The Question that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 3 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, earlier today I expressed very serious objections to this Clause. One of the points that I was seeking to make was that 20 per cent was being given to the landlords for which the landlords intend to do absolutely nothing. The landlord does not have to provide any improved services or anything like that.

The Minister said that they would bring in Regulations. They have brought in Regulations and I have had an opportunity to look at them. They provide for the future in respect of the 20 per cent increase, but there is no obligation on the part of the landlord to provide improved services.

I go one step further. I do not know who drafted the Regulations, but Regulation 3 (d) speaks about where there has been an increase in land tax or water rates within the tenantry. Immediately this 20 per cent goes on and the new land tax comes for the year 1974—75, there will be another increase in the land tax which will create a greater hardship on the tenants. For that reason, we cannot support this section which in Paragraph (d) refers to an increase in water rates within the tenantry. Any increase in water rates will fall on the tenants and will not affect the landlords. 5.50 p.m.

So the mere fact that you get increased water rates, cannot be used to justify the landlord getting an increase in rent, so I will ask the Leader of the House to carefully look at the Regulation 3(b) because where there has been an increase in land tax, I feel it is unfair to pass on the land tax to the tenant. It is making it a sort of consumption tax now; it is like occupancy tax, because it is like if you put on a duty on an article and then allow the person importing it to pass it on to the consumer, because if you put a land tax on the land and then you allow the landlord to pass it on to the tenant to get an increase, you are not taxing the landlord, you are not taxing the tenants; and this is an indirect way of putting greater burden upon the tenants; and I would bring a Resolution to deal with these Regulations, because if you allow the increased land taxes to be passed on, then any time you put on a tax, it is a tax on the tenant and not on the landlord, and this is further creating hardship in this day and age; and for this reason, Sir, we must object to it because in addition to the 20% — I do not care about all these people getting up in here making these speeches. At one time when I heard the Member for St. Michael South Central, it reminded me of the days when he represented St. Andrew; as a young boy I used to come to the House when he used to represent St. Andrew, and I for one moment thought that I was hearing his predecessor in St. Andrew speak rather than hearing him. By that I mean the late Josh Haynes, by the speech that he made. Nonetheless, Sir, this legislation as worded gives the landlord an immediate increase of rent of 20% and then it is going to create a further hardship Sir, on the tenant and for the reasons earlier stated, I am opposed to this.

Mr. WEEKES:

Mr. Chairman, there is only one point I would like to make, Sir, and it is this. Let us consider the man who has an acre of land and he charges each tenant 50 cents per week. He will get an increase of ten cents per week and he will be able to charge only 60 cents per week. Now that is \$5.20, and if you deal with the six tenants you will see that it is \$31.20 for the year. What can the landlord do? What kind of improvement can he make with \$31.20? That is what I would like to draw to your attention, Sir.

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

Ayes: Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. A. MORRISON; Hon. F. G. SMITH; His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Mr. E. E. GREAVES and Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES - 8.

Noes: Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Mr. H. deB. FORDE, Mr. W. C B. HINDS, Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, and Mr. L. S. CRAIG - 5.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Hon. A. MORRISON:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

Hon. A. MORRISON:

I beg to second that. 6.00 p.m.

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

Ayes: Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. A. MORRISON, Hon. F. G. SMITH, Mr. W. R. LOWE, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. E. E. GREAVES, Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD and Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES - 8.

Noes: Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS; Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY; Mr. L. S. CRAIG; Mr. W. C B. HINDS and Mr. H. deB. FORDE - 5.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill do now pass and be cited as the TENANTRIES (CONTROL AND DEVELOPMENT) (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1974.

Hon. A. MORRISON:

I beg to second that.

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

Ayes: Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. A. MORRISON, Hon. F. G. SMITH, Mr. W. R. LOWE, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. E. E. GREAVES, Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD and Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES - 8.

Noes: Mr. J.-M. G. M. ADAMS; Mr. H. deB. FORDE; Mr. E. D. MOTfLEY; Mr. W. C. B. HINDS and Mr. L. S. CRAIG - 5.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this concludes Government Business for today's Sitting.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, the 2nd July, 1974 at twelve o'clock noon.

Hon. A. MORRISON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would have thought that the circumstances of the country warrant a more regular meeting of this House, and I am surprised that the Government has no business at all and it wants a 6—week vacation at this time. The Government seems to have run out of ideas. If the Government is tired and the Prime Minister wants an extended holiday to lecture at Harvard, we can relieve him of that obligation now. An adjournment until the 2nd July is surprising in these circumstances. What has gone wrong with this party with the 18 seats, full of ideas, willing to lead the country into the commanding heights of the economy? What is wrong with this Government? Is it asleep? Is it tired? Is it fed up? Is it incompetent? Is this how things are to be in this country? Do you want a 6—week holiday again? Soon we will be in summer. I would ask the Government to reconsider coming to the House with some of the people's business. Let us be in a position to discuss the serious economic circumstances, and have positive measures to deal with them.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am shocked at hearing the Leader of the House, who, time and time again in recent weeks, has been trying to impress on this Honourable House the necessity to have this Bill, or this Resolution, taken through all of its stages, giving the Opposition just a moment's notice, making a statement like that. You will recall that at the last Sitting of this Honourable House, the Leader of the House was at pains to have the House adjourned until 10, 30 a.m. today, and it was I who moved that we come here at twelve o'clock. We have come here at twelve o'clock today, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Is this not a reasonable time to be bringing Government's Business to its end? I wish to say that the Leader of the House has now come to the end of his tether. I do not want to say that he has lost control of his senses.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Will the hon. Member for St. Peter give way and let me hear his point of order?

Mr. HINDS:

It is not a point of giving way. He has no point to make.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I am not a prophet. The hon. Member will please take his seat.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are two hon. Members on their feet, and you must not discriminate. You must ask both of us to take our seats.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is nothing introduced today...

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that a point of order?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The hon. Member rose on a point of order. That is what I have said. Will both hon. Members take their seats.

Mr. HINDS:

That is right, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

if there is any further disturbance of this nature, I will be forced to use the power vested in the Speaker.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, Sir. If the hon. Member will recall, no matters have been introduced today.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, can you entertain that as a point of order? It shows that the Government is bankrupt in ideas; it is bankrupt economically, and bankrupt in every form or fashion. They are a decrepit lot managing the affairs of this country.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Order!

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. He cannot use offensive remarks about any Government. Who are a decrepit lot in here? Mr. Deputy Speaker, I ask that it be withdrawn.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, ...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Will the hon. Member take his seat. I am ruling the affairs of the House. Will the hon. Member for St. Peter withdraw the word "decrepit"?

Mr. HINDS:

If you ask me to withdraw, I will withdraw. 6.10 p.m.

I did not call them lame ducks.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I will have the remark withdrawn.

Mr. HINDS:

You have called on me to withdraw and I withdraw, but remember, when they come to thinking and planning, they are not equal to the task. There is a mental deficiency somewhere. The whole House has been on holiday not many weeks ago, we have hardly had any Sittings at all during the Session, but now

the Leader of the House finds himself having to go and have his battery charged. Mr. Deputy Speaker, is this fair to the taxpayers? During the last two or three weeks, the Leader of the House has been at pains to tell us that we are well paid for what we do.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, let me draw to the attention of the hon. Member and the House that my going away is not out of the taxpayers' money. I have been invited to go to Taiwan at the expense of the Taiwan people; so do not talk about the taxpayers' money. You are paid from the taxpayers' money.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are not trying to deny the Leader of the House an opportunity to visit Taiwan. I would like to go to Taiwan or anywhere else, but the Leader of the House has been at pains during recent Sittings of the House to let Members of the Opposition know that they are being properly paid to do the taxpayers' business. Is it that the taxpayers' business has come to an end? Let them call a general election if there is no need to have further Sittings of this House. Let the public know that the Government has run out of ideas, they do not have anybody to run the country, all the taxpayers' are now bankrupt, the banks do not have any money with which to help the poor people to carry out any serious investment. I know that the Leader of the House will not be facing the starter again; so he now wants a rest; he wants to go to Taiwan. They have eighteen seats; if he has to go to Taiwan, is it not possible for the other seventeen to carry on. Do you not have a majority out of 17 if the Leader of the House has to go to Taiwan? We are told of the crisis with which this country is faced; the people in my constituency are hungry, naked and unemployed, they want something to do, and in another few weeks the few cane blades will all be cut down, and woe unto this Government. The time has come when some consideration must be given to the man in the street. Every morning about 8.45 you can see young men liming on the streets of Bridgetown and along the highways. They would be glad for something to do, but there is no work for them; but you hear that this person is on an extended lecture tour perhaps again at more than \$US1, 000 a week while at the same time drawing the taxpayers' money in this country. He is drawing the taxpayers' money here and going elsewhere in the taxpayers' time and the taxpayers do not get one red cent out of it. Is it fair, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for us to be told under these conditions that the House is going to be adjourned until 2nd July?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, where is the pride of the Leader of the House in a matter of this sort? Where does he place his own constituents? If he thinks so callously of his own constituents, what think you how he thinks of mine? There can be no denial of the fact, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Minister of Communications and Works has been telling the world that he has no money for roads, no money for lights, no money for this and that; water rates are going to be increased 200%, all these afflictions they are bringing upon the people and they are getting a few yard fowls to walk about talking about an international crisis.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, my house and your house can become the circumstances of an international crisis. If you have \$X to run your house or manage your business, you can have a crisis in your own home or business, and I am telling you that running a Government is no more difficult than running your own home. If you have something with which to run your own home and you do it badly, or if you have something with which to manage the affairs of the country and you do it badly, you will create a crisis, and we maintain that all that has come upon our people in recent months has been definitely through the mismanagement and bad handling of the affairs of this country by the Government in power. From the

time the oil crisis really struck us until this present moment no accounting has been given to the nation; nobody has had the sense of responsibility to the country to let the country know that when motorists were queueing up at the various gasoline stations for hours each day their wives were in offices not contributing anything to this nation. The husbands sat in their cars going from pump to pump and wasting time while the wives were doing nothing but concerning themselves with whether their husbands would get gas to take them home or collect the children as the case might be. All the machines in the various factories were left unmanned by people who had motor vehicles and had to get gasoline in their tanks before attending to production to boost the economy of the country, and I am telling you now that if the Government of this country had any sense of decency, if they had any pride, they would call a halt, they would tell the people that they are satisfied that since 1961 until now has been too long. Mr. Deputy Speaker, how long is too long when it is good! I am telling the Leader of the House and the Ministers on that side that if they still continue to fool themselves that being in office for this length of time and doing what they would like to fool themselves has been good for the people, is not good enough for all of them to be kicked out of office by the electorate through the ballot box.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, why is the Prime Minister of this country leaving the affairs of the state at which we find them and running abroad and leaving the people here to eat themselves? It is the Prime Minister who has caused agricultural production, particularly the cultivation of canes which are now bringing a good price for sugar, to be at its low mark by his "no cane blade" talk at King George V Park, thus turning people's minds from cultivating cane. 6.20 p.m.

Now he goes with a big, sweaty vest, with a cane bill, a machette, a collins, and do you know he was clever enough to take with him - the Minister for Communications and Works would never back his jacket to cut a cane hole, the Leader of the House could never be approached to take off his jacket and cut a cane hole — the newly appointed Minister for Agriculture, put a machette in his hand and made him cut canes. The Minister of Agriculture never cut a cane hole for a soul, except he had a little bit next to his house, and the Prime Minister of this country took that poor young man, a good civil servant and took him and put him up there to cut canes. Why did the Prime Minister not take the Minister of Education, because it is all teaching, why has he not taken the best teacher he has on his team and carried him to teach the population of this country how to cut canes? I am telling you the Prime Minister of this country, you cannot take him and drive any nails in his hand, but I pray God that when the time comes for him to die, he dies with the collins across his chest for the injustice he has done to the Minister of Agriculture. I plead with you, Sir, and with hon. Members on the other side to act like men and if they are satisfied, as they must be satisfied, that the affairs of this country are not being now administered as they would like to have them administered, to bring social justice and economic existence to all the people of this country, let them get around the Prime Minister - if they can find him and if they know where he really is — because in truth and in fact you have the & Leader of the

acting Prime Minister, but when he is acting prime Minister he is being confused every day with telephone messages, so that the Leader of the House is only acting in name but the Prim Minister has the country as confused as ever,

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is a shame, it is a dis-grace, it is a burning shame, that in this country all the young men and women are walking the streets out of disgust. They do not know what to do with themselves, some of them refuse to shave, some of them refuse to put on clean clothes, some of them plait their hair to see if they can look dotish because they think the Prime Minister is doting, andwhen

these bad feelings come about the people, neither you nor anybody is safe, and we must call the Prime Minister as if before a tribunal, to have him declare his hand. The Prime Minister now finds himself as having no part of what is going on in this country, but nevertheless he was given 17 seats and his, making 18, and we in the Opposition have six. I hear now there are some people who are going about with so much pressure being put upon them, and I warn you now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that some people went into St. Peter a couple of nights ago and said they are going to nail up the House of Assembly because not one of the 24 members is doing anything for the people. Any time you come; here and find the doors out there nailed up, you would know. I would really like to stand up and see see them carry out their exercise. Mr. Deputy' Speaker, you cannot continue — and this is not an attack on you — but you will agree with me, not in here but outside, that you have been treated as badly as anybody else and worse than anybody else. When the time came that you should have been considered for promotion you were overlooked, are you going to continue under all these circumstances? The Prime Minister is not with you, he is looking for, extra money that;* ef**' he retires, he will get a big pension here and still have a teaching assignment. Nobody out there cares anything about you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Leader of the House is looking after himself, the Minister of Communications and Works will be a bush 'doctor* in a couple of months, and I am asking you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, ...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I would like the " hon. Member to confine his remarks to the adjournment.

Mr. HINDS:

All of this is on the adjournment. I want to remind you that you are getting older and you will one day want to know that you have served the people, who elected you to office faithfully and well, and you do not want to be cat off. The Leader of the House now plans to adjourn the House until some time in July because of. this person going on a joy ride. Mr. Deputy Speaker, you are in this Hon. House, and of an hon.

Member, who used to sit in a chair, in the same position and remember, Mr. Deputy Speaker, he was cut off at the time of reckoning. I am praying and hoping that you will not sit idly by and allow yourself to be found wanting at the next time of reckoning. I am asking you to concentrate your efforts on seeing that the people of this country get better treatment in every respect. We want roads, water, housing, and as for foodstuffs, let those people whose bodies are now racked because of starvation, because the food shops have nothing to sell and what is there is sold at such high prices, let us look again at the garbage which is providing all the disease with which to riddle the weak bodies of the nation. I really thought that when some people are conducting meetings, they would make reference to 13 rodents, but there are now thousands of rodents which are taking advantage of the situation in this country.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, my appeal this afternoon is to eradicate 18 whether they are rodents or else. I sea hon. Members on that side, who ought to be willing bold, brave and sincere enough to their cause, not to their calling, that they should resign. The Prime Minister this afternoon should be summoned from wherever he is to answer to all of this.

6.30 p.m..

The Prime Minister should be told that the people of this country will no longer tolerate his expeditions abroad. Let him come and answer if he has; not brought this country to anything but shame

and disgrace. We are not a begging country dependent on Canada for thousands of Canadian dollars.

People are now wondering to whom do we really belong. Does this country now belong to us, or to the Canadian. I remember, Mr. Deputy speaker member of their own party saying we now have a country.' I would like to ask What do they really think now. Do they have a country or does Canada have them ?

Nothing is being done except to fool people that there is an international crisis and that you can do nothing to cushion inflation and bring down the cost of living. Mr. Deputy Speaker, do not be swayed by all of this. Do not be lured into this kind of cheap thinking that nothing can be done to cushion the shock or to bring about better circumstances and a better existence for the people who find themselves today landless, with land sharks, friends of members of the Government being placed in a position to take more and more advantage of the people.

Some people have been so successful in using the name of the Prime Minister, that a man was able to go to a bank and tell the manager that he was here to have an interview with the Prime Minister, and was able to go about issuing cheques; but people who have given of their blood, tears and sweat to help build this nation, cannot today get any such assistance.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The honourable Member has four minutes in which to conclude his address.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I shall spend those four minutes summing up the situation with which this country finds itself confronted. We have postmen, policemen, nurses, doctors and others, and while some Civil Servants can work five days a week others have to work six days a week.

You will find that there are people who cannot get a loan from a bank in Barbados because the Central Bank with its mismanagement has confounded the economy of the country. The Central Bank of Barbados has given such bad advice from time to time that the commercial banks in Bridgetown are sitting back in the saddle, and who ever goes to a commercial bank finds that his overdraft is cut in half, and whatever amount is outstanding, you have to get liquidated in the shortest possible time.

In other words, Sir, the Barbados dollar has no purchasing power whatever. The Government is fooling the working class people of this country, telling them that they have this kind of take home pay; and when they go to the supermarkets they find that the dollar is only worth 39 cents of what the dollar was worth in 1961 when this Government came into office.

I am saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Minister of Finance, the Prime Minister, who has something in Economics, whatever it is, has been successful in running the ship of this nation aground, and that we on this side, will be able to pull it off and let it float again.

But, Sir, we are only six; but remember that these six over here have more know-how, more courage, more dedication and more ability to execute the tasks that confront this country than the Government which boasts that it has 18 Members.

I see that you are watching your clock, Sir. I never knew that you were a clock watcher until now. But

it is my duty to speak on behalf of the down trodden masses in St. Lucy, in St. Philip, in St. George and all over this Island.

Let me tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we had a hotel strike earlier this year and we find today that more hotel workers are laid off. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have today many a hungry man, and you and I know that a hungry man is a desperate man and a dangerous man. When you yourself have to face up to these hungry men in St. George, who voted for you, and the people who gave your party 18 seats, and told them that they would get manna dropping down from Heaven.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Your time has expired.

Mr. HINDS:

I can do no more than obey Your Honour's ruling and bring my address to an end. (Cheers)

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not want to question your ruling, but if this type of conduct is going to obtain on a motion for the adjournment -this ranting and raving.....

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order. The Member must withdraw that or I will withdraw him.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I would advise the Honourable Member to take his seat. It would seem to me the the Honourable Minister got up and challenged the ruling of the Chair. In my opinion, as Deputy Speaker in charge of the proceedings, I do not feel that the Member for St. Peter was out of order. He was speaking on the motion for the adjournment and he raised points which he felt it was good for him to raise at the time.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister must withdraw the words 'ranting and raving', 6.40 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The words objected to are 'ranting and raving' and I will ask the honourable Member to please withdraw them.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

On what grounds, Mr. Deputy Speaker? I would like to know (ASIDES He must withdraw them. He must withdraw them).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I consider them improper due to the fact... (ASIDES See to it that he withdraws them) I will not be dictated to by any honourable Member. I did not ask for this job in here. I only asked to be elected a Member of the House and this was put to me, but when I am here, I am going to make my ruling.

I was saying. We have had our discussions and I do not think the words "ranting and raving" appropriate to be used in here and I ask the hon. Member to withdraw them.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I will draw them on your ruling, but we have had a "Brother Lally" exhibition in here; an evangelistic attempt ranging over the whole gamut of matters which he sought to get off his chest. It is like a man making a dying confession; anything that comes to his mouth, he says. The only thing he did not say was, he did not ask his Creator for forgiveness, but he ranged over every aspect of Government, from the Prime Minister, garbage.....

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. My sins of commission cannot measure up to those of the honourable Member or any honourable Member on that side.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

No point of order. Please take.....

Mr. HINDS:

They are the sins of commission of his Government that I was referring to all the time.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Please take your seat. The honourable Member may continue.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

He talked about the people in his own constituency starving, and hungry, and unclothed. He talked about everything which he had talked about in 1971. He has not said anything new. But I deplore the system, if these are the rules of this House which can allow a motion for the adjournment to permit abuse of a Prime Minister.....

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order. Abusing a Prime Minister?.....(Asides)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Just a minute. Order please. I listened very attentively because I know Members would be carrying tales, but, I have listened to the Member who spoke, and in my opinion, he did not abuse the Prime Minister or anyone. He made reference to the Prime Minister going out on various trips but I have heard no abuse.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking you to call on the Minister to withdraw the remark that I abused the Prime Minister in my address. He must withdraw that.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

He started out speaking.....

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, he can make no further comment until you rule. I am objecting to his saying that I abused the Prime Minister in the course of my address. Let him withdraw it. We are serious about

this.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

All right. When I rose I thought I made it clear that I did not hear any abuse of the Prime Minister.....

Mr. HINDS:

He must withdraw it. He must withdraw it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I listened to your speech and there was no abuse. If the Hon. Minister feels so, I will ask the speaker..... Asides

because it will be an accusation against me as well. There has been no abuse, as far as I am concerned, of the Prime Minister.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I withdraw. He spoke sneeringly and.....

Mr. HINDS:

Oh! No! (Voices) Oh! No, Mr. Deputy Speaker. That is unparliamentary.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I know the honourable Member knows what is the meaning of sneering. Will he please refrain from using such words.....

Mr. HINDS:

He is not refraining. He has to withdraw and then refrain. (Voices)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

There is too much disorder in here.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Cammie will soon come back, and.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Will the honourable Member for St. Joseph be quiet? I can hear your voice. I am speaking. You should be quiet. If you want to speak, speak in undertone.

The hon. Minister should not use the Word "sneering" because in my opinion.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Well, he spoke disparagingly.....(Voices)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Are you speaking while I am standing? Please take your seat. I am willing to hear any comments on the adjournment, but I will kindly ask the Honourable Minister of Communications and Works, not to

involve me in anything about sneering, or say that the hon. Member who spoke — I mean the honourable Member for St. Peter abused the Prime Minister, sneered at him, or anything so. You can make your speech but please be accurate.

Hon. F.G. SMITH:

When the honourable Member for St. Peter, Mr. Deputy Speaker, speaks of the Prime Minister who is flying about making money for his retirement, is that not speaking sneeringly and disparagingly? (Voices).....

Mr. HINDS:

He is now repeating the same accusation. Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is now aimed at you, to show that you are incapable of ruling us in here. That is what he is doing. He must withdraw it for a second time. If the Speaker was in the House, he would not be doing this. Mr. Deputy Speaker, he must withdraw this.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I would not like to have to adjourn this House because of disorder but I would like the honourable Members to refrain from this. If the Honourable Minister of Communications and Works continues in the same vein, I would have no other choice but to put Members out of this Chamber for disrespect for the Chair, and then adjourn immediately afterwards.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the honourable Minister repeated the remark that I spoke sneeringly and disparagingly of the Prime Minister. I am calling on you to have him withdraw the remarks, and further, that all of this that has gone on in here, and to have it expunged from the record. Remember, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am calling on you to have the Minister withdraw those words.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

That is an opinion. There will be no further discussion on that.

Mr. HINDS:

What is an opinion, Sir?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The question is that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, the 2nd July, 1974 at 12.00 o'clock noon.

The Question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, the 2nd July, 1974 at 12.00 o'clock noon was put and resolved in the affirmative with-out division.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

This House now stands adjourned until Tuesday, the 2nd July; 1974 at 12.00 o'clock noon. (Voices).

6.55 p.m.

