

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1971 - 76

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 4th August, 1976.

A Special Meeting of the House was held on Wednesday, 4th August, 1976, at 12.10 p.m.

PRESENT

His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P., (Speaker); Hon. C. E. TALMA, C.B.E., (Deputy Prime Minister and Leader of the House); Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, B.Sc., (Econ.) LL.D., (Prime Minister); Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister Without Portfolio); Mr. R. ST.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees); His Honour A. DaC. EDWARDS, (Deputy Speaker); Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; Mr. L. S. CRAIG; Mr. J. B. SPRINGER; Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, (Leader of the Opposition); Mr. C. L. BOLDEN, LL.B.; Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, O.B.E.; Hon. F. G. SMITH, Q.C., S.C., B.A., (Minister of Education, Youth Affairs, Community Development and Sport); Hon. P. G. MORGAN, C.B.E., (Minister of Tourism, Information and Public Relations); Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND; Hon. P. M. GREAVES, B.A., (Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance); Mr. H. deB. FORDE, M.A., LL.B.; Hon. A. MORRISON, (Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology); Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., M.A.(Econ.), (Minister of Health and Welfare); Mr. E. E. GREAVES, B.A., Ed.M.; Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS, LL.M. (Lond.) and Miss B. A. MILLER.

Prayers were read.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: This is a Special Meeting to continue debate on the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals which were presented to the House of Assembly on Friday, 30th July, 1976, and also to receive notices of any measures and to lay documents. The first order of the day is to continue debate on the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, Sir.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would give way, I have asked permission to lay certain documents. Can we proceed with that and get that out of the way, and then continue? I am asking for leave to lay documents and give notices and then we can proceed after.

Mr. SPEAKER: Leave has been sought to give notices and to lay documents and there being no.....

Mr. HINDS: With due respect, Sir, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition rose on a point of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would have to interrupt the hon. member at this point. He was asked by the Leader of the House to give way and he willingly did so. I will still hear the point of privilege.

Mr. HINDS: He gave way, but what I am submitting is that a question of privilege takes precedence over all other matters.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am also submitting that if the Leader of the Opposition's point of privilege was so important he would have continued. He took his seat. The Leader of the Opposition was co-operative by taking his seat, and I think that you should take yours now.

Mr. HINDS: The point that I am making is that the Leader of the Opposition rose on a matter of privilege, and having heard what the Leader of the House had to say.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I did not know that the Leader of the Opposition rose on a point of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER: I heard that, and I want to make that point quite clear. The Leader of the

House asked leave to give notices and to lay documents, and there being no objection, leave is granted.

PAPERS PRESENTED

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to lay a Review of the Economy by the Minister of Finance which was circulated on the 30th July, 1976.

I also have the honour to lay the Retail Sales Tax (Exempted Goods) (Amendment) Order, 1976, and the Consumption Tax Order, 1976.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to provide for the imposition and collection of a tax on travel tickets used for the purposes of certain journeys commencing from Barbados and other related matters.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to provide for the imposition and collection of a tax on travel tickets used for the purposes of certain journeys commencing from Barbados and related matters be now read a first time.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative with division.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I wrote to Your Honour today relating to.....(*Asides*). I will represent the hon. member. What I am writing about is exactly about the lights and everything else. I wrote to Your Honour today about this very matter of the televising (*Asides*).

Mr. SPEAKER: I will hear the hon. member. Please have those lights taken off. (*Asides*).

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, what is the purpose of these lights being here?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition may proceed.

Mr. ADAMS: It relates exactly to the lights and to matters pertaining to the lights. I have written a letter to you today relating to the fact that I am concerned about reports in the Press and on Radio that it is expected that at the

conclusion of today's debate on my Resolution that the House do take note of the Prime Minister's Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals, the Prime Minister will make a reply which will be broadcast on television and radio.

I said that I could not see how first of all the occasion of the Prime Minister replying to the debate would arise at all. The Standing Orders quite clearly stipulate that after all other members have spoken, the mover of a motion may reply thereto. I am therefore, as the mover, the person entitled to reply. The Standing Orders go on to say that a Minister may conclude the debate on a motion which is critical of the Government, or a Government Officer. In discussing this matter with you I think we agreed that the terms of the motion were not critical of the Government; but I understand – and Your Honour will know what I am referring to – the Clerk of Parliament has advised you that the words “take note of” import criticism. That is, in my view, very totally mistaken, and a completely wrong interpretation of English words, as well as being quite unsupported by parliamentary tradition in Barbados and overseas, I continued, Sir, that I am therefore entering a strong protest against any Minister concluding the debate on my motion. I will deal with that later.

12.20 p.m.

The second point relates to the broadcast of any reply. I have reservation, Sir, as I said in my letter, about broadcasting parts only of any debate in any event, but this now seems to be accepted Parliamentary practice. That is what I said in my letter, Sir. What is not in my view proper is a situation where the rules give two persons the right of reply and you give permission for only the second of these persons to have the privilege of a broadcast. This was not the case during the Constitutional debate in 1974 since only the Prime Minister could have made a reply under the rules. Later in that year, I understand that the Prime Minister was also afforded a broadcast of his final reply to the emergency budget debate. That case is also different, since I was out of the Island on the date set for the winding up of the debate when the broadcast was made, and the wording of that motion was also such that a minister incontestably had the right to the last word.

I am therefore asking that Your Honour authorize the broadcast of all replies and winding up speeches which Your Honour may

find are justified by the Standing Orders applicable to today's debate.

Now, Sir, it is a clear matter of privilege. First of all, to deal with the fact that it has not been our tradition to broadcast the whole of the debate. There is a time when you have to have a break with tradition. I have conceded that in the letter, Sir; but if all members are equal in here and all members come in here by the same vote of the electorate, it is in my very respectful submission, unfair to those hon. members who are not afforded the opportunity of having their contributions broadcast as well as reported in the Press; in effect you are having one set of rules for the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition and another set for other members of Parliament; and to my mind this infringes on the privileges of the House as a whole.

I submit that matter for your consideration. I do not think this is a matter on which facts are either in dispute or arguable. We know what has been the practice in the past and I am suggesting to Your Honour that it should be broken with at this stage. That is quite straight-forward.

The second point which I make is more a point of order than a point of privilege and therefore I will not dwell on it at this stage. You know my views, Sir, on what the rules mean but just in passing I would say "take note of" has for generations been used in Parliament as an uncritical form of words in dealing with a motion. The Government can vote for a Resolution to take note of the budgetary proposals and be in no way criticising the Prime Minister; and any suggestion that the words "take note of" import criticism is clearly to trespass on the English Language in what I submit is an unacceptable way. I am not expanding on it; but as for now — and this deals with my privilege — as far as the question of the broadcast of the replies is concerned the rules — I do not know if the Government will find some way — I believe there are ways of the Government conducting themselves in this debate so as effectively to allow the spokesman of the majority party to speak last. I believe it is possible to do that within the rules. (*Aside*)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. ADAMS: The reason why I am silent, Sir, is because I cannot hear myself speak for the aside of the hon. member for St. Michael West.

Mr. SPEAKER: I can hear a voice other than that of the Leader of the Opposition who is speaking on a point of privilege; and I take this opportunity now — (*Asides*) I am hearing a voice. When I am speaking, I do not care who it is, there must be silence in here, and the Rules will be adhered to strictly today; not for one side and not the other. Let us have a decent debate here today, and anyone can speak. I am going to adhere to the rules to the best of my knowledge.

Mr. ADAMS: The asides have come from someone who last Friday went out of his way to show us that he was wearing a white suit and saying he at least was pure. He went out of his way in the lunch room to say so. He said that was the symbol of purity.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Is that your point of privilege?

Mr. ADAMS: No, Sir. I am sorry, Sir.

The final thing is this. The Rules clearly give me the right to reply. I moved the motion, I have the right to reply. Whether a device can be found to allow a Minister to wind up is up to those who want to reply. I have made my position clear on the Rules already; but it cannot be right, in my submission, to broadcast only part of the summation of a debate. This is not the Constitutional debate, where only one person was entitled to sum it up. This debate even on our rules is entitled to be summed up by two persons; if it were a critical motion it would be entitled to be summed up by two persons. As it stands at the moment, in my submission, it can only be summed up by one, but if some way is found, or the Clerk's, in my respectful submission, wrong advice is adhered to and there are two replies the entire reply session should be broadcast.

I have had no notification, Sir, and I do not believe any member of the House has as to why these cameras are in here. That is how really the point of privilege arises. There are big cameras, big lights all over the place. I understand that there is no insuperable technical difficulty — although I must say I do not see the microphone system at the moment — but I understand there is no insuperable technical difficulty in the whole debate being recorded, and I am informed by somebody who contacted CBC that the entire debate is going to be monitored — that is the word that was apparently used and what was told to me — and when the Prime Minister comes on it would be put on. That is what was told to me.

If the entire debate is going to be monitored CBC should be directed to record it and broadcast the entire debate. In any case I am submitting, Sir, that it cannot possibly in the circumstances where I have a fair right of reply in any case, that my right of reply should be subjected to different treatment — I am the mover of the motion — should be subjected to different treatment from any other right of reply. I have the primary right of reply and the concluding right of reply, and if you rule that anybody else has it, if circumstances arise which would give somebody else such a concluding right, it cannot be right that the primary right is excluded from the purview of the cameras and the concluding right is broadcast. That is my point of privilege, Sir.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, before you rule.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Is this also a point of privilege?

Mr. FORDE: It is a point of privilege, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please make your point clear. When you stand I must know on what you are standing. (*Asides*) May I hear the hon. member?

Mr. FORDE: Sir, I am raising a question which has also been raised by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. It appears to me that — I do not know what will be Your Honour's ruling on this matter — but it appears to me that in this House there are some people who are more equal than other people, and I wish to draw your Honour's attention.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I interrupt to say that when you come in here you come in as a member. All of us are members of this Honourable House of Assembly.

Mr. FORDE: That is right. And it is for that reason that I am submitting that any facilities that are made available to any other member should be made equally available to all members if we have all come in here as the same members. That is the point I am making. 12.30 p.m.

This is the point I am making. I notice that the equipment in this House is so arranged that there is intended to be obviously a recording or a broadcast by the media of the speech of only one person in this House today. In my submission this can hardly be fair. I myself in the constitutional debate suffered

from a speech being made about me in which my reply to that speech was not carried over the media, and I want to make it absolutely clear that it seems to me that my privilege in the House was breached on that occasion and I trust that on this occasion equal treatment will be given to all members in this debate.

The other point which I should like to draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, is that I would expect that at the beginning of a Session if we are to have..... (*Asides*).....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Michael West. Your voice can be heard.

Mr. WALCOTT: I rise on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Your voice must not be heard above mine, and it is being heard above mine. Please do not let it be heard above mine. I have spoken to you, you are repeatedly interrupting and I do not want to hear your voice except when you are addressing the Chair. I want to make this abundantly clear in here today with anyone of you, left or right.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I want to know if every member can get up here on a point of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am to decide a point of privilege.

Mr. WALCOTT: Because I am going to get up on a point of privilege when you finish.

Mr. SPEAKER: If I decide what is the point of privilege I will hear you too.

Mr. FORDE: I have never been deterred by either volubility or loudness of speech, or pugnaciousness of manner, and I will not be deterred now. The position is, Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, as I understand it — and I am not attacking you, Mr. Speaker, in your capacity —

Mr. WALCOTT: I rise on a point of order. If I cannot speak in here and you are going to allow an outburst from the Gallery to take place there will be an outburst all day long, because if you are going to sit here and allow an outburst from the Gallery as if this is a football match, I want to know that, because privilege or no privilege, if the hon. member could rise on a point of privilege and one has not been disposed of, every member can rise in here on 24 points of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like the hon. member to know that I know the Standing

Orders. Someone will have to bring it to my notice.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, that is what I am doing now. I beg to move that strangers do withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is what I was saying, someone will have to bring it to my notice. (Hon. F. G. SMITH: Are you deaf?) I would like the Hon. Minister of Education to realise that if he thinks he knows the Standing Orders better than I do and he wants to enforce them to suit himself, when he gets in the Chair he can do that. (Hon. F. G. SMITH: You will never see me in that Chair). But when I am here I am going to rule in my way.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: It is quite clear, Sir, for the past few months there has been — I would not like to say armed bandits — but the introduction of hooliganism in this Chamber during sittings of the Chamber by the Opposition bringing people in here. I do not know whether they are armed.

Mr. ADAMS: No, Sir! On a point of order, Sir, we have been very calm this morning.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that strangers do withdraw.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order!

Mr. SPEAKER: There will be no point of order. The question is that strangers do withdraw.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order! Order No. 77, Mr. Speaker. You just can't tell strangers to withdraw like that, with all due respect to you. Order 77 must be followed.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir, the Prime Minister got up and said that persons who are not armed bandits but who are hooligans are brought in here by the Opposition and I object to that. The Prime Minister must be asked to withdraw that, that we have brought hooligans in here to disturb the order of the House.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I myself have been assaulted coming into this Chamber by people with weapons in their hands. I am not withdrawing it. I have made a motion that strangers do withdraw, and Your Honour is using 77(3) to Your Honour's discretion. If they can keep them in here let them keep them in here. I have been assaulted in these precincts by supporters of the Barbados Labour Party.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, Sir. (Asides).

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Sir, I am drawing to your attention that the hon. member for St. James has said that I am a hooligan. Ask him to leave the House, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please take your seat.

Mr. CRAIG: Why must I leave? For what? Nuisance.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that strangers do withdraw.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is suspended for 15 minutes.
12.38 p.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: The Sitting is resumed.

I want to make the following statement:

It is imperative that order be observed throughout this sitting. Any disorder will be treated with the sanctions authorised by the Rules governing this Chamber. In particular, any interference of any sort by strangers who are present only on sufferance will be treated most seriously. Sanctions against members would make no sense unless they apply to all persons present in or about the Chamber. Let there be order at all times. Any person who wishes to express himself in any way not permitted by the Rules must first leave this Chamber.

I will also add that Standing Order No. 77(3) says:

"The Speaker may, whenever he thinks fit, order the withdrawal of strangers from any part of the House or its precincts."

I will also deal with the privilege made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. A letter had been sent to me by the Leader of the House and I as Speaker have granted permission for the equipment to remain herein until the time necessary, and that is why it is here.

That is the end of my ruling as regards the privilege of the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of privilege, what use is going to be made of the cameras? The

point of privilege related to the use of the cameras, not just their presence.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will deal with the occasion as it arises as I have all the necessary information.

Mr. ADAMS: The first application was for the speeches of all hon. members, so it is on.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have made by ruling regarding your point of privilege.

Mr. ADAMS: I made a point of order before the suspension. The Prime Minister said that a lot of hooligans are brought in here by the Opposition and I am respectfully submitting that.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I respectfully did not hear that. If he said it I can have the records checked.

Mr. ADAMS: I submit that should be withdrawn. That is a very dangerous accusation to be made.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already ruled on the point of strangers and I hope that order will be preserved for the remainder of the day.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to rise continually to fret you, but the Prime Minister must not say, if he did say, and all of us heard it, that the Opposition has sought in effect to break up the proceedings of Parliament. You cannot say things like that about us. We have had to withdraw far less serious remarks made about the Government or that a member did something, and I have been told that it reflects on all members. The Prime Minister specifically said that the Opposition have brought hooligans in here, and I submit that is an insulting remark. I have not brought anybody in here and it should not pass.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have ruled since that came under the heading of strangers, and that is settled.

Mr. ADAMS: I am asking the Prime Minister to withdraw it, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have ruled on that.

Mr. ADAMS: We started in here on the Opposition side so calmly with every intention of going through, with no quarrel. We have come in here to try to make the debates satisfactory, and the Prime Minister is going to

be allowed to get up and say we bring hooligans in here. You said you would call on the Reporter to have it checked.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have given my ruling. That discussion took place when you talked about strangers and I have given my ruling as regards strangers.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, before the suspension of the House and before the various points of order, I was making a point to the Speaker and you did entertain me and I had not concluded, but I gave way on points of order. One of the points I was making to you you have now drawn to the attention of the House, the reason why the television cameras are here, because one of the points of privilege I was drawing to Your Honour's attention was the fact that the privileges of the House should demand that their presence be explained even if you have exercised your discretion as you have now told us you have.

The other point which I am pursuing is this; I understand it is your ruling that you have permitted them to be here. If the debates are continuing on the Budgetary Proposals as the first Order of the day and it is intended at any stage for Your Honour to consider as I believe within your breast you will know at this point broadcasting the speech of any one member of this Chamber, then I respectfully submit at this stage that those of us who are speaking in the debate should have an equal right to have our speeches broadcast, and that is what I am submitting. You will remember we moved a motion in this Chamber concerning political broadcasting, and I am respectfully submitting that the privileges of this House cannot be interpreted or should not be interpreted in such a way as to permit one or two members to have more privileges than others. This is the point I am making. The hon. member for St. John should have no more privilege in this House than I should have in the House, and for that reason the hon. member for St. Thomas or indeed the hon. member for St. Michael West. I do not talk as much as they do, but on this point I am submitting to you that there should be no greater privilege for those. There has only been a limited convention that from my research on the Rules of the House I have seen introduced in here subsequent to 1966, and if that convention is being extended, then in my submission the Chair must find good reasons for so doing with the concurrence of the House as a whole, otherwise there is a preference of one member of the House over other members of this House,

and it is for this reason I am raising this matter on this side, because if an accusation is made at any time during the sitting, I will object most strenuously. (*Asides*).

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Michael West.

Mr. FORDE: When people reach the stage that they quarrel with themselves.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not quarrelling with anyone.

Mr. FORDE: I am making that as a general comment. Your Honour will know that when people reach the stage of quarrelling with themselves, what is the state of their minds; so I am not entering any quarrels with myself or any hon. member. I am asking at this stage for Your Honour's ruling as to the rights of members vis-a-vis one another on this question of broadcasting of debates.

Mr. SPEAKER: My ruling is that permission has been sought and I have here a document in which permission has been sought. Let us get on with the debate.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of privilege, Your Honour says permission has been sought. Earlier Your Honour said from the Chair that you had permitted these cameras to remain here until it is necessary. Necessary for what? Are we to go along in the dark not knowing for what permission has been sought? I do not believe it is fair to the 23 members to say that permission has been sought and Your Honour sits in the Chair and holds a piece of paper and not tell anybody what permission has been sought to do.
1.05 p.m.

It is very unfair to 23 members of the House, and I think that it is the duty of Your Honour to let the House know exactly what procedures we are going to follow. There is nothing in the Standing Orders, and if Your Honour is supposed to conduct the business of this House let us know what the procedure is. Let us know what procedure Your Honour intends to follow today. Let us work within the laid down principles of broadcast in Parliament. You will know, Sir, that as they say in law, you cannot approbate and reprobate at the same time. We must know where we are going.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. A letter addressed to the Speaker about the business of the House belongs to the House,

and if Your Honour is telling us that permission has been sought, with great respect, Your Honour must tell us clearly for what permission has been sought. We do not have two levels in here.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will give way. My recollection is that on Friday, 30th July, 1976, the Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for St. Thomas, alleged that he wrote a letter to Your Honour stating that he was going to call names of certain persons, or the name of some person. I am not quite sure on that because I have not seen the letter. That is the point that I am making, that a name or names were disclosed in the letter.

No satisfactory solution came out of Your Honour's intervention, and the hon. member continued to call certain persons' names. There is no rule in the Standing Orders which says that a letter written to the Speaker is a document of the whole House, and has to be disclosed to the House. A letter to the Speaker is a letter to the Speaker. If the Speaker elects to inform the House of the contents of the letter that is a matter for him. There is only one letter by the hon. member and there are 23 other members; and there is no rule which says that the Speaker has to copy that letter or pass it around like any round robin. I speak under correction, Sir. If there is such a rule, will you please bring it to my attention?

Mr. SPEAKER: I have checked that myself only last night. When the Hon. Leader of the Opposition sent me this letter I did not disclose the contents. I have received the letter and I have no intention of disclosing the contents. I rule that.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order. There are letters and letters. I sent no letter to the Speaker. I gave you notice as required by the rules, and it is untrue to say that I called anybody's name after that notice. There is no rule that requires you to give notice if you are going to call names. There is a rule that requires you to give notice if you are going to comment on conduct. I gave notice that I was going to comment on the conduct of Mr. Sydney Alleyne, and I commented on his conduct. (*Asides*).

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I will at this stage let the House know that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition did call names other than those he supplied to the Speaker. You cannot have it one way and then the other.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order. Does that refer to me? There is no rule that says that you

cannot call a name without giving notice; so I am not going to have my motives questioned, Sir. Already a falsehood has been said about me, that I continued to call names after you intervened. That happens not to be true. The name of the individual was not called after your intervention.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us proceed.

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE ON FINANCIAL STATEMENT AND BUDGETARY PROPOSALS

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the next Order of the day is an amendment by me to the motion made by the hon. member for St. Thomas. I rise to move the amendment to delete the full stop after the word "Finance" in the hon. member's motion as contained in the copy circulated in the Order Paper, and add the following words "commends the Government for the sound measures taken to reduce inflation and to ensure the continuing economic stability of the country."

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I beg to second that motion. I have very great pleasure in seconding that motion.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Sir, I only gave way for it to be seconded because the rules say...

Mr. SPEAKER: You are the mover of the motion.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am not speaking now. I was only moving an amendment so that the debate can be concluded.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, last Friday we listened to the Minister of Finance present his Budgetary Proposals. I think that it is accepted on all sides that the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals is perhaps one of the highlights of the parliamentary year. One would have expected the Leader of the Opposition also to take the opportunity to analyse the economy and comment on the fiscal measures as put forward by the Minister of Finance. What did we find? One is that he tried to create in the minds of the public that the Government was taking advantage of him by asking him to speak on the same Friday, even though he has said on countless occasions that he is so competent and knowledgeable that he can speak for an hour and a half immediately after the Minister of Finance.

As soon as he realised that he could not reply to the Budgetary Proposals he decided to take advantage of T.V. and Radio time, not only

to garble and take figures out of his head, but also to go in for a degree of political assassination; and there is no doubt in my mind that what is worrying him about this debate this morning is that he is not going to get away with it, that he is not going to tarnish others' reputation using the media without getting his own back; and he had better believe that.

Now, what did he do? He could not deal competently with the economy because he claimed that a document given to him by the Hon. Minister of Finance he did not open. I do not believe it, knowing him as I do. I believe that he opened it and sealed it back; but I cannot see...

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order. He is insulting an hon. member when he says that something an hon. member says he does not believe, that he could have opened it and sealed it back.

Mr. SPEAKER: If he does not believe it, he does not believe it.

Mr. ADAMS: All right, Sir.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I said I do not believe it, because if you are a serious Shadow Minister of Finance and you get a document from the Minister of Finance who is about to deliver his Budgetary Proposals, and you are really serious and not out to assassinate people, you will at least take the document and see what it says.

Mr. FORDE: On a point of order. What I must object to is the statement that the Leader of the Opposition was out to assassinate people. Those were the Minister's exact words. In my submission, those words were unparliamentary and ought to be withdrawn. I am asking the Hon. Minister to withdraw the word "assassinate".

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I said "political assassination". I withdraw the word "assassinate".
1.15 p.m.

I withdraw "assassinate" but what I am saying is that the Leader of the Opposition deliberately took the time, knowing that he was on TV and Radio, to make accusations — and I am going to deal with it because I want the House to see what he really intended to do he has got the Trinidadian Guardian to do, and I want it to be brought; and now he is shifting his ground. I will deal with it in due course. Now he could not deal with the economy and he comes out with some bogus figures about unemployment and he trotted them out as if they were John 3 Verse 16

because anybody who is conversant with the world economy would know that the world has passed through a recession due to an oil crisis between 1973 and 1975. Unemployment throughout the world has been high. In America, in England, in Italy, you name it. There is no country in the world that has ever existed without unemployment or an increase in unemployment within the last two years; because all economies were depressed. Prior to that, Barbados even under their Government, has never had a system of full employment.

So he comes out with figures, population 245, subtract X for this, subtract Y for that; he did not even mention the school children. He subtracted everything except the number of school children in Government schools...

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir. I am not going to interrupt the insults but he must not assassinate, he must not tell lies...

Mr. SPEAKER: I am asking the Leader the Opposition to withdraw that.

Mr. ADAMS: I withdraw that the hon. member for St. Michael South Central must not tell lies but I do not even add that he can tell the lies...

Mr. SPEAKER: That has nothing — I only asked you to withdraw that.

Will the Hon. Minister proceed?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Yes. What I am saying is; to show you what a sort of person he is. He does not know that children go to school from three and a half years of age, which form part of the population and that they go to the primary school up to fourteen years. He is now saying — he subtracted for children in secondary education, when there are 37,000 children in the primary schools in this country.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, he cannot go on misrepresenting what I said. The figures I quoted were for the population age 15 to 65. He cannot understand that?

Mr. SPEAKER: Your point is well made.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: But I am talking about the people born up to 15. That is what I am talking about. They are another 40,000 or 50,000. What I am saying Mr. Speaker, is that he had no statistical basis but because he knows that the unemployment in this country due to the recession has been slightly higher than it was, he comes in here pretending that this Government has created the unemployment which other developed countries are experiencing at this time.

Even in England the unemployment figure is 1.6 million. All over the world; but thank Heaven the economy of the world is improving and Barbados is part of the world.

Then he goes further now. He tells you that the national debt is colossal. I do not see how in one breath he can quarrel about the national debt being high, when most of it is incurred in providing employment facilities. The Deep Water Harbour, the Airport, the Flour Mill, the Community College, the Polytechnic — could Barbados finance these projects out of local money if we did not get aid from international agencies? And what is even worst is that no reputable international institution would lend Barbados money if they thought the National Debt was so high that they could not service the sinking fund and interest charges from the revenue. This is obvious commonsense. So when they come in here and get somebody to bow and repeat that they did not know that the national debt was so high, the national debt is money borrowed for development which has enabled people to see and to say that Barbados within the last 15 years has improved beyond recognition.

Any country in the world whose national debt has been static — at least we did not have to go to the International Monetary Fund for assistance. We did not have to liquidate our investments overseas, so what is alarming about the national debt of \$200 million? Because it sounds big to a lot of people they come into the House telling them that the national debt is colossal and they get somebody to believe that that is so.

What else did he say? He dealt with the sewage project. I have the sewage project facts here. The only thing I agree with the Dean about is, that we should get rid of some cheap politicians, because all they are saying is that the people of Barbados want development but they must not pay for it. Let me read from the document that the Leader of the Opposition has. A simple document giving the public the impression that water rates are going up next year, water rates going up the year after. Let me read paragraph 10. This is part of the Agreement. A study — that is what it is — 'a study of the existing tariff and rates system utilized by the Waterworks Department with a view to determine how such rates and charges together with the rates and charges to be levied by the new Authority — which will be the Sewage Authority — for both water supply and the provision of sewage service should be gradually increased in order within three years after completion' — after completion; and the project is a four year project; so water rates cannot be increased under

seven years, if they are increased at all; but they come with a big alarm as if tomorrow morning or if the Government gets back into power, early next year up goes the water rates.

Let me read it again because this is very vital. A lot of people run off saying this Government was concealing something. The sewage project has not started yet. It is due to start in 1977. It is going to take four years. Within three years after completion, meantime you are carrying out a study of the rates in order that you will arrive at a figure to service the sewage scheme as well as pump water.

Now let me say, if the people of Barbados do not want the sewage scheme — and I want the Opposition to tell the public if they get into power if they are going to dump the loan or refuse it. That is the important question. We are not increasing any rates. The Agreement says, "a study of the existing tariff and rate system utilized by the Waterworks Department with a view of determining how such rates and charges together with the rates and charges to be levied by the new Authority for both water supply and the provision of sewage service should be gradually increased in order that within three years of the completion of the sewage project such rates will cover at least all the operating expenses of the Authority including those for operation and maintenance and to the extent, possible depreciation.

So all this big hullabaloo that this Government — that the Minister of Health went to Washington and signed an agreement which is going to cause water rates to go up next year is nonsense, and it is deceitful to tell the people or to fool the people that this Government was holding something under the shelf, before it rises. When he talks about sales tax, saying that he is going to take it off, he can take it off if he gets into power, but he cannot take off \$5.3 million without correspondingly the economy suffering, and all over the world you go you find sales tax imposed. If you leave Barbados and go to America you pay sales tax.

Only this week I was reading the budget of New Zealand and the Government in power has increased the sales tax on certain commodities in New Zealand. The sales tax is a fair and equitable tax, and if you buy a dollar and you pay five cents on it to a government to subsidize bus fares, provide school books, and other social amenities which — you know we get an impression in this country that in your personal life the money you have is losing its purchasing

power but for the Government it does not go up; the drugs in the hospital do not cost more.
1.25 p.m.

We get an impression in this country that in your personal life the money you have is losing its purchasing power, but for the Government that does not go. The drugs at the hospital don't cost more, the textbooks in schools don't cost more, buses don't cost more, agricultural machinery doesn't cost more, it is only the individual who is suffering the cost of inflation and the increase in world commodities, so that the public has to understand that they cannot get development in any country unless they pay for it. This is a basic need and a basic requirement of the governmental process and if they cannot understand that they will never get anywhere.

So that when he comes in here as if he has made a scoop, as the journalists say, that the Democratic Labour Party is just waiting to get into power to increase the water rates, and holding up a document flaunting it, this is what the document says. Within three years, but in the meantime a study which in the general context can take four or five years, because you do not know how the sewage system is going to operate, and then there will be gradual increases in order to be self-financing. But now, what is even worse, one is that the sewage scheme for the City is going to prevent pollution in the harbour and all over the coast, and since one of the planks in Barbados is tourism, the question of controlling pollution in the ocean and the sea is vital to the continuance of Barbados as a tourist resort bringing in money for the country.

But if that were even all, during the construction of this same sewage scheme it is going to provide employment for about 250 to 300 people, so you don't want employment, for the Government is trying to get money to provide employment. They grumble that unemployment is too high and then when you try to get employment they tell you that the resulting establishment of the particular facility is going to cost the taxpayers more. You can't win in politics, you really can't win, but what I don't like is this attempt by the Leader of the Opposition to give to the public of Barbados the impression that as from next week when the Democratic Labour Party, or whenever it gets back into power, immediately your rates are going to go up. This is not a fair presentation. It was done entirely to

mislead, it was done to make a political gain, because people know that water rates is something over which they can always come, and if a man doesn't want to pay taxes, fair enough, but they feel that water now is something with which they can get on the bandwagon, but I want the public and the record to be straight, that the Agreement signed by my colleague in Washington for the establishment of a sewage scheme in Barbados is intended and has therefore long term effects.

It is intended to give to the City a proper sewage scheme, to stop pollution of the ocean, and it will have the long term and temporary effect of providing employment for the very people that the Leader of the Opposition says are unemployed, and if of course in the long run it results as it may will result in an increase in water rates, then the people of Barbados must be prepared to pay a reasonable amount for a necessary improvement in the preservation of health standards in Barbados. Too often we do not tell the people what they ought to know and cheap gibes like this by the Leader of the Opposition they get away with, because you create in the people's minds the feeling that they should not do this for a service they are getting, and the consequential result is that some misguided people having heard him the other night saying the water rates are going up will really and seriously come to the conclusion that they are going up in 1977, 1978 or 1979. That is not fair.

Let us come to the final part of his speech. The political assassination aspect of it. The Leader of the Opposition is a lawyer, so am I, longer than he was. Now he took this opportunity — now, you see, that is why I was against broadcasting debates in this House when the motion was here, because you can do a lot. He has psychology. I do not know if they did it at Oxford, but he has some idea of psychology. When he was finished speaking on Friday, Mr. Speaker, he had not accused anybody of anything directly, but he left it to the minds and imagination, and fertile imagination, of every single person who had heard it. And what is worse in Barbados, when you hear it and you tell somebody and it goes to somebody else you will understand. Here is a responsible journalist, I would assume, who took it or sent a report to the Trinidad Guardian on Wednesday, 4th. The headline: "MOE DENIES UNDERHAND MONEY DEAL." You can imagine that? That is exactly what the Leader of the Opposition

wanted, to throw enough facts out to create an impression in the minds of the people — and obviously he is a reporter, whoever sent this report to the Guardian, he got them to do exactly what he wanted.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order. The hon. member says that I got a reporter to send some report to the Guardian. That is reflecting on my motives. I do not know the reporter of the Guardian. This the first time in my life that I know it has been reported in the Guardian and I am dying to see the newspaper. I absolutely deny and I ask that he withdraw the aspersion on my motive, that I got a reporter to do anything, and lend me the paper. I know nothing whatsoever about the Guardian.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I will withdraw. I did not mean that he went and bribed or paid, I meant that by the way he put it over on television and radio he got by mental thinking, by leaving it to the imagination even of a reporter, a trained man, — that is what I meant, I am not accusing him of taking money and hiring CANA or whoever sent it. I withdraw it unreservedly, because I have no evidence — I almost said I wouldn't put it beyond him — but I have no evidence that he did it. All I am saying is that so cleverly did he put that matter over that reporter who must have heard the evidence can send to the Guardian a headline which reads "MOE DENIES UNDERHAND MONEY DEAL." The exact thing that the Leader of the Opposition was intending to create. I will tell you why he intended to create it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Did the Hon. Minister say he intended to create it?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: He intended to create that impression, because he is now shifting his ground in the Press. This is what I am dealing with. Now that he is forced to admit that the dealing in this matter happened to be a legal matter, the lease in existence could show that the amount of \$600 was paid for rent, but to show what sort of man he is, he does not even call it rent, today's paper said "subventions." Well, I did classics. "Subvention" comes from the Latin word "subvenio" — I help, so he is now saying, even today, although he has been shown the lease to Senator Moe's mother, he is not even decent enough to admit and to delete the word "subvention" which again he repeats in today's newspaper.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am getting the impression that when you say "he" you mean the Leader of the Opposition. That is an improper motive to him and I am asking you to withdraw the words "he is not decent enough."

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I will withdraw it.

Mr. SPEAKER: You were very specific. That is my reason.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I meant him, I am talking about the Leader of the Opposition, but if you say withdraw I will withdraw it. This is dangerous. As a matter of fact, the paper goes further. He got up and said he has all these cheques against everybody and he took his folder and he played he was pushing something into it, and if I know him and he had more, you know he would have let them go on T.V. But be that as it may, what hurts me is to show what damage he has done to the reputation of this House and to honest members, there is a report which says here, "Mr. Adams went on to present to the House photostat copies of cancelled cheques from Alleyne made out to Moe who is Foreign Affairs Minister, and other M.Ps."

1.35 p.m.

So everyone in this House on the Government side.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister will make that a document of the House immediately.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: With pleasure, but not immediately; when I am finished with it, I will make it a document of the House. So not only has he created the impression about Senator Moe to gain the headline, but other M.Ps. are involved, but if he was decent he would write to the Gleaner and say that he only produced documents in respect of "A" or "B", but the other M.Ps. based on this article are completely exonerated. You owe it to the public to get up today and say that when you spoke on Friday you only presented documents against "A" and "B", and just as you quarrelled about the report in the Advocate, you should be honourable enough to say that when it was reported that other M.Ps. were involved, it was not true. But he goes further, as I say. Now he is confronted with the fact that this is libellous. The Attorney General will get a piece of change from the Guardian; I cannot practise now, but he has a good thing there. But be that as it may. Do

you know why they did not meet yesterday? I am going to accuse you again. You did not meet yesterday because you wanted an opportunity to write to the Advocate today, and if you had met and got a firm defence of Senator Moe you would not be able to write your article today, and I say to you now as Leader of the Opposition that you were standing up behind the Speaker's Chair yesterday when the motion before the House was your motion to be debated by you and your colleagues; but you stood behind the Speaker's Chair seeing that the Government had eight and you did not come in in order to give yourself time to write a letter to appear in the Advocate this morning. If you think that is good tactics, stay outside; but that is exactly why you did not come in yesterday. Let the public know the real reasons and that it is not a question of the Government having to form a quorum or that it is Government's business.

I have never seen, Mr. Speaker, a worse case or a more deliberate case than I saw last Friday, an attempt to destroy without evidence. He is a lawyer and he could have made enquiries and found the evidence. You came into the Chamber and looked at the Attorney General and tried to destroy him because your Deputy Parliamentary Leader may well be in trouble. I will go further and tell you that this whole thing was hatched when the Opposition visited New York, and I can tell you who were present too, and I can tell you the street. It was hatched in New York and the hon. member for the City was present when it was hatched. So let us get the records straight.

Anyhow, Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, one would have expected the Opposition to deal with the budget and the economy. There was not one word of it. There were red herrings across the trail, veiled insinuations, no analytical attempt except to tell the people that he agreed with the Minister of Finance on the Corporation Tax. He said if he were there he would have done it, and he had to stick to his removal of the sales tax. What else did he say monetarily or fiscally. Oh, he was going to incorporate trade with corporation. That is all I could get. Not one measure did the Leader of the Opposition tell the public he would do in order either to inflate, reflate, deflate or any "flate" the economy of this country. (*Asides*) I know exactly what we are doing; I do not know what you are doing.

Sometimes in education I feel that unless I can get people to think, I am wasting my time. That is education, not just filling their heads with facts or insinuations. I want them to think. When the public listened to the Leader of the Opposition, apart from the political assassination, the misleading on the sewage, the pulling of figures on unemployment out of his hat like a Houdini, what did they learn? One would have expected the Opposition to tell the public of Barbados, without revealing the details of their so-called manifesto, exactly how they would create employment, how they would reduce it. That is why I say that people will get a shock if they make a mistake. Up to now we have not on political platforms or in this Chamber learned one way how unemployment is going to be brought down, and that is what I would like the Opposition to tell the public; that if they get into power by some mischance, they will not accept the loan for the sewage system since within seven years or maybe six years from now there is a possibility that water rates may be increased and therefore they would not accept it, they would do away with the employment possibilities, because they are not increasing water rates under seven years. I want you to tell them that.

As I say, I am not worried about the national debt. The Central Bank Governor has dealt with that. That only sounds a big figure because \$200 million sounds a lot, but when you look at the external debt of some countries like the United Kingdom, Italy, France and even the great United States, you realise that the only value in an external debt is that the external debt must not be of such a magnitude as to prevent it being serviced from the economy of the particular country. As I said before I have been in Government long enough to know that no international agency will lend you a penny if you cannot service the loan which they are lending you.

Mr. Speaker, I would love to have replied longer, but I do not know what to reply to. If it is a budget speech I have to confine myself to the few points he made. I will have plenty of opportunities on political platforms to deal with him and he with me, and I shall confine myself basically to what I understood to be the matters dealt with by him in his so-called reply — unemployment, national debt, sewage scheme and the character assassination of the Attorney General.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I think the last hon. member in speaking on this matter has done a service because we heard a lot about the bonafides of people, and even today

I heard a lot about privilege. Well I do not want to crave Your Honour's privilege nor do I want to say anything more than is necessary.

The question of unemployment was raised by the hon. member, and I think those of us who have been dealing with this matter for all of our lives will know that unemployment has been a problem in Barbados for all time. Fifteen years ago it was a very serious matter and I hope to republish a statement that was made fifteen years ago in its same form. Unemployment is still arising among the sectors of the community which we have to control in the sense that the areas where children are growing fastest are the areas where unemployment is highest.

1.45 p.m.

Some people today sometimes because of their exuberance, react in a way for which you have to excuse them. That is where the greatest problem resides. I think that members had better seriously get down to realise that the problem of unemployment is not the whipping boy of any Government. Unemployment is going to be the whipping boy of all of us, because the problem that arises in Barbados is that those who can be regarded as the have nots are breeding faster than the haves and are unable to get jobs. We are not creating jobs for the have nots as fast as they are breeding, because the facts of life are that the social and economic conditions of our society are in the hands of a few.

I see even a few now who want to enter politics — those who say that they are employers — but they are not spreading the economic cake on an equitable basis, and the have nots are going to destroy as a matter of survival. It is not going to be a question of which Government is in power. I am sorry that I have to talk about the Reverend Dean, but it is stupid for any person in as exalted a position to begin to talk about the economy and about politicians in a wide, general sweep, as though all politicians are a bunch of dishonest people, and that purity is only in the church. Dishonesty is not a question of taking up some thing belonging to somebody else. Dishonesty comes from the statements that you make. There are dishonest people in the Church. If you are intellectually dishonest, that is dishonesty too.

When you analyse it, it is like the stupidity of the statement that everybody in the economy pays for everything, and therefore nothing that you receive is free. You do not make that statement when you talk about the economy because you are talking about areas of policy; because if your policy is one of a better distribution of the economy, you are talking

about a better distribution of the money that people put into the economy. You are not talking about a better distribution of a freeness. That is a fact of life. I have a neighbour living beside me with three children, and the mother has gone to the university because she is ambitious and desires to improve her education; but she could only do that because there are opportunities available to her to go to the university. Her three children are getting State aid in the sense that there are two girls at Queen's College and one at the Foundation. Do not tell me that they are rich people. They are not; but the big difference is that she does not have to pay for school books for those children this term. I have been talking to people and they tell me that they know what school books mean. Do not tell me that people working for small salaries, people working for \$50 or \$60 a week who have children would be able to get the money to pay for these books.

If your policy is one that aims at a redistribution of the economy and the taxation in this manner, it is not a freeness, when it comes to public expenditure I want to deal with these so called conservatives in this community. Even sometimes I hear the Minister of Finance — and I want to tell him that I do not subscribe to the ideas of some people who talk about the public debt. In a community like Barbados and with a population like ours public expenditure has to be a necessity. You cannot hold back because you will get another 1937. If the Government does not spend money in the public sector you are going to get thousand of unemployed.

I heard people talking about taking us back to where we came from and giving us the name that we had. When I hear that I wonder what is going wrong. The name we had when? When ignorance and poverty were like two twin brothers? Is that the place you want to take us back to? We have to spend more money, and we have to have a public debt if we want to keep unemployment down; but you have to be able to control your economy in such a manner that you do not live beyond your means, and therefore we have to discipline ourselves in our own economy by hard work and prudence and understanding where we are going.

I have had to discuss with people the expansion of the harbour, and I have had to tell them that there is no point in telling me that you will have to have more dockers unemployed and higher equipment when the Prime Minister is saying that you have an unemployment figure and when the Leader of the Opposition is saying that you have an unemployment figure; but you want us to have more people out of a job.

I do not agree with the Leader of the Opposition or the Minister of Education on their whole unemployment assessment. Barbados always had cyclical unemployment. We have never been able to measure it because even in the days when you had 20,000 people working on sugar plantations you had unemployment. What do you call employment? A man who is working three days a week on a plantation, a man who is working at a hotel and whose aggregate days of work a year is 152 or 162, what happens during the number of weeks that he is not working. This is something that you have to be able to measure, and I agree with the hon. member that we do not have the sophisticated labour statistics in order to measure the whole unemployment situation; but this is one of the diseases which has been left to us from colonialism, and all parties will have to fight this same social outlook. We cannot look upon unemployment as a partisan issue. We have to look at unemployment as a matter of social justice. Can a man get a job? Can a woman get a job? How do you go about it?

You cannot begin by saying that unemployment is 28 or 30 per cent. You cannot say that there are 98,000 people registered with National Insurance. That is not a precise way of measuring employment. The Leader of the Opposition must know this, because there are going to be people outside of the economy of Barbados who are not employed in the active labour force between the ages of 15 and 65. There are some people outside gainful employment. They have retired, and they are not seeking employment. Mr. E. K. Walcott at the "Rock" is still alive, but he is not seeking employment.

National Insurance can provide a guide in a general way, something that one can take up and look at at a glance, and I feel it is something that one should watch. The only other thing I would like to say when it comes to public finance is that in the same way that some of our friends on the opposite side are having expenditure problems — and the Leader of the Opposition will know this. What I would like to say is that some people can advise the Government on public expenditure, when their private expenditure gives them a run around. It has been drawn to my attention that I have been invited to a sale, a public sale, and I know that members of this Chamber have their own problems about keeping their heads above water. (*Aside: Speak for yourself*). I say that because of the economic crisis.

The Leader of the Opposition may be more fortunate because I understand that he does very well. I am glad to see that nobody has to run around his house measuring it to see where he lives. I remember that when I built a House some hon. members used to make a pilgrimage to see where it

was. I have not made a pilgrimage, but I would like to congratulate the hon. member. He has not been in this House 10 years and I feel very pleased to see that young leaders are making some provision for themselves and for their families. I see nothing wrong with it because Barbados is a house conscious community.

1.55 p.m.

I do not see anything wrong with that because Barbados is a house-conscious community and therefore if people at a young age are trying to make appropriate provision, let us then see that in Public Expenditure on a broader basis that they are members outside of this. I do not see that it would be easy for anyone to say that between 1973 and 1975 when the Hon. Leader of the Opposition would know — one of the things that I was very sorry about this debate, is that there is a habit in the Caribbean that I do not like. I do not like Governments and Governments' successors or would-be successors to say that the fellows in there were thieves and before we can do anything we have to spend about five years in cleaning up the mess. I do not like that. I do not like excuses and there is no point in the Hon. Leader of the Opposition raising these that, as the Hon. Minister of Education has rightly stated, if the probity of any hon. member is at stake, I would be the first member to tell the hon. member this now — I heard them talk about the CIA and I say openly, if my colleague here works with me and I find that he is a man who is not worthy of the trust that has been reposed in him, I would ask my Executive Council to relieve him of his duties and I would have nothing to do with him.

If I have evidence against a member whenever I say anything against a member I do not guess, I will say it, and I have proof for what I say. The hon. member spoke and I am coming back maybe after 2 o'clock and speak about these agricultural wages because the hon. member who is now entering the House, when we were talking about agricultural workers I heard him on record — the hon. member of the Opposition was saying one thing, singing in one choir although singing at the same organ, one singing and the other singing but not even singing the same hymn. One singing 'Abide with me' and the other one singing 'Now the labourer's task is o'er'.....

SUSPENSION

Mr. SPEAKER: According to Standing Order 6(3) the hour being 2.p.m., this Sitting is suspended until 2.45 p.m. today.

2. p.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When this Sitting was suspended the hon. member for St. Michael West was speaking.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the point I was beginning to develop at 2 o'clock was regarding the agricultural workers. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition stated that — I believe reading from what was in the Review of the Sugar Producers Federation and the statement coming from the organ, that it is the idea that any proposal to reduce wages — I do not think that the Leader of the Opposition making a statement about that, need to worry about that, because by now we should realize that the employers in Barbados, it is not within their province to decide to increase or decrease wages in the sugar industry. The point I was making was that, the Hon. Leader was making one point when we were debating this question and the hon. member for St. Joseph was stating that the wages in the sugar industry from these negotiations seem to be burdensome. Well, I do not know how two members who belong to the same party and both of them represent rural constituencies and how a member can say that an agricultural worker now getting \$1.75 an hour and a cane cutter working for \$5 a ton, how you can begin to regard that as burdensome. Burdensome on whom? For people who have been struggling all of these years — well, maybe the hon. member will explain that to his own people, what he meant when he said that these were burdensome. However, I think we must come around to the idea that we must get away from the idea that the public debt — what I was worried about is to hear the Hon. Leader speaking about public debt. The hon. member sounded to me like a Conservative, Mr. Heath, talking about public debt. This is a Conservative slant. As you are talking about public debt it looks to me that you are becoming worried about what is going to be spent.

They are doing it in England now. They accused Wilson of all things; they are accusing Callaghan of all things, but if you are a Socialist, if you believe that you have to put people to work, you cannot begin to talk about the public debt as an indication — future generations must pay for some of the things that we have done; the hon. member will know this. When the Labour Party was in power — and we have to understand the value of money. The hon. member said that they are taking credit for any infrastructural arrangement that was done, and he said 'look at the Deep Water Harbour.' Well, look at the Deep Water Harbour; how much do you think it would cost today to put up a Deep Water Harbour like that? Not \$25 million. So if you had to build the Deep Water Harbour today it would cost, not \$25 million. You have to think in terms of borrowing \$100 million or more; and what we said then — and that is why we had to make this cruel decision at the

time; that if the Deep Water Harbour had been built before 1956 or it had been decided to build before 1956, we would not have to pay \$25 million but we would have been paying \$12 million and the generations now would be forced to pay back \$25 million but it would have been a lower figure.

We have to make up our minds at some point in time, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but when you are thinking of the future and you are planning — and you must plan in our time. You must have a policy that commits the country not to 1976 but to 1986 and to the year 2000. So therefore you cannot have the situation that you are going to commit the country to the year 2000 but you are borrowing on a basis that you are going to pay it back tomorrow. You have to be borrowing on the basis that you may be forced to pay it back; so the baby that is born today, when it begins to enter the economy, when it reaches the age of twenty-five years it is going to be repaying some of the money that is sending the children to school.

On the question of unemployment, I would like to seriously join in any discussion on unemployment. Not unemployment on any flimsy basis but unemployment on a basis of examining the situation in Barbados as it applies to unemployment. It is a serious social matter that is affecting all of us. More serious than we think. Not in the terms of pure economic matters but in the terms of social outlook, and I say this to all members of the House; Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you want to know what I see in the seriousness of this matter, I have to pass through some villages to go to the Labour College and incidentally sometimes I hear somebody make some comment about the Labour College. I would like to say the Labour College is something that is financed by the Barbados Workers Union. It cost the Barbados Workers Union \$1.6 million. It cost the Barbados Workers Union \$190,000 per annum, pure cost; nothing to do with subvention. We feel that this is a contribution we made. That is why I was very grieved indeed when I heard the Leader of the Opposition make the cruel statement that the Barbados Workers Union should not have been given the loan for housing out of the levy. How cruel a statement one can make? Who should be given? On what basis? On what grounds?

2.55 p.m.

Call an organisation that is a social organisation which represents more of the poor people in Barbados than the Barbados Workers' Union. For over a quarter of a century we knew the needs, but we will not plead for any special

thing, because we do not seek any aid like we are any Olympic team going away to get any money, we have to be a social organisation making a contribution, the contribution we are going to make is for the upliftment of this country, but when I travel from Bridgetown to St. Philip and I go through the villages I can see that when I go through the middle class villages you do not see anybody during school hours, the children are at school and the parents are at work. When you go through St. Patrick's, Sargeants Village and the working class areas this is where you get the problem, and this is where I see that we, not the Government, we collectively have a social responsibility to this total society. It is not a Labour Party matter, it is not a DLP matter, it is a matter for everybody whether you are in politics or not. The mere fact that you are finding that people are forced in Barbados now to imprison themselves in iron bars, that they are building houses and the only safety they can find is to lock themselves up in iron bars and close themselves up in iron, not from dogs, not from lions, but from whom? The very people that they fear.

Arthur Lewis some years ago said there is no point in bringing machinery, there is no point saying you are going to create a problem of doing things, following the foreign industrialised countries and doing things they do, but then at night you have a proliferation of burglars coming into your house.

On the question of unemployment, there must be public expenditure and greater public expenditure where you have to employ more people, and the Government has to spend more money in this.

I have noted that the hon. member has spoken about housing. I visited some of the areas in housing. Very rarely people like to give credit, but let us give the Housing Authority credit now, whoever the officers are, for there is an excellent programme in housing that is taking place, and if the pace is kept on it is going to be a tremendous social relief to this country, so do not let us continue to bemoan where we are, let us give ourselves credit for some of the things, but let us admit that the international organisations — and it is true that Dr. Meana who is at the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development has taken a different view from his predecessor — but too many of the developing countries at the beginning were expecting from the international institutions that they were not going to lend them money for social development in areas like housing, and they were telling them to get housing out of their own resources, they

were only lending you money maybe to do harbours, roads and dams and things like that, what they would regard as income bearing things. But housing in a place like Barbados has a social and economic content. It has a means of providing homes and it has a means of finding employment for artisans and a wide range of people.

While I am on this, I feel that in our budgetary proposals the Government should be given credit. The hon. member when he made mention of the school programme, and I watched the school programme, I think the Government should be given credit. There can be no denying of the fact that the Government must be given credit in its approach and its policy on education. There has been this niggardliness about saying that the Government's approach to education is one that only helped those who are able to pay, but I do not think you can be so silly as to put it that way. You must have an educational system that would absorb all talent, you cannot have an educational system that is so incomplete that it cannot absorb all the talented, and Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have my own views. The talented people, and you are going to get them in all societies, but they are not going to be as great in numbers, but the talented people will come through in any system as long as you give them an opportunity, but what is important is more come through when the system is open to more of them, like it is today.

Now that you have more opportunities for scholarships, there are more boys and girls who gain scholarships. That is why I do not subscribe to the view that the people of today are not as good as the people of yesterday used to be, because you only used to read about one, nowadays there are so many you do not have to read about them. You cannot look at a bright girl or a bright boy any more by looking at their life style, they do not dress that way any more, the bright ones are walking barefooted and in a pair of dungarees with their hair plaited, so you do not know who is who. You do not tell anybody now about how they look, the rustier he is now you can say he is a fellow that went away, in a pair of old dungaree pants, so you do not get that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member has one minute more to conclude his speech.

Mr. WALCOTT: For that reason the Government's policy on education has equalised the society which was fast becoming a snobbish society, because those with education were too quickly becoming the ones to believe that they

had a bigger advantage than others, and for this reason when I revert to what the Dean has said about the system of education and the condemnation he has made about giving the students the opportunity of having school books and things, you would have thought someone in that exalted position coming from the pulpit would have exhorted the nation to accept these things. This will make people understand the whole meaning of where they had to live before, and I do feel that the budget proposals are not spellbinding by any means at a time like this. I think the Prime Minister must have the courage. I believe if he had come up with what one would call an election gimmick budget one could really say this is a gimmick for the election, but then I believe the Opposition would have condemned him for bringing something that was only sugar coated to catch votes, but I think it was a plain, simple, straightforward budget that no one could accuse him of electioneering.

3.05 p.m.

Mrs. EASTMOND: Mr. Deputy Speaker, indeed I am glad to be joining in this debate this afternoon, but first I would like to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for St. Thomas who so brilliantly and painstakingly demolished the party on the other side, for indeed he has enlightened the people of Barbados about the happenings behind the scenes. I have heard the hon. member for Christ Church South Central say that what the Leader of the Opposition said was hatched in New York. Strange it was hatched in New York and it is all the way in Canada.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: On a point of correction, I have not spoken yet. I am the member for Christ Church South Central.

Mrs. EASTMOND: I am sorry; I mean the hon. member for St. Michael South Central. One has to wonder how things come to Barbados so late because from my recent visit to Canada it was no surprise to me to hear what the Opposition said in here last Friday, because I warned on Tuesday last week that I had come back armed with ammunition. The Leader of the Opposition has not disclosed everything and I am not here to do that. I am not going to the gutter for them because as I have said previously, they have destroyed themselves. Nobody is going to do it for them, and least of all, I am not going to do it, for the people in Canada who are Barbadians and some who are non-Barbadians know what is happening and know the corruption that is going on in high places, and I realised then that I had been with them far too long - not all of them, but I am not calling names.

For years there have been several rumours moving around this Island and in various countries about things that have been happening in this country by the Government, but I am one who prefer to see things with my own eyes. I listen and I was pleased when the Leader of the Opposition presented photostat copies of cheques in here, for all that has to be said about certain cheques, not all of them, has not yet been disclosed. I think this is also a right opportunity for me to join with the Opposition members in calling for legislation to have all persons seeking public office declare their assets. It is shameful and disgraceful to think that in this House we are discussing the Budgetary Proposals, and the country as it stands is in a very bad state economically, and why? When you look around you see persons who have not sweated by their brow for their bread; but when they go into politics they have achieved more than they could ever have expected to achieve. There are a lot of poor, hard-working people who sweat daily, masons, carpenters, people in the field, even maids, all sorts of people, small shop-keepers, big ones that started small and have worked to achieve something, and most of them have realised that unless they make sacrifices and work hard they cannot get a little home, a little refrigerator or the comforts they want, but today we see people come into politics as if it were a business for the love of the money and for what it can offer, and then in certain places certain things can happen.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Hon. Member for St. John spoke recently at a meeting in my constituency and told the people to pray for me because since I have made my decision I need a doctor and he does not mean a medical doctor, but a psychologist. What I would like him to know is that the pot does not tell the kettle it is black.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the hon. member would take her seat. We are dealing with the reply to the Budgetary Proposals. I do not want to listen to irrelevancies; I want to listen to the reply to the Resolution made by the hon. member for St. Thomas, or as a matter of fact, the amendment to the Resolution. That is what we are debating now. I do not want to hear about the pot and the kettle. Let us deal with the things that are relevant to the Resolution, otherwise I will be forced to ask the hon. member to discontinue her address.

Mrs. EASTMOND: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member for St. Michael South Central dealt with things pertaining to what the Hon. Leader

of the Opposition said and I am here to support the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am prepared to listen to the hon. member speak in support of the Resolution. I am not prepared to listen to the hon. member speak in support or out of support of a meeting held in her constituency and about the pot and the kettle. This is what I am saying and this is what I mean.

Mrs. EASTMOND: Now for the matter in hand, or so it was called by the hon. member for St. John, Minister of Finance. It was a bunch of half-baked measures delivered in a vain attempt to cloud, and I use the word "cloud" the real problems that face this country.
3.15 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Budget delivered by so able a leader of the past only reinforces our fears that his days are over. The measures outlined will do little, if anything at all, to stabilise the economy of this country. We have problems, serious, serious problems, and I was hoping, and I think that the people of Barbados or the electorate were hoping that in an election year they would have been told the state of the economy; but now we realise that the Government does not have the ideas, the plans, the initiative, nothing to lead this country through another five year period.

In an attempt to ease his conscience, the Minister of Finance has removed the sales tax on some items. Yes, after two years when several persons could ill afford to pay a five per cent sales tax on medicines. People who had their relatives sick. They could not afford to pay it, and now he has come back to this House to ease his conscience. At that time I was in the Government, and I spoke against it. I said that it would have been better to impose a 1 per cent overall tax; but again I am joining with the Opposition members and calling for the abolition of the 5 per cent tax.

This is election year, and the people want to know something about the economic structure of this country. Do not try to tell them that it is a bed of roses. I have been waiting to hear both sides. If the Government had been honest enough to tell the people what is happening, I would have been willing to support the Government whether they liked it or not. I would be big enough, woman enough to do that; but as far as the Opposition is concerned, many members have said dirty things about them — that this person is that and that person is another thing; but

whatever they do, they do openly. If they play card games they do it openly. There is no sin in that; but you will have children, and one is easy and pretentious and wipes his face clear and nobody knows what he is doing; but he is worse than the one who is brazen.

Today I am supporting the members of the Opposition, and I am prepared to give them a chance to see how they will run the Government if it is given to them regardless of who they have. When I make my mind up I will give them all the support in the world. Gertz Eastmond does not have to run. If they want me to run I will run. That is not the crux of the matter. The crux of the matter is that I love my country, and I want to see my country put right. There are lots of wrongs happening in high places. The former Minister performed his duties as Minister of Health seriously and now as Minister of Communications and Works. In his former Ministry he asked for an investigation into the hospital. What has happened? I think that we should have an investigation into the airport and into several things in this country to see where the money is going and why the economy of this country is not performing properly. (*Asides*)

They need not threaten me. All of that I have been through. They need not worry to go back to Haiti for me, or say that I am crazy. I can stand on my own ground, and when I cannot stand on my own ground, unity is strength. The Opposition members will pick up the pieces and carry on; and there are persons in Canada that intend to carry on too. (*Aside*) Do not tell the pot that it is black.

As far as the Budget is concerned I will deal with the Corporation Tax. This measure, although a good one, comes too late. The Minister said that the tax did not slow down investments; that the investment climate was already lagging when he imposed the tax. For goodness sake, my mind boggles that a Minister of Finance with this knowledge would still come and impose a tax on investments that were lagging, and altogether kill investments and further depress a sick economy. He had the knowledge. He knew and he sat in here and imposed this tax which means that what the people in Canada tell us is true — that the Prime Minister does not want to win the elections; and the electorate had better look and see who want to win them and believe the Opposition members. They had better look hard too because the reason for this is that there is one member there who has gone all over including the Ministry of Communications and Works. He does not want to see him Prime

Minister of this country and he would do nothing. He is bringing in another doctor too.

There is really not much for me to analyse in a budget like this, because it is not really a budget that people can understand. The people want to know something about what is going to happen with the unemployment situation. They want to know what incentives you are going to give to business people. They want to know how we are going to stimulate the economy. If this economy has not been stimulated since 1971 do you think that the Minister of Finance can now stimulate it? If he would listen to people who have ideas, or step down and let somebody else be Prime Minister he would be a greater man. (*Aside*) I am not ready for you yet, mister, so do not worry about me because you said that I am rude. (*ASIDE: I am waiting for you*).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Earlier today Mr. Speaker issued a warning. I would not like to be forced to enforce the provisions of the relative Standing Orders; and I would like to issue a further warning that strangers are here on sufferance and they should be silent at all times during debates in this House. A word to the wise is enough. Let the hon. member continue.

Mrs. EASTMOND: For the Minister of Finance to come here with a budget putting a few things straight because it is election year is a down right shame when we have a national debt of \$200 million and a deficit of \$100 million in this fiscal year.
3.25 p.m.

I say we need action. We need action and I am prepared to align myself with anyone that is going to give that action. This country is not going to be sold. This country is not going into any and everybody's hands. We Barbadians are a proud people and we intend to stand up. It is nothing to do with party alignment, or else. I do not intend to stick to any party and drop dead with any. I intend to stand in this House and criticize, and tell people fearlessly what I think because I love my country.

The first area that we have to make a big slice in is the overseas mission. Spending a lot of money lavishly on a lot of properties and doing stupid things. You can hear — I would not even begin to talk about that right now. That can stay for another time. Let me get on first with this. The next area they have to attend to is in the Ministries where a lot of money is being spent and being wasted, and the Government seem as though they think they

must be the biggest employer. There are other people who employ people too. Give enterprise some incentives and give them something to work towards. Let the Union do their checking up and make sure that the workers are getting the right money. Let us have some money coming into the Treasury coffers from private enterprise. Do not tie their hands. Do not tell them what they must do and what they must not do. Give them a free go. Let them sail their boats. If they make money they will pay taxes, and they will be pleased and proud to pay taxes.

So many, many things are wrong that I never knew of. No wonder. When they talk about I asked for a Ministry, I could afford to ask for a Ministry. I can do more than some of them over there can do because I am honest and I will spend the taxpayers' money right. There is no crime in asking for a Ministry, but there is a great crime in taking the taxpayers' money and using it in the wrong way.

Most of the citizens of Barbados — because there are still some citizens who are blind, they cannot see, and they will be led until they go right down into the well; but thank God my eyes are open; because when people talk about churches and talk about various persons in the community who have been doing good, as you criticize a certain person over there, you have had it. When men are not good enough to take criticism they have no right in politics. The time has come when the hon. member for St. John who gave his budgetary proposal in here should ask in a decent manner of his colleagues — some of his colleagues have more knowledge of what is necessary to let this country grow and make it a country that should be outstanding. This is like a cake with a beautiful icing on top and when you cut the cake, the inside of it is black and bitter. If you look all around Barbados, there are so many people who have borrowed and borrowed to the extent that they cannot borrow any more; I have said it is time to narrow the gap between the haves and the have-nots. How are we going to do it? Are we going to do it with people coming in Parliament with nothing and going out of Parliament with their pockets full and with big houses and all sorts of things, and deals, and money banking here and there all over the place, even buying properties in the United States of America? Are we going to do it this way? No. Awaken to what is happening, my dear people. Do not wait until it is too late.

I am sure that the lower echelons of this society have the same aspirations that I had

when I had nothing, and those lower echelons need to be supported. They want to know that someone is there giving them confidence and faith in themselves that they can go through and build better and greater for their children. Do not think that I am not a proud woman today because I have children and grand children who can work for me — and let me correct something here now by a newspaper. I am not yet fifty-two years old. I look well for my age but I do not tell people I am 52 when I am not 52. I look damn good. I intend to look good.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would suggest to the hon. member to withdraw that statement 'I look damn good.' Put it in better parliamentary language.

Mrs. EASTMOND: Mr. Deputy Speaker, for my age I still have charm and great charisma.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is a better and more acceptable description of the hon. member.

Mrs. EASTMOND: Is that more acceptable? Very charming.

Now there is another point I want to draw to Your Honour's attention.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: And I would like to draw to the attention of the hon. member that she has only two more minutes.

Mrs. EASTMOND: Only two more minutes. Thanks, Sir.

The Hon. Prime Minister was worried about our balance of payments, and banned English apples and grapes, turkies and certain things, but yet he is permitting motor cars valuing \$20,000, \$30,000 and maybe \$50,000 to come into the country. A ban should be put on cars costing over \$15,000. If we are serious about the economy of this country we have to take some drastic steps to keep the money here. Certain food stuff that people want, you are going to ban and still you are going to bring in — nobody can sleep in a motor car; a motor car is not a house. The people want good houses; let the Government decide to allow certain things to come in that would make these people as comfortable as possible.

Again I say we need action, and the action from what I have seen is not forthcoming from the other side. They have been propping up a long time on a certain member over there and

that certain member has only lost his prestige by sticking around, but let him go ahead that is his business. As far as I am concerned and as far as the majority of people in this country are concerned there are two parties – because it is difficult for a third party to have any real rooting in this country especially in an election year, and since the Government's party has not got the answers, has no policy – they just pull things out of the hat and as they pull something out of a hat they say 'Ah, this is it, let us do that.' Just like the ship. There is a lot of talk about that, there is a lot of scandal in the Housing Corporation. Where there is not scandal and talk, I do not know. Wherever you turn you hear people, especially church people today telling you that what they have against the Government is that there are too many loop-holes and too much money not being accounted for in the right places, and the things that are hidden from the electorate the people want to know; and if the Opposition should take the Government I hope and pray they will have decentralized departments where in each parish or constituency the people of this country will know what is happening.

3.35 p.m.

Politics does not only mean that the politicians who are in power are the ones who must talk politics, it is the people who put us here, it is the people who have the power and it is the people who we must hear, and I hope that these people will realise that the time has come for a change, and the change is not far off regardless of whether it is three, four or five weeks. The Barbados Labour Party – and I am saying it and I am not ashamed to say it – because when people that you have been with can tell you you are mad and impute this...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let the hon. member conclude her speech, please.

Mrs. EASTMOND: ... it means that I have no use for them. Thank God there are no records that can show that I have been mad, and I thank them for the time that I have been with them, I thank them for the experience, and most of all I thank the true God for giving me the courage and the strength to come out and say what I have said today, because the hon. member for St. John says he does not believe in immortality, but I believe in immortality and I believe that there is a true and living God. He is going to judge all of us. The hon. member says he has to get whatever he can now here on this earth, and perhaps what he wanted might have been shares in Gertz Supermarket, thank God Gertz

Supermarket still stands as Gertz and her family. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If there is no other hon. member who would like to contribute to this debate, I suppose the mover of the motion is willing to reply.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as far as I can see, no other hon. member wishes to speak so I will exercise my right of final reply.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir. There are two points here. The mover of the motion has to speak before he can reply. Secondly, I have never heard of the mover of an amendment replying. I am the mover of the motion and if you call on me to reply I will reply, but I am the mover of the motion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: What is being debated before this House is an amended motion. What is being discussed here before the House is an amendment to the motion. If the hon. member for St. Thomas wishes to, or if any other hon. member, he can although he might have spoken on the substantive motion he can speak again on the amendment to the motion. From the time that the amendment was accepted by the Chamber, or was introduced, the debates would have been in respect of the amendment. We are discussing the amended motion. There is an amended motion. The hon. member has had the right to speak on the amended motion. That is what we are discussing. The amendment to the motion has been seconded and therefore that is the motion before the House. That is my ruling.

Mr. ADAMS: I do not quite understand this business. On whom is Your Honour calling to speak? The mover of the amendment or the mover of the motion at this stage?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The motion being discussed is the amendment to the motion.

Mr. ADAMS: There is a motion, there is an amendment, there is a right to move an amendment to the amendment if we want to, if Your Honour is with me, but what I really want to deal with was whether Your Honour's remarks were directed towards the person who moved the amendment, but he has not moved it yet, he has not made a speech, he reserved his right to speak.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The appropriate amendment has been moved and seconded, and

I shall read the amendment. What is before the House now is this motion, "that this House take note of the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals presented by the Minister of Finance and commends the Government for the sound measures taken to reduce inflation and to ensure the continued economic stability of the country." That is what we are discussing.

Mr. ADAMS: We are discussing that the words proposed to be inserted be added. That being so, Sir, I understand what you mean. When you said the mover of the motion you had me baffled, Sir.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: There is only one motion now before the House, Sir. May I explain the position to him?

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am listening to a point of order.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of privilege which must take precedence over all other matters.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Not necessarily. It is in the discretion of the Speaker or the Chairman to accept a point of privilege. I will listen to the hon. member's point, but it is not customary for one to get up on a point of order or a point of privilege when another hon. member is on a point of order. I will listen to both sides, but let us listen to the point of the hon. member for St. John.

Mr. HINDS: A point of privilege must take precedence over any other motion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is in the discretion of the Speaker. I will hear the hon. member.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The position is simple, Sir. When the question is put, whenever it is put, on the amended motion and that motion is passed, the substantive motion cannot stand. If the amended motion is defeated the Hon. Leader of the Opposition then has an opportunity to go on to speak on his original motion and reply to that, but I think he understands that. What privilege could arise out of that? Anybody with the most elementary knowledge of parliamentary procedure would know that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. John has made his point. Let me hear

the point of the hon. member for St. Peter, a point of order.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, anybody over there can put whatever they want. The hon. member for St. John rose and began to speak. Suddenly the lights from the cameras came on. This, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am submitting is an encroachment upon the rights and privileges of hon. members, and until we are told what right even now men have standing where they are in this Hon. House, we are submitting that the cameras and all the equipment should be thrown out of this Hon. House. This is a very serious matter, Sir. All we have been told today is that permission has been given for this equipment to remain on for as long as necessary or until it was necessary for it to remain.

3.45 p.m.

It was given to us to understand that an application or something of the sort would be made before this Honourable House so that all hon. members could express their feelings on the matter, but nothing has transpired and all we are saying is that even now that I am addressing the Chair, there is somebody aiming the camera in front of me. One would say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that at this stage the camera man ought to be asked to leave the camera until this matter is settled. This question of the privileges of hon. members is being encroached upon, and we are submitting that he is within the Bar of this Honourable House, and any person for that matter can jump from there and go over there and exercise the same right or do as the camera man is doing. This is an infringement of the rights of hon. members. We need your protection in a matter of this sort. You cannot have it like this. I am submitting that there is a question of the privileges of hon. members being encroached upon by having a man behind a camera at this moment. I am not laying any charge against him...

Hon. C. E. TALMA: If the hon. member would give way, on a point of order, I thought the hon. member might have understood by now that His Honour the Speaker has granted permission for the cameras to be in here in order to televise and broadcast the reply by the Minister of Finance, and I have the letters here.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Leader of the House has never given this Honourable House to understand the use of the cameras. He gave us to understand the presence of the equipment being here and when the use of the equipment was queried, the Speaker said

that that would be dealt with at a later stage. If you were to check on the records, you will see that was exactly the position as represented by His Honour the Speaker when he sat in the Chair. The Speaker has told us that he has given permission for the equipment to be on the premises. We tried to find out from the Speaker to what use the equipment would be put and the answer is as I gave it to Your Honour not so long ago. In the circumstances I believe it is not for the Leader of the House to rise now and say he thought "A" understood or that "B" did not understand or that "C" understands something else. This House does not belong to the Leader of the House. It is not his house.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: If Your Honour were to read the letter and the reply, it would clear up the whole issue.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, when we asked His Honour the Speaker to interpret the letter going to him as a document which concerns each and every hon. member, His Honour the Speaker said he was not reading any letter. He said it was a letter addressed to him and he would not read it to the House. All of this is what we tried to debate this morning and we had a reason because we did not want this type of impasse to occur as is occurring now.

You will appreciate, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that His Honour has certain discretions; he has within him a certain authority, but it is not an authority which can take away the rights of each and every hon. member of this House. Look what a farce this Honourable House is being reduced to! What a farce this House is reduced to where there is a man standing in the House beckoning to the Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no man standing in this House beckoning to the Speaker.

Mr. HINDS: Are you in a position to see everything?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Deputy Speaker does not see behind his back.

Mr. HINDS: That is exactly the point I am representing. That is what I am seeking to draw to Your Honour's attention.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Speaker has already given a ruling on this matter, so the question of

privilege does not arise. A matter of privilege can only arise in something that the Speaker has not dealt with.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, His Honour the Speaker has given no ruling as to the use of this television equipment in here today, and anyone who suggests that His Honour has given a ruling misunderstands the question altogether.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Would the hon. member please take his seat?

Perhaps if I were to read these two letters, hon. members would be quite clear as to what is happening and the use of the Speaker's discretion one way or another.

"M.P. 0015 Vol. XXV/88

3rd August, 1976.

His Honour the Speaker,
House of Assembly,
Public Buildings,
BRIDGETOWN.

Sir,

Further to my letter No. 0015 Vol. XXIV of 28th July 1976 about the presentation by the Minister of Finance and Planning of his Budgetary Proposals for 1976-77 to the House of Assembly, I seek Your Honour's permission for the Minister's final reply in the debate on those Budgetary Proposals to be broadcast from the Chamber by the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation and Barbados Rediffusion Service by television and radio, on Wednesday 4th August 1976, or on such other day on which it may be made.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,

Your obedient servant

C. EDWY TALMA
Leader of the House.

c.c. Clerk of Parliament,
Chief Information Officer (for making the necessary arrangements with the radio and television stations)."

The reply is dated 4th August, 1976.

"Hon. C. E. Talma, C.B.E., M.P.,
Leader of the House of Assembly,
Ministry of State,
Government Headquarters,
Bay Street,
St. Michael.

Sir,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter dated 3rd August, 1976, Ref: M.P. 0015 Vol. XXV/88.

I am to inform you that permission is granted for the Minister of Finance and Planning's final reply in the debate on the Budgetary Proposals to be broadcast from the Chamber by the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation and Barbados Rediffusion Service by television and radio, on 4th August, 1976, or on such other day on which it may be made.

Yours respectfully,
C. A. E. Hoppin,
Speaker, House of Assembly".

From the letter, the Speaker has granted permission and I now so inform the House that the Speaker has granted permission for the broadcasting of the final reply by the Minister of Finance on the Budgetary Proposals. I think it is quite clear, having read those letters, that the Speaker has given permission, and that is the position as it stands.
3.55 p.m.

Mr. ADAMS: I also wrote to the Speaker. In fact I set out both possibilities, that there could be one reply or two replies. From the time that the Leader of the House rose, the Minister of Finance had no right of final reply. Mr. Speaker gave permission.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have already dealt with that. I will not entertain anything against the ruling of the Speaker. The Speaker has already given permission, and if anyone wants to question the action of the Speaker, it will have to be done by way of a substantive motion.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order. What I am saying is that at the time when he ruled, he was ruling on a possibility and not on a certainty; but nevertheless he has ruled and I am not questioning it. I am just saying that it depends on what actually took place at the time at which he ruled; but the point has been

developed. I also wrote to the Speaker asking for the television camera for such speech as I might make in reply. The Speaker has not replied to that letter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is not for me. Such information as I have from His Honour the Speaker I have given to the House. I will not entertain any question of why the Speaker did this or that because I do not know why. I have got before me a letter. I will inquire into it.

Mr. ADAMS: Can I move the suspension of the House while the letter is being checked and let Your Honour rule?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If you want to move the suspension of the House....

Mr. ADAMS: It is a matter of privilege. If one member writes to the Speaker on a subject and he knows that another member has written on a subject, and the member has got a reply, surely I should get a reply too.

Mr. WALCOTT: That cannot arise. If the Speaker has made a decision on a matter, that cannot be a matter of privilege. It is in the Standing Orders.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not think that the hon. member has been rising on a matter of privilege in respect of a decision made. The hon. member is rising on a point of privilege in respect of a letter which he purports to have written to the Speaker. The hon. member for St. Peter rose on a point of privilege in respect of television cameras being here. As a result of this point of privilege, this Chamber has been told the reason for the cameras being here. Letters have been written, and I have been told that the Speaker has given permission for the T.V. cameras and operators to be here. What I am saying is that the hon. member for St. Thomas cannot question a decision of the Speaker. My impression is that the hon. member rose on a point of privilege about a letter which he purports to have written to the Speaker. I cannot rule on this question of privilege. The Speaker will be in the Chair later today, and the hon. member can rise on that matter of privilege where he has written a letter and got no reply. I do not know about the letter. I have not seen it and I am not going to make a decision on it.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, with all respect to you.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will not entertain any discussion on a point of privilege except on one matter. The hon. member rose on a point of privilege in respect of television cameras, and that matter has been cleared up. I have ruled and made a decision. The hon. member rose on a point of privilege. No other member can rise on that point of privilege, according to the Standing Orders of this House until that matter has been cleared up. What I have said is that the Speaker himself will have to clear that matter up when he is in the Chair. I am not entertaining any other point of privilege on that matter.

Mr. HINDS: The point of privilege which I am on, Mr. Deputy Speaker,.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will not accept any point of privilege until the one before the House is cleared. The Standing Orders are quite clear on that.

Mr. HINDS: I was addressing the Chair on a point of privilege.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have already ruled on that point of privilege. I am satisfied that the point of privilege has been made. I ruled on it and will not entertain any further discussion on that, nor will I entertain any discussion on the point of privilege raised by the hon. member for St. Thomas on which a decision has not yet been made.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy speaker, I am not discussing the point raised by the hon. member for St. Thomas, the point that I am making affects the rights of each and every member to have the same T.V. facilities here this afternoon. If one member has been given T.V. facilities, any other member who wants to address the House this evening should be given that same privilege.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member would be entitled to raise that point of privilege if the Speaker or the Presiding Officer accepts his proposal. I sat and heard mention made of this matter earlier today on a point raised. That is the point I am making. The matter has been cleared up. The hon. member for Christ Church West raised the point today, and I will not accept any other point of privilege from the hon. member for St. Peter or any other hon. member.

Mr. HINDS: I agree with you.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member will please take his seat. What I understand to

be your point of privilege is a point of privilege which was raised by the hon. member for Christ Church West today. There is no debate on a point of privilege and therefore we cannot have a discussion on the same point of privilege today.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order. There is no question of any debate. We are asking for a ruling.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will not be browbeaten into having further discussion on this point. The Speaker, the substantive holder of the post, made a ruling today on that matter. As far as I am concerned, that matter is settled, and I will not accept discussion on that same point. If hon. members are not satisfied with the ruling of the Presiding Officer of the Chamber, the instrument is there to deal with it.

Mr. ADAMS: Is it not best to summon the Speaker and let him rule on my letter, Sir? Because if, as Your Honour says, nothing can be done about my point of privilege because you do not have the letter and you had no instructions, is it not best.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think it is out of order to ask the Deputy Speaker to sent for the Speaker.

Mr. ADAMS: I am not reflecting on the Deputy Speaker in any way, and you know that. But you have said that you have not seen the letter and have been given no instructions. Therefore the only person who can resolve this matter is the Speaker.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. You cannot have a discussion with the Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have so indicated already. There is a motion before the House. I want to make it clear that the Speaker has given permission to have the address televised and broadcast by CBC and Rediffusion. A few minutes ago I was looking around to see if any hon. member wanted to make any further contribution to the motion before the House on the amended motion. I waited and I drew to hon. members attention that if there was no other member willing to contribute at that point in time to the motion before the House I would call on the mover of that motion to reply. No other member stood in his seat. The hon. member for St. John the mover of that motion stood in his place to address the House.

As far as I am concerned, for the hon. member of St. John it is the time to reply on that motion. I am instructing C.B.C. operators to get the cameras in motion in accordance with the decision of the Speaker, and I will call on the hon. member for St. John to exercise his right of reply. That is my ruling.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. With respect, there are two points I wish to raise. I do not like to interrupt the Chair when the Chair is speaking. I believe that one must wait until the Chair is finished. I believe that the point I made this morning was never ruled on. The position is that the Speaker said this morning that at the appropriate time he would indicate what was his ruling. The point I raised was that all members were entitled to similar treatment, and I respectfully ask that the point be ruled on. The second point I wish to raise is that at the time when Your Honour made your indication, the hon. member for St. John came in. Before other members could give their indication, various points of order and privilege arose.

4.05 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the hon. member would take his seat. The hon. member for St. John was in his place standing and he began to address the Chair. (*Aside*) The hon. member for St. John began to address the Chair. The records are there. When the hon. member began to address the Chair, then the hon. member for St. Thomas rose on a point of order. I do not want to deny hon. members the right to reply but in as much as the hon. member for St. John who introduced the amendment was standing and he began to address the Chair — he did address the Chair — what I would like to suggest is that the discretion of the House be sought, or if the hon. member would give way since there seems to have been — (*Aside*) I would not like to say it is uncouth but it is out of order for hon. members to be speaking on either side when the Chair is speaking.

The point I have been trying to establish is that I do not think that the hon. member for St. John would like to deny any other hon. member the right to contribute to this debate but if he stood in his place because hon. members did not rise, and since it is now indicated that hon. members want to rise because there was some confusion or ambiguity as to whether they were speaking on one motion or other, I would like ascertain from the hon. member if (*Aside*) Yes, I will have to ascertain from the hon. member

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, not too long

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Deputy Speaker, is speaking. Let the hon. member take his place and have some manners. The only person to whom I should listen on a point of order is the hon. member for St. Michael West. I asked the hon. member for Christ Church West to take his seat and I was speaking. Let me continue what I am saying.

Mr. CRAIG: I thought you were having a private conversation there, Sir. That is why I got on my feet; but as far as my manners are concerned I will accede to your request if you ask me to take my seat. Do not mind my manners for now. I thought you were carrying on a private conversation over there with the Prime Minister, and I got up, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The point I am making is that if the hon. member for St. John who was given the right by the Chair to speak — because he stood in his place when the hon. member for St. Thomas rose on a point of order — would reserve his right to speak for other members to make a contribution to the debate, this would be quite in order. (*Aside*) If I were to rule according to how I should rule, if I am to rule, it is the time for the hon. member for St. John to speak. What I am saying is that if the hon. member for St. John is willing to give way to other members by reserving his right to speak, I will permit this.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, can I speak now, Sir.....

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member is on a point of order. The hon. member for St. John.....

Mr. HINDS: Is it on a point of order?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Sir, you called on me and I ask to be heard without interruption on this matter. Without interruption. I am very serious about it. They are reducing Parliament now to some kind of circus. The position today in here, Sir, is that having delivered himself fulsomely and in full view of the general public of Barbados, there is some conspirative attempt to prevent the Government from replying. There is no doubt in my mind whatsoever on that.

Now I want to say this, Sir. We sat here not on one but on three occasions. On three separate occasions

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Do you mean each time a member of the Government gets up to speak there is a point of order? It has to be something out of the order book, Sir.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the hon. member gets up on a point of order, I will have to hear the point of order and determine and rule on the point of order.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member for St. John has stated that there is a conspirative attempt to deny the Government members from replying. This could only be to the Opposition, Sir. If not the Opposition, who else? We are asking that he withdraw the remarks, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I can only rule something unparliamentary if it is offensive or if the statement is considered by me unparliamentary. The hon. member has made his point of order. Let the hon. member take his seat.

Mr. HINDS: What Sir?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let the hon. member take his seat. The hon. member has made his point.

Mr. HINDS: I ask.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member has got to take his seat. He has made his point.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Now what is he on now?

Mr. FORDE: You will hear what I am on if.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I have not heard you yet.

Mr. FORDE: Wait, eh.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am waiting.

Mr. FORDE: Sir,.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There are two members on their feet.

Mr. FORDE: On a point of order, Sir. You will recall that I was speaking when you asked

me to take my seat. I must ask for your guidance to take my seat. If I am making a submission to the Chair and I have not completed my submission, the Chair does not hear me out, I would expect that the Chair would have heard me out on the position as I saw it. I was asking for the Chair to give me a particular guidance and to protect my right now as a member of this House representing a constituency.

What I am saying, Sir, is that in the midst of the contretemps — the talk that was going on between the various parties, your guidance was being sought as to various persons' rights to reply. In the meantime the hon. member for St. John said that if there was no other member who had anything to say, he would wish to make his reply; before any other member got to his feet, there began a conversation on various points of order and procedure which should take place.

Now, Sir, I never tried to talk at the same time as various other members are talking but the fact that one remains silent does not mean that at that stage, in my submission to you, Sir, that hon. members should not be given an opportunity then to say having regard to the guidance which was finally given as to the motion and the amended motion — and in my submission, in those circumstances it seems to me that my right as an individual in those circumstances have been taken away, not wittingly, Sir, I am saying in the confusion which has occurred.

4.15 p.m.

In my submission, in those circumstances it seems to me that my right as an individual is being taken away, not wittingly, Sir, I am saying in the confusion which has occurred, and it is but right that hon. members should be given an opportunity to talk if we are now told that we are on the amended motion and not the motion. This is the point I am making.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is the opinion of the Chair that every hon. member who wants to speak on this motion, since there seems to have been some sort of confusion, should be allowed to speak, and therefore the Chair is prepared to allow addresses from hon. members on either side.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Sir, I was interrupted and I just want to make my position clear. I was misquoted just

now. I did not say that I was waiting to see, I said that no other hon. members appeared to want to speak, and it was three times that it occurred today. We would even omit and forget, commit an act of oblivion about the behaviour yesterday when there were five members of the Opposition and we needed one for a quorum and they refused to come in to do the people's business. I am saying they do not want the public to hear what we have to say, and before the hon. member for St. Peter rose to speak, there was a deadly silence on that side, because they had no intention of getting up until the very last minute, and they did it three times today.

When I rose to speak I said it did not appear to me that any other hon. member wanted.....(Mr. HINDS: I have not spoken, Sir).... He has spoken too much already.

Mr. HINDS: All you must do is put a lasso to my mouth.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I did not think a lasso could get over your mouth. Your mouth is not all that big man, do not do yourself disservice by suggesting.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER rose.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let both hon. members take their seats. The Speaker warned the Gallery today. I warned the Gallery not so long ago, and I am asking the Marshal to have the Gallery cleared. There were two warnings to the Gallery. I am not referring to the inner Gallery, the Press and those in the inner Gallery can stay.

Mr. HINDS: Everybody goes out, no exception, the Gallery is the Gallery. You cannot chase out half the Gallery.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Press has permission to stay.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, what is before the House?

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This sitting is suspended for 10 minutes.
4.25 p.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed.

I have been instructed by the Deputy Speaker, that he requested to have the Gallery

cleared and after the suspension visitors could re-enter.

Please take your seats orderly. Any hon. member who wishes to make a contribution, I am willing to hear.

Miss MILLER: Mr. Speaker, like the rest of Barbados, I sat through forty minutes in which the Prime Minister put his Budgetary Proposals to the Nation. It has already been mooted in this place that the Economic Review as is customary was not put to the Nation. I have observed in the course of the Budgetary Proposals that certain other customs had not been observed. For instance, Mr. Speaker, mention was made of a 25% tax credit; mention was made of a 10% withholding tax, mention was made of a 10% travel tax. The Prime Minister as we have grown to expect might have informed the nation of the quantity of money he would have expected to raise by virtue of these tax measures. He declined to put that. My own opinion of course is that had an economic review been read, had the quantities of money been disclosed to the House and the nation, that the budget speech in fact would have gone on for much longer than forty minutes. By the same token, of course, the Opposition would have had much longer than forty minutes to reply, on television that is.

There was talk in here today about certain members not wishing to cooperate, but it is my view, Mr. Speaker, that as has been the custom of this Government, too much has been left unsaid. As has become the custom of this Government too much remains hidden not only from the hon. members of this ancient and Honourable House, but from the man in the street. We were treated, Mr. Speaker, to another of those 1976 hurry-come-up, rough-shod measures. We of course bear in mind that 1976 has long since been entitled the year of the gimmick, the year of the trick, as long as members on this side have audience in this Chamber, much of what the other side over there would want to keep hidden will be revealed.

There were revelations on Friday and there will be more revelations today and in the fullness of time, to use the phrase so often used by the hon. member for St. Thomas, in the fullness of time there are going to be further and worse revelations to come. Today we heard the hon. member on the other side make reference to the sewerage system and the water system that is proposed. I have waited in vain for the Minister of Health to speak on this matter because after all it is his Ministry, he is signatory to the contract on behalf of the Government of

Barbados, but for reasons best known to himself he has declined to speak so far. I wish to speak on this matter.

The matter of a sewerage plant was much canvassed during the city by-election and even if perchance the Minister of Health or members on that side who are deemed to know about this contract would claim that it was an oversight or it slipped somebody's memory, this matter has been under heated debate in other places. Now the Minister was very careful today to read out bits and pieces from the Resolution which was brought from the Inter-American Development Bank. What was not known to the Minister at the time was that the Opposition does not only have in its possession this Resolution dated 9th October, 1975; the Opposition also has in its possession a copy of the Loan Contract between Barbados and the Inter-American Development Bank dated 8th April, 1976. It also has in its possession the agreement for technical cooperation between Barbados and the Inter-American Development Bank also dated 8th April, 1976. The hon. member just quoted Clause 8(h) as he saw fit and made out a case that the Sewerage plant would take four years to completion and that the sub-clause contemplates that the gradual increase in rates should take place within three years after the completion, therefore giving us a total of seven years before an increase in water rates might occur. Mr. Speaker, this is another vain attempt to distract members from the truth of the matter. This is another conscious and deliberate attempt to mislead this House. The last sentence in that clause reads, Mr. Speaker:

"That in view of the foregoing such graduated rates shall be presented to the Bank within thirty months of the date of the loan contract."

Now the hon. member quoted from the Technical Agreement Cooperation Agreement which is a document drawn and signed subsequent to the Resolution. The Resolution is dated 9th October, 1975. I am quoting from the Resolution. I read again: "In view of the foregoing such graduated rates shall be presented to the Bank (that is, the Inter-American Development Bank) within thirty days of the date of the loan contract."

Mr. Speaker, the point is that the Resolution and the contract itself have as conditions in black and white and within their contemplation certain basic facts.

4.50 p.m.

It is clear from the resolution and from the contract that the rates, the gradual increase of rates do not have to wait for completion of the sewage plant; In fact, to the contrary, the resolution and the contract make it clear that these rates have got to be completed and submitted to the bank well before the completion of the contract.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the resolution and the contract state among other things that within 45 months of the date of the contract, that date being April, 1976, this instant year, that the water system must be transferred and be fully operational to what would be the Water Sewage Authority. The hon. member made mention of the fact that, as he would have it, the sewage plant would not get under construction before 1977. I draw it to the attention of this House that the Resolution and the contract signed between this Government and the Inter-American Development Bank state very clearly that until the first disbursement is taken up — if the first disbursement is not taken up on or before 9th October 1976, this instant year, that the contract will automatically be terminated.

So it is a gross and deliberate mis-statement to say in here today that the sewage plant will not get underway before 1977. The first funds must be drawn down before the 9th October, 1976. That is a fact signed to. So are we to believe that the sewage plant is going to cost \$27 million (Bds) when the resolution and the contract state clearly that the Inter-American Development Bank is putting up \$9,700,000(US) almost \$20 million (Bds)?

We find that the upshot of that will be that the Barbados Government is going to have to look for another may be \$7.5 or \$7.56 million. That has been kept from us. I believe that this is the first time that you will be hearing this. All of this is in the document, and he will get up in here and try to pretend that when the Leader of the Opposition said on Friday that these are tax levies which the Government of Barbados knows in the very near future are going to be inflicted upon the public of Barbados to support a sewage system which will be surely for the benefit of the merchants of Bridgetown, that this is misleading the public.

That is patently untrue, and that is why I at least would have expected that the Minister of Health who is a signatory to this document — he said that he went to Washington and signed it. That I did not know, but I know it now. I would have thought that he would have obtained and made some sort of disclosure to this House. The

contract and the technical co-operation agreement go further and make it clear that it is within their contemplation that the Waterworks Department as we know it now, will have to partake in this gradual increase in rates. That is something that has got to be studied and analysed and put before the Inter-American Development Bank in great detail within the next two and a half years.

It is abundantly clear to me that the hon. member for St. Michael South Central has not read the contract nor the resolution; but we have read them, and we make it our business to let this House and the country know that this is the sort of Government we have, a Government which for months and years now has been telling the people of Barbados half truths. In fact, the total unvarnished truth is unknown in too many aspects of the Democratic Labour Party Government as we know it. Their technique is one of coming to the nation and to this House with half truths, and on many occasions with no truth at all. At this going down all the truth will have to be known.

The Leader of the Opposition made it clear on Friday – and I repeat here today because it bears constant repetition – that the people of Barbados deserve to know in this election year after 15 years in Government, and certainly to my own knowledge, at least five years of total mismanagement of government business what the state of the nation is.

The Prime Minister came in here and he spoke about the Corporation Tax. He added a few more items to the exemption list in respect of the Retail Sales Tax – drugs, sewing machines and seeds. What about toiletries, Mr. Speaker? This Budget only touches the small minority groups in this country. It does not touch the broad masses of the people. It is not every citizen of Barbados who uses drugs. It is not every citizen of Barbados who wants a sewing machine. It is not every citizen of Barbados who buys seeds or cigarettes; but every citizen to my certain knowledge uses toilet paper, soap and toothpaste. (*Aside*) You must speak for yourself, if you do not use them.

Mr. SPEAKER: I use them please. You are addressing me.

Miss MILLER: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I beg your pardon.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please continue.

Miss MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I am constantly being led away by asides from an hon. member

who constantly makes asides. I was not referring to you. If he is not interested in the exemption of toiletries because he has no use for toiletries, here is not the place to ventilate that.

5.00 p.m.

This House and this country full well knows that my father and the Barbados Labour Party are committed to the abolition of the sales tax as we now know it, as has been inflicted upon us; this five percent sales tax. This total abolition of it; but if the Prime Minister has come in here to do three or four things which we have been crying out for for months for him to do, these things come as no surprise to us. The tax credit comes as no surprise to us. From the day of its imposition we have cried out against it. The exemption in respect of drugs again comes as no surprise to us. We have cried out for this. This is a budget, Mr. Speaker, which as I have said before touches a few select minority groups in Barbados. The broad mass of people still feel the pinch as they have been feeling it and will go on to feel it. This is a feeble effort and I am amazed that the man who came in here with this puny effort should get up today and suggest that he should be commended for it, Mr. Speaker. Commended.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I spoke this morning and what I said this morning it is still the same day. I will correct the hon. lady member who is new to the House, but let me do it please. Please refer to any member as the hon. member. Not 'the man'. You are doing pretty well. So let us get it that way.

Miss MILLER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Prime Minister; I will repeat it. That the hon. Prime Minister should come with a puny, feeble, hurry-come-up, half-baked speech, half a speech on Friday 30th July and come back today on August 4 to ask this Honourable House to commend him for that? Mr. Speaker, in my view there is nothing for commendation there. There is no cause for celebration in this. The man in the street feels the pinch, the shopkeepers are feeling it, the housewives are feeling it, we all feel it. There is no relief here for us. We were grateful when we heard that the hon. Prime Minister was going to come with a budget speech. After all, Mr. Speaker, we have screeched, screamed, thundered, begged, pleaded; all we did not do in here was to get down on our knees for him to bring a budget speech; but then to bring this, Mr. Speaker, and ask us to commend him for it? And now want to make a reply to the Opposition's reply?

Mr. Speaker, are you aware that if you go out in the street today, and you ask anybody passing what they thought of the budget speech, the general answer to that question is, what speech? I do not know if you are aware of that Mr. Speaker, but that is the kind of comment that you hear on the street.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is one other thing that I wish to allude to, which has come up in the course of this whole budget debate. I am bitterly ashamed when I reflect that the hon. member for St. Michael South Central and the Attorney General are members of my profession. I am ashamed. And Q.C.'s at that. You see, Mr. Speaker, that is what happens when you get these type of Q.C.'s being made. Bitterly ashamed, that the Chief Legal Officer, the Attorney General of this country should be totally unaware of one of the basic first legal principles — that of conflict of interests. I hear another member of my profession out there giggling, Mr. Speaker, but I cannot pay any attention to him because that is another cause for shame. Another cause for shame. How is it, Mr. Speaker, that the Attorney General — and the Prime Minister makes this perfectly clear. During the months of November and December, 1975, January, February, March, April, May, 1976 should have — I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker. During the months of November and December 1974, January, February, March, April and May 1975, that his Ministry, a department of Government under his direction should have a certain person and/or bank, and/or company under investigation, and that that Chief Legal Officer should at the same time during the course of the period that I have just pointed out to you, Mr. Speaker, be carrying on private business transactions with that same person and/or company and/or bank? That the Attorney General should make it abundantly clear on the front page of our daily newspaper that he does not see any conflict of interests there, is a great cause for shame in the profession. (*Aside*) The Government's Chief Interpreter. I do not know; these things are sent to try me, Mr. Speaker.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister who is speaking has already spoken. The Minister of Education, I have it noted that he has already spoken on this Resolution.....

Miss MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I do not know why the Lord sets the Hon. Minister of Education and the member for St. Michael West to constantly interrupt me. Anyhow,.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am safeguarding your interests.

Miss MILLER: Thanks, Mr. Speaker.....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Let me hear your point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. lady member said that I have interrupted her. I intended to interrupt her to ask her if it is true that the broad masses of this country do not use medicine, but I did not interrupt her because she was speaking; but I am sure she does not mean that. That is what she said but she had better correct it now that I have interrupted her.

Miss MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I do not have anything to correct. It would not be true to say that every person in Barbados uses medicine. I do not use it. The point is that the budget does not touch every person as it ought to do. There are things affecting every person, and every person is working for relief. It is not only the people who use drugs and who will benefit from the ten percent tax credit who need relief, Mr. Speaker. All of us need it. It is only a select group of people who are going to benefit by the ten percent tax credit. I am glad for them but I am sad for the people who find no benefit, no tax relief under this budget, and he knows that that is what I mean. He is only trying to get away from the toilet paper talk.

Mr. SPEAKER: Due to the interruption you have two minutes more.

Miss MILLER: I am thankful to you, Mr. Speaker,.....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I would not get down to that level with the lady.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Miss MILLER: Mr. Speaker, in the two minutes left to me I want to say that it is almost beyond my belief; had I not seen it with my two eyes in the newspaper yesterday, that the Attorney General should not understand where a conflict of interests arises. This man is a lawyer, a Q.C., this man is the Chief Legal Officer of Barbados.

5.10 p.m.

This man is a lawyer, a Q.C. — albeit Government made — this man is the chief legal adviser of Barbados. There is no hard law in that, Mr. Speaker, take it from me. That is one of the first basic principles, and all of these revelations and all of these disclosures they will try to patch as best they can, but, Mr. Speaker, no kind of patching will stretch wide enough to cover all the mighty sins of commission and of omission committed by this Democratic Labour Party Government. The time for them to answer up is drawing very near, and if this budget speech — although I hesitate to call it that — a half budget speech, is intended to be any kind of palliative, or any kind of answer or any kind of account to the people of Barbados, it is my considered opinion and that of the Barbados Labour Party that it must be termed a dismal and a total failure.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the amended resolution on which I rise reads: "That this House takes note of the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals presented by the Minister of Finance and commends the Government for the sound measures taken to reduce inflation and to ensure the continued economic stability of the Country."

On Friday, 30th July, 1976 at about one minute to 5 o'clock the Prime Minister delivered or read these budgetary proposals to the nation. As I understand the proposals, Mr. Speaker, there are going to be additional tax burdens on certain sectors of the community especially the commercial and mercantile sector of our community. Other than that, the budgetary proposals purport not to levy any further taxation on the people of this country.

Sir, this is 1976 and an election year. For me to examine the budgetary proposals of the Minister of Finance in their true context it is necessary for me to return to the year 1971 at about the same time as we are now sitting or were sitting in July, 1971. I well remember that budget debate and in particular the presentation of the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals for 1971 and I recall the Prime Minister saying there would be no taxation in 1971, and he ended his speech by saying "Advance with the Dems." Shortly after we were in the throes of a general election. So having given a freeness in the election year of 1971, what were the taxpayers of this country faced with after 1971?

Now let us examine the years from 1971 to 1976, Sir. Notwithstanding the promises of freeness, in 1972 there was an enquiry into the bus fares in this country. The result of that

enquiry at which Mr. Wendell McClean was then the economic adviser to the Transport Board who were asking for increases shows that the bus fares of this country were increased, No. 1. No. 2, in the same year, 1972, the year after the election and after the massive vote of confidence in the Government to the tune of 18 seats, a land tax was introduced in Barbados which had the effect of burdening the taxpayers of this country even further. A new system of taxation on land was conceived and the rate of tax was levied in accordance with the ministerial order. That was 1972.

In 1973, I believe it may have been 1974 and I am prepared to be corrected on this, there was an increase in the water rates of this country by a multiplication of four. In 1974 there was also an enquiry by the Public Utilities Board into the electricity rates of this country. The Government as the single largest user of electricity in this country did not deem it fit, right, meet or expedient to send through the Attorney General's Office anyone to object to the increase in electricity rates. The result was that the electric company got a free ride and we know now there being no objection out of Government of fuel adjustment charges and kindred levies in our electricity supply being imposed. In the same 1974 there was an increase sought by the Barbados Telephone Company. The first objectors were the Bajan Consumer League, thereafter Mr. Eric Sealy, thereafter Mr. Miles Rothwell and Nurse Thompson, individuals.

The last objector to the telephone rates was the Government, as the single largest consumer of telephones in this country, and only after Mr. Eric Sealy had gone to Marine House and there were photographs of him sitting with the Attorney General to try and point out to him the necessity for Government to object to the telephone rates. What we witnessed therefore up to the time of the telephone enquiry was a steady increase in the cost of living in this country, the imposition of certain taxes and the failure by the Government in respect of certain utilities to be aware of its responsibilities to the public and to make the necessary objections.
5.20 p.m.

I am not like others in here who are prepared to take credit for everything they do. I know that I sat for fourteen days in the telephone enquiry and far from the Telephone Company getting 13.8% return on their capital, they were awarded only 10%. Now in December or late November, 1974, a 5% sales tax was introduced and a corporation tax, despite the Prime Minister's assertions in 1968, I believe it

was on the 19th January or it may have been the 16th January, 1968, that he had no intention of introducing a corporation tax in Barbados. That was six years before, and I am not being critical of him for that because in six years a lot of water can flow under the bridge and a man can change his mind; but in November or December a corporation tax was introduced in this country and 372 items I believe were also subject to customs duty and the cost of living increased by the imposition of duties on these items.

Now the day after the mini Budget, the Leader of the Opposition who had sat the previous night until 3.30 a.m. at Labour Party Headquarters with some of us going through the Budgetary Proposals of 1974 and made the reply, came in here and said that it was his Party which was against the Corporation Tax in its then form and asked the Government to give us a tax credit such as we have now got in the proposals of 1976. In addition thereto he pointed out that the sales tax bore a particularly heavy burden as the hon. member for the City has said on people who use drugs and medicine. He even went so far as to call on the Government to take off the tax for fishing tackle and off fertilisers because if you were saying on the one hand that you intended to stimulate agriculture, then you were imposing a disincentive to agricultural development if you taxed the fertilisers and insecticides and so on which were in the 372 items.

Now the Minister of Education today expressed wonder at the speech made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition in reply to the Prime Minister's proposals last Friday, but I believe there are members in here or in the Democratic Labour Party who have me on tape last Wednesday night in the Prime Minister's constituency in a district known as College Bottom, two days before the Budgetary Proposals were read, and I told the audience there that the Prime Minister had to amend the Corporation Tax legislation. He had promised it earlier this year. It therefore was not difficult to anticipate that he would have to come in and amend it. He promised it about March or April this year. That one a blind man could see. I said then that it was necessary to do something about cigarettes and I mentioned that in Church Village in St. Philip after 1974 certain shops went out of the cigarette trade because of the administrative difficulty of dealing with the 5% on a box of cigarettes to the extent, I believe, there may be about three shops in Church Village where you can get cigarettes. I pointed out further that he had to do something about the sales tax. This was last Wednesday. I did not see the budget, but it has always been our party's policy from November 1974 when it was

introduced to abolish it, and I identified the areas of drugs and vegetable seeds because as I pointed out there are people in the country who stay at home and they have a little piece of kitchen garden which they work during the day to assist them in meeting the high cost of living which all of us acknowledge, and it was bearing particularly harshly on that sector.

I do not claim or profess to have the skills in economics which the Leader of the Opposition has, and if I could anticipate some of the things that would come in the Budget, don't you think that he who is more learned than I in that area could see too? It was no big thing. As a matter of fact, as the hon. member for St. Michael North East has said, the Budgetary Proposals have told us nothing about how we are going to get the country going.

Now I digress a little bit. At the same time as we witnessed between the years 1972 after the freeness year and 1975 a steady increase in taxation and a steady increase in the cost of living, the economic sectors of this country were making no progress and appeared to be stultified to the extent that the Prime Minister in virtually every Budget presentation since 1971 has had to use phrases such as "the economy has made little real progress", "the economy was being kept down". Now it is interesting to note that some weeks ago when I made reference in here to the Central Bank Report up to December 1975 for the year ending 1975 the Prime Minister asked me if this was my bible. Yes. It is my new bible, the gospel according to Dr. Blackman and his disciple. The Central Bank Report for 1975 is not only my bible, but an indictment of the member for St. John. Throughout this document which was not read to the nation but which was laid, that is, a review of the economy, one sees a language that is closely similar to the language of the Central Bank of Barbados Review for 1975. Let us take sugar. At page 2 of this document and at page 11 of the Central Bank Review we have here — "The performance of the productive sectors demonstrate a number of encouraging trends. Sugar production fell in physical terms by 11% below the level of 1974." Similarly in the Central Bank Review the same figure of 11% is quoted. "The 97,000 tons of sugar produced was 11% below last year's output and the number of acres harvested was 39,799 compared with 41,431 in 1974."

When you come to page 17 of the Central Bank Report dealing with tourism you find "by the end of the year the number of visitors was 4% lower than in 1974." In the Review of the Economy you see the same kind of language.

"The number of long-stay visitors to the Island in 1975 was 4% lower than in 1974."

Similarly at page 15 when they are dealing with the industrial sector, you find the same language.
5.30 p.m.

So, when the Civil Servants or the speech writers or whoever wrote this document, the Prime Minister himself must have had to resort to the Central Bank's review because the language and the conclusions are similar, if not identical.

Now it is interesting. We have been complaining about the question of unemployment. This document was not read on T.V. and on Radio for the public at large to hear; but on the very first page of this document there are these words dealing with unemployment: "At the Regional level, while the rates of inflation in the more developed countries of CARICOM have fallen from the very high levels experienced in 1974, output has stagnated and unemployment has continued to remain at unacceptably high levels."

Why were these words not read to the general masses of the people who would have watched and listened last Friday afternoon? When, therefore, the Leader of the Opposition by a methodology which he discussed in here said to the nation that the figure of unemployment was about 28 per cent, and showed how he arrived at this figure, how then can it be untrue if their document which was not read says that unemployment has continued to remain at unacceptably high levels?

According to the report of the Central Bank, there was a decline in agriculture, there was a decline in tourism — these are the words I am taking from this report. If the report does not say "decline" it says "downward trend". Nothing went up. When it comes to Construction, this is what the Central Bank has to say: "Activity in the construction sector continued to decline" — in the public sector, the Government which is the largest employer in this country is included in these terms: "In the public sector no major projects were started. Applications to the Town and Country Planning Office for permission to erect new buildings were at the same level as in 1974."

The Leader of the Opposition in his speech last Friday said that the number of houses built by the Housing Corporation were 195 in 1975 and 357 in 1974. Early this year (*Aside*).

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The Hon. Minister has the right of reply.

Mr. SIMMONS: I will deal with him. Let me read what this says because I do not have a verbatim copy of what the Leader of the Opposition said last week. "The number of houses built by the National Housing Corporation (NHC) fell from 357 in 1974 to 195 in 1975." I want to ask the Minister of Housing if he is aware that there was a front page report in the Advocate this year that his Ministry proposed to build 779 houses in less than one year, and that in two years they did not even get near to 600; but this is a year of tricks. Tell the people anything. Do you think you can fool the people all the time?

I am not going to go into all the other aspects of the Central Bank Report. Other people will deal with them. Let us deal with the positive side of the Budgetary Proposals. What, out of the number of proposals are intended to get the economy of this country going? I agree that there has been an international economic depression. Let us be fair. I do not like to accuse the Government unless I have the actual evidence. There is some international economic depressed state, and we will get some of the spin off.

What we are going to do, looking at the matter introspectively as Barbadians within Barbados to stimulate the economy? What do we find here? In my submission, nothing. We are not told what money we are expected to raise from the travelling tickets tax. The Bill has only been laid today, and I have not had the chance to study it in its entirety. What bothers me is that in all of the high falution economic jargon put forth last Friday afternoon, there was this statement put forward, proposals which I believe escaped the ears of those who listened, but did not escape my ears or dim my eyes.

It is on Page 3 of the Budgetary Proposals, last paragraph. I want to know what these words mean. "It will therefore be necessary to simultaneously initiate measures with a view to restoring fiscal balance by 1977-78. In particular revenue collection will have to be streamlined and made more efficient. Consumption spending will have to be severely pruned in order to reduce current account deficit, and every effort will have to be made to concentrate on capital projects which are likely to be productive."

Now, Sir, does the first part of this mean that by 1977 — and we are in 1976 — that in the income year 1977-78 the people of this country will have to pay more taxes? He says that it will be necessary to simultaneously initiate measures with a view to restoring fiscal balance by 1977-78. I would throw out the suggestion that

there will have to be an increase of taxation, perhaps by way of another budget later on this year. If I am wrong, he must correct me. He is the big economic giant.

We are told that consumption spending will have to be severely pruned in order to reduce current account deficit. What does all of that verbiage mean? Tell us quickly. Tell us if by next year we will have to look for more dollars to pay to the Commissioner of Inland Revenue. As regards the sales tax, which our party is committed to abolishing, we are told that it yielded \$5.7 million. This is significant, Mr. Speaker, because \$5.7 million is the precise sum which we voted in March to run the Ministry of External Affairs. We hear that the people are going to have to prune consumption spending but we have heard no statement that the Government intends to prune its External Affairs policy, thereby affecting a saving which could be used in turn for the betterment of the domestic economy.
5.40 p.m.

I notice, Sir, — before I wind up — complaint was made in the budgetary proposals, page 10, Sir, that there was one insurance company which was not paying its taxes for twenty-five years. I think that that is what was said. Let me get the exact words, Sir. "One company in Barbados has paid no tax for twenty-five years". Now the insurance companies and the whole tax system is under the purview and is within the province of the Minister of Finance, and he allowed one company of which he should have had the proper oversight, to get away for twenty-five years? When we say that in managing the economy he has shown himself not to be a vigilant supervisor, manager, then what more evidence do I want than this? This is out of his own mouth and it does not lie in his power to come and say something different now.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the trade tax should be incorporated into the whole corporate system of taxation because the trade tax was introduced in the days of Local Government for people like garage proprietors, wayside repairers of cars and so on, hauling contractors and the like, and it was imposed in return for services rendered by the Local Government Authority. We no longer have Local Government, Mr. Speaker. What therefore is the purpose in its continuance? Could it not be amalgamated and streamlined within the system of corporate taxation? But that would be the subject for, I believe, another member of my party.

Before I sit down, Sir; I began with the text of the Resolution "That this House takes note of the financial statement and budgetary proposals presented by the Minister of Finance and commends the Government for the sound measures taken to reduce inflation and to insure the continued economic situation of the country." Do you know that this is wrong, Sir? This should read as follows:- "This House takes note of the financial statement and budgetary proposals presented by the Minister of Finance and condemns" — not commends — "the Government for the — not sound — for the unsound measures taken to reduce inflation and to ensure the continued economic stability of the country."

Mr. Speaker, I thank you.

Mr. SPEAKER: And that is the end of your time.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, I sat here and listened attentively to the various speakers and to hear their criticisms of this Government. Now I want to say that this amendment has my wholehearted support. As a responsible representative of the people I feel it is my duty to commend the Government for the interest that it has displayed at all times in the people of this country and especially the masses.

Now the amendment to this Resolution reads thus:- "That this House takes note of the financial statement and budgetary proposals presented by the Minister of Finance and commends the Government for sound measures taken to reduce inflation and to ensure the continued economic stability of the country." Now Sir, I sat here and I listened to the hon. member for St. Michael North East, a member whom I have always respected, but I must say this, that I am going to be very frank with her today. While I am in sympathy with her I am aware that she has a grievance and if I were to quote this old adage, "A drowning man catches at a straw," I would say this is quite in order. Any person who becomes a turn-coat must pay the full indemnity.....

Mrs. EASTMOND: Mr. Speaker, ...

Mr. SPEAKER: I am asking the hon. member to withdraw the word "turn-coat". It is unparliamentary. That is my ruling.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw that and I say 'any person who changes their political ideology.'

The last point cannot prevent me from saying what I am going to say here today. I am in sympathy with her because she is a freshman and in the novitiate stage. Consequently she has to learn that she has started before she is ready. That is where she made a blunder.

Now weekly we come here and the various members of the Opposition, they table questions, they table Resolutions, and all of those things which they do in here call for funds. The hon. member for St. James has asked to reduce the old age pensioners' age from 68 to 65. That would increase the amount by approximately 75% to 100%. Now those things call for money. The hon. member for the City, she wants a City College, she wants day nurseries, she wants everything for her constituency yet you are getting the very members in here saying that they will abolish the five percent sales tax. Yet you are getting them telling us here today that included in these budgetary proposals they have found no relief, no reduction of taxes; all of those things have been said by members of the Opposition.

5.50 p.m.

Yet they are demanding all kinds of improvements for the country. You get the hon. member for St. Philip North coming in here weekly trying to fool the public by asking a hundred and one questions, and every question he asks in here calls for money. We are dealing with a road in the constituency and it costs the Government approximately \$150,000, and with all the roads, with all the improvements he want for St. Philip North, he still comes in here today telling you that this should be done and the next should be done. I am asking you, you can fool some of the people some of the time but you cannot fool them all the time. I am asking him now and I am asking members of the Opposition, where must the money come from to deal with all these amenities, to deal with all these improvements that they want for the people of this country?

Now, let us deal with the unemployment situation. Barbados is a rock approximately 166 square miles. It depends on two industries, sugar and tourism. You are telling us here today that with the size of Barbados with the two, sugar and tourism, we have in this country to run the affairs of this country that we can send a man to the moon. I am saying we have to be realistic, we have to realise that this country is not a rich country, and I am saying that in England, the United Kingdom, with all the resources, with all the oil now they are having, England today is in

more trouble financially than even this small country. When you consider the number of people who are unemployed in England, over 1½ million people, when you consider the number of people who are unemployed in New York, you can only come to the conclusion that when certain people make statements they are irresponsible people and people who do not think. They are playing cheap politics, trying to mislead the community, trying to create chaos and confusion in this country, and therefore the time has come when the people, the man in the street, should be told in no uncertain terms that we must all think about the resources of this country before we can listen to people who go on platforms and make wild statements. And for what? A thirst for power, but you do not get it that way.

When you criticise our people, or some of them over here, look below there and you will see some who you should criticise. To place Ministries in some of those people's hands, what will happen with the Government of Barbados? It is as serious as this.

Now let us deal with the employment situation. The laws of immigration have been changed in England, they do not want us there. Canada has tightened up on her laws and America had done the same. Consequently the avenues which were open are not available to us.

Now the oil crisis came down here. It was a world wide thing and I repeat we are only a rock, and if the whole world felt the pinches of the shoes with the oil crisis, what do you think about this small country with no resources? That is why I commend the Minister of Finance, regardless of his detractors, for the able manner in which he has performed his duty during the time when we felt that this island was actually at the cross roads. What would you change this Government for? For whom or for what? Can you make it any better? Can you make any better contribution to this country? It is as simple as that.

You are claiming this \$200 million deficit. You are laying special emphasis on that all the time, but when you consider the number of new schools built in this island from 1961 to the present date, when you consider the fantastic improvement which has been done at the airport, when you consider the polytechnic, when you consider the number of reservoirs built in this island, when you consider the Community College, when you consider the number of properties which this Government owned since 1961 and you check on the size of this country,

you will find out that the \$200 million is by far less than what we have done during the 15 years in power.

The building insurances have increases, in some classes by 3% and 4%. That carries up the value of the buildings. The lands which the Government has have gone up by 300 and 400 percent in Barbados and therefore it is nonsensical for anyone to get in here, regardless of how much he knows, he could have a PH.D., regardless of what he think, I am saying that with the size of this island I consider the \$200 million a very small amount and it can be seen in every crevice in this country.

6.00 p.m.

It can be seen in every crevice in this country, and therefore for one to go about on platforms and preach in Church and to talk about the public debt being \$200 million shows that he has not studied the set up of this country. Their consciences are not alive and they are just doing things to see if they can destroy this Government. I am going to say this, and I say it in good faith; if God be for us who can be against us.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I feel that with the oil crisis this country has been very fortunate to meet its demands. The stability of this country stands second to none in the West Indies, and perhaps I will go as far as to say that I can only appeal to the people of this country to be faithful, be true to themselves and to their children and their children's children by giving responsible people the opportunity to continue with this fantastic programme which has been going on for the past fifteen years. We must look at things in the true perspective. We must face facts and until we do these things I am saying that the people of this country will regret if they ever make a mistake, and I am sure that they are intelligent enough as not to listen to others and their satellites, and that at election the Democratic Labour Party will be returned with an overwhelming majority.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, it is surprising how short the memories of some people are, especially the member for St. Philip South who has just taken his seat, because he sets out to lay blame of the serious position in which this country finds itself on the oil crisis. Had he and the others in going through Hansard to find out what I had said at any time since I came to this House that could be used against me read carefully, they would have seen that the Prime Minister in this very Chamber said that there was no oil crisis in this Island; the crisis was only in

the minds of those who said so, and he forthwith in a budget speech levied a tax on fuel oil. He said if they can pay the oil company they could pay him some more money. Where was the oil crisis? Why at this stage, because of mismanagement of the Government do you now come here and talk about an oil crisis. The hon. member who has just gone outside cannot face it. He does not understand what he is talking about when he talks about unemployment figures. It is time the people in this country understand the nonsense which people try to put in their heads and baffle them with figures and statistics. Let us talk plainly. When he talks about England having 1.4 million of unemployment, let him tell the public that in the United Kingdom that represents 4½% of the total population, but 22% to 27% of the population of Barbados is unemployed despite the fact that in Barbados we have got every system of taxation which is levied in the United Kingdom and in the United States. The purchase tax levied is equivalent to a value added tax in England, and it is applied in the form of purchase tax in Barbados. So what does he talk about where you are going to raise the money? Tell them to go and look at the National Insurance Building. Why is it that two floors are not occupied and what is the cost of putting up that monstrosity over there? My information is that the floors are condemned and you can ask the Fire Department why. That is where the mismanagement of Government is clearly seen.

When he talks about the number of properties Government owns, had he done his research on the speech written for him, he would have understood that Government owning all these properties would entail a recurrent expenditure to upkeep them and half of them are not being used, therefore the taxpayers in this country must pay more taxes to keep up buildings which do not produce something which can cause employment for the population of this country. The unemployment figure in this country is such because the Government does not know how to channel its money into profitable operations.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry the Trade Union General Secretary is not in here, but I am going to tell him a lot facts on the platform. In relation to the dishonest practice in here today when he said that the Leader of the Opposition said one thing on agriculture and the hon. member for St. Joseph, referring to me, said something else, I will say that they have searched Hansard for years to find something I said to use against me, and there was only one statement and a nitwit who is running through St. Joseph trying to think

he will get a seat is telling people that I opposed an agricultural labourer getting \$14 a day and he promised to bring Hansard and show them, but neither he nor the General Secretary of the Trade Union can produce one word that I have ever spoken which is contrary to the interests of anybody in agriculture in this country, and in the statement he referred to today he practised the same trick as the lawyer sitting in front of him when he was in the Court reading half a report and leaving out the other half, and reading it to suit himself, but thank God all of us can read. I refer Your Honour to the Debates of 14th October, 1975 reported in Hansard at page 5498. This is what I said dealing with the levy on sugar. I said:

"This is how I feel about the matter, Mr. Deputy Speaker...." I was referring to the Government's inability to produce a proper agricultural policy. They talked about an agrarian policy; at one time they talked about ten acres a man, and at another time they talked about 20 acres per man, and they have not yet been able to produce a proper agrarian policy. So I said:

"That is how I feel about the matter, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and we must not talk about what Trinidad is doing or about what the sugar workers there are getting. This is now said to be one of the most burdensome operations in this country because of the wages which are paid to agricultural workers."

These are my words reported in Hansard.
6.10 p.m.

One of the last things that I want to say is that if you ever talk about profit sharing in this country, it is the planting, harvesting and production of sugar. The Prime Minister was right when he said that the price should be fixed right first and the wages fixed last.

Mr. Speaker, I was referring to Trinidad and its operation, and the way in which money was paid for sugar in Trinidad. I will show you the dishonesty of everyone of them. The Prime Minister in 1976, coming after my statement in 1975 dealing with the Trinidad situation in sugar, in a Review of the Economy and Budgetary Proposals made by the Rt. Hon. Errol W. Barrow, Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Planning, on Friday, 30th July, 1976 — this is not what he said. This is what was handed out. To show how dishonest the whole lot of them are, these are the Prime Minister's own words.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you saying that the Prime Minister is dishonest?

Mr. BOLDEN: Did you hear what I said? I said the dishonesty of all of them. Make me withdraw if you want me to.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am asking you to withdraw that.

Mr. BOLDEN: What? I said the dishonesty of all of them.

Mr. SPEAKER: Continue.

Mr. BOLDEN: I am referring to the Prime Minister's statement which was handed around, and I am going to read what he said in relation to the Trinidad Industry on the same question of sugar. It is on Page 2 and it reads: "Although the production of sugar has been generally lower than in 1974, the higher prices obtaining in 1975 made it possible for Barbados and Guyana to strengthen their holdings of foreign exchange. Trinidad and Tobago's position as an exporter of petroleum products has enabled it to continue to accumulate large holdings of foreign exchange reserves."

He could not quote Trinidad on the sugar issue. Why did he leave out Trinidad when he dealt with Barbados and jump from sugar to petroleum when he dealt with Trinidad? It is because if they watched the trend of sugar around the world, they would understand what is going on, but they do not know how to. If they knew how to, the Prime Minister in addition to the release of \$3.5 million from the Stabilisation Fund would have removed the \$20 surcharge on fertiliser which would have increased the production of sugar in this country; because it is common knowledge that the more fertiliser you use, and the better fertiliser you apply, the better your production.

I go further, Mr. Speaker, to show how they try to smear the Opposition when their own words condemn their statements because if there is one thing that I have found out, it is that every member of the Opposition benches has other employment. We do not get pay for doing nothing. We do not have private secretaries or Parliamentary Secretaries or the whole establishment of the Civil Service to read documents and tell us what they say; but fortunately, in the interest of the people, we find time to read and analyse documents handed out at the last minute by the Government.

The Prime Minister goes on on Page 2 to say: "Sugar production fell in physical terms by 11 per cent below the level of 1974, but the high average price per ton of sugar permitted the industry to earn in excess of \$110 million."

Let me deal with that factor. Those of us who know anything about agriculture, know full well that during the drought last year and in 1974 many persons put fertilisers in the ground, but when the rains came and they should have refertilised they were unable to do so because the situation with the supply of fertiliser to the country is such that you buy in advance; you take it from the wharf if it ever goes into the warehouse and you pay an exorbitant price for it thereafter.

That is where the Prime Minister should have sought to give relief to the people of this country if he now realises that sugar is still the backbone of the economy of Barbados. If you look at the speech I made in 1975, I said then that when the Prime Minister went to King George The V Park and said that he would like to drive around Barbados and not see a cane blade that I put the most favourable interpretation one could put on that statement. My statement was then that the Prime Minister meant that he would have liked to see the Research Department in the Sugar Industry create sugar cane without cane blades; but little did he realise that he would come back and vindicate my statement.

He went on: "Despite adverse weather conditions which severely restricted vegetable production, other agricultural production has been estimated to have been some 15 per cent above the level obtaining in 1974." What other agriculture have we got in Barbados except vegetables and sugar? Who is the Prime Minister trying to fool in a document prepared to be delivered and handed around to members of Parliament but which could not be told on T.V. to the nation and to the world? Because we would have had another fiasco like the coast guard boats and the operators who sent out a distress signal giving some points in the sea which put them in the Azores; and when it was picked up in Puerto Rico you had them asking please do not say it on the floor of the house. Please do not put it in Hansard. Is that why the director is now home? Why his contract has not been renewed?

However, time will tell. When the member for St. Philip South says put back the DLP, put them back to do what? You can fool some of the people some of the time; you can fool some of the people all of the time but you cannot fool them all of the time. He does not know what he is talking about.

The Prime Minister's own statement condemns him and his Government on the

management of this country. Do not get up trying to tell me foolishness. Let us look a little further. He is removing the 5 per cent sales tax on live poultry and seeds. What live poultry do we import into Barbados? Barbados is self sufficient in poultry. Turkeys are imported dead because the Ministry of Agriculture does not allow you to import them live. Back and necks used to be imported by the Barbados Marketing Corporation — dead birds, not live birds. Three weeks ago one hatchery imported a few pheasants and quail. About 240 arrived in the island; but all live poultry that we are using in Barbados is produced from hatching eggs; but they do not understand what is going on in this country in agriculture and so they remove the 5 per cent sales tax on live poultry.

From time to time after the last Budget I queried the Minister of Agriculture on the removal of the sales tax on seeds. He said that he was making representation to the Minister of Finance. There is nothing big on that. All the proposals have come from this side of the House. When he talks about the perfect management of the economy, he means second rate management and instructions from the Opposition. If we are good enough to instruct, we are good enough to take the driver's seat because you have to be a driver before you can become an instructor. It is time that when you get into the driver's seat and get a licence to get out and let the good drivers get in front.
6.20 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the document also related to a story here, which, when I challenged the Prime Minister — and you see the general public has got to know this; the economy has not been performing in such a way as to give people employment. The wage level of the people in this country has not been to the point commensurate with the work they do and the normal amenities of life which they require. The Prime Minister admitted this. The cost of living in the country has risen from some 84% to 85% over the last two years. His highest wage awards to the civil servants have been 35%. Now it means this, Mr. Speaker, that the average man in the streets who want a chair in the house, who wants a common Symmonds bed, who wants a little fridge in the corner, who wants a television set like anybody else can only get it by hire purchase. A long term method of paying for something.

Hire purchase is now the common practice of purchasing around the world, but what did the Prime Minister do? He introduced legislation to give the Central Bank the right to control hire purchase and credit sales; and he came in here

and he tried to tell the House he was giving the consumer better protection, and I challenged him on it. I said 'No, you are not; you are giving Central Bank the right to set the level of down payments which will put it outside the reach of the ordinary man;' and he got vexed and he walked out. In this same document here, on page 7 he says: "Government intends to take firm action to ensure that private consumption expenditure is not increased at the expense of saving and investment." Now what does it mean? If you invest he hits you with a corporation tax; you do not get back any return. It is still the talk about a negative tax on savings in the bank and if you go to buy on hire purchase, he clamps down on you.

Under this Legislation the Central Bank will be able to exercise powers under the direction of the Minister of Finance to control credit extended by any establishment in the Island by way of hire purchase, credit sales and hiring agreements. In other words, Mr. Speaker, as soon as the next election is over and by freak of chance they manage to get back, woe betide each and everyone of us, Mr. Speaker, in this country, because when he puts the 10% tax on air travel it is those who travel abroad and buy their tickets through the companies, that will offset it in your company expense account, and as soon as it goes into your company expenses account the company must write it off as expenditure and recover it through its business, which means from the consumer in the street. The Prime Minister cannot deny that. He has not told you, Mr. Speaker, what is the volume of travel done in this country and what he hopes to recover from that 10% tax. He has not told you, Mr. Speaker, how he is going to account for even the \$5.2 million just voted to have the 25 cents bus fare, but thank God the people in the country realize that if he ever gets back into power bus fares will be \$1.25 per journey and not 25 cents. Let him deny that now. Let him tell you how he is going to offset the \$100 million in deficit the country now faces, and you can only get it by taxation. Let him tell you how he is going to offset the cost of the other \$4 million or \$5 million required to put in the sewage scheme. Where is it going to come from? It can only come from taxation, and if the people are already so over-burdened with taxes, Mr. Speaker, the simple levying of a 5% sales tax reduced the standard of living of every Tom, Dick and Harry in this country because he applied it most harshly on the items you buy daily that you need.

Let us look at the construction industry; the way it is applied. It is applied to certain bath tubs; the bath tubs that are exempted — and you

know this, the ones that are now sold in Barbados.

The cost of housing has gone up tremendously. Let us go further. You see when I talk about the dishonest people in this country. Ask what is the price of marl fill within the last three months after a labour agreement; that the quarries in this country upped the price of marl fill from \$2 per square yard to \$5 per square yard. The man in the street who now lives in a boarded and shingled house shall never have the privilege of living in a wall house, other than in the 2 x 3 boxes up in Union Village in St. Philip. That is where they are going to have to live. So all of them who talk about this Government is a good Government managing the economy — all of them, those who live down in Cats Castle, who live in boarded and shingled house, ask them what a house would cost them to build today, because the house that would have cost them \$30,000 three months ago would now cost them \$50,000 to build.

Ask the Prime Minister why he admitted in here despite instructions from the Central Bank, why is it the commercial banks have taken the stand that they have taken. The public now understands the Democratic Labour Party Government. The dictatorial manner in which they operate is such that every right thinking human being in this country now detest them. The mere presence of television cameras in here today and a onesided letter — the letter answered from the Leader of the House to allow the Prime Minister to have television time, but the letter from the Leader of the Opposition, no notice is paid to that. That is why the Opposition comes in here and talk.

Tell them I live in St. Philip South; ask them what the roads look like; but where I live in Gemswick, from the time I went in Gemswick they put electric lights, and paved the road up to my house. How dishonest can you get. A Jacob coat. Let us get down to facts now. St. Philip has been under a DLP regiment for fifteen years. The worst kept parish is St. Philip. Does he not see the road I drive on every morning? Ask him what has happened to the Industrial site at Six Roads. Go and see part of a road shovelled out of dirt; grass is growing on it. The only thing that is there is another IDC project, St. Philip Industrial Site. What foolishness are you trying to tell the people? Why don't you be honest to yourself and then be honest to others? That is what you must do. Do you not think the young people can read? You talk about giving them free education? What are you giving them education to do?.....

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

Mr. BOLDEN: I will sit down but I am going to blister you when I get back up.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will hear the point of order but, to the hon. member for St. Joseph, you will not be blistering me, I presume.

Mr. BOLDEN: No Mr. Speaker. Not you.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I hear your point of order.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. Joseph has said that I should be honest to myself. I am requesting that as a member of this Honourable House he should withdraw those remarks. He has said that I should be honest to myself.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will rule on that. Please take your seat. He is requesting you to be honest to yourself.

Mr. WEEKES: He is not requesting me, Sir, He said.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you arguing with the Chair? Is the hon. member arguing with the Chair?

Mr. WEEKES: No, Sir; but I am just telling you what he said. He has not said he is requesting me.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have ruled on that. Please take your seat.

Mr. WEEKES: On the other hand, Sir.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Please take your seat.....

Mr. WEEKES: I am saying that the hon. member for St. Joseph said — St. Philip was represented before he lived up there.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please take your seat....

Mr. WEEKES: And it does not want him to come in here and represent St. Philip. I am capable of representing St. Philip.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must leave this Chamber. I told you to take your seat. This is disobedience to the Chair. I am not tolerating it. Leave the Chamber.

Mr. SIMMONS: You told him to go outside.

Mr. SPEAKER: I request you to withdraw from the Chamber.
6.30 p.m.

Mr. WEEKES: On the other hand, Sir, I am saying to the hon. member for St. Joseph that St. Philip was represented before he lived up there and it does not need him to come in here and represent it, I am capable of representing St. Philip.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Philip South will take his seat. (Mr. WEEKES: I only want to tell the hon. member that). The hon. member must withdraw from this Chamber. I told him to take his seat and he was disobedient to the Chair. I am not tolerating that.

Mr. R.St.C WEEKES left the Chamber.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, every Government raises money by taxation to be used for the benefit of the economy and the benefit of the taxpayers. Let the hon. member say what development he has seen in St. Philip South. He talks about representing the people of St. Philip. I will invite him to my house every Saturday morning to see the number of people who flock there for representation. I tell them to go to him because he represent St. Philip South.

A lot of them believe, Mr. Speaker, that as soon as they hear that somebody is dead in a parish and they run to the church and grab the head and put down the box that that is representation. The Bible says let the dead bury their dead. If you believe that picking up collection in church and walking up is representation of the people, that is for his own salvation, but the people need proper representation, they need somebody to bring to the attention of Government the lack of employment facilities, the lack of proper roads and schools. Neither one of them can deny that in this very year every so-called secondary modern school has turned out children of the age of 14 years telling them that they all must go home, and when you talk about building schools, what are you going to do with them when they go home? What is the \$200 million doing? He says that \$200 million is not a big deficit, but there is no representation for children between the age of 14 and 18.

I tabled a motion in here asking that the National Insurance make provision for those people, but when he talks about the 1.7 million

people unemployed in the United Kingdom or in the United States, tell him that in those countries those people who are unemployed have unemployment benefits paid to them every day and they can still survive on the bare necessities of life. In Barbados when you go home you go home to wind pies and nothing chops, but he eats his belly full, so do not come in there like the Minister of Education and talk about school children, there are children going home whose mothers have to go to work and leave them. There are families in this country where the mothers are not working, the fathers are not working, nor are the children, and what have they got to go by? A Government which tells them they are doing well? Like the Minister of Tourism whose word every year is that you will see more people in Barbados than there are inhabitants, and yet still the Government statistics show that tourism has been falling year after year.

When you listen to the radio, and if you heard Mr. Fitzgerald the other night saying in the most diplomatic language that you have to broaden your area of canvassing for tourists, you will understand. He means that the present market is not supplying the number of tourists to fill the number of rooms there are in Barbados, but ask them what the \$200 million means? That Government in its insanity is seeking to increase the Hilton Hotel by 100 rooms, and the Caribbean Tourism Centre published a report which says that the occupancy rate is less than 50% of the hotels in this country. That is what you must look at, and when I advise you to be honest to yourself first and then you will be honest to people, I want you to look into your heart, read the statistics of this country and do not take papers which are pushed before you and get in here and say you are praising the country.

Mr. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir, when you put out the member for St. Philip South, how long did you put him out for? He has come back in.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I did not expect to have the privilege of addressing the House at this particular time, but nonetheless I am glad for the opportunity.

We heard recently some comments concerning the tourism Ministry, and it is that on which I will speak. The prophets of gloom and doom, and I understand very well that it is

in certain people's interest and obviously part of their job in a way to make things look as bad as they can make them look, and this goes not only for the official Opposition but it also goes for such persons as Mr. Al Gilkes who has his own axe to grind and manages to do it courtesy of the Barbados Labour Party through the Nation newspaper.

We heard some comments on tourism, the decline of tourism over the last five years from the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, and we heard some other comments about hotels going bankrupt. We heard reference made to the tremendous expansion in St. Lucia, and we heard about the fact that if there has been a decline in tourism in Barbados that the Government is as much to blame as the influences which have taken over in North America, and I would like to deal with some of these points specifically.

As regards the decline in the tourism industry over the past five years, the figures are quite simple. In 1971 there were 189,000 visitors, in 1975 there were 221,000 visitors.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir, the Minister is selecting his figures in such a way as to give an impression that I spoke of five years. I spoke of from 1973 to 1975. He is speaking of the Leader of the Opposition selecting figures and the decline of tourism over the last five years. He is not telling the truth, I never said five years, I said since 1973.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point of elucidation.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: A point of elucidation, Mr. Speaker, and only Hansard will eventually show which it was, but my impression was that he said both the five year period, as also it seems the Advocate newspaper had that impression as well as it was reported in the Advocate, and 1973 to 1975, a substantial decline and all this kind of thing. There were less people who came in 1975 and 1973. In fact, in 1975 there were approximately 222,000 people who came and that was 504 persons less than in 1973, a decline of which a great fuss is being made of less than one quarter of one percent. For the record the facts are that the.....

Mr. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I want to know if the Minister is going to give the facts about the winter visitors and the other visitors.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I hear your point of order.

Mr. SIMMONS: The point of order is that he is quoting wrong figures because the industry declined by 4% up to November last year. Man come and tell the truth; it is in here.
6.40 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, it is a pity people do not know how to behave in the normal way and keep to the ordinary rules. He knows very well that is not a point of order and he stands up on points of interruption at all times. (*Asides*).

Mr. SPEAKER rose.

Mr. SIMMONS: You are an abnormal Barbadian; that is what you are.

Mr. SPEAKER: Gentlemen, please contain yourselves. I am willing to hear you.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, and I am willing to address you. It is simply that there are too many non-points of order and interruptions and it is distracting, and it is not reasonable.

Now let us get the figures straight again. In 1971 there were 189,000 visitors and in 1975 there were 221,000 visitors. The value to the industry of Barbados in 1971 was \$102 million and in 1975 the value of the expenditure on the part of visitors was \$165 million. There was indeed a decline last year as compared with the year before of 4% as the hon. member for St. Philip who has the figures a little mixed up said, because he got the 4% right, but it was the one particular year of visitors, not in revenue, an increase in money of approximately \$8 million. (*Asides*) I am not going to argue about real terms.

Mr. Speaker, everybody knows that in the world there has been a decline in tourism, and a little decline of that kind is an extraordinary achievement in this particular time. This has happened because everybody, even they must know, that there have been difficult economic times in the world and people have not travelled as much as they used to. The growth therefore has slowed down and for the first time ever actually there has been a slight decrease in the number of visitors. As compared with the rest of the Caribbean and the rest of the world we are doing exceedingly well. We

had a comparison of St. Lucia made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and a query as to why weren't we doing as well as St. Lucia. Last year we had a decrease in the number of visitors of 4%. I do not like to wash other people's linen but in St. Lucia they had a decrease of 9%, and I am sorry about it. I would hate to come in here and bring figures on all my friends and colleagues in the other Caribbean countries such as Puerto Rico, Jamaica, The Virgin Islands, Curacao, Antigua, Grenada and St. Vincent. The decline in the number of visitors is incredible and I am sad for it. I am not pleased about it as they seem to be. I very much regret that those Islands should have suffered this kind of economic depression through tourism; but we have to face the fact that, as I say, less people are able to afford to travel, and it is not entirely surprising.

Now it was said furthermore by the Leader of the Opposition that several hotels have consequently gone bankrupt in Barbados and it may be that with his legal connections he has more knowledge of this than I do, but the only hotel that I know of that has gone bankrupt in recent times was one that hardly even opened its doors which was called Bajan Inn in Browns Gap in Hastings, and that never got off the ground. Now in the Bahamas, in Jamaica and in Puerto Rico...

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of elucidation, the Minister quite correctly states that there may be hotels known to hon. members on this side with legal connections which are bankrupt in the popular sense. I would not like him saying that the only hotel that has gone bankrupt is the Bajan Inn to be accepted as a statement of fact. I have no intention of discussing my clients' business, but he must not make that as a statement of fact in any way to contradict me when I say that hotels have gone bankrupt. If he wants to discuss what bankruptcy means in the case of limited liability companies, he can. I do not know that any hotels have gone into receivership.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a speech now.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: I do not know quite what the expression "bankrupt in a popular sense" means. That must be something I am unfamiliar with, but nonetheless I would have thought that it would be fairly wide knowledge in this small country if a hotel went bankrupt. There was only one which I knew of. I doubt there are others because in our small country it is usually widely known with any company of any size when it goes bankrupt,

and therefore I am saying that the general statement that hotels in Barbados are going bankrupt...

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I will hear the point of order, but I am finding it extremely difficult to hear. There has been more discussion this time on the Opposition benches between themselves, and I see that the Reporter is finding it difficult to hear the hon. member. I am appealing for the last time to both sides to speak in undertones.

May I hear the point of order?

Mr. ADAMS: The Minister in my submission is misleading the House when he says that the Bajan Inn is the only one to go bankrupt. You have the Coral Arms, the North Point Surf Resort, the Sugar Cane Club, Tropicana, a whole series of hotels all of us here have had dealings with. I have some shares in North Point Surf Resort belonging to a client of mine. I would be glad to get some money for them.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: I hardly think that a whole series of hotels as he talked about have gone bankrupt. He talked about the North Point Surf Resort.

Let us move on. It is my contention that there is not a whole wash of hotels going bankrupt as the impression was given as so many impressions were sought to be given the other night which were not based upon facts either. I would mention for the information of hon. members some of the peculiar difficulties which have arisen this summer in addition to those which were anticipated. It was anticipated that this summer would be a difficult summer because of the Bicentennial Celebrations in the United States and because of the Olympic Games in Montreal, not just the question of those people who were going to watch the olympic games live or attend them, but those people who would want to stay in a place where they could watch it live on television, and this has had its effect. There is no doubt whatsoever, but there are one or two other things which have happened which were not anticipated. One was the fact that the Leader of the Canadian Government or the American Government permitted I.C.A. to fly to Washington, Boston and Montreal, and the situation which was certainly not anticipated

with regard to British Airways this year. Many of our hotels particularly the smaller hotels and apartments depend very greatly in the summer season on airline staff. These are people who work for the airline in any capacity, from the pilot to a chauffeur of a car, a stewardess or whatever who are entitled to rebated fares on their airlines and sometimes on other airlines. They travel anywhere free or sometimes for a nominal 10% of the fare which you or I would be expected to pay.

6.50 p.m.

Therefore one cannot reasonably expect the airlines to operate services which are mainly for the purpose of transporting its own people at a 10 per cent fare. Last summer, however, British Airways which was one of the main flyers of hotel staff during the summer season, put an embargo on staff travelling to Barbados because the traffic was already so heavy to Barbados; and they had many staff who came down here and then, because of heavy bookings, could not get back to where they came from, and this has caused a great deal of disruption.

Last year we made representations to British Airways in London and they assured us that with the advent of the weekly 747 Jumbo Jet, the seating capacity to Barbados would be increased this summer by 25 per cent. This would seem to have been ample in order to accommodate most of the airline staff and other staff, not only that of British Airways who travel here on rebated fares. Yet this summer they have virtually embargoed it again because of increased business on British Airways.

It is hard for us to understand. We have argued with them a number of times. The flights are controlled from London and there is little we can do about it except to make our protest. However, they know the problem and they have promised to see what they can do to help us; but the problem really is that they have had so much an increase in business coming to this part of the world from Britain.

The other problem which arose was a more complex one, called contract bulk inclusive tours out of Canada. They were not applied in the sense that we expected by Air Canada. I had a meeting in Montreal with the principal person responsible, the Executive Vice President, (Marketing). He came here, and this situation is being corrected, but will pose us another problem — more hotels this summer.

The situation with the small hotels, to be frank, is quite simple. Some of them are full,

some of them are empty and most of them are in between. Some have been either successful in building up a clientele, or making arrangements with a particular tour operator, or they distinctly have better places at better prices. I am afraid that others at the other end of the scale may not operate the sufficiently advantageous kind of places with too high rates.

Generally speaking, the only way small hotels can possibly compete is by the co-operative effort, certainly in marketing, and to a certain extent in purchasing. However, it is an extremely difficult thing to bring small business men together. It is a question of the one trusting the other. It is a question of who will get what out of what; but one can only continue to try. We have a person on loan from the OAS whose job will be to assist small hotels in particular.

Now, Sir, reference was made a short while ago to the Caribbean Tourist Research Centre's report. I would like to comment briefly on that. It is the first opportunity that I have had to do so. I am in a little difficult position because I am Chairman of the Board of Directors of CTTC, and have been since its inception. I still reserve to myself the right to disagree with them even though I think that they are doing a very fine job.

I think that to some extent it has been pure research, but none the less I think it needs to be leavened with a little more practical experience of these matters. For example, the report stated that if the country had an annual average 10 per cent growth in the number of arrivals, that the country could probably go ahead expanding at a reasonable rate about accommodation, but pointed out that the accommodation was not there at the moment; and therefore they stated that construction in view of accommodation should come to a halt.

This to me does not make too much sense; because if such a report had been compiled two years ago, the annual growth in terms of arrivals in Barbados before that time was 15 per cent. So presumably three years ago they would have said keep going ahead expanding your facilities, and then, when that had happened, we would have been in real trouble because a slow down came. For anybody to say that you should stop developing your facilities and building more accommodation right now means that they will be able to tell you what the economy of the world, and certainly the Tourism market will be two years from now; because anyone who is planning hotel development of any kind right now can hardly expect to open it, if it is a small

hotel, before the winter season of 1977-78; and if it is a larger kind of project, you have to look around for finance and for architects, and you will be looking for the winter season 1978-79. So you will have to have pretty good forecast.

Now, it is not the Government that makes these forecasts and looks ahead in this kind of way. Clearly it is the investors themselves who must project what they believe will be the market up to the particular project; and one has to have confidence in people such as the Marriott Hotel Corporation which has expanded Sam Lords too, I believe, 200 rooms or 250 rooms, and the Paradise Beach people who, according to yesterday's newspaper, are investing \$1½ million in room expansion, and is basing a ship in Barbados and St. Lucia for cruises. We have another project which will start very shortly, and this is the development of the former Rockley Golf Course. There, there will be the construction of 150 units. Some are the condominium type apartments, some are what are called country houses and some are single bedroom or efficiency units.

There will be 150 units on which down payments have already been made for all; two-thirds of those units are to be owned by Barbadians. The other remaining one-third will be hopefully owned by citizens or residence of Trinidad and Tobago. This only awaits the approval of the Central Bank of Trinidad and Tobago, and I understand that our own authorities are optimistic that the authorities in Trinidad and Tobago will give permission for their nationals to invest in Barbados in this particular project.

That is as far as some of the developments are concerned, Mr. Speaker. I was told by our New York office and our Toronto office that since the actual date of the Bicentennial, July 4 has gone by, the excitement of the Bicentennial has waned a little, and the interest and the number of enquiries which are being serviced by our New York Office now has multiplied several times since about the middle of July. A similar thing has happened since the end of the Olympic Games. The extra-ordinary thing is that it also happened at the end of Expo, when we had a pretty thin summer and there was a tremendous upsurge in tourism after.

I am confident that, provided the North American economy does not do any more tricks, we will have a very good Autumn and also that the Winter season will be a good one. Business from Europe too is looking very healthy.

The last criticism which was made and on which I must comment was the comment of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition who stated that the Government was as much to blame for the decline in the growth of tourism as the conditions in North America. Now, I could refute that. I could make all kinds of statements that the Government has been doing this and that and all kinds of things, and therefore it is not so; but people would still wonder who is right because there is an authority over on that side and an authority on this side saying different things.

Therefore, Sir, I would like to make a Document of the House an extract from a speech because the Speaker can be called a neutral authority, but still an expert witness. We, of course, as politicians are inclined to be modest and self effacing; but we must. I think at certain times allow ourselves to be forced into bringing forward documents such as these. This is an extract from an address given by Mr. Robert Crandel, Executive Vice President of American Airlines, to the annual general meeting of the Caribbean Hotel Association in Aruba on the 7th June, 1976. I was not present.
7. p.m.

We are all of course as politicians inclined to be modest and self-effacing but one must nevertheless at certain times allow oneself to be forced into bringing forward such documents as this, because this was an extract of an address given by Mr. Robert L. Crandel who is the Executive Vice President of American Airlines to the annual general meeting of the Caribbean Hotel Association in Aruba on June 7, 1976. I was not present. He said amongst other things: "I would like to say a word about two places, Barbados and the Bahamas which, in different ways, perfectly illustrate the kind of well-planned, forward thinking tourist programme that can ensure a prosperous future for the Caribbean.

The Barbadian Government and the Barbadian people have long appreciated the pivotal position of tourism in their society, and so complacency has never set in. Visitors to Barbados are made to feel welcome by people who are well trained and who understand that tourism is something that provides real benefits for both guest and host.

At the same time, the Government has avoided enclave tourism, encouraging the entire Island to develop its tourism potential.

If it is true that nature has graced Barbados, it is also true that Providence has had only a

small hand in the Island's success. The popularity Barbados enjoys can be attributed to hard work, good judgment, sound marketing and, most of all, the right attitude. In short, a well-run ship setting a fine example."

SUSPENSION

Mr. SPEAKER: As the hour strikes 7 p.m. this Sitting is automatically suspended until 8 p.m. today.
7 p.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting is resumed.

When the suspension was taken the Hon. Minister of Tourism was addressing. I do not know if he has concluded.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: Yes Sir. I have concluded.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, on the 27th day of July, 1971 the Hon. Minister of Finance in presenting his then budget speech to this House, ended on a lofty note. I think that many people will recall the famous words which were to have become a catch phrase for the election of 1971, and it is timely I believe, to remind this Honourable House of those words. He said 'there is only one command to Barbados for the 70s now that we have left the security of our prepared positions, advance.'

It is a great tragedy that since the word to advance has been given the troops had been led in economic retreat, and the review of the economy and the budgetary proposals made by the hon. member paint a picture of depression, paint a picture of failure of economic improvement, paint a picture of falling in production rather than a limited increase, gradual recovery in the second half of 1975 in the industrial sector, paint a picture of increase in inflation starting in 1968 in a limited extent and increasing rapidly between 1971 and 1973, it paints a picture of a balance of payments subjected to crisis and a monetary policy that increased taxation and slowed down demand, and it paints a picture of a tight spending position for the country and its citizens over the next few years.

The 1970s so far can never be characterized as a period of advance for this country. Instead it has been a period of retreat in all sectors of the economy, and obviously the command given by the leader of the troops has been one disobeyed in Government's projects and Government's performance. I do not believe that any Barbadians today can feel other than depressed and sad at the situation which has occurred after

indeed the Democratic Labour Party had inherited the prepared positions of the 60s and the 50s from the Barbados Labour Party.

Many members have spoken in this debate and there are one or two features of the debate which have been highlighted. I wish to underscore some of these. I think, regardless of what figures are produced, that any reasonable economic survey of Barbados will show that there has been a slackening off in the pace of growth and in nominal terms I think something like 7% in growth in the last two years and the last year and in real terms no growth whatsoever.

In unemployment the share of labour in manufacturing between 1960 and 1970 showed no real improvement. In fact, in employment terms it remained static at 26% of the labour force which operated during the Labour Party Government; and one of the things it is timely to remind the Minister of Finance of in his budget is that this has shown that there has been no significant thrust despite the proud boast of industrial development in the industrial sector insofar as creating job opportunities have occurred. There has been a slight increase, of course, in the share of labour in the service industries, and there has been a slight increase — some increase — between 1960 and 1970 in productivity at the rate of 5.5%. In 1974 there was a net lay off in persons in employment industry in the region of 400, and since then in 1975 and creeping into 1976 there has been a cut back in the labour force.

8.05 p.m.

In sugar since 1971 the effect of controlled burning of canes has meant a decrease in the acreage and in the tonnage produced in Barbados, and indeed between 1971 and 1974 there has been no significant increase in tonnage. In yams the same story, in potatoes the same story, in pork the same story, a slight increase in the production of tomatoes, beets and carrots and our agriculture seemed to have stood still.

Between 1971 and 1974 the performance of tourism has been not much significantly better than this. Indeed I think 1971 was the peak year when there was something like 18.9 or 20.9% increase over the 1970 figures. In that year we had 189,075 visitors coming to Barbados, the increase in 1972 was 11.3% to 210,000, an increase in 1973 to 5.6%, in 1974 to 3.9%, in 1975 a minus position of a 4% drop in tourists coming here. And although there has been a nominal increase in the earnings from tourism in real terms there has been no growth in this economy in 1975 in the tourist sector.

The Government attributes this slow down in the economy solely to external forces, and it is

my submission to this House that one cannot accept so glib a reason for this low economic performance in the country. It is true that there has been an acceleration in inflation in Barbados from 1973 to 1975 in particular. In 1968 to 1971 for instance, Mr. Speaker, the rate of inflation in this country was something like 7.1%. In 1971 to 1972 the increase in prices was something like 12.4%, in 1973 to 1975 an increase of 26.7% per year. The first quarter of 1974 it was 46.4%, and there has been a slight tailoring and falling off after 1975. But the reasons for this cannot only be international, part of the reasons must be sought in the last budget presented to this Hon. House by the Minister of Finance, and that was the so-called emergency budget, and also as well the effect of the CARICOM Agreement as negotiated by this Government.

The tax increases in 1974 have had an effect of increasing Government revenue, but at the same time it inflated the economy to the extent that there was a slow down in productivity and investment in the country. We warned the Government in 1974 of the deleterious effects which the corporation tax would have had on investment and not only on the people who are holding shares but also people who were going to open new businesses. This was a clear warning given to the Minister of Finance. He ignored it, he saw only the revenue effects of the corporation tax, and the result has been that between 1974 and 1976 there is now some confusion that the corporation tax has not worked in the manner in which he anticipated. I cannot accept his submission by merely saying that it is not true to say that the corporation tax has no effect at all on investment in Barbados.

If one analyses the figures of the equity share market one will find that the growth in the sale of shares has decreased and the formation of new companies has likewise stopped. In addition to this there has been tremendous uncertainty in the private sector and as a result real productive activity has not been taken up in the private sector.

Likewise the policy followed by the Government in exchange rates has had an adverse affect on the economy. Since 1973 and before the Hon. Leader of the Opposition in his capacity as shadow Minister of Finance was warning this Government about the effect which real high exchange rates must have on the capacity of the economy to respond in production and in job opportunities, and more specifically he was warning the Government of the effect it would have on the construction industry in particular. Now the Government in 1973 for a period of

two weeks in particular let low interest rates and we saw the prime rate rising rapidly to 11%. You will recall that after October 17, 1973 the Government then came back and reversed the Interest Rates Order to such an extent that it operated a three tiered system and the effect of this was still a pretty high prime rate of interest. People will not borrow money at high interest rates for risk production or risk capital, the risk project if I may put it this way, because they are not sure that they can have the capacity to repay, and we have witnessed particularly the effect of this on small businesses and the slowing up in the creation of new job opportunities.

It was not until much later that the Government amended the Exchange Control Regulations, the only explanation given this House was that at the time the country was part and parcel of the East Caribbean Currency Authority and that therefore it took some negotiations and some period of time before we could come out of the system. But even prior to 1973, I think as long ago as 1971, the Minister was aware of the necessity to free ourselves from a system of exchange control which was regulated by our association completely with the sterling currency. This he was tardy in doing. I remember during his absence when he was recharging his batteries speaking in this House and pointing out then to the Acting Minister of Finance the effect which flight of capital was having in Barbados and the fear which was existing in the investment sector in relation to the high fluctuation in exchange rates.

None of these warnings by the Opposition was taken, and if the Government found itself less capable of coping with the oil crisis which succeeded rather than preceded these conditions, then the Government has only itself to blame for this, and it can blame not merely external sources but its failure to respond to economic factors which must have been obvious to any person with a slight familiarity with the economic conditions of a country such as ours. I cannot see the excuse being simply laid at the door of foreign economic circumstances.

Now, what measures would a Minister of Finance look for at this time? It is obvious that the most pressing problem confronting Barbados in the 70s, and indeed in the 80s, is the problem of employment, and bound up with the problem of employment is the necessity to bring the productive sector of the economy moving at a fast rate to take up the slack. In short, we have to reflate this economy.
8.15 p.m.

You cannot reflate the economy simply by giving some slight relief in two narrow sectors and leaving everything else as it was before. If we may look at a comparison between the actions of the Minister of Finance again in 1971, that is the Advance Budget and now at the time of the Advance Budget there were some fourteen or fifteen measures, eleven of which were of a positive nature, relieving taxation in some respects and giving an added filip to the private and public sectors. No one measure of any such significance has been advanced on this occasion. Instead there seems to be a retreat from prepared positions.

Now I wish to point out to the Minister that in his 1971 Budget he was conscious of the effect of inflation and indeed to say that he is budgeting as he says this time for a deficit situation which is nothing new to him because in 1971 he said he was using a similar technique of 1971. His measures obviously have failed as indeed they will fail again. I want to analyse what it is he is looking at now. He says he has staring him in the face something like \$105 million in order to raise enough revenue in one form or another for the short-fall which will occur in his revenue. Now I challenge the Minister on these particular figures. In no year in Barbados even from 1961 to 1976 has the Minister ever on capital account managed to spend the amount of money that he has budgeted for. Indeed I think the highest figure ever spent was something in the region of \$38 million and this time they have pushed in the Capital Estimates figures in the region of \$60 million. He will not have to find something like \$32 million in my submission by the end of the year, and therefore he knows that there will be a short-fall in the performance of the country on capital account.

Part of the failure of this Government has been that it has always failed to push capital investments sufficiently fast in Barbados so that he will be getting returns sufficient to pay our way and to help finance any shortfalls that we may have on our current account, and this will continue to be their failure until they grapple with the true problems confronting this country.

Now on relief for people, there is no doubt that this budget is by and large devoid of any relief to the taxpayers. I would have expected that in a situation where the Minister admits a high rate of inflation in the economy between 1971 and 1976 that he would have had an

increase in personal allowances to taxpayers since the allowances which they had in 1971 would not have been sufficient. They would have been in fact undermined. In real terms they would be worth less than in 1971. I would have expected in 1976 that the Minister would be coming to this House and not only giving a piece-meal measure in relation to the relief on corporation tax, but he would face the problem of the unearned income of several wives whose unearned income is still joined to the earned income of their husbands for taxation purposes, and he would have acknowledged at least in the decade of the international women's year the significance of treating women as an equal for all taxation purposes in this country. No such measures. He would have relieved a bit of the taxes that are mismanaged and misspent to throw it back in the net of savings in the country so that they can be used in the economy in order to stimulate growth. Instead we are getting a collection of taxes and a series of measures on an *ad hoc* basis with no concerted plan or attack, and I make a serious prediction in this House. I predicted in 1973 that we would have reached exactly the position as we have reached in 1976, and I have not been proved wrong yet both on public finance and otherwise, and I predict now, Mr. Speaker, that if the Government is returned and this is the policy of the Government, that within a year or less the Minister will be coming to this House with further taxation measures for the country. That is why in my view it is not only a political mistake but it must be an economic mistake for the country to have prolonged election in this country to the stage at which we have prolonged it. There is too much tinkering with the economy of Barbados for political advantage which is undermining the real growth and improvement and a diversion from the real task ahead of each one of us, which is to raise productivity at a tremendous level.

The Minister has now conceded that he is going to have a national productivity or economic council. When the Union raised this matter several years ago, I remember speaking quite clearly on a supplementary Estimate and saying that this was a necessity because you can only by negotiations and consent initiate measure of restriction put a ceiling on the growth in the wages if you are going to give some corresponding benefits in personal allowances and income taxation to the workers in the country. Nobody has sought this by negotiations. Instead we have had the confrontation with the Unions in the public sector at a time when we needed the cooperation of the public sector if we were to motivate workers to produce more for the economy. I believe the Minister of Finance has

been tired in his economic policy, and he has lost grip with the real problems confronting the economy, and at the moment he is really only biding time. Whether or not he will ever get up enough steam again I really do not know, but the point is that things seem to have slipped completely out of his hand and in his political anxiety to keep the Opposition at bay, he has not always appreciated the constructive criticisms that we have given at a national level. For instance, if I may give you an example, the Minister can never be proud of the delay in the physical development plan being propagated in this country; he can never be proud with the speed with which applications at Town Planning are dealt with so as to spur on development in the private and other sectors of the country, and yet it is a matter under his Ministry in his other capacity as Minister of Planning.

These are the factors that really bother me as to whether we are truly running Barbados. It was once his proud boast that we would be commanding the high heights of the economy; it was his proud boast that by 1976 he would have had full employment and he said that were it not for the effects of inflation in 1973 he would have been there, and yet figures prior to 1973 cannot support this type of conclusion which he has reached. I want to deal with one of the side effects that has come into this debate, because many people seem to think indeed that the debate is simply about licensing of banks, but I want to take up this question of licensing of banks in the few minutes that remain and seriously say this to the Minister; he has not been correct in his judgement on banks and in particular in his judgement on the Alleyne Mercantile Bank, and even taking his Press Release at its best, I want him to state in this debate what was the actual capital brought into Barbados by the Alleyne Mercantile Bank, whether it was brought in in foreign currency, Eastern Caribbean or otherwise, whether they brought in gold bullions, what were the benefits which came to the economy and not simply the question of the payment of a licence fee of \$2,000. I want him to state this quite clearly and I want the Minister in his capacity as Minister responsible for finance to say to this country what steps has he taken with a bank which he licensed going under within less than a year, with its inability to pay simple creditors even on hire purchase account and what enquiry he has instigated for this situation recurring in the future. That is the real criticism of his Ministry, and you must couple this with the fact that regardless of what other explanations have been given by the two Hon. Ministers, there has been no explanation forthcoming in the press or to this House as to why an employee of the Ministry of External Affairs should be receiving

cheques from a bank which is a failure in the context in which these cheques were received.
8.25 p.m.

If it was a consultant fee, it is a very serious thing. What right would a High Commissioner or Ambassador have to be receiving a consultation fee from a bank which has been a total failure in this country? I have heard all sorts of explanations. I would have expected the Minister of External Affairs, as well as the Minister of Finance in issuing a Press Release which they did on the statements made, to have explained the position of a very senior employee in the service of this country, or otherwise to have recalled him or have a proper explanation made.

I want to know what has happened in this affair. There has been no explanation up to date and I would advise the Minister that instead of treating this simply as a political issue, he should treat it as an issue which concerns how public officials must conduct themselves. If it was for consultation advice, why was it given? When was it given? The circumstances in which it was given must be of tremendous importance and obviously must be raised in this House at some stage.

There may be a proper explanation. I certainly have not heard it. Instead, I have seen the diversion of T. V. cameras, the build up of political confrontation and an effort to misprove and disprove this, but no effort at a real and genuine explanation for those of us who want to see in the country on an official or any other level, regardless of who it is, a certain amount of integrity and probity in the conduct of public affairs; and I fault this Minister in his own presence. He can reply to me as much as he likes. I fault him for his lack of judgement in financing the Alleyne Mercantile Bank.

Barbados should be looking to becoming the financial centre of Eastern Caribbean, and this is one of the true ways in which you would improve it. This is one of the measures that we should be seeking; but you cannot create that sort of climate if we allow fly by night banks to come here and misuse their position in the economy and create the impression that you only have to be a mover of motions at the Democratic Labour Party conference or something of the sort and you have much better treatment than otherwise.

The Minister must be aware that this is the same bank that issued a cheque for \$1 million (US) for which there was no money behind it. He must be aware that this is the same bank which was buying up a phase of the Heywoods Project

for something like \$6 million and could not back it. He must be aware that this is the same bank that was offering Dominica to pay \$50 million and there was nothing there.

Mr. SPEAKER: And the Hon. Speaker is aware that you have three minutes.

Mr. FORDE: Three minutes. I am interested to know what correct advice the Central Bank gave. What advice the Ministry of Finance and Planning gave. I am interested in these answers from the Prime Minister and I want to hear him on them. I do not want political poses as we so often get. There should be no problem in making explanations in this House.

A lot of people are being diverted from the true issue here, because there must have been a very serious error of judgement; and do not mind whatever explanation is given, I have made a statement in this House before that Statutory Boards are using their position in a way that even the former Executive Committee, and now the Cabinet, does not have the authority from this House to do. I am amazed that in the context of our financial position you can get the sort of guarantees being given by Statutory Corporations such as the Development Bank, being given to companies that have no adequate assets to operate in the economy. The Prime Minister must realise that this comes straight out of his Ministry, and my comment here is that he is not doing as Minister his job of a proper enquiry in these particular aspects of his Ministry.

He probably has too much on his plate. I realise that he carries about forty departments of Government, but in which case there comes a time where your junior Minister should be taking some of the work load off your shoulder, both in the interest of the efficiency of Government and your own good health. If you have continually to carry the whole load of Government, something must be wrong with your political judgement, if you carry the work load and slippages are occurring in the context where only as one man you cannot carry the full work load of Government. That is my comment on that aspect of the Budgetary Proposals.

Regardless of what is said, unless I hear from one of the Ministers of Government a satisfactory explanation of why these cheques went to a senior employee of the Ministry of External Affairs, I must conclude in those circumstances that all has been properly explained on this matter. I am prepared to be convinced, but the Minister must be satisfied that I believe that a proper and independent enquiry

will reveal to him that the true figure received was not \$20,000, but much more substantial than what has appeared in the debate so far.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, when the Leader of the Opposition made what could be called his reply to the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals in the House of Assembly on Friday afternoon, there were two issues at that time which I thought merited a reply from me. Since then I have had the opportunity to hear other members of the Opposition speak and to realise the areas of difference over there.

I would, however, like to respond to certain statements or issues raised by the hon. member for Christ Church West and the hon. member for St. Philip North. In 1973 which is the period to which the member for Christ Church West referred, at that time I happened to be acting Minister of Finance. On a number of occasions I have had the privilege of speaking in this Chamber on matters relating to the economy, and I tried from time to time to enlighten the member for Christ Church West on certain reasons why at the time we could not take certain steps which he was at that time advocating.

I have done it before and I think that the time has come when I should repeat some of the things that I have said in this Chamber previously. In 1973 when we were members of the East Caribbean Currency Authority — commonly known as ECCA — I explained why we could not unilaterally take any decision in respect of sterling as was being advocated by the member for Christ Church West, the reason being that the whole Authority had to agree with it. As a matter of fact, history has so repeated itself, that in recent weeks we have seen how the members of ECCA could not take certain important steps because there had to be unanimous action on the part of all the members of that Authority. At that time I was challenged that what I was saying was not correct. I believe that the hon. member has seen that what I was saying then was absolutely the case.

8.35 p.m.

In 1973 shortly before the Arabs imposed their oil embargo and created further economic chaos in the world — I say 'further economic chaos' because prior to that there was not only an oil crisis in the world, there was a money crisis in the world. The United Kingdom had decided to put its pounds to float, and floating meant it was floating downwards. All of the major economic centres in the world were facing problems. The United States of America in

1972, Germany subsequently, because the Deutsche mark remained strong for a very long time and is still strong today; the Japanese Yen suffered too as a result. As a matter of fact, at that time the oil crisis — perhaps only two currencies had any strength; that was the Deutsche mark — I am talking about the Western world; I do not know what values are placed on the currencies in Western Europe. The Deutsche Mark and the Japanese Yen, and, to some extent one cannot exclude the French Franc. Now that was in 1973; but there was absolute turmoil in the international world. Britain itself was suffering tremendously, and Britain at that time in order to depress demand for money had very high interest rates, and because of the high interest rates that were being applied to funds in the United Kingdom at that time we, because we had no sterling control, found ourselves in the position where particularly persons who had a line of credit with the banks here in Bridgetown that would take up their full amount of money, they allowed them in over draft, and sent it abroad to the United Kingdom in order to attract very high interest rates.

There was only one thing that we could do at that time because, as I said earlier, we were members of the Eastern Caribbean Currency Authority and we could not impose any sterling control. We had no sterling control and we could not unilaterally impose any. The only step that we could take at that time, Mr. Speaker, in 1973, was what we did, and we relaxed the interest rates to which the hon. member for Christ Church West referred. We did not intend that that rate should be relaxed permanently, and in fact it was not done permanently, and I believe I have explained that in this House before. We relaxed it intending that — we realized that the level was ridiculously low and because of the low level there was a flight of capital out of Barbados, and we relaxed it at that time in order to enable the level of interest rates to find its own level, at which point we could then control it; but what happened at that time, Mr. Speaker, was that the banks themselves, taking opportunity of this, went into competition among themselves for whatever deposits there were available in the country.

One bank today offered 10½% and another tomorrow offered 11% and another bank tomorrow offered 11½% and created all kinds of confusion. People were withdrawing money from here today and placing it over there tomorrow and creating all kinds of confusion, but it did have the good effect that was intended, and what was intended was that it should eliminate the flight of capital out of Barbados to the United

Kingdom capital market, and it wiped it out immediately.

I make this point here this evening because the Hon. member for Christ Church West has returned to this subject here again in his speech a few minutes ago, and we were right at that time — the hon. member was saying that he was right in what he said, and we were right in what we did. If we did not do it at that time, the place was being deprived of whatever capital it had; and what is more, money became absolutely scarce. Of course, Mr. Speaker, when you allow interest rates to be increased, of course, borrowings are going to be less. You reduce the demand for money. You can have the effect, if you reduce the demand for money — and I am aware of this — you reduce the expansion opportunities of those business countries; you reduce the expansion opportunities of firms, which means, of course, you are simultaneously probably putting a curb on increased employment.

All these things were known; but when you had to weigh this against the flight of capital from your country we had to take a step which we did not want to take but we could not get away from taking that step. From time to time it had the effect, Mr. Speaker, of causing a lot of deposits to build up in the country — creating a number of high deposits in the country; and because of the higher liquidity which probably has now transformed to high liquidity we have been able to reduce step by step our interest rates hoping that, because now of the lower interest rates, that the commercial firms and industrialists and so on will be able to take this opportunity in order to expand their business and create now again, further employment.

Something has been said about employment in this debate which, Mr. Speaker, I have I think, to set straight. It has been said by the Leader of the Opposition that unemployment rate in Barbados stands somewhere between 28% and 30%. That is not at all in consonance with statistics not only made available to us but in the work carried out by the Statistical Department. I have here, Mr. Speaker, on my files, the most recent, the most up-to-date statistic on the unemployment situation in Barbados, and which shows that at the end of 1975 the unemployment — and I am talking about persons who were seeking work; you cannot include persons who are not seeking work. You have people who were not interested in working, you have people who are not seeking work; so therefore you have to measure your statistics on those persons who are

seeking work — and a survey was carried out at the end of 1975, figures at the end of 1975, showing that of the males seeking employment 10.3% of those — there were 10.3% of those persons who were seeking employment; who were unemployed, in other words. Females 17.1%. I am talking about the end of 1975. This is no guess work This is a result of a survey carried out.

It is one thing to come in here and call out figures for which one has no basis in fact. Any international institution that makes a report on the employment situation in this country can only do so on the basis of what information we ourselves have, because they do not carry it out. We carry it out and we supply it to them. They do not carry it out. So nobody comes here and carries out any survey on his own. So let us get that straight. So any survey we have here is.....

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir, The Minister is correct in saying that I said 28% to 30%. The figure should have been according to the United Nations survey carried out in November, 1975, 26% to 28%. I wonder if he will agree with that. Ten percent of males and 17% of females make 27%.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point made.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I do not understand that kind of statistic (*Asides*) That is too high for me.....

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of elucidation. If the Minister would give way, Sir. If he does not mind. The real point I wanted to make is this. I do not want to correct the figures given in my speech. I did say 28% to 30%. That was a slip from 26% to 28%. If he does not mind my just making that correction.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point of elucidation made.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: This survey shows, Mr. Speaker, that of those persons who are unemployed and seeking work, that there were 13.2% of all persons at the end of 1975.
8.45 p.m.

This is a fact that I want to make available here to this Chamber from our records supplied to us by the Statistical Department; 13.2%. This is what this has shown. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is correct to say that there had been some projection of full employment in this country here in 1976.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, if the Minister does not mind, he is dealing with papers. He is asked to lay the whole United Nations survey; what is it he is laying, Sir? He just said he is going to lay something regarding the figures. He said that a survey was carried out at the end of 1975 by an international institution. I am asking him to lay that survey in the House and let that speak for itself rather than let him speak for the dross the Statistical Department has put on him.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a speech.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I never said anything about any survey carried out by any International Institution, I talked about a survey carried out by the Statistical Department at the end of 1975. That is what I am reading. I am saying that no survey has been carried out by any International Institution; that is what I said, that when they come here and they want information they go to the Statistical Department. That is what I said. Anyhow, let me carry on from where I left off, Sir.

Full employment does not necessarily mean in economic terms that every last person in this country must be employed. Full employment does not necessarily mean that at all. In 1973 we as a Government had been pursuing certain measures which would have effected what I would consider to be full employment in this country had they been able to have been implemented. We are members of certain financial institutions. We are members of the Inter American Development Bank, we are members of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, commonly known as the World Bank, we are members of the Caribbean Development Bank. Of course we have our own Development Bank, but let us not talk about that. There are several employment projects to the value today — the value in 1973, and this is what has made the difference — of about nearly \$200 million. I have a note of them here and I can repeat them for hon. members. The Deep Water Harbour \$24 million, the sewage plant \$27 million or thereabout, the airport development \$23 million, the cement plant \$30 million, the cluster block of hotels at Heywoods \$30 million, the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic \$19 million, the Post Office \$9 million. We are still carrying out work on the Community College and there are still a few million dollars yet to be spent.

These are public projects, then there are other individual projects. These public projects amount to somewhere in the vicinity of \$200

million worth of work, in other words, of materials and employment in this country, and these are long lasting projects. (*Asides*). You will have a sewage project in this country. Structures, channelling, pipe laying, and you will tell me it is not any kind of employment? What kind of rubbish is this? What kind of nonsense is this we are going to hear?

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order; I am sorry to interrupt him so much, Sir, but he is referring to something that has been expunged from the record and therefore what he says must be expunged too, Sir.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I know what I am saying is going to rile you, but I am not finished with you yet.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us hear the debate on this amendment.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, the other thing mentioned in this House was the question of housing, and that is my pet subject. I am reading from the same Bible they read from, but the hon. members of the Opposition purposely refrained from quoting the figures for 1974, and this is what I was trying to point out to the hon. member for St. Philip North, but of course he obviously has some special reason for not quoting the 1974 figures.

Mr. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the hon. member for St. Thomas referred you to page 17 of the Central Bank Report when he was dealing with it.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a point of interruption. Will the hon. member please proceed?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I will read this to you. It was read already, but I will read it again, and there is only one sentence I will read. "The number of houses built by the National Housing Corporation fell from 357 in 1974 to 195 in 1975." The hon. member was glibly talking about the number of houses they built previously and referred to one year in which they built 300 houses, 1956–1957. I will come back to that in a minute. I have in my files here the record of the houses built. In the National Housing Corporation our year begins in April and ends in March of the following year, so I do not know how to look at 1975, whether from 1974 to 1975 or 1975 to 1976, so therefore what I am going to do is give both figures.

The figures I have here in my files show that in the year 1974–75, that is the period that

ended in March, 1975, 290 houses were completed in that year and 274 houses were under construction. If we are thinking in terms of April 1975 to March 1976, well then the figure is 232 houses built in that year and 299 houses under construction. That, Mr. Speaker, is the record.

Now let us look at the record I referred you to just now of the Barbados Labour Party for that fantastic year of 1956-57. Of course I know, Mr. Speaker, that none of them know anything about housing. They are just like the Dean who probably knows a little more about theology than he knows about housing.
8.55 p.m.

I do not have to deal with him because he is a coward. He can maintain the sanctity and security of his pulpit. Let him come down. So I will have to leave him out.

In 1956-57 303 houses were built, but of what type? They were the hurricane relief houses. There are several in my constituency behind the Montgomery School, houses sixteen feet long by nine feet wide with no sanitary facilities whatsoever. These were the houses built by the Barbados Labour Party in 1956-57, and they are going to come and boast that they built 303 of those houses in that year. Of those houses they should have built not less than 3,000. The bulk of the houses of that year were hurricane relief houses. If you want to talk about houses, I invite you to go to any of the estates we have under construction in housing in this country. Go to Oxnards. There we have 128 under construction, durable and popular houses with applications for them running at ten to one at least, and of which about half are completed. We go further south. Go to Lodge Terrace. I am talking of this year's record. We have just finished 75 houses and we have nearly finished selling them all, and we have started 109 more right there. Let them go and see them. Let them go to Wildey and they will see over 215 houses that have been built this year and more are under construction. Fifty-two will be on the market in not less than a week and there are more of the rentals up there which are in the final stages of completion. Let them go to Haynesville in the constituency of the hon. member for St. James.

Mr. FORDE: On a point of order, would the Minister tell us what is the number of applications he has for houses and how he is responding to the need? (*Asides*).

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Minister of Education addressing the Chair?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member proceed.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: A point of order cannot be a question.

Mr. SPEAKER: I ruled that not to be a point of order.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: It cannot be a question; it is a breach of the Rules of this House. They do not want to hear what I have to say. Well I can tell you something.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. C. E. TALMA: If the hon. member would give way, Mr. Speaker.

I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow, Thursday, 5th August, 1976.

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

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

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting is resumed.

As Speaker, I make this statement. The right to grant a member permission to broadcast his speech is not covered by the Standing Orders of this Honourable Chamber. Consequently it is the discretion of the Speaker to grant or refuse this facility. As Speaker I am of the opinion that this discretion should be exercised impartially. Consequently the member will be granted permission to broadcast his speech provided that all the necessary and appropriate arrangements are made with the appropriate authority.

This is the Reply to the letter from the Leader of the Opposition.

We shall continue with the Budgetary Proposal.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I am just seeking a little clarification on.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you speaking on this? There will be no debate on that.

Mr. HINDS: I am not debating anything, Sir.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Not one word. Standing Order No. 39, the decision of the Chair is final.

Mr. HINDS: Nobody is questioning the decision of the Chair, Sir. What we want to be clear on in a matter of this nature is, when his Honour the Speaker tells us that once arrangements have been made with the proper authority a member would be entitled to have his speech broadcast, what, Mr. Speaker, would be the proper authority? In other words, — just a minute, Sir, can I go to Rediffusion, can I go to CBC or any other television station and make arrangements with those bodies and say, well, all right, I am okay for having my speech broadcast in the House of Assembly, or, are we to understand that Your Honour is the proper and ultimate authority in a matter of this sort?

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Your Honour's reply will deal with the points; we have put Your Honour to the trouble of two matters. Your Honour, I am in a little difficulty. I am sorry I was not in my seat. I am raising a private matter, a matter not connected with this debate, and I apologise to Your Honour that I was not in my seat at the time. I did hear what Your Honour said. Am I to take it then that I have Your Honour's authority to apply to the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation for broadcast of my reply and that I can state Your Honour is agreeable? That Your Honour will give permission subject to that, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: This is part of the statement I made. I will read it only because the Leader of the Opposition to whom this reply is really directed, admits that he was not in his seat and he did not hear the full text. And I will say, before any further discussion, that by Standing Order 39 of this House the decision of the Chair is final. This is the full text of my reply to a letter received yesterday from the Leader of the Opposition; "The right to grant a member permission to broadcast his speech is not covered by the Standing Orders of this Honourable Chamber. Consequently it is in the discretion of the Speaker to grant or refuse this facility. As Speaker I am of the opinion that this discretion should be exercised impartially. Consequently the member will be granted permission to broadcast his speech provided that all the necessary and appropriate arrangements are made with the appropriate authority."

That ends my decision, and Standing Order 39 says the decision of the Chair is final.

We shall now continue our debate on the Budgetary Proposal. When the House was suspended last night the Hon. Minister of Housing was addressing. His time as noted here by me had not expired but if he wishes he may resume his debate.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Yes, Mr. Speaker. You are quite right. At the time of the suspension of the Sitting yesterday evening I was at that moment giving this Honourable Chamber the benefit of the current record of the Ministry of Housing because as I said before, this matter was put in issue by the Leader of the Opposition and it was mentioned as well by the member for St. Philip North. So I thought I should set the record straight. We must know precisely what we are doing because — is that a gun that the hon. member is moving around?.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I have not noticed anything peculiar but I.....

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I saw something being pushed in my direction; I did not know what it was.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I said then what we were doing in Oxnards, I said what we were doing in Lodge Terrace, I said what we were doing in Wildey. I believe I said that we were in the final stages of completing about forty houses at Cane Vale. I think it was at that stage that the suspension was taken.

I should also like to state at this moment work is going on at Sion Hill and Orange Hill, two sites which we have ear marked for our removal of houses in that programme, which is a new concept in housing development in this country, as well as work is in progress at Clapham. I was not really intending to consider this as part of our housing development programme but in fact it is part of what we are doing in housing to accommodate over 100 houses of those to be removed from the Emmerton area, not only to make for the sewage plant but also as part of our programme in slum clearance.

Mr. Speaker, this aspect of our record contrasts greatly the record of the Barbados Labour Party when they were in power. I was at pains to show that in fact the record of which the Hon. Leader of Opposition boasted so much about was in fact related to houses 16 x 9 and 20 x 9 feet wide, which were in fact hurricane relief houses in 1956. And what is more? There was no accompanying facilities for those houses; and I do not mean day nurseries, I do not mean playing

fields, I do not mean nursery schools; I am talking about lavatory facilities. Look at the record, Sir, again; look at the Princess Royal Avenue in the Pine, look at Field Place in Bayville and see what kind of houses they constructed there for people, where the lavatory facilities are constructed in the yard, so that if you wanted to make use of those facilities, be it midnight, midday, 3 o'clock in the morning, thunder, lighting, sun or whatever it may be, one had to move out of your house and go into the yard to use those facilities. What is more. They put one set of families to live on top of the other. When the children wet upstairs the people below got wet, and this was not by part of their own family. When they scrubbed upstairs, those below got wet; but we are pledging this here now, that we are going to remedy that situation, not only in Field Place, not only in Princess Royal Avenue but wherever these conditions are. So you can put the record of the Barbados Labour Party, if you like, against that of the Democratic Labour Party where housing is concerned and see the houses that they have been building.

I was a member of the Authority for two years before I became a Minister, and that is a long time ago because I became a Minister in 1965.

12.10 p.m.

I was a member of that Authority up to 1965 and I know what I am talking about. Some of those houses did not even have doors, those that they did condescend to put toilet facilities in did not have covers for the toilet seats. That is what I am talking about, because I know what I am talking about. I was a member of the Authority, and you are going to talk now when we built so many houses? We have standards for our people and when we have built a house it is a house which conforms to the standards of anybody else's in Barbados, even if it is the very rich, so this is what I want to get straight in our record.

A lot was said, Mr. Speaker, about the state of the economy and the managing of our economy. I can forgive those who do not know for talking. I would like to come back to the question of the economy of Barbados, because it has been said on the floor of this House that the economy of this country is in this tarnished state because it has not been properly managed, and I think those of you who have been keeping abreast with what is happening in the world would know that this is absolutely and completely untrue. As a matter of fact, I go further. Not only has it been competently

managed, but if it had not been so competently managed Barbados would be on its knees today. Quite honestly, Mr. Speaker, we have no right being in this reasonably good economic situation we are in, because we do not have the resources, we have not got the resources of other countries to back us up, so we are the most densely populated country in the western hemisphere, we should not be where we are today. For what we have done and what we are proposing to do it is nothing short of a miracle, and it is an economic miracle, which has resulted from having more than sound, sound economic management of our affairs.

Talk was made of our retail sales tax and it was even stated that in fact the amount of money the sales tax yielded is equal to the amount of money it takes to run the Ministry of External Affairs. That is a gross mistake and a gross falsehood. The amount of \$5,771,000 has been allocated to the Ministry of External Affairs this year. Out of that allocation, Mr. Speaker, at least \$2 million is paid as contributions to international bodies like the ILO, the World Health Organisation. Whether or not we have an External Affairs Ministry, are you suggesting that we should not belong to places like the ITU, WMO, ILO or IDB? Is this what is being suggested?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister will have to conclude in three minutes now.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, everybody gets in here and talks about the tax. The member for the City said how the tax is killing everybody, but nobody gets in here and talks about the profits the merchants will make. If the tax yields \$5.7 million, and if we are competent to do our arithmetic, we can easily see that in fact it costs no more than \$22 per person per year, which is less than \$2 per month per person in tax. It costs no more in retail sales tax than \$2 per person per month, even less than that, and in the majority of cases, particularly with the poor people, they will pay probably less than \$2 for the entire year.

That is the situation with the sales tax that we have today, but they are not going to put these facts to the people, they are not going to come with the profits the merchants will make, they will not come in here and say one word if in fact the merchants put up their profits by 20%, but let the Government put up its sales tax by 5% and they all come in here and howl. I think the reason is very obvious because they will have the support of those retail merchants and they are looking to those retail merchants for

their support, and those same retail merchants will be running this country if the people of this country were so misguided as to put the Government of this country in their hands.

Mr. Speaker, we have to identify who we are dealing with. We were scheduled for a meeting of this House last Tuesday. It was not our resolution, it was the resolution of the Opposition. Some of us were here, and you were here as well that day, to do their business, it was not our business, but they came and when they came and saw that we were ready for them they put their tails between their legs and they ran. This is the type of people we have to deal with, but let them know this, that he who fights and runs away lives to run another day. I thank you.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, from as early as 1972 it was made known that there had been less than 1% real growth in the economy of this country. I make mention of this for the simple reason that I have heard much being blamed on the energy crisis which started properly in 1973, as if to make the people of this country believe how glad some people really were for a situation such as the energy crisis to arise so that they would have something on which to lay the blame for the misgivings and the mismanagement of the economy of this country.

It is well known, Mr. Speaker, that prior to what we knew as the cement crisis that the Ministry of Communications and Works one day laid off 466 workers. There was not any energy crisis then, this was in 1972. You will find that there has been no significant progress in the economy of this country ever since then, and we are to say that the present economic crisis which this country is still facing would have come about without any fuel crisis or any other sort of crisis coming upon us in 1973. I am saying this, Sir.
12.20 p.m.

What we have got to look very much at, Mr. Speaker, is that the fortuitous profits that we got from the sugar boom of 1974-75 helped the Government to ride through the 1973 crisis and indeed helped to carry this Government right through to 1975. You will see, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that the profits from sugar were nothing related to any management policy of the Government of this country that helped us to be in the position that we can now hear the Hon. Minister of Housing telling us that we have this density of population, and we ought to be thankful for having been able to live through the economic miracle working period and words to that effect. What we are saying, Mr. Speaker, is

that it is this Government that has demonstrated every effort on its part to destroy the sugar industry of this country in so much that even when it was found that the price of sugar had shown an inclination of being far better than what it had ever been in our 300 years of history, I made the suggestion and I am sure the Leader of the House can bear me out, that the open lands that are presently uncultivated in this country the Government should have made available to every land owner cane plants free, and the Government ought to have placed its ploughing equipment to the benefit of these land owners to bring the lands under cultivation, so that every acre of land that had not been under cultivation for any length of time would have been able to produce some sort of sugar crop help to cash in on those prices that are obtaining even up to the present. But nothing whatsoever, Mr. Speaker, was done in this respect.

Now you will find, Mr. Speaker, that there is nowhere to be found between 1971 and 1976 any real growth in the economy of this country. As a matter of fact, it is on record that there was less than 1% real growth. In 1972 if we were to say there was the appearance of a modest attempt at recovery, the 1974 budget brought home to us that the increase in the value of goods and services produced in 1974 was all but eroded by the increase in the price level. In other words, when the Minister of Finance had his confidential chat in 1975, there was evidence that the economy had continued to be depressed and that the Minister of Finance himself was so depressed at the depressing situation that he dared not come before the television camera as he now wants to, once, twice and thrice to discuss matters which to my mind up to the present have been totally unrelated to the economic situation of this country. It is our view that we have got to look to the future. As a matter of fact, it is to the future that the country is looking, and since there has been stagnation and failure to grow in the economy between 1971 and 1976, this brings home to me what some of our sports writers and sports commentators have often sought to recommend in cases where you have cricketers who have put up a reasonably good performance over the years, but they could not make the West Indies team. Some of our sports writers have often suggested that you do not cast them aside, but you give them what is called a benefit tour. I am saying now that the electorate gave this Government of ours a benefit tour between 1971 and 1976 and it is only in fairness to the same taxpayers that this Government after having ten years of batting and bowling performance at certain levels and

having been paid off with a benefit tour from 1971 to 1976 that we say, Mr. Speaker, in the name of God this Government should go.

Mr. Speaker, there has not only been a decline in the number of jobs provided in industry in this country, but there has been a decline in the income levels of the few who have been retained in jobs in industry. Time and again we have made the point of the garment industry, how our young men and young women are being paid pittance in relation to the contribution they are making to the industry, and when you find a Government is telling us about setting up this industry with a view to employing 300, 400, or 500 persons, it is in the Government's interest to ensure that you not only set about to employ x number of persons, but that the wage level introduced in the industry ought to be one commensurate with affording those employed therein to reach a decent standard of living. There has been no attempt by the Government to bring this into effect and as a result you will find that employers in the various industries are taking a mean advantage of the few workers to the extent that they are undergoing repeated training processes because the employers do not intend at any stage hiring them as full-fledged workers. 12.30 p.m.

Even when the Government sets up its own training programme to provide workers for industry, the Government does not then see when they are sending out fully trained workers to take their rightful place in industry that they are paid wages that bear some relationship to the degree of training which the workers have had.

To be told that domestic agriculture between 1973 and 1976 has made no significant growth and particularly more so during the last year bears this out. Mr. Speaker, one has only got to look at the figures provided in respect of the Barbados Marketing Corporation's purchases, and the Barbados Marketing Corporation's involvement in this respect because one would see a significant reduction or decline, and this must cast some serious reflection upon the industry as a whole; because if the BMC which is the main outlet for domestic agriculture as such, one must find that there must be a corresponding decline in employment figures, since you will find the contention we have heard about the vast numbers of unemployed persons.

All of this must be taken into consideration, because it must bear some significance; because it cannot be denied, Mr. Speaker, that the Government, and particularly the Minister of Finance, in his Budgetary Proposals, has not

forecast or foreshadowed anything nearing what we would like to believe would be full employment at a time such as this in the history of this country. All that we find is an attempt to carry the electorate to the polls on fair promises.

We have heard it held out here about a cement factory. Sir, in 1961 the Manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party told us about this cement factory and what not. As for the flour mill, by this time one would have thought that there would have been a lot of pigs fattened by the coming into being of this flour mill so that neither the BMC or processing plant would have no problem, and consumers would be able to buy pork at reasonable prices. None of this was to be. The question of the flour mill is now being held out again.

It is also being held out to the electorate to get their minds tumbling over about the expansion of the deep water harbour. Right now, expansion has been taking place for weeks at the deep water harbour. Of the thousands of people who have gone to register for employment — and this only demonstrates the extent of the unemployment situation that we have in this country — when all is said and done, with the expansion of the deep water harbour, at no time will you find that more than 200 persons are employed at any one time in the expansion of the deep water harbour; and if that figure is reached, I think we have gone a long way.

You will also find that you are told about the sewage scheme for the City. This is also held out as providing work for persons. All of these things have been examined in some detail, and we are satisfied beyond the shadow of a doubt that in truth and in fact there can be no real claim to anything being done to allay the fears, anxieties and frustrations of the numbers of persons who are willing, able and ready to work and cannot find work.

I heard the Minister of Housing make mention last night about unemployables in this community. I want to say that prior to 1961 the number of unemployables in this country could hardly be reckoned on the 10 fingers of the hands of the hon. member; but we maintain that it is the behaviour pattern set up by this Government that now finds this country saddled with a bunch of limers and that type of person. Prior to 1961 nobody in Barbados knew what a limer was except what we heard about in Trinidad and those places. Today our people genuinely want to work and cannot find work.

You will find that the Government is spending a lot of money on Education, but the

Minister of Finance has not disclosed in his Budgetary Proposals that it is intended to provide work at any significant level to absorb the people who are supposed to be coming from schools with O Levels and that sort of thing.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am hearing members of the Government benches speaking too loudly and disturbing me.

Mr. HINDS: What we find is that the Government's practice is one of spending for show. This Government comprises a lot of show business people. They are not spending for utility. All that they are doing from the beginning until the end is showing how good they are at show business; but at the same time hundreds of thousands of young people in this country are literally starving. The young children are still going into the garbage cans in the City looking for food, and the Government does nothing to demonstrate its ability to cope with the situation and to retrieve these people from that type of situation.

You will find that these show business people will spend millions now to establish a polytechnic; but what we maintain that this country wants is not a gigantic institution, not just a bundle of steel. The same money that the Government now intends to spend on building one polytechnic could supply this country with four polytechnics, and that is what this country needs, so that you could carry the education and the skills to people wherever they can be located in the country districts rather than building one polytechnic next door to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, therefore having to bring all the people from the country and elsewhere to be chucked into this institution.

The Government has again demonstrated its inability to cope with a situation that is of considerable intensity. What we want this Government to do is not only to set its priorities right, but to lend an ear to the assistance offered from time to time whether it comes from the Opposition or elsewhere.
12.40 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, whilst on this matter of education — the Hon. Minister of Education was on the floor yesterday demonstrating but he has not yet told us what he proposes doing about the technical wing at the several secondary schools and other schools in this country. He has not yet told us that he intends to see that these institutions are productive of the type of skills that this country is presently demanding for the prosecution of the work of this country in nation

building. He is not associated at all with this. He does not begin to familiarize himself with anything that education is really demanding in these days.

Since 1962 the education system of this country has been subjected to a type of what we call destructive criticism. This is what we want to say; and one would have hoped that the Government would have taken stock of all this and would have sought to set its house in order. There is nothing of the kind, but what we would find is that an education officer from the Ministry has recently gone into a school attending a teacher's meeting at a school and to have told the teachers that it is the policy of the Government to set about what he calls downgrading of the older secondary schools to bring them to the level of the comprehensive schools.

This comes, Mr. Speaker, from the mouth of an education officer from the Ministry in this country, and he said it to the teachers — that the policy of the Government will be to downgrade the older secondary schools. It is not a case where he has suggested that they propose upgrading the Comprehensives and the newer secondaries or anything of the kind to the level of the older secondary schools; so it must mean therefore, Mr. Speaker, that all we have been trying to suggest to this Government in the past, of seeking to set about to create an atmosphere where we can witness what is called the parody of esteem in all our secondary schools has fallen on deaf ears and the Government is not prepared to institute such a system.

Nobody in this country, Mr. Speaker, wants to see any downgrading of anything. We want to see that we uplift, wherever possible, and in the field of education there could be no greater demand from this society; but it is nearly twenty-six years ago, Mr. Speaker — and if the Hon. Minister requires any assistance, and he does require our assistance in matters of this sort — if he were to read the booklet entitled Teachers' Notes on Pupils' Record Card — and I do not want him to subject himself to the entire exercise. All he needs to do is to read Part 1 and Part 5. If the Minister of Education were to read Parts 1 and 5 of that booklet he would see and know and understand what the Government of twenty-six years ago was trying to do with the educational system in this country.....

Mr. SPEAKER: You can speak for three minutes more, please.

Mr. HINDS: Three minutes more? All right, Sir.

This being the case, what we have got to do is this; we have got to see and to make sure that we do not have a system whereby we have got to ignore the youth, that we do not have a system whereby, as the Minister of Finance has given us to understand, that it is not the intention of this Government to live off of borrowing. Mr. Speaker, we believe that the Government has now come around to appreciating the fact that we cannot afford to live off of borrowing because the Government comes face to face with the fact that there is nowhere else from where they can borrow. In other words, the gaps of borrowing have been stopped. Road blocks have been put up. We have got, Mr. Speaker, to see that we have got production at every level in our society; that we have got to cut out the wastage in our society.

Let us, Mr. Speaker, for a single moment think of the fiasco with those fire engines at Seawell International Airport. The history associated with them and the question of buying spare parts now for fire engines that have never been used. Mr. Speaker, let us look at the fact that the Government not having its priorities right, before one bag of cement or a factory is built, the Government throws its ship in. Mr. Speaker, I need not call on the vast sums which have been wasted on a crematorium, a coast guard station, on a lack of supervision in all the MC&W projects, and Mr. Speaker, if I were to attempt to say anything about our foreign affairs Ministry, that, I feel, would bring down the cry of this Honourable House...

Mr. SPEAKER: That is your time.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I will then wind up.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I have given every member.....

Mr. HINDS: If there is a lack of consideration.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Just a minute please. I am the time keeper here for myself and I have time put down here for you and every member. I am not robbing you, according to the Standing Orders, of your half hour debate.

Mr. HINDS: I must finish off, Sir, because you are not the time keeper for yourself. You are the time keeper for hon. members.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Anyhow, wind up. One minute.

Mr. HINDS: One of the greatest blunders I must say, Sir, on the part of this Government is its unwillingness and its failure to provide agriculture with the sustenance that the exercise demands, and as a result of that failure we now find ourselves even with this year's crop, not being able to cash in to the extent that one would normally have wished.

12.50 p.m.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I spent some two years and 38 minutes waiting, like all my colleagues and all the citizens of this country, to hear what is the position of this country, and the taxpayers are entitled to know. After waiting two years and 38 minutes a demolition job was done by the Leader of the Opposition in 37 minutes.

I have spent ten years in here like you, fortunately or unfortunately, and now by an act of God you are saying goodbye to this Chamber, but I am confident that you are going to leave us in here with probably happy memories after the last five years, part of which you presided as Speaker within the last few months, and now we are turning into the home stretch and we are about to draw the final curtain. We witnessed last Friday a feeble, disgusting member for St. John attempting to find....

Mr. SPEAKER: Now please withdraw the words "feeble and disgusting."

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, I am going to withdraw..... (*Asides*).

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not wish any member on this side or that to tell me, I am saying what I want withdrawn.

Mr. CRAIG: I withdraw "feeble and disgusting", but it would appear to me, Sir, that the Minister for Finance and Planning is a feeble, worn out Minister of Government, and listening to his presentation, when we are used to having one hour and 45 minutes of proposals presented to this country, only after one year we find that after two years he was found only enough time to present his budgetary proposals in 38 minutes, so we must ask ourselves why. We must ask ourselves that question. This is my conclusion. When you have nothing to say you should sit down, when you are to speak up you must stand up.

On this occasion, Sir, you may agree with me that the Prime Minister presented an empty budget saying absolutely nothing about the country's position. We have heard of depressurising from the Minister of Health and of

removing. We have heard in 1966 of the spraying of acid on people and bullets and blood baths for those who were not interested in independence for the country. That was a resolution passed at the Government Party's Conference. (Hon. P. M. GREAVES: That is not true). I will soon tell you what is true.

Mr. SPEAKER: I expect you to address me and to tell me the truth.

Mr. CRAIG: All we have heard about is that this is depressed, the Government is depressed, the economy is depressed, and in all that I have heard one thing hurt me and that was the member for St. John depressing the Gallery yesterday when he referred to them as hooligans. That was what was most depressing to me, for when citizens can go out there and work morning, noon and night and give their blood and sweat to this country for the Minister of Finance to live the way he and his Ministers, and in particular the Hon. Senator George Moe whom I have referred to in this debate, Sir.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like the hon. member to know that if he is going to refer — and I believe he knows the rules — to people like that he should do to me the same courtesy as the Leader of the Opposition did, so I will ask him to withdraw the names of any member in the Other Place and he can continue his debate. He knows that pretty well, so do not let us breach the Standing Orders, because I am keeping the book in my hand. Will you please withdraw the name of Senator George Moe?

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I agree with you, Sir, because it boggles my mind even to mention his name the way I feel about the incident, so I will withdraw the remarks because I do not think it is really worthy of me even to mention his name, and I must apologise, Sir, I withdraw the remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER: Proceed.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, we have listened to the Prime Minister. I have listened to the Minister of Housing in particular, and I can say to the member for St. Michael West in the evening of his years that he is speaking like a real statesman. It is regrettable he is not going to be in here long enough to make contributions of that nature. I will give credit where credit is due. It was a statesmanlike speech; he has dealt with the subject. When he is wrong he knows that I will not only tell him on the floor of the House that he is wrong, I will tell him anywhere.

When you hear what appears to be nonsense by the Minister of Housing, and I am going to deal with that particular speech now, about people not having toilets in their houses when we built them..... (Hon. P. M. GREAVES: That is true). Nobody denied this, we are accepting this as a fact, but according to the Minister of Education who made it very clear on the floor of the House when we were dealing with pensions, he said that the old age pensioners cannot get another cent, that the Government can only afford to spend as much as they can afford to spend. On that occasion we looked first at what we considered the basics, which was to provide housing for them.

Now let us look at the houses built in 1929, in 1945, in 1956 and in 1976. You will agree, Mr. Speaker, that in 1929 the economy of the country was such that Barbados could only have afforded maybe a shack, no toilets or anything at all, a shack probably out of shavings or leaves, so you went on. In 1945 you were able to afford homes out of timber. You were cutting your cost to suit your pocket. In 1956 the Barbados Labour Party embarked upon what they considered some of the basic needs of the country after taking over from the Conservatives and fighting to give this country what can be considered a political, economic and social transformation. That is what we did, battled against the capitalists, battled against ignorance, social injustice and poverty, and step by step the late Sir Grantley Adams along with the member for St. Michael West went out in the byways and the highways and held the light and gave this country what today we can be justly proud of.
1.00 p.m.

When I hear this nonsense that we built houses with no toilets and people had to go outside, at the time we provided for them what the country could afford. We could not afford the toilets no more than today in 1976(Asides)

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. James is speaking and I do not want to hear voices from the other side. I want to hear him clearly as well as the Reporters, because if a word is said I cannot ask him to withdraw if there are other voices.

Mr. CRAIG: Technological advances is responsible for this type of thing today. If you had to build a house today you would have to look for a geyser, a bath tub, a bidet for the wife, and the toilet is supposed to be one that hardly keeps noise, but you could not do that in 1946 or 1951; so this bogus argument that the

Barbados Labour Party built houses for the people of the country without toilets is nonsense. What we did was to make sure that we provided for the people of the country within our limited financial resources the basic need, and that is shelter. We set the pattern so that when they came along all they had to do was to put in the toilets and dig the wells. Do you believe, Mr. Speaker, that jumbo jets came to Barbados or would have come to Barbados in 1956? We are using jumbos now, but at that time we used the little twin-engined planes which took three days to get from here to New York. It is not the Democratic Labour Party that did this; this is technological advancement throughout the world and Barbados is fortunate to have had people with the vision of Sir Grantley Adams to put a Deep Water Harbour there with limited resources. In the meantime we built houses, an airport and a hospital, provided roads, built a technical institute and the Housecraft Centre and an Evening Institute, and now the present Government has brought them together and called it a Polytechnic, bandying words. We provided an Evening Institute where girls could go and do Shorthand and Typing; we provided them with the Housecraft Centre because we were ready after putting the Harbour there and knew what would have happened; so we were providing our people with skills.

Mr. Speaker, the Technical Institute was not for a man like the Leader of the Opposition, a lawyer; it was for people to get the basic skills: plumbers, electricians, radiotricians, carpenters, masons, painters, and in the meantime with our limited resources we were able to lend people money to go to England and Canada for the purpose of sending back a few pennies for their families, and they are still sending back. I am saying this to lead up to this point; On \$200 million what can the people of Barbados see? The young people are frustrated and disillusioned, walking the streets day after day with no ray of hope unless you have a passport where you can get a little nay-nay job with the school meals.

The Government has built the National Insurance Building and the Treasury Building, and when you examine it and you examine the only building which the Ministers occupy in Bay Street, you can see that we are thinking. But what they lived on was the ten year development plan of the Barbados Labour Party in 1959, and by 1969 they had run out of ideas. The Grazettes Housing area was not only put there for the purpose of finding somewhere for poor people to live, but to provide facilities for light industries. In the meantime we built the Parkinson School, Bay Primary where the Minister of Health keeps

meetings, the one at Clinketts called Selah, Foundation Boys and Girls Schools, two Combermeres, one fell down and the other went up. You cannot blame us for the one that fell down, but we provided the idea and the money. All we hear about now is free secondary education. Is it really free? You had better check with Bradshaw and the member for St. Andrew who used to run a school and see how free it is, because the people who can least afford it are the ones who are getting half scholarships, and they have no school meals, and some children do not get at all.

I can say this for the Government. I like to give credit where credit is due. Between 1971 and 1976 I have always contended with my colleagues at our caucuses that the Prime Minister is a myth, walking about posing that he has some economic degree. In what? In industrial relations? I challenge him to get a job anywhere at the University of the West Indies as an economist. He is not a Steve Emtage or Charlie Skeete, William Demas or Frank Alleyne or Wendell McClean. He is not in that company. He is just a bogus economist and Hansard will reveal that the hon. member for St. Michael West said he was a half-baked economist way back in the 1950s. But you see, life plays some funny tricks. The hon. member for St. John believes he has a divine right to rule. Oh no! The people make you and the people break you, and the same hooligans that put him in are going to take him out. I heard him say in here, and it is in Hansard, that he would not sit in the Opposition. Do you know he is right! Because it was said that Sir Grantley Adams said he was going to be Prime Minister and it came to pass. He is not going to sit in the Opposition because I suspect Linton may choke him.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not a nice thing to think of someone being choked.

Mr. CRAIG: Politically, Sir. Choked in the ballot box. He was beaten in St. George and he trembled and he is going to be beaten again. He was beaten once, he was beaten twice and he can be beaten again. It is nonsense walking about the country talking about the leadership by a Minister of Finance who condones corruption under his nose. When the hon. member for St. Andrew was under suspicion we brought a Resolution in here to enquire into the Housing Authority and the Prime Minister got up and defended it, and then said that members of the Opposition benches are corrupt. You must first look under your nose and see the dead skeletons. You have had a bankrupt Speaker. All this has happened.

Mr. SPEAKER: Correction please.

Mr. CRAIG: A former bankrupt Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am still Speaker and I am not bankrupt yet.

Mr. CRAIG: I am not so sure. I hope you will not be. As long as amusement centres continue you may not be.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not even know about them.

Mr. CRAIG: I know you are not a one-arm bandit or pool person, but you may have a little interest looking at them to see the cheques which may come from them. Look at the West Indies Hospital Sweep. Barbadians abroad and at home complain of what they had a degree of suspicion in, all under the present Government. The Housing Authority where it was alleged that thousands and thousands of dollars went down the drain, the Community College; and you look around and see half a dozen people among the Government boast that they are millionaires, and not one agricultural worker can boast of that.
1.10 p.m.

Not one mason, not one carpenter, not one electrician, can boast of being a millionaire; but look across there, right across from me, and you will see a young man who actually says, "I am not half a millionaire; I am a whole millionaire" — and all in ten years. This is the type of behaviour. That is the type of thing to speak about; and that is where we challenge the Government with corrupt practices and mismanagement of the country's economy.

The Leader of the Opposition brought in a Resolution taking note of the Budgetary Proposals. Have they taken the opportunity? Well, do not take it. Let the opportunity take you. Where I think that the Prime Minister scored on the Leader of the Opposition is that he did not speak long enough, but perhaps, so to speak, he smelled the rat. We would have murdered him politically.

The battle is not going to be won or lost in here. You will hear a lot more things. You can believe me. You, Sir, do not have to be worried like the member for St. Michael West when he is dressed in white. You can put on a white suit and come in too. You are pure. What we are concerned about — I heard the Minister for Education defending cheques in here to the amount of \$600 each; but nowhere did he refer to a \$5,000 cheque which the member referred

to, and His Excellency the Barbados Ambassador to the United Nations drawing sums from Sidney Alleyne, a man who was defended by the Prime Minister of this country for counterfeiting coins.

Mr. SPEAKER: Again I must warn the hon. member.

Mr. CRAIG: I am talking about Sidney Alleyne. He is not a member in here. I am saying that he was charged before the Law Courts and defended by the Prime Minister in his capacity as a legal practitioner for counterfeiting coins, and the Prime Minister sat down knowing the individual, knowing what he stands for, knowing that he plans to overthrow Barbados, and gave him a licence for a bank in this country; and then members of Government, and high ranking officials like the United Nations Ambassador from Barbados received amounts up to \$20,000. Then they come in here talking a lot of nonsense about members of the Opposition and saying that they are going to rinse out somebody? They first have to put their own clothes in the clothes basket.

The Barbados Labour Party during its tenure of office behaved in such a way that not one single person could point their fingers at them. I am told that M. E. Cox was charged and cleared about some hut, and the late Grantley Adams brought an inquiry about the hut that cost about 12 cents in that day and it was discovered that the hut was up at the Transport Board providing some of the Transport Board workers with a pavilion.

Now we have got the Hospital Sweep and the Housing Authority. I am not dealing with the one-armed bandits, Sir, because I know that you like looking at games and at the horses when they run; and a person who likes games, likes games. So I am not dealing with you and Cardie Clarke and the one-armed bandits. I have a great respect for Your Honour's prestige, and I am sure you will not be in anything like that. (*Aside*) You talk about going to the Law Courts? My life is an open book in this country; but when they walk about dressed up in cloaks they carry daggers at their sides.

No one would have expected this information, this dynamite to come, and this is only the beginning of things to come. I have listened to the member for St. John. I am not calling him Prime Minister. I have no respect for him and I never had any. I knew him long ago in James Street in an old grey flannel pants with a saddle patch.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are imputing improper motives to the Prime Minister.

Mr. CRAIG: It is not imputing improper motives to say that the member for St. John used to walk around Barbados in a grey flannel pants with a saddle patch. What is improper about that? He was looking about for jobs like anybody else, and now he comes in here calling honest people hooligans? I am going to bathe him.

Mr. SPEAKER: In here is not a bathroom. That has nothing to do with the debate. Let the hon. member confine his remarks to the Budgetary Proposals.

Mr. CRAIG: That is what I am doing, but there are very wide ranging proposals — the Prime Minister, the Attorney General, the Barbados Ambassador to the United Nations, the Leader of the Opposition, the member for St. Peter, the member for the City and you, Sir. It concerns all the citizens of this country, and the charge that I am making against the Government is that the country is depressed because members of the Government take time out to look after their own interests and not the interests of the people. That is the problem. I have brought facts to prove this. You cannot be thinking about people's business and at the same time thinking of how you will get a \$5,000 cheque on the Heywood Development Project with Sydney Alleyne in the background. You cannot think about the people's business and think about how you are going to pay the bank for an aeroplane. You cannot figure how you can get a friend of mine by the name of Carlton Brathwaite to buy a ship for \$250,000 and then take away \$7 million. Barbados cannot afford that kind of luxury.

I cannot venture in those deep waters because the marine genius is looking at me; but I am going to call on the Minister of Finance and Planning to lay on the table of this House the insurance on this boat. I want to see how much it has been insured for, because if you say that the cost is \$7 million, I would think that the insurance policy would at least come to \$5 million.

Take Rayside at the airport. Rayside's contract is already arranged for the stones and cement for the Deep Water Harbour, and blocks went up from 52 cents to 78 cents because he has control to buy these products in bulk. A former Minister of Government, the Deputy Speaker of the House — seven plantations in seven years. The Government bought Ilaro Court. They are buying real estate right and left, not a single member of the Opposition nor Government

back benchers can say that they knew anything about it until they read it in the newspapers or it comes up in here.

I think that Al Gilkes did ask a question and it came out that Barbados had bought a boat to carry cement from Barbados to Guyana. They even dug up grass to put down a dock and the boat is still up there lying down. That is the taxpayers money. You are one, Sir; and the duty of the Opposition is to be the watch dog of the public purse.

I have heard the Prime Minister in here saying that after a Government is formed, the leavings are the Opposition. I want to tell the Prime Minister that I agree with him. We accept the wishes of the people; but if you have 16 members, and 8 members and Mr. Speaker form a quorum, and the other 8 members are prepared to stay outside and look after their own interests and their underhandedness, we cannot help you. It is only when we respect them as a Government, when we have trust in them and their integrity, when no one has to be suspicious of their doings that we will form a quorum with them. Let me warn the Leader of the House that for the couple of hours that we are going to be here I am going to make the position clear to him. Anytime they cannot form a quorum we are not going to form one with them. We are told by the members of the Government that the people gave them 18 seats to run the country, and they must run it.

Mr. SPEAKER: And I give you two minutes to finish your speech.

Mr. CRAIG: The coast guard is not a priority yet. There is nobody smuggling anything in here. If the coast guard is so efficient, why is it that everyday somebody gets arrested, charged and convicted for dope? The coast guard is a prestige type of thing for the Government. You can have a coast guard, an airline, an army and a navy with one plane and one boat. (*Aside*). You making sport. You do not know what is going on.

What we are concerned with, Mr. Speaker, is proper food for the people. More bacon and eggs, milk, some toast, steak or pork chops if they want it, or chicken. The Minister of Education is not a bad behaved person. Sometimes he takes a few drinks out there and gets a little confused.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no point.
1.20 p.m.

Since I have been in here for the past ten years — you know this too, Sir — we have never had debate over the Budgetary Proposals as long as this. There is something wrong somewhere; and you know what I believe it is? The Government is not interested in the people's business. They are interested in defending things that we have brought to light....

Mr. SPEAKER: Your time is up.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I am winding up.
(*Aside*)

Mr. SPEAKER: I would give you an extra minute.

Mr. CRAIG: Thanks, Sir. A minute for the interruption. I may not have the chance again, Sir. I am confident that you are not going to have the chance, though a man of the age of 52, I think it is, and the Minister of Education is almost 56 and the member for St. Philip South is 67, it grieves me to know that you are not going to join me in here even as our presiding officer, and I will leave this note with you. You are a big man; you are a strong man I assume, and you should also have a lot of courage to defend what I believe is not fair.

Dr. Haynes will not come in.

Mr. SPEAKER: That has nothing to do with this.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, Dr. Haynes will not come in, and I believe, Sir, that your wishes and dreams will come true. I shall make sure of that, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, we have had a long debate and I must say that apart from the first contribution thereto, it has been a debate of a high standard, formidable arguments being marshalled, intelligent speeches being made, important points being places before the House and the public.

Before I deal with the implications of the amended motion I want to deal very briefly with the speech to which I referred, namely, the first speech made by the mover of the first amendment, the hon. member for St. Michael South Central....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I never moved any motion. I think if he was in here or was *compos mentis* he would know I did not move the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point well taken.

Mr. ADAMS: I am lacking — my mens is lacking *compos* because I referred to the maker of the first speech as the mover. Goodness gracious me. How would other people judge the mens of the hon. member when they read that Adams would not get away with failure to analyse the economy, which is how our daily newspaper headlines this. Nobody would think that he was speaking in the same debate.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order, Sir. I am not responsible for what the Advocate writes; so what is he quoting me for as writing Adams would not get away? I did not write it. (*Aside*). I am not responsible for the Trinidad Guardian.

Mr. SPEAKER: Your point is well taken.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Do not come telling me that I am responsible for writing Adams would not get away with anything. I did not write it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the Leader of the Opposition commences to speak again, a final warning to members at this stage. This is a very serious debate and as long as I am in the Chair it has to go the way I see it proper to conduct. If members on this side or that cannot hear, I will only ask them to leave the House. That is my prerogative as I exercised it yesterday. I would like to hear the Leader of the Opposition. Everything was going pretty smoothly; let us keep it that way.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, I heard the hon. member distinctly say that the Leader of the Opposition would not get away with a failure to analyse the economy. That is what he said. I heard him say so myself, and I do not believe that the hon. member has any cause of complaint if a newspaper headlines 'Adams would not get away with failure to analyse the economy.' Why I mention this is that it is hardly credible that a person who can speak of somebody else being *non compos mentis*, after hearing the Prime Minister's speech, could blame the Leader of the Opposition for failing to analyse the economy; but the Prime Minister did not say a word about the economy, and he is supposed to be presenting an annual financial statement and budgetary proposals; and he came in here evidently with a long speech prepared, and cut it in half at the last moment, and ignored all that part which dealt with the economy; and am I to be blamed by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central for failing to analyse the economy? When the Minister of Education blames you, who blames you?

I had to tell the Minister of Housing once that when he cursed me, who cursed me? Gear Box can do it better. I had to tell the Minister of Education that he has taken over now in the Gear Box stakes. It is he and Gear Box. The Minister of Housing has graduated above that. I interrupted him often during his speech and in my opinion his speech was of a high standard, the interruptions could very well have been left. I offer him perhaps an apology. The interruptions can very well be left to the speech which I am now making. I have never heard such unadulterated nonsense as I heard in that speech.

Now it is significant that the Minister of Health who was responsible for signing the document to which I referred dealing with the water works issue did not at any stage rise to defend himself or defend the circumstances. One would understand he is a recent Minister of Health but I would also add to that that he is a prudent Minister of Health. He is a prudent man generally. The Minister of Education jumped in with both feet and when he was drowning, tried to get his feet into his mouth where they customarily reside, because (ASIDES)

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Education. This is no laughing matter or a place for laughter because, if members on both sides behave in that manner you are exposing and showing up to the gallery how you want them to behave too. (ASIDES) I am speaking. I ask you to behave yourselves. You have a right to reply. There are other Ministers here. They are not doing it. Why are you doing it? This heckling must stop or you will go outside. (Asides) Order.
1.30 p.m.

Mr. ADAMS: Yes, Sir. The hon. member spoke of this Technical Co-operation Agreement from which I read. What the hon. member didn't realise is that the aplomb with which he always jumps into a trap, that with the abundance of ignorance which he always brings to bear on every situation with which he has to deal, he has fallen into a very simple trap set for him by the Opposition. The Technical Co-operation Agreement was only one of the three agreements which the Opposition has had access to. We were not only in possession of the Agreement itself, as the hon. member for Bridgetown said, which pledges the Government to an increase of water rates, we were also in possession of the Technical Co-operation Agreement from which I read and of the Resolution of the Board of Directors of the Inter American Development Bank which was passed at their meeting in October last year and

which made as a condition of lending Barbados money for the sewage scheme that within 30 months of the date of the contract that the water rates in Barbados had to go up, and this fancy figure of seven years, do you know how he arrived at it? He said this in an Agreement for technical co-operation, I do not have to accept it. I heard Dr. Haynes say at Marley Vale, we can accept it or reject it, we are a sovereign state, we don't have to mind what they say, and so on. But the point is Barbados has already accepted it and there was a condition of getting the loan for the sewage scheme, that the Waterworks Department will shut down and its offices transferred to the new Authority within 45 months.

So all this, that it takes three or four years to work out something, and then three more years, it will be seven years is totally false. What I will say to the Minister is that I do not believe he knew it is false, and that is more of an indictment than if I believe he knew it was false, because it shows that he is ignorant rather than dishonest.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I will object to that. I am prepared to go outside, I am not going to stand for any insults from the Leader of the Opposition. I am prepared to go outside when you say I have transgressed, but I am not going to stand for anything from him in here today. My bag is right here, ready, locked, and I am not going to sit down here and be insulted by anything like him, so you make your speech as you would like to make your speech, because I am prepared to go out of Parliament, out of public life rather than let you insult me, so get that straight.

Mr. SPEAKER: Take your seat. You are not going to have any harangue in here, you or anybody. (Aside). Are you warning me how to conduct the Chair? I am not going to let you insult me or the Chair. Your voice must not be heard except you are addressing this Chair.

Mr. ADAMS: Also, to deal with outside comment on this particular matter, the Advocate newspaper commented that the Leader of the Opposition was at his weakest in connection with the Waterworks argument. The Advocate has misconceived what is going on. What has happened is that a sewage scheme is going to be built in Barbados and it will service a small part of the City of Bridgetown. The costs of that sewage scheme are going to be charged to its customers, but as a condition of the advance of \$18 million, very little of which will reach Barbados, only \$400,000 of it will actually be

spent in Barbados, the Inter American Development Bank has made provision that the water rates throughout the island will have to go up, and I think that the Leader writer of the Advocate once he understands that the two things are not necessarily connected will be able to deal with that.

I also want to deal with something else. I gave you notice that I was going to refer to the Chairman of the Development Bank in his official capacity.

Mr. SPEAKER: Did you give me that?

Mr. ADAMS: Do not worry about it, Sir, it will not be harmful.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, you do not know when a thing is harmful until you have said it. I am only warning you and listening very carefully. If you say anything I detect it must be erased and I am warning you.

Mr. ADAMS: I am sorry you are so suspicious, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are putting me up to be suspicious.

Mr. ADAMS: No, Sir, I am sorry, but the situation is this. It has been drawn to my attention that the Chairman of the Development Bank was appointed to the Board of Bath Plantation to look after the interest of the Development Bank and that he was not put on the Board of Bath Plantation by the shareholders to look after their interests. In other words, that though he sits on Bath Plantation's Board he is supposed to be sitting there in the interest of the Development Bank, and although I suppose it is still possible to maintain that the right hand giveth and the left hand receiveth, I gather that some exception has been taken to that remark, and I regret it, because the true criticism of the Chairman of the Development Bank and his sitting on Bath Plantation's Board is not that there was a conflict of interest, the true criticism is that he has sat on the Board of Bath and presided over a situation where the contingent liability of the Bank, that is, the money which the Bank is liable to have to support under its guarantee, has increased and increased beyond the security. In other words, while Mr. Bernstein has been on the Board of Bath the liabilities of Bath have reached nearly \$3 million without having been repaid or settled with City Bank and Mr. Bernstein has been unable to stop any of this. He has been put there by the Development Bank to look after its interest, and on the face of it, he

has failed to look after the interest, and I regret if it should be thought that the criticism was that he was looking after two sets of people's interests at the same time. That is not in any way the criticism and I would be glad if the Minister of Finance would pass on to Mr. Bernstein the true nature of the criticism rather than the ostensible nature.

Now, Sir, having dealt with the seconder of the amendment, I now wish to move an amendment of my own. (Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: That would be two motions). That cannot be two motions, Order 23 Rule 2 provides an amendment may be proposed to another amendment. Don't worry with that. I wish to move that the words occurring in the third line "commends" and "sound" be deleted and the words "condemns" and "unsound" be substituted therefor. That the words in the third line of the motion as it now stands — I believe you have a copy of the motion as it will appear if the amendment is carried — in the third line remove the word "commends" and substitute "condemns" and remove the word "sound" and substitute "unsound". Speaking on the amendment, Sir, I am glad..... (*Aside*).... Somebody will second it after I have sat down.

Mr. SIMMONS: I second that.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Sir, according to Standing Order 23, in the course of one debate can the same hon. member rise and make an amendment to his original motion?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA: He cannot make two motions.
1.40 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition was speaking on the amended motion, and he has just informed the House that it is his intention to move an amendment to the amended motion. According to Standing Order No. 23 — Relevancy of Amendments (2) "An amendment may be proposed to any amendment if it is relevant thereto."

I am asking for order because I want myself to be understood clearly that the amendment is in order.

Mr. SIMMONS: I am seconding it and reserving my right to speak.

Mr. ADAMS: When I sit down you can second that. Anyhow, thanks.

Mr. SPEAKER: You do not have to second it at this stage.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, I will speak on my amendment and in the course of it I will deal with one or two things. To start out, there is little or no doubt that what has attracted the attention of hon. members in this debate and of the public is the relatively short passage of my original speech which dealt with banking. My speech covered, I thought, all aspects of banking. It dealt with foreign commercial banks; it also dealt with a bank, not a foreign bank, but not as it turned out a commercial bank, a bank which was licensed in this country. I do not want to go on at any length about this, but I think the public interest demands, and there have been one or two speeches which have dealt with it, very short further comment. The burden of my argument on banking is that the Minister of Finance has a duty to regulate and investigate banking and banking must be above board in this country.

The Banking Act, for example, which is Cap. 322 of the Laws of Barbados, under Section 10 says —

(a) "Any person who has been a director of, or directly or indirectly concerned in the management of, a bank which has had its licence revoked in accordance with paragraph (c) of section 17 or has been wound up by a court; or

(b) who has been sentenced by a court to a term of imprisonment for an offence involving dishonesty and has not received a full pardon for that offence; or who is or becomes bankrupt, suspends payment to or compounds with his creditors, shall not, without the express authorisation of the Minister, act or continue to act as a director of, or be directly or indirectly concerned in the management of, any bank."

Now I know if you want to go away from Barbados or if you want a whole variety of jobs or to become a citizen of Barbados, you have to produce a police certificate of character from the Police Authorities of all the territories in which you have lived since a certain age. I am going to ask the Prime Minister if he ever received a police certificate of character from Sidney Alleyne before he licensed the bank and if not, why not. And did he receive a certificate of character from the Commissioner of Police of Trinidad,

from the Commissioner of Metropolitan Police of London, from the Commissioner of Metropolitan Police of Toronto, from the Chief of Police of the State of New York, not to speak of Algeria, Angola and all the other countries to which Mr. Alleyne lays claims. I can produce, if the Prime Minister wishes, an affidavit by a person stating that the Prime Minister has informed him that he once defended Sidney Alleyne on a charge of counterfeiting coins.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Just on a point of order, I heard that allegation made by the member for St. James. I categorically deny that I have ever at any time defended Sidney Alleyne or anyone else in the whole of my legal career for counterfeiting coins or any offence connected thereto. And just to put the mind of the hon. member at rest, I am not supposed to know where, somebody spent two nights or spent a vacation; but in so far as the official place of residence of the managing director of that institution was concerned, I have on file from the authorities of the United Kingdom a statement to the effect that there is nothing recorded against him.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point well made.

Mr. ADAMS: Has the Prime Minister also got one on file from authorities in Trinidad and in Barbados? If I can just continue on the affidavit. I must confess that the hon. member for St. Peter when I told him of this affidavit informed that he did not believe it was for coining that the Prime Minister defended Sidney Alleyne, but nobody has denied and the affidavit contains that the Prime Minister was paid with a paper bag with 100 half crowns in it the day before Sidney Alleyne left Barbados, and that when he sent the half crowns at Maxwell to be changed.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, when the hon. member is making statements he can make them about people who are not in this Chamber, but when he has the effrontery to make statements to my face which are untrue, I am saying I was never paid in any bag of coins on the day before Mr. Sidney Alleyne left Barbados. I was never paid by Mr. Sidney Alleyne at all.

Mr. ADAMS: I am not saying.....

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order.....

Mr. SPEAKER: You are getting too warm. Please sit.

Mr. ADAMS: Now, Sir, I am not saying that the Prime Minister had received a bag of half crowns. I am saying I have an affidavit from somebody who says that the Prime Minister told him so. If the Prime Minister was weaving a flight of fancy some years ago, that is up to him. I happen to know because I played with the counterfeit half crowns myself, that my father, the Late Sir Grantley Adams once did defend a coiner and I heard my father quarrel with his messenger, and holding out the palm full of half crowns he quarrelled with his messenger because he said "you know this man makes the money and you still let him make some and pay you?" And as a youth these counterfeit half crowns were kept at Tyrol Cot for a long time. What I believe happened is that when the Prime Minister came here as a young lawyer, my father told him this story and it was such a good story that he told it to impressionable young men who came within his grasp, but merely shifted the personality of the lawyer who received the half crowns. These things happen in life. I know the story about the half crowns is true and when I put it to the person who was swearing the affidavit that I knew about the half crowns because it happened to my father and the half crowns were at Tyrol Cot all my young days, he said it shows perhaps it is a regular practice because it happened to Dipper too. Nonetheless there it is. It could not be told about Sydney Alleyne were he not a person who does not command credibility. He is a man of charm, a man who is all things to all men, a man who talks happily with persons against whom he may make charges or who next day he will disagree as not being in their camp; he weaves flights of fancy — I think they are no more than flights of fancy; he is a person altogether in my humble opinion unsuitable to have been given a licence to run a bank, and I do not think that the purported defences of those who have made statements do them any credit.

The Prime Minister stated that he had no communication with anyone except counsel for the bank, officials of the Ministry of Finance and so on, but obviously he forgot the fact that he had communication with officials from the Attorney General's Department, because he quoted them in his press release.

1.50 p.m.

The position of the bank was evidently referred to the Attorney General's Department, because the Minister of Finance has power to make a decision — and his decision is final — as to whether an institution is not carrying on banking business. The Act says that whether or not an institution is carrying on banking business

shall be submitted to the Minister of Finance for his determination and the decision of the Minister thereon shall be final; and the Prime Minister very properly submitted the facts to the Attorney General's department and received therefrom an opinion that the Alleyne Mercantile Bank Limited was not carrying on banking business, an opinion which was favourable to the Alleyne Mercantile Bank Limited. I should not say that, because perhaps the fees which it saved in one direction it would have lost in another; but it would have saved it the trouble to carry on as a bank.

From the time framework as set out that on February 14th the Principal Crown Counsel reported. On 5th March some kind of family business is being dealt with by the Minister in charge of that department, and later on other kinds of family business are being dealt with. This does no credit to any of the persons concerned except, perhaps the Prime Minister for his full and frank disclosure of all the facts; because he could have very easily suppressed the fact that the Attorney General's Department was dealing with the Alleyne Mercantile Bank in February. I congratulate him on telling the entire story because it has given the public the means to judge the issue more reasonably and to see where the true issue is.

The true issue is not one of wickedness. The true issue is that standards have so fallen that we no longer think it necessary to observe the old adage that justice must not only be done but must manifestly be seen to be done. We do not observe the adage that Caesar's wife must be above suspicion, that Ministers must be absolutely free from any suggestion that they have engaged in any activities which can point a finger of doubt and suspicion at them. That is the true issue.

Other hon. members who have spoken have dealt with Mr. Tudor. That matter is obviously still at stake. I am not referring to Mr. Tudor in his official character, but it is still unfortunate that all of these people in the joint Ministry, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Attorney General's Department should be engaged with Sydney Alleyne at so sensitive a time. Explanation? What explanations? Could Spiro Agnew when he took \$20,000 as Vice President of the United States from a building contractor be heard to say that the money was used to pay his mother's hospital bill? Does the purpose for which the bribes that Agnew took have anything to do with the attitude which public opinion in the USA showed toward him?

What you use the money for has nothing to do with the issue. That is a separate transaction. There is a transaction of receiving and there is a transaction of payment. Then you have the Heywoods matter. All of these things are exposed in letters. I was most surprised when the Minister of Housing talked about the Government investing \$30,000 at Heywoods. I believe that there is an innocent explanation for that letter that was reproduced in the Advocate Newspaper about the postponement of the Heywoods project. I believe it is perfectly possible that the people who were building the Heywoods project were also going to put up apartment blocks on the land of the Minister's mother, and that they were explaining that they could keep the appointment on the particular day because they would not be needed down at Heywoods; but I still think that these matters would have been better not entered into.

I was very distressed to see the nature of the explanation. Somebody outside commented that Tom did not accuse George, George is accusing himself. That is something that the public will have to judge; but an enormous edifice has been built around this when the facts are very simple. Nobody has suggested that the cheques are not genuine. Nobody has suggested that the Alleyne Mercantile Bank was not under review by the Government at the time. Indeed, the Prime Minister has asserted it; but the whole fabric of abuse of the Leader of the Opposition has been mounted arising out of fully authenticated statements made in the House of Assembly and repeated outside and to be repeated again outside.

One final comment on this matter. The Minister for Education said that the Trinidad Guardian has spoken of cheques for other M.P.'s. I am stating as a fact that I have here in the House photostat copies of cheques made out by Sydney Alleyne to other members of Parliament. (ASIDE: Why?)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. ADAMS: I do not have to produce anything.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I am not as a member of this House going to stand under any cloud on any pretext by the Leader of the Opposition that he has something in his portfolio. If he has anything let him make them documents of the House. I do not want to be under any cloud leaving suspicion over 24 members. I want him to come out with them. I am very serious because even the

Guardian mentioned it before he said it and that has made me suspicious. But, as a matter of privilege, it is the duty of the Leader of the Opposition if he has allegations against members of the House to produce them, or otherwise he stands condemned as a spreader of manure and gossip.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I want to get in a word before 2 o'clock.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now 2 o'clock. (*Asides*) Order. It being now 2 o'clock p.m., this sitting now stands suspended until 2.45 p.m. 2.00 p.m.

On Resumption :

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting is resumed.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, will you kindly ask that the Bell be rung? There is no quorum.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am raising a matter of privilege. Mr. Speaker, before the House was suspended for the luncheon adjournment the Leader of the Opposition made it quite clear that apart from the cheque to which I was referring in the case of Senator Moe, he had other cheques for members of the Honourable House of Assembly — other members of Parliament of which the Honourable House of Assembly is a vital and most important part.

Now Mr. Speaker, the circumstances under which the Opposition both on Friday and in the course of the debate had been arguing are tending to show that members of this House, the members of the Government, or members of Parliament acted improperly or had improper dealings with a man called Sydney Alleyne. I am a member of this House. I am not pretending to be Mr. Simon Cure but I feel I should say this to the Leader of the Opposition that if he does possess cheques from Mr. Sydney Alleyne for members of Parliament whether on his side or our side, he owes it as a duty to the public of Barbados and to the entire community to explain in the circumstances, if he can, under which those cheques were issued, whether they were legitimate, illegitimate, corrupt or not corrupt; but he must not today, after having made that blanket statement that he has cheques for members of Parliament, he must not today leave this Honourable House — if he is a responsible member and has respect for Parliament and for

the privileges of Parliament and for the rights of members of Parliament — he must not leave this House today unless he let the public of Barbados know who the cheques are for, if they are for members of the House, if they are for members of the Other Place, and if he can say under what circumstances these cheques were issued.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Parliament is the highest Body in the land to a large extent. An election is due very shortly. How can I go into my constituency and argue with my people if the Leader of the Opposition under the cloak of privilege says he has cheques for members of Parliament? I am included. I am under a cloud of suspicion, and I think he owes it to this House as a matter of privilege, as a matter of right, to say John Brown, the member for St. George North, South, St. Philip South Central, whoever he has it for — because he has created the impression not that he has cheques under legitimate transactions, but since he has linked it with the cheque on which he complained something improper was done, he owes it to this Body today, not three days before the election, not four days before the election, not after nomination day, not any time after, but he owes it this very moment to let the public of Barbados know that the member for South Central, the member for St. George, St. Michael South, South East, St. Lucy, St. Peter, whoever it is, he owes it — and I say now that if he falls from this sacred obligation to this ancient Chamber, his credibility must be doubted since he cannot when called upon by the House and called upon by the member of this House for South Central as a matter of privilege, to mention the names of the members of this House or Parliament, for whom he has cheques given or received in improper circumstances, then if he fails to do that, then he stand condemned as I say, as a person who has no regard for the integrity and the honesty of certain members.

If he does not do that and leaves this House this afternoon with members under a cloud of suspicion, then he has certainly brought Parliament to the depths of degradation and disgrace.

I am taking him at his word. If he gets up and says 'I have cheques for the member for South Central but I am satisfied that they were given under proper circumstances, fine; but he has the right to tell the House whether the cheques that he said he has which last Friday he pretended to slip into his folder are cheques which indicate to this Honourable House that they were given under improper circumstances. I say more now, Mr. Speaker, that I feel very strongly — and as I said before I am not

pretending to be Mr. Simon Cure but I belong to a Chamber which I first entered in 1956. Twenty years ago I entered this Honourable Chamber. Never before in his father's time or in anybody's time have I as a member of this House been under suspicion of having done anything improper in the way of corruption, or as he said, received money from persons with whom association was undesirable. I have been Attorney General for five years and the allegations I am hearing have never been made against me. I on the 5th day of August, 1976, want to leave this House this afternoon with the assurance of the Leader of the Opposition that of these members in this House he has cheques which show improper payment or receipt to Mr. So and So from South Central, North Central, South East, West, North or South, and I think I am only asking what common decency demands, that the public of Barbados should be made to know if he has it, to whom were these cheques paid under improper, corrupt, or other circumstances; and if he fails to do that and waits till three days before election or two days before election the public of Barbados should condemn him.

As a matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I am appealing to the member for St. Thomas as the Leader of the Opposition, as the potential Prime Minister if this Government loses, to say to this House that "I am prepared to let this House know that the documents in my possession and the cheques in my possession indicate that Mr. So and So is guilty of having received improper payment."

I am not prepared to walk through this door satisfied, unless he honours that sacred obligation to the hon. members of Parliament.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is a rather improper statement to be made by any member, that he has cheques about other members in here. The Hon. Minister of Education spoke at length and has brought it to my notice. At this stage I can only ask the Leader of the Opposition if he would so kindly — or let us deal with this under the Committee of Privileges. (*ASIDES*) Every time I make a ruling in here today everybody is criticising it. I am still the Speaker; but I am asking the Leader of the Opposition if he would withdraw that statement and make no further ado about these cheques for members of Parliament. It is regrettable it was made at such a stage prior to the adjournment.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, I am actually in a very difficult position because there is clearly no rule of Parliament that can compel me to produce the

cheques. That is the whole point. We know that — If I produce the cheques, consider all these possibilities. I may be in the process of getting cheques, investigating the cheques, seeing whether they are proper or improper, all of these things may be in process.

Parliament embraces the Senate and it embraces the House of Assembly. So it may be people in the Senate, it may be people in here. All of these things are at stake. I cannot see any rule of practice. It is just that we have built ourselves up into such a state about these cheques.

Now Mr. Alleyne, I presume he ate, so he could have dined at a restaurant belonging to an hon. member. He needed a lawyer so he could have paid a cheque to a lawyer. He may have needed a motor car, so he could have bought a car from an hon. member, and all of these things...

Mr. SPEAKER: I at this stage — I have said already that there must be no debate on a point of privilege.

Mr. ADAMS: I am in a difficult position because.....

Mr. SPEAKER: You know that very well.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, a long submission has been made to you about this matter of privilege and I am at a loss to understand on what it is based. I do not mind the matter being referred to the Committee of Privileges. I do not mind that but it would.....

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I think this is a matter which we should try to get straightened up as soon as possible. I consider reference of this matter to a Committee of Privileges as a dilatory tactic. A direct charge has been laid against members of Parliament, and certainly I have been a member of this Honourable Chamber since 1971 and I would like to know whether the hon. member for St. Thomas, the Leader of the Opposition, has a cheque belonging to me because I know he cannot produce one with my name on it.
3.00 p.m.

I would like to get my name cleared. As the member for St. Michael South Central has indicated, we are all concerned about this. I understand, for example, that there is supposed to be a cheque which was issued in the name of the member for St. Philip North and I am sure that he would like to get his name cleared also.

This is a situation which I consider that the Leader of the Opposition owes a public duty not only to the members of this Chamber but also to the members of the public to put all the cheques he has on the table and let us know who he has the cheques for. This is a very serious charge and I think he owes it to us to get our names cleared.

Mr. SPEAKER: That point is taken. I understand what the last speaker said quite clearly. What is the use of having Standing Orders dealing with matters of privilege and you are going to abuse them?

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, a matter of privilege is not a matter of abuse. If there is a matter of abuse, abuse would have been made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, because your character is not anything that can be messed about with by any other hon. member, and if an hon. member is saying that any of us in this Chamber is behaving improperly the onus is not on me to free myself, I am not in any French country where I have to prove myself innocent, and it is for the hon. member. If the hon. member is saying that Mr. Sidney Alleyne is a disreputable character and all of these things, and the gravamen of his speech is cheques by this same person and labelling them to people, therefore if he is making out that he has cheques from a disreputable person against hon. members of Parliament, he cannot associate all of our names with this man, because Parliament and M.Ps is not so large a class, you do not go out of this place and say that M.P means a military policeman. You have people coming off a British warship and you see them with 'M.P' marked on their arms, but you do not mean them, you mean members of Parliament in Barbados, not M.Ps in the United Kingdom, but the hon. member knows that if I or any other hon. member had said of him that we have cheques that would impute that he had been the recipient of these cheques he would want to clear his name as a member of Parliament.

If he wants political grace get on the platform and say it, because when he gets on the platform he can say whatever he likes, because I can say whatever I like on a platform and we can go to court; therefore whoever wants to go to court can go to court, but you are saved from the courts in here, and as you are saved from the courts in here I think the hon. member should clear the air. This is not any matter of privilege, the first thing he said was that he has a lot more to bring and he can read them out. I can challenge the hon. member. The hon. member can have a lot more but he could not have any belonging to me. The hon. member or any other

hon. member might think they would like to associate a man like me with any kind of skulduggery, but that sort of thing is not in my makeup at all, but when you associate all of us with something like that you are saying that all of us are thieves, because that is why people make these statements, and for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member owes it to himself and to Parliament because he has kept back the House a long time on this. He had a full television programme on this. After all, I do not want any television programme on this, I want to be able to tell him that if you are saying that you have it against us, I agree with the hon. member for St. Michael South Central that you owe it to us to divulge the names, because you can call the names in here. Nobody can sue you from in here, call the names, if there are names in here call them, and I am sure.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member is carrying on on a speech. Please take your seat. This in my opinion is not a matter of privilege and I am closing it off now.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker,.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Please sit.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, I have another cheque here which I am going to make a document of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please take your seat. This is the third time you have been disobedient to the Chair. This is not a matter of privilege, it is an unfortunate incident, it is a matter in which the Leader of the Opposition chose to say something which I do not deem worthy to be said in here of members and I have asked him to withdraw those remarks about having cheques about members. It is in breach of the Orders. *(Aside)*. I have ruled on that. I would like to hear the Leader of the Opposition and no one else.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, I really would like to close this chapter which very few people seem to realise started because of a remark made by the Minister of Education, that if I have other cheques I should say so. People seem to have forgotten that he said so yesterday, and now I am going to be pilloried for doing what he asked me to do, and by him.

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir, I believe we can get on with the debate in the manner in which you would like us to get on with it. If there is an argument as to whether the

member for St. Thomas said he has more cheques, I am going to make a cheque which I have here a document of the House, and there are others to come. *(Aside)*. If you want cheques, come for one. Look at them here, and there will be more to come. Come, Mr. Clerk, I make this a document of the House, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that it will be made a document of the House. It will be taken in time.

Mr. ADAMS: This is not a law court, Sir, and more important, I think somebody in the end must have some sympathy for poor Sydney Alleyne. It may seem an absurd thing to say at this stage, but hon. members are not understanding what I am saying, that no matter how irregular the man's conduct may have been the man is entitled to carry on ordinary business and we must not therefore say that the receipt of a cheque from Sydney Alleyne is a sign of guilt. But even the Opposition didn't say that, why is the Government saying it? That if you say you got a cheque from Sydney Alleyne you are guilty. *(Aside)*. I never said so.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Leader of the Opposition.....

Mr. ADAMS: I am speaking.

Mr. SPEAKER: On what?

Mr. ADAMS: My Speech, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: No, I have not resumed the debate on the budgetary proposals, this is a point of privilege raised by the Minister of Education which has been delayed until now. I am trying to get the air cleared about privilege. (Mr. ADAMS: I will stand on the cheque with you, Sir). I asked you to withdraw and you haven't said that you withdraw the remark about members here.

Mr. ADAMS: Which remark, Sir? I withdraw any remark which imputes to any members any impropriety in which — no, I can't withdraw that, I am sorry, I can't say that — Sir, you better tell me exactly what I should withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER: That you are in possession of cheques from members of Parliament.

Mr. ADAMS: I cannot withdraw it, Sir, I can't tell a lie.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will you produce those cheques?

3.10 p.m.

who made such a valid point of order just now that he could have made three quarters of an hour ago talked about 303 houses being built in 1956, some of which were storm relief houses. I think it is fair to say that he chided me for referring to the Central Bank figures for 1975. I understand that the Housing Authority's Report in fact gives the number of houses completed up to the end of the last calendar year. The report for 1955-60.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: On a point of elucidation. In the first place the Central Bank Report refers to the calendar year, January 1 to 31st December, 1975. The Housing Corporation does not deal that way. They operate like the Government and their year is from 1st April to March the following year.

Now as regards the question of the Housing Authority's Report to which the hon. member is referring, this does not prevent the Housing Corporation from time to time making statements to me because I require them, as to how many houses have been completed in any one calendar year. I said earlier that the number of houses completed in 1974-75 were 290 and that there were 274 under construction. From April 1975 to March, 1976, 232 were completed and 299 were under construction.

Mr. ADAMS: The burden of what I was saying is that I did not only quote what the Minister called storm shelters built in 1956. I dealt also with 1958 when 375 houses were built. That was the year, I believe, of peak construction at the Pine. In 1959 there was big construction at Gall Hill — 305 houses. In 1960 we fell back a bit, and built 269 houses. In 1959, I think it was Grazettes. In all, 1,514, an average of 300 houses a year, and this compares with 2,059 houses built between 1961-71, an average of just over 200 houses a year.

These are the figures which I have taken from the Housing Authority's Report. I contacted the manager who was kind enough to reproduce the figures for me. You are dealing with a Government building an average of 200 houses a year, a Government with greater resources, between 1961-71, and a Government which was running on an average of 300 a year, with less resources between 1956-61; and in 1956-61 the Government was also building a harbour, an airport, and a hospital, none of which major projects were built between 1961-71. I believe that our housing record can stand comparison with any.

I believe that the present Minister of Housing has given a single minded devotedness to

this particular Ministry which does not bear example to his tenure of office in the Ministry of Finance and other offices. He is understandably proud of his recent record, but that does not alter the fact that the record of the Democratic Labour Party Government over a long period of years cannot compare with the intensive housing programme which was put into shape and handed down as a pattern for housing development of this island until recently.

I believe that questions of finance have meant that not so many houses are being built for rent. More are being built for sale so that you can have a revolving fund. I happen to think that this is an error. I happen to think that there is a great demand for rented houses in this country. I think that there are old people who would be better off living in rented houses, on a well run Government housing estate, with neighbours close at hand rather than living in welfare houses which will be taken away from their descendants when they die. I think that in economic terms and in social terms it would be much better to have old age pensioners living on housing estates set aside for them where these old people could live together and to be close to an inhabited area and to health and other facilities.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: If the hon. member would give way. When the hon. member speaks of houses built, does he speak of units or singled units as such? Take for example, the Farm. The Farm has many blocks. The Farm area as a whole has about 300 units. Is the hon. member referring to single units?

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, in the interest of serious debate I will give way to all such matters because it has worried me myself. Just let me deal with this point. If we are prepared to talk about housing, as far as I know, the housing Authority's constitution from which I am reading refers to units and not structures. Each unit in the Farm appears as a unit in the statistics which are supplied to me.

I know that the point has been made in here before that there is need for rented accommodation. I know that the Minister will have a chance to make another speech. I know that I interrupted him a lot yesterday. I know that he is breaking ground tomorrow for new rented accommodation. I think that the Government should be prepared to make rented land available to everyone who wants it. They should continue the present system of inviting applications for the acquiring of homes whether

on hire purchase, or purchase or what not. I think that the three branches are equally important; but I think that in the case like this rent more land schemes are needed.

I happen to be counsel for a tenantry owner. I like to think that it is a well run tenantry. I like to think that the owner is an enlightened landlord, willing to sell spots to his tenants, anxious to put in roads and eager to accommodate and so on; but it is still my impression that over Barbados people who rent lands from private landlords would prefer to rent from the Government; and I think that the Government should be prepared to use some of the waste land in potential built up areas for rented accommodation for houses.

Chattel houses are going to be with us for a long, long time and we hope to put chattel houses in places where facilities can be easily provided for larger units. There should be land schemes still available to people who want spots. The present system leads to many delays around the courts. You get private landlords bringing orders for possession against tenants. Then there is a to-ing and fro-ing; and you have to carry the order of the court to the Housing Authority and then you have to bring back a letter to the court from the Housing Authority. There is often a great deal of confusion. I think that it would be a relatively cheap programme to acquire more land for house spots, and at the same time give some work to people putting down the necessary roads and so on.

3.30 p.m.

The Minister has defended his record as best as he possibly could but I hope he remembers that at the height of the building boom when there was no money coming in, because houses were not being sold to tenants, when the rents were very low and when the Government was building at least 300 houses a year, that the whole vote for the Housing Authority was only a little more than \$1 million. It was \$1.443 million. That was an actual record year. That covered everything; landing schemes, Grazettes, The Pine and Gall Hill, all of them without any serious income coming in to the Housing Authority. In those days there used to be the Labour Welfare Fund whose moneys were voted year by year.

I believe the Government also provided some of those funds for administrative expenses. I do not know how much money is actually spent by the Housing Authority these days; it is very difficult to elicit it from the accounts but I believe that a figure of \$14 million was quoted in here not so long ago for a year's expenditure.

That was not the cost of the Housing Authority because money was coming in but I think that that figure was quoted for expenditure.

Now, Sir, employment, Again we are running into difficulties with statistics. The Minister of Education said that I did not review the economy but I think I reviewed the question of employment fairly well. I think I dealt with employment fairly well, and my argument has always been, it is not meaningful in Barbados to speak of a labour force of 90,000 people. It is not meaningful to imagine that because boys leave school at 15 years or 16 years of age and do not get a job, do not enter the statistics until they are 20, that that means they do not want work. Of course, they want work and of course they should be in the labour force statistics. There have been reports made available to the Government quoting figures of 26% to 28%. No matter whether those reports are laid in the House or not their existence is known to a certain number of persons. There are reports which indicate that the self-employed and the employed in 1960, at that time, was around 80,000 which is around the same number that I gave. All figures are roughly equivalent to that. There have been reports to which I have referred already, indicating that employment in many areas has fallen and it has not risen in others. The Government owes it to the people of Barbados to set out all the reports that it has got available, if necessary with its own comments, on the figures found by persons overseas. Set out all the reports that it has got available and make them documents of the House, put them before people so that our own assessments may be made.

Now tourism, Sir, I heard a speech from the Minister of Tourism, how terribly bad everything is everywhere and in Barbados we are not so bad. It is significant, Sir, that no contradiction was made of any of the figures produced on this side. Tourism in every country is one of the growth industries. If tourism does not grow it is the same as if it declined. The reason for this is very simple. Tourism is like food consumption. There are more people in the world every day. There is a general upward trend in the world in earnings. The United States do not have per capita drops in its real earnings. More and more people every year are in a position to go abroad on vacations. All over the world it is so. Europeans are achieving much in our two favoured countries, Sweden, West Germany; Swedish wages per hour are now higher than American wages per hour. I heard a Japanese businessman say recently, as far as he is concerned, North Eastern United States is an area of cheap labour and he suggests putting a steel mill in those parts. The Japanese themselves,

outside Europe, all these people now have more money to spend and are in a position to travel abroad. Think of the Arabs in their travelling especially now Beruit is not any longer a health resort. When tourism stands still or declines, the blow is much greater because the whole dynamic of the tourism industry is not to give static employment to a fixed number of staff. It is to inject into the economy of developing and indeed developed countries a growth which helps construction in the country, adds to its hotels every year, and around the hotels other residential developments grow. This is tourism since the war. This is the dynamic of tourism since the war. The areas that have been opened up — Spain, south of Valencia, has been politically neglected because that is the area of Spain that never surrendered to General Franco in the civil war therefore Franco never spent a cent on its development. It took the British to go there and build hotels and villas and develop South Eastern Spain; and today it is one of the most prosperous parts of Spain because British tourists tell their friends that living is cheap, sherry costs 3-p a glass and meals cost such and such, build a villa down there and people will rent it all through the year. It is a dynamic growth area.

The day that people do not go to Spain and build more houses — not just go and visit — the day that happens, that part of Spain will fall back into a decline. Similarly in Barbados. We are not yet in the stage of Bermuda where there has to be a limitation on tourist building. Bermuda has about the same number of tourists beds as Barbados but there have been many more tourists and they can no longer allow new hotel building because the economy is over-strained. They do not have people to work in the hotels. Anybody who has been to Bermuda will know that the man who serves the bacon and eggs in the morning in the hotels is probably an English waiter. They cannot even get Bermudans to work as waiters in their own hotels. So they have reached a saturation point, but we in Barbados have not reached that saturation point; and I think a mistake is being made, Mr. Speaker, in the approach to hotel operation. The apartment hotel appears much more attractive especially to persons resident in Barbados because the initial costs are often less and the management skills are much smaller and you really do not have personnel difficulties because they do not employ the same volume of staff; but none of these things are good for Barbados. Barbadians should be encouraged to acquire the management skills. Unless you have Barbadian-owned hotels in numbers you perhaps do not have people in Barbados with an interest in acquiring those skills.

3.40 p.m.

Why does Barbados have, I think, a relatively successful sugar sector? Why is it in Barbados you do not find Englishmen coming down here from sugar factories to work here as overseers as you find in Guyana, Jamaica, Antigua, when indeed in Antigua they broke the whole back of the sugar industry, the expatriate staff extracted all the profits from the sugar industry and ruined it finally and for all? Because in Barbados the sugar industry is Barbadian owned and the Barbadian owners give the children work and give their friends' children work in the sugar industry. A manager's son is sure of employment as an overseer as he leaves school at some other estate, and I believe that this extends through all shades and colours of management and ownership too. It may be said to be a tight world, but you can be sure that those who own the sugar industry in Barbados do not easily and will never tolerate — not for years did they tolerate — the bringing in of outside overseers.

When I heard that many many years ago the Hawkinses of St. Philip brought in an overseer called Leacock from Scotland, and you know the ultimate results when we see a great commercial and land owning dynasty arise, I was actually surprised because I didn't know that in Barbados people had ever found it necessary to import men to run the sugar industry, but I don't believe that the hotel industry is any harder to run than the sugar industry. But we take for granted the skills that people demonstrate in the sugar industry, and the skills that year after year produce out of the not particularly high rainfall soils of Barbados, the not particularly fertile soils of Barbados sugar on conditions that can compete with sugar from more favoured land. Part of it is because of the intensity of human skill that has gone into the sugar industry over these years.

We will never get this same human skill applied to the hotel business until there are more Barbadian owned hotels. I cannot expect, Sir, Trust Houses Limited, the Holiday Inn, the Hilton, to have the same affection towards employing a Barbadian manager as I can expect from a Barbadian who owns a hotel, and this is why I think that the shape and the direction of the tourist industry must be pointed towards hotel building in which Barbadians have a greater stake, probably initially it will have to be smaller hotels, probably initially we cannot expect that Barbadians without skill are going to put up \$10 million to build another Hilton. We can't seriously expect that, but there has to be a real effort on the part of Government to provide not fancy hotels but the good, solid, middle range

hotels built at a reasonable cost, managed by its owners or persons close to its owners, at any rate not managed by people who receive a salary of \$1,200 a month here and a tax free bonus in the Bahamas of another \$2,400 a month. They should be managed by people who receive all their salaries here and contributes to the taxation of this country. That is what is needed with tourism.

I am quoting what nice remarks appear in the 'old boy' network, the back scratching fraternity of the Caribbean Hotel Association and the Caribbean Tourist Research Centre, all people who are good friends of each other and who have only good things to say about each other's management of their respective spheres of interest will not help us along at all. The facts are that tourism has been growing at a much slower rate every year since 1971 until this year it has actually fallen into a decline, and when we have pointed these things out to the Minister, the Minister has 'pooh-poohed' the whole idea. The hon. member for Christ Church West pointed out that 1973 did not mark the beginning of bad times in Barbados. I made a speech in July 1972 in which I said Barbados was facing its greatest economic and political crisis ever, and the Prime Minister 'pooh-poohed' that, laughed at that, he said that the Leader of the Opposition has to say something. He said so on television. They are the days when he could relax and laugh at things, these days he has to fight us. He laughed at that, but it wasn't taken seriously. So little seriously was it taken that he went away in 1973 on his sabbatical and left the finances of the country in inexperienced hands. You know the song "I let my heart fall into careless hands," that is exactly what happened to the Government of Barbados at that time. I am not making any particular indictment of the Deputy Prime Minister at that time or of any individual Minister, but the fact is that Barbados' difficulties date from precisely that period. If the Prime Minister was here perhaps they would have been worse, because he has shown no capacity since he has come back to make things better, but things are getting worse.

If the Minister of Tourism had understood it is not an immutable law that the number of tourist arrivals in this country will grow every year, therefore providing the dynamics for the general expansion of Barbados, we might not be in this state today. He is the expert, Sir, I am not the expert, I only know that people have been saying that the hotels in Barbados are too high-priced, I only know that people have been attacking the promotion efforts of the Barbados Board of Tourism, I only know there has been steady criticism for five years and now the critics are seeing that everything about which they have complained has come to pass.

Now manufacturing, Sir. A lot gets said in the House about manufacturing, and I think it is now widely accepted that those engaged in manufacturing have hardly increased in number since the Barbados Labour Party has been in power, and this is one of the great, the stupendous indictments of the Democratic Labour Party, that in 15 years of an intensive industrialisation programme that no more jobs have been created than existed at the start. The pretty factories all over the place, the number of new industries that are claimed, no more has in fact been done for the real purpose for which those industries exist, which is to give work to people, and I think that this although accepted is too widely lost sight of in the wider context of our economy.

There are many useful studies going about — I can refer hon. members to studies on Operation Bootstrap in Puerto Rico, I can refer hon. members to the very able studies which can be read in translation by Professor Amin, I think he is, Sir, an Egyptian professor who writes on the economies of African countries and under developed countries generally. He has analysed the African countries who have tried the Barbados solution, he has analysed, for example, Senegal, for a long time the model colony of the French Empire, a colony which even today President Senghor will tell you is proud of its five hundred years association with France. The French landed there in 1475. Even today President Senghor will tell you what the French did for Senegal. And what did they in fact do for Senegal? They created a West African Common Market and they concentrated in Senegal all the light industries to provide light consumer goods to the West African Common Market. They did it over a period of years. They also developed agriculture in Senegal with groundnut schemes and they gave the producers guaranteed prices and they thought they had a first class economy. Agriculture and industry were well taken care of, and today the Senegalese economy is stagnating, and it is a place where model studies are made of what goes wrong in industrial development.

3.50 p.m.

Today the Senegalese economy is stagnating and it is a place where model studies are made of what goes wrong in industrial development, and uniformly all those who have studied it have come up with the conclusion that in the long run the screw driver industries, the light assembly industries, the light manufacturing industries after a very short space of time take more out of the economy than they put into it and the gains in employment are only illusory, and poor President Senghor has even reached the stage now where he

says that a one party state is not good and he has ordered that the country become a three party state and he has directed people to form two other parties and set out what policies the parties must follow, in the hope that by political tinkering he will undo some of the economic damage.

Now Barbados has not got to have the political tinkering, but unless you have political parties with wisdom to see beyond outworn policies, whose usefulness has been indicted in economies that have had longer experience of it, you are still nowhere. Unless one or the other of the political parties in Barbados is prepared to break free from the shackles of present economic thinking, we are not going to improve things in Barbados, and I pray God it will be given to the Barbados Labour Party so to break free and introduce a new breath of fresh consideration where industrial expansion in this country is concerned. We have these examples, they have been tried and failed, we in Barbados have to break free from it. No amount of talk by the Minister of Trade and Industry will change it. Right now for a year all he has concentrated on is quarrelling with poor David Seale and so on. I do not think it suits this House to get into these wrangles. I do not think it suits the Minister to be getting in wrangles with an individual merchant. He should be giving his attention to the criticisms of these industrial development programmes.

It is an unfortunate but significant fact that the factories which can be of most use to us, because they are labour intensive and employ a lot of people, they do not displace anybody in Barbados and they bring in foreign exchange — I refer to the assembly plants, the electronic plants particularly going back to International Scientific Limited — that the highest casualties are among these factories. They are big employers, they are doing something that was not done in Barbados previously and they are not producing for the Barbados market, all three things good and useful and interesting. They are giving a lot of young boys and girls of Barbados skills which they would not otherwise acquire. But these factories do not seem to be able to survive more than a few years. One has closed down and it is a matter for immense self-congratulation when another factory is very shortly thereafter founded to take up the slack; but what serious long term attempts have been made by the Government to get these assembly factories to sign long term contracts with Government, providing them if necessary with some Government investment funds on condition that they guarantee employment and show the Government the means also of

guaranteeing such employment for a certain number of people for five years and make sure that if they have to close down the business that their machinery will be sold to provide severance pay for the outstanding staff. Indeed I suppose they have to provide severance pay anyhow, but put it in such a way that it would just not be possible for manufacturers to throw large sections of our labour force out of work at very short notice.

I want to deal with something very small. It has been mentioned by some hon. members already, the purchasing policies of Government. Too often in here, and thank goodness this does not reflect on any member of either House of Parliament, we hear that things are bought for departments and then they are not fit for the purpose for which they are bought, and it is never typewriters, chairs or desks; it is never erasers or black leads; it is always fire fighting equipment, sprinkler systems, a ship. The latest purchase, a ship. A name has been called in connection with the ship which is the same name, I believe, as the name called in connection with the sprinklers and the fire fighting equipment at the National Insurance Building, which I understand has been condemned by the Chief Fire Officer. The same name now is called in connection with a ship. Who could have taken a decision — and I very much hope the hon. member for St. Michael South West will contribute to this debate — to purchase a ship for use in Barbados that does not have its own winch and crane system? These ships are suitable for inland waterways; they were originally built.... the ship I am talking about was a ship off which vehicles would drive and therefore there was no need to unload. That would be a ship that would have so many and so many tanks in it and personnel carriers and they would drive off, so there was never any need to unload anybody. The soldiers would walk out or jump over and swim ashore, the vehicles drive out, but how can you buy a ship like that when in Barbados you have a Deep Water Harbour without dock-side cranes? I do not know who could take that decision. I do not believe the hon. member for St. Michael South West was entirely himself if he had any part in it. There are no cranes in the Deep Water Harbour to unload ships that do not have their own equipment. If you go in the Deep Water Harbour you have to unload yourself if you are a ship. Ocean going ships are usually provided with cranes. Coastal ships do not necessarily have them because inland ports in Western Europe and in North America are all provided with dock-side cranes since so much inland traffic is carried on barges which do not have cranes by definition. The ports in North America, the Great Lakes and

the St. Lawrence River, the ports up the Mississippi river, the barges go up there. I have been in the Mississippi myself and seen strings and strings of barges going up the river, all without a crane being towed by a tug boat, and they have to be unloaded by cranes. But Barbados is not an inland port, it is an ocean port, therefore ships that come here and ships that belong to Barbados ought to have cranes which can unload the cement or whatever the case may be.

To get back to the fire tenders which I believe cost \$638,640. Eight old refurbished fire tenders of 1957 vintage not in working condition, sold at auction in Canada, bought by a gentleman from HARP. They were tanks that were used in the Second World War and were converted by an English Company with the Royal Air Force. None of that fleet of converted tanks ever worked satisfactorily and were condemned, and they find their way into Barbados. Even now they spend more time, I understand, in the workshop than they spend in operation. These fire trucks had Rolls Royce engines once, but were replaced with Ford engines and bought at \$70,000 each. I beg your pardon, Sir, the two fire trucks that cost \$638,000 actually work; they have an extinguishing capacity of 6,000 gallons of water. The fire trucks, the eight of which were brought at \$70,000 each altogether have a total capacity of only 5,670 gallons of water.

4.00 p.m.

The fire trucks bought at \$730,000 altogether have a total capacity of only 6,570 gallons of water. Now all of these examples are the answer to what the hon. member for St. Philip South said when he asked where would we find the money. You find money to buy condemned fire trucks. That is one of the places where you could find money. It is some of the economies which could be effected by an efficient government. In money saving devices they would avoid the public revenue being drained by these unnecessary purchases.

We in the Opposition do really urge that hon. members read the resolution as amended and as seconded. I thought that the resolution was congratulating the Government on holding down inflation. That was the first amendment. The second amendment condemns it. Now I defy, as the little children say "I double dare defy" the Minister of Health who has not yet contributed to this debate to get up and say what monetary measures he sees in this Budget that will contribute to holding down inflation.

There are the Prime Minister's Proposals to remove the 5 per cent sales tax on certain items. Sewing machines and seeds etc. were never components in the cost of living index nor were drugs. Medical care as a whole is only 5 per cent of the cost of living index and together with the measure about travel tickets and the long term effects of the other measures taken, the first amendment is only a joke.

Lastly, the amendment to give the Prime Minister the last word. I am not in any way going to argue about that. My amendment, if carried, — and not only get in here and waste time. I am just saying that I am satisfied that with the amendment to the amendment the Minister has the right to conclude.

We are dealing with the monetary proposals. Now, how do you fight marshmallows, and how do you fight straw bags in these circumstances? What are we actually talking about? There is no financial statement. There is no prepared plan or policy. We are hearing about the national debt as being \$200 million, and the Governor of the Central Bank says that he is not worried about this because so much of the national debt is owed by Government to Government departments.

This is a very dangerous statement. When you hear that the national debt is \$200 million and that only \$X is owed overseas and the rest is owed to Government departments there are a lot of comments that can be made. In the first place, the comment that the credit of the Government is so low that it could not have been able to raise \$200 million overseas. The second point is that the Government may not be able to raise money from non-statutory bodies. The third point is that it was intended and envisaged that the National Insurance money should find itself falling through the back door into general revenue balance, when the National Insurance Fund is one generated to meet its own commitments.

I myself am not so worried as some economists or persons in public life not connected with politics, who said that the Government will take money from the National Insurance Fund and spend all of it. That is what has happened. The Government has borrowed money from the fund and is spending it; and the end result is that the Governor of the Central Bank says that he is not worried about the national debt.

If hon. members will recall, four years ago the Prime Minister said that charges of debt

formed a comparatively small proportion of the expenditure of Government, and that it was known to reputable economists that the Government's debt could increase much more; and those who manage the economy, from the Prime Minister back down, took these opinions as a licence to borrow more money without any regard to the productive effect of what they were borrowing the money for, and without regard to the meaningfulness of the borrowing programme.

Now we have a national debt that has doubled since 1971. What has been done in other words for the \$120 million extra? The total national debt stood at, I believe, \$81 million at September, 1971. I think that these figures are correct. It was \$203 million according to the last Budget Report. I want to deal with the frequently repeated argument of the erstwhile Minister of Finance, the member for St. Michael North West – and to say that the national debt relates to the indebtedness of Government and not just a debt under the Public Debt Act, and therefore not just \$100 million.

The national debt refers to that, plus the day to day debts of Government. It is no use for a man to say that he does not owe money because he has an overdraft. Treasury bills represent an overdraft to the Government. In fact I have had an overdraft for about eight or nine years on my principal bank account. Sometimes I have had to ask them to add a little to it, and therefore I am in debt. The Government is in the same position. You cannot say that you only owe money for your house and that you do not owe your overdraft. All of this represents the indebtedness of Government and therefore the national debt is at a figure of \$200 million.

4.10 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

Mr. ADAMS: Now the whole point about the national debt. At this stage I would like to congratulate the hon. member for St. Michael West whom I do not now observe to be in his seat, on making a most wise and valid contribution to this debate. It really was a pleasure these last couple of sittings to hear the hon. member speak so well on the subjects to which he made his contribution. I must confess I came into the House hearing well of him and have for years studied his policy and I am glad that in the twilight of his days in the House he is batting so brilliantly all around the wicket. He made a very wise contribution about this question of debt. He pointed out that today's generation cannot be called on to deal with the payment for all the

projects of Government which will benefit future generations. That is a commonplace; but what projects have been financed by the national debt for the last five years which will benefit future generations? That is the question that we must all ask ourselves. What has been the result of this national debt? This great increase on the national debt?

I also would like to deal with what the hon. member said in respect of what I said in the earlier part of my speech about the Secretary of the Barbados Workers Union. He made a statement of which all of us in here have to take note. It is a very important statement for the future. It is, that unemployment is not a matter of partisan outlook. He went on to state that it should not be a matter of partisan outlook. With the possibilities of a change of Government – and I put it no higher, Sir – I congratulate the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers Union for recognizing that he will have to work with a new Government and a principal part of his work with a new Government will be to recognize the truth of that self same maxim – unemployment is not a matter of partisan outlook. To widen it a little more labour matters should not be matters of partisan outlook, and I believe that the Barbados Workers Union will be well able to weather the storm of a change of Government after 30 years – more than that. You can almost say 32 years, broken only in 1957, 1958, 1959, those years, and not entirely broken in those years although those were years of having a Government in power with which the union was politically associated.

In my respectful view this will not be the case in another few months; and I am very glad that the hon. member for St. Michael West has shown some intellectual preparedness which I hope will be transformed into the necessary emotional preparedness at the appropriate moment, to work with a new Government not of his political complexion. I welcome his speech and I welcome the extent to which he has risen above partisan consideration in these last few months of debate in here.

Sir, I am still dealing with the national debt. In the middle of all this national debt evidently Barbados can lend money to Jamaica. First of all it appears big; it is a loan. Barbados is lending money to Jamaica, and then when a little protest arises, out of it you hear we are only transferring the holding of some of our overseas assets to Jamaica. Sir, you take your money and you take your pick. Is it a loan or is it not a loan? What I know is this; if the Jamaican Government like the Government of the City of New York finds itself

unable to service its loans, will we not find that we are just ordinary creditors who have lent the money to Jamaica? That in fact the loan is not going to be serviced? I say God forbid that our brothers in Jamaica should ever fall into such difficulties, such political and economic difficulties, that they would find it impossible to pay debt on a loan. The last time I believe that it happened to a Commonwealth country in this hemisphere, it happened to Newfoundland which had self Government, which defaulted in its loans and the British took it back and ran Newfoundland as a colony until Canada took it over and the Newfoundlanders were finally ready to do what they should have done in the first place and gone with Canada in 1948.

I do not anticipate that Jamaica will fall into such a sad state of affairs; but you cannot approbate and reprobate, to adopt the language of an earlier speaker. You cannot say you are lending Jamaica money and then try to make out that it is not a loan. What is needed is for Barbados to inject some capital — have some injections of local capital into productive enterprise; and merely saying in the budget speech that it is intended that this should be done, will not make it be done.

The sewage enterprise will be productive so long as the work is being done. A couple of jobs — a couple of hundred jobs it may be — will be provided, the sewage plant will be built, 20 or 30 more jobs will be provided at the combined waterworks and sewage facility, because you have to know that there is still going to be a Waterworks Department of Government. The whole staff of the Waterworks, I doubt, is going to go anywhere. Some people will be left behind to write letters to the staff who have gone over to the new Authority, so there is going to be some expansion, I believe, of those concerned with water and sewage; but this is not a scheme which to me is productive in any long-run sense. It will be productive of Government revenue because coupled with the sewage scheme is the provision that water rates have to go up so as to produce Government revenue in three or four years. Two million dollars worth of it....

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. What I have found out in here today is that the Leader of the Opposition has been repeating himself. There is such a thing as repetition. He has been talking nonsense all the time and going over and going over the same thing. He is just filibustering the whole issue, and I want to draw that to your attention, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member's point is heard. I have just assumed the Chair and I have been listening to the hon. member for St. Thomas very carefully and I am satisfied since I have taken over the Chair, that the hon. member was quite in order in what he was saying. Honourable members can rest assured that if there is any tedious repetition at any time I will exercise the authority which I have. Let the hon. member continue.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, I will challenge the hon. member who has just got to say that since moving the amendment I have discussed the sewage scheme or that when I earlier discussed it, that I discussed either the employment or productive aspect of it. I discussed the documentation relating to bringing in the sewage scheme, and the speech of the Minister of Education. I have not discussed the other aspects of the scheme.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, he has interrupted me really at the point where I had finished because if I do not consider the sewage scheme a productive scheme, I do not consider it a productive scheme. It is an infrastructural scheme; and it is not productive in the sense that a new road may be productive; it is just an infrastructural scheme for clearing up an existing evil rather than aiming at the new development, so I do not know what he interrupted me for.

4.20 p.m.

Sir, I am watching it very carefully, and if I do tend to repeat myself I very much hope that you will warn me if you hear any argument over twice, or if I trench in a subject that has been already dealt with at any length.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair is listening attentively.

Mr. ADAMS: Yes, Sir. Now, the budget speech. It spoke of the sewage scheme, it spoke of the Deep Water Harbour. I think in fact I may be mistaken in saying it was the budget speech, I think it was the speech of the hon. member who just sat down, for St. Michael North West, that referred to various productive schemes that the Government is instituting. I think it is that speech, and I hope in dealing with it I won't be accused of going over the arguments of other hon. members.

Various of the schemes have an aspect of productivity to them. The harbour, it is supposed, will give work over a period of time and again will lend infrastructural support to the economy of Barbados, but a deep water

harbour is not a new project in Barbados, this is not going to have the productivity of the first deep water harbour which immediately induced a tremendous expansion in cruise ship traffic, immediately reduced the cost of landing cargo to the lowest it is anywhere in the Caribbean, and it is probably still the lowest of any quayside off loading facility that exists in the Caribbean, although I wouldn't be so sure about Guyana which can't carry the same size vessel. It immediately created a situation in which the cost of living could be seen to go down, and so on and so forth. The expansion of the harbour is perhaps gilding the lily. I mean, the lily is getting a little tarnished now, you need more space, you need more facilities, so you expand the harbour. I am very sincerely hoping that if the Government continues much longer that the plan for the Port will be laid so that we can see exactly what the Government has in mind in the new Port development. I myself believe that it should not only be a Port development, but that it should be a development undertaken in connection with the rather depressed areas of St. Michael West and St. Michael South West — and I am not referring here to constituencies, Sir, I am referring to districts such as Brandons, even as far north as Brighton, Goodland, Land's End, — I am hoping that a first class road system will be driven through Goodland and Brandon to link up with the Brighton Road and ultimately with the Farm Housing Area and those districts generally. These are districts of waste land which are very depressed at the present time.

There are swamps that need drainage. I know the hon. member for St. Michael South West is really very interested in this subject, he has canvassed it in here before. The rivers that run through Goodland and run through Land's End, Brandon's river, Bird's River, all of these rivers, all the development down there should be undertaken at the same time as the northward expansion of the harbour. I do not know what all the plans are, but I can give the House a pledge that the party which I lead will so undertake a development if we are returned to power and will treat the whole area between Eagle Hall and the present harbour, the area bounded by President Kennedy Drive, Highway I and Paradise Beach Club, treat the whole area as an area that should be developed in connection with the harbour, but especially the southern part of it. The splendid beaches at Brandon unfortunately marred by the swamp that used to be called the Mental Hospital swamp, now I suppose it

is called the Deacons Farm swamp, all of that is part of the port development and should be treated as such.

The hotel cluster development at Heywoods. Now I believe that this would be a productive enterprise; I believe so. I think that \$30 million is a lot of money, that is three Hiltons, it is a lot of money. I don't know if Higgs and Hill are the main contractors, I don't know what position Hubbard & Sons are in, old Sir Joslin Hubbard's firm I believe, I don't even know what name it goes under. These are main contracting firms, extremely reputable firms. Higgs & Hill, I believe, is one of the ten major contracting firms in Western Europe, unless it has gone down a little bit in recent years, and I do not think that merely because it was associated with a certain person in a certain enterprise that we should condemn it, because I won't even call the name lest I arouse prickly memories, but if these firms are interested it lends the project some authority, and I would like to hear from Government that this \$30 million hotel cluster project is not just pie in the sky, it is not just like the Dominica Development Project in which a certain person signed a contract with the Government of Dominica to pay \$50 million a year to build an airport and not only an oil refinery but a petro-chemical complex — in other words, a company producing plastics to make shirts and make the whole range of modern products that arise from plastics, and the Premier of Dominica was ill advised enough to go into this project. I only hope the Government of Barbados has not entered into any agreement with any such operator for this \$30 million development at Heywoods in which in fact the Government and Higgs & Hill, or whoever, will be left looking at each other in polite but mutual embarrassment. (Hon. F. G. SMITH: It is a World Bank project). I have heard something which pleases me very much, it is a World Bank project. Recent remarks and hints had given me the impression that somehow the Alleyne Mercantile Bank was connected with it.

Anyhow, I hope that the project will not fail because any part of the Government's contribution or private contributions were to be financed by the Alleyne Mercantile Bank. I am not here making cheap points, Sir, not in connection with Heywoods, Heywoods is too important a project. This is years and years that Heywoods should have been developed. I am sure you know that, Sir, I am sure you know the area. This is years that you have had the people cleared off. I believe those people, the

tenants, were cleared off when the Barbados Labour Party was in power. I believe that Church Street Gardens, Speightstown was built to accommodate some of them as long ago as 1960. Perhaps the Hon. Minister of Housing will have the date a little better than I can have it. I remember that I was asked years ago when I was a comparatively fresh attorney to negotiate a sale at Heywoods to developers and I was very excited, Sir. I could see some commissions, some fees that would have floated me for life and I approached Mr. Chapman and he made me feel even better. I think he was then acting for the owners — Mr. Chapman who is now our Consul General — and that was so many years ago, that was before I was in politics. I learned at an early stage there is many a slip between the cup and the developers' lip, so I am hoping that Heywoods will really come off, but I will ask the Government to bear very much in mind that people do resent diversions of a highway. People really resent when a highway is diverted, and I hope that the highway will not be built over.

4.30 p.m.

I hope that the highway will not be built over. (*Asides*) We diverted Sandy Lane. Hon. members in asides seem to think I am here to hide something. We had the Government once and we know that people resent highway diversion because we agreed to it and we saw the people's resentment. You learn only from action and yet at Sandy Lane nobody lost access to the beach, because when you drove down the old Sandy Lane highway there was a barbed wire fence and you could not stop in Sandy Lane and go to the beach. At Heywoods you would actually lose access to the beach, but I am hoping that the road will remain there and some means will be found even if you divert vehicular traffic of maintaining the road in being and allowing pedestrian traffic of some sort. All these are details. It is a major project which undoubtedly will be productive for Barbados and if it falls to the lot of the Barbados Labour Party to bring it into being, I hope that I will have the grace in the fullness of time to acknowledge the debt that we will owe to our predecessors, a grace which is not always apparent in the speeches of hon. members on the other side when dealing with the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the Deep Water Harbour or indeed the housing areas. These schemes we hear of must not be pie in the sky. Barbados positively needs development, and the first problem before you can start to develop is to decide in fact what are the conditions of public finances.

Now the Prime Minister told the Civil Servants that there was an enormous deficit, the

public finance did not allow them to get any more money. Nonetheless I see that in the turnover figures for 1975-76 — and I must thank the Central Bank for keeping hon. members on this side so up to date; they have been supplying documentation right up to this morning — show there was in fact a budget surplus of perhaps a record order of \$18 million at the end of the financial year 1975-76; so the Civil Servants had to hear how they would get all they asked for if the Government had the money, but the Government did not have the money. I would have wished that at that time hon. members on this side and the hon. members for St. Lucy and St. Michael West had been aware that there was an \$18 million budget surplus sitting comfortably in the Treasury. I do not know what the other facts are. It seems to me that \$18 million by itself would very nearly finance the raise of pay for civil servants when you take into account the tax recovery expected by the Government on the new salaries. It would not be too far off financing it. It is obvious that it financed other projects of Government, but why did we hear nothing of it? Why were we not told anything about it and why are we given only the most cursory explanation about the \$100 million deficit which the Prime Minister claims to see looking Barbados in the eye at the present time?

I very much hope that the Prime Minister's reply will deal at length, in depth and in detail with those initial holes in his argument. I want the Prime Minister also to deal with what has not been dealt with adequately in this House for several years, the figures of national income, whether gross domestic product at factor cost, whether gross domestic product at market prices, whether 1970 prices, whether crude prices. I want to hear per capita figures and I want to see whether in fact the Prime Minister has figures to contradict ours which have been presented in the speech of the hon. member for Christ Church West and mentioned in my own speech. The gross domestic product at market prices, that is allowing for indirect taxation, has risen from \$369 million in 1971 to \$700 million in 1975, that is a rise of 89.7%. Over the same period the cost of living has risen more than 100%, 124% if you count back to September which is the currency of the life of the current Government. Clearly on such evidence as that we will have to go further than the hon. member for St. Peter. We will have to say, not that there is no less than 1% growth, but that there is negative growth over five years. I have a calculation here of the gross domestic product at factor cost on 1970 prices which therefore excludes changes in tariffs and they have generally been upwards, and it excludes increases in the cost of living, not just the crude

cost of living because you have very clever economists in the Planning Unit who create their own deflators. The cost of living goes up 40% but the deflator is still 20%, but taking their deflator — and in fact I should not poke fun at them. I have a lot of respect for the economists in the Planning Unit and for the figures which they give. I think I have a photostat. I must not talk about photostats, Sir, but it is only a photostat of an IMF document which gives some recent deflators; a 7.3% deflator for 1972, 13% for 1973, 22.4% for 1974, 20.6% for 1975. I think that is a bit high for 1975, but that probably balances out with 1974, and the figures that have been presented to me are that in 1971 the gross domestic product at factor cost 1970 prices was \$299 million, and in successive years it has gone to \$296 million, stayed at \$296 million, dropped to \$257 million and stayed at \$257 million; so at 1970 prices it appears that the gross domestic product of Barbados had fallen in five years and certainly I think it is beyond doubt that it has fallen in real terms, that it has fallen in real per capita terms, that the per capita income of Barbados was more in real terms when this Government came into power in 1971 than it is now. I do not think these figures can safely be contradicted. They are based on figures which I know have been supplied to the International Monetary Fund and supplied through the Planning Unit of this Island and calculated by reputable economists and made available to the Government. The Government may have different sets of figures, but in my opinion any figures other than these would have very little validity.

I see the Central Bank speaking in successive reports of last year's gross domestic product being \$700 million and compared to year before's of \$527 million, but in fact the \$527 million was at factor cost; the \$700 million is at market price; so if you are misled as I was by looking through Central Bank Reports and trying to compare those figures, you would get a very false picture indeed of Barbados' economy. But I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I have produced figures that can stand the test of serious examination, and I am suggesting that the whole thesis of the Barbados Labour Party that this Government has allowed the economy to stagnate for five years is a thesis which is well supported by evidence.

4.40 p.m.

Ultimately, the public will be the judge. What is said on Television in here, what is said in argument in here is not going to be the final word; but the public has a right to all the publications of Government. We have no business to be giving figures to the IMF and publishing

those figures selectively. Every now and again you see in the Press where the IMF says something about Barbados' economy favourable to Barbados. You will see that Barbados succeeded in holding down retail prices in such and such a year better than anybody else. All that is true. Suppose it is true, you do not see that the IMF perhaps goes on to say that this was at some expense to the growth of the economy? You do not see that the IMF said that the economy was stagnated over a particular year or showed negative growth?

That is very seldom published. The good points are made known. The bad points are not even laid on the table of the House of Assembly. I will take the retail price index to which the Prime Minister referred during his Budget Proposals and about which Senator Taitt never ceases to congratulate himself.

Now, Sir, I said in here before, but not in this debate, I remember that my members in the parliamentary party and later when I appealed to the policy committee of our party, my members held me down at the time of the linkage of the Barbados dollar to the United States dollar. I said that we had to point out the dangers and I have heard members in there and not anybody who is a member of the House, intelligent people not candidates argue against reduction in price; and I said I am not arguing against it; but you have to put a case for the seamen, whose wives and families are going to suffer by 20 per cent production in their income. I said you have to put a case for all the Barbadians in Britain, or New York. Their remittances of \$10 million a year, that by an overnight stroke will be turned into \$8 million. I said that you have to put the case for all of that.

We are a democratic party, Sir. We have opened a frank discussion on these matters. The members in there said do not worry with that. Now we have seen this debate about revaluation going on in other countries, and the public of Barbados have had to learn about the dangers of revaluation from the Eastern Caribbean and from Trinidad. Now, there is nothing that will make me believe that the Prime Minister of Barbados is as intelligent a man as the Prime Minister of Trinidad. Eric Williams, perhaps, has too much brains to be a politician. Sometimes he goes too high; and one thing about our Prime Minister is that he is a very consummate politician. He never pitches his sights too high. He stays at his own level; but the Prime Minister of Trinidad, in his wisdom, spent years, two years reaping the advantage of a currency in devaluation. Devaluation is one of the dirtiest words in

political life all over the world until President Nixon, a man whose acts of wisdom in economic affairs and in international affairs contrasted so vividly with his acts of dishonesty and his duplicity of character in political affairs, that make you really realise that what the doctors say about schizophrenia is true, and that two people can live inside one body, one good and one bad. God knows we have examples of that in Barbados.

President Nixon was not ashamed to sit down and decide that the American dollar should be devalued in relation to gold. And America's comparative economic recovery and its comparatively good weathering of the economic storms of recent years is partly due to Nixon setting the dollar free from gold and allowing gold to rise from \$35 an ounce to \$190 an ounce as the support price. It has fallen again now, Sir. More examples of the wisdom — even the wicked can do good, if properly advised.

In Barbados we jumped with great speed into a revaluation, and I have heard — I hope you do not mind my saying so, because I have heard your arguments, and I have heard them cogently and well put, saying that we must admire Barbados because we have the highest value currency in the Eastern Caribbean. But are we richer than Trinidad? Are we richer because a Barbados dollar is worth more than a Trinidad dollar?

The two things do not add up. But we thought up an illusion as well by doing that. To begin with, the revaluation has not succeeded in bringing down the cost of living; because the Central Bank Report makes it clear that there has been a fall in international commodity prices, such as the price of foodstuffs, and these contribute very largely to the holding strain in the cost of living in recent months. From October last year commodity prices were falling in the U.S.A. and the wholesale price index which deals with foodstuffs and other commodities, I believe, was dropping at an annual rate in the last quarter of the year by 7 or 8 percent. Barbados would benefit from that naturally. We would not expect our prices to go up in the face of these international trends.

But, Sir, we jumped into this revaluation and we are holding on to it. In the Eastern Caribbean the Ministers obviously could not agree. Dominica wanted a very low price for the EC dollar, and others wanted a high price. The exporters wanted a low value and the importers wanted a high value; and so they ended up by settling for the cross rate which would be the

rate on the day that they cut free from sterling and connected to the dollar.

I think it was a bad decision. The Trinidadians thought about the matter, considered the matter, allowed Trinidad merchants to have several scares — you know that whenever they talk about devaluation or revaluation, if they think that there is going to be a devaluation, they hasten to pay their overseas debts. If they think that there is going to be a revaluation they keep back the money. The Trinidad merchants kept back the money several times; and each time they suffered because there was no revaluation, and they found themselves having to settle outside, period.

Something like that could have been done in Barbados too. You talk about the Barbados merchants and our party is favourable to them? The merchants of Barbados reaped the greatest harvest they have ever reaped. Read the Central Bank Report in July 1974 when the revaluation came about. The foreign reserves of this country went sharply up and then came sharply down again after revaluation where the merchants had to pay a draft of £3,888 or whatever it was just overnight. That went down from \$15,000 to \$12,005 and that money went in the merchants' pockets ultimately at the expense of the devalued foreign reserves in sterling held by the Government of Barbados.

It is an indirect connection, but I think that nobody has lost. It just looks like money that you have, but in the long run somebody has to pay for it. We jumped into that overnight. The external assets of the commercial banks fell from \$2 million in August to less than \$1 million in September. I do not think that I have the exact table. It is there for all members who are interested to see and study. Another aspect of devaluation, Sir, is to make hotel rooms more expensive than hotel rooms in neighbouring islands such as St. Lucia.

4.50 p.m.

I stayed recently at La Toc Hotel, a first class hotel; it is indeed really in my view better than Sandy Lane — it may not be, but it is a first class hotel. I cannot remember what the rates were but they were less than Sandy Lane's. It charged US dollars. They are that much less because the US dollar buys so much more. They are that much less than in Barbados because of devaluation of the EC dollar and the revaluation of the Barbados dollar. It is said of all of this that the real reason why you revalued was to bring down the cost of living. I have searched the economic textbooks, I have searched authorities

which can give me some clue as to whether there has ever before been a revaluation of a country's currency in order to bring down the cost of living, and I must congratulate the Prime Minister on taking a unique step in economic history.

The Germans revalued in order to stop money flowing in to Germany. It was embarrassing the Germans Central Bank. The Swiss revalued for the same purpose. The Swiss have reached the stage now that they do not pay interest on what is commonly called Swiss Bank deposits — Secret deposits. Most people when you give them ten million dollars they give you X percent on it. When you give the Swiss \$10 million you have to pay them so many hundred thousand — well, probably it is less than \$100,000 — a year to keep the money for you. (*Asides*) I would ask the Minister of Health to go through the files of his department and he may learn something about Swiss bank accounts. He would not have to go so far back...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let the hon. member get back to the Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: Very well, Sir. I am dealing with revaluation and the Swiss revalue. It is actually an embarrassment to the Swiss. (*Aside*) I hear the hon. member for St. Michael West asking when did the Swiss revalue their money, and I think I had better deal...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair has not heard the hon. member for St. Michael West. The Chair is listening quite attentively to the hon. member for St. Thomas.

Mr. ADAMS: But it is a sound point, and if it is worrying hon. members I would like to deal with it very shortly. Some revaluations are carried out by a positive act such as the Barbados revaluation; some revaluations are carried out in a negative way such as not devaluing when other currencies associated with yours, devalue. You can revalue by standing still or you can revalue by taking a step, and I trust now that the hon. member does not want me to go and put myself to the hard labour of finding out what a Swiss franc was worth in terms of the pound, the French franc, the German mark and the United States dollar in 1914 and what it is worth now, because he must not make asides that reveal a lack of thought about the subject on which he is contributing. (*Asides*) I have not repeated myself; I do not know what they are going on about, Sir. The Prime Minister, the Central Bank Report all talk about devaluing the Barbados currency. (*Aside*) The hon. member is quarrelling with me so much that I cannot even hear myself. I am

going to withdraw that the Swiss have revalued. Do you wish me to withdraw that?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let the hon. member withdraw to the Resolution under discussion.

Mr. ADAMS: I cannot talk, Sir, because he keeps on telling me about the Swiss revaluation.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have not told the hon. member about the Swiss revaluation. I would like the hon. member to stick to the subject matter and let us hear him continue on the Resolution before this House.

There are certain Standing Orders of this House to which I would like to call all hon. members to adhere.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, I think there has been some misunderstanding on the part of the hon. member because to tell the truth, I really do not want to have any quarrel with him. I have just heard him say all the other currencies...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There are some hon. members who have not yet spoken on this amendment. Let the hon. member continue to address on the the amendment.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, a remark might very well be made that all the other currencies have devalued but the Swiss remains hard. That remark would exactly sum up what I am trying to say; that the Swiss have not devalued their currency, if that is preferred...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Therefore that is part of the condemnation of the Government for its unsound measures taken to reduce inflation....

Mr. ADAMS: Because the Barbados Government has not devalued its currency either; therefore the two are associated. I am trying to show that there are only a limited number of countries which have felt powerful enough...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like to draw the hon. member's attention to Standing Order — the hon. member must confine his remarks to the subject matter. The hon. member must seek to confine his remarks to the words 'proposed to be included or excluded.'

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, I believe that since we are talking about revaluation, that on the principle of revaluation. the principle of revaluation can only be illustrated by example; but I think you will agree with me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I do not

mean any disrespect for the ruling of the Chair. Sir, what is detaining me over poor Switzerland and its franc is the constant interruptions. I am trying to talk about the Swiss franc, not any other franc, and if I could be heard in silence I could get on.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like the hon. member to pay special attention to Standing Order 34(2)...

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, ask him to keep quiet. I mean that. I really am not making sport. He is trying to distract me and I cannot speak at this length with distractions.

Sir, you have drawn my attention to the particular omission and addition that is proposed. I want to make it clear. The Government wants to congratulate itself. I must say the Prime Minister is the first person I have ever heard in any Assembly move a motion seeking to congratulate himself for a speech he had just made.

5.00 p.m.

I have seen many things in time but I have never yet heard anybody make a speech and then move a motion seeking to commend himself on the sound measures which he has just proposed. Modesty normally suggests that you invite somebody else to do it, and if for no other reason than to save the Prime Minister's modesty from the trespass which he himself is offering to it, I am moving to leave out these words, but please let me get on, because I haven't yet reached trade balances.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am going to warn the hon. member again. The Prime Minister's modesty has absolutely nothing to do with the proposed amendment to the amendment.

Mr. ADAMS: Yes it has, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, not the Prime Minister's modesty, and it is my ruling that it has nothing to do with it. Let the hon. member continue to debate the amendment that is before the House.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, I have notes here and can't reach them with the interruptions. Yes, Sir, now revaluation also has a very important relationship to a subject in which the hon. member for St. Michael West and the hon. member for St. Joseph and others should be very interested, which is the trade balance and the price of sugar, the price which we get in Barbados for our products. Contrary to what was

said some time ago, and it would never be possible for me to commend the Prime Minister for his proposals while this is so, it is not true that we are being paid in European units of account for our sugar, we are being paid in sterling and the revaluation of our dollar meant an automatic reduction in the amount of money which we got for our sugar exports, and this is a matter for which the Prime Minister must be condemned, and condemned very severely indeed.

It was all right when the price of sugar went up and we got \$110 million for the exported sugar in our *annus mirabilis*, but it is not all right now that the price we are actually receiving for the guaranteed amounts of sugar which we are selling abroad is not only reduced, by operation of the world market, but is also reduced by operation of a revalued dollar. Now this is the argument that prevented Dominica for so long from agreeing to any revaluation. They said they could not afford the loss of revenue involved in the reduction in the export price of bananas which would result from a revaluation. This is the argument which appealed to Trinidad which sells so much oil abroad, it is more profitable to the Government of Trinidad to sell its oil with the Trinidad dollar at \$2.40 to the U.S. dollar than to sell its oil with the Trinidad dollar at \$2.00 to the U.S. dollar. In Barbados it remains less profitable for us to sell our sugar abroad with the Barbados dollar at \$2.00 to the U.S. dollar, it remains unprofitable to us to sell our beaches to visitors from abroad in foreign currency at that rate of exchange.

All these are matters which deserve a debate in here. My party has taken the view, and I am limited by my party's view, that the measure must not — I can't say must not be attacked — but my party has taken the view that, as I said, we cannot argue against a reduction of prices or whatever, but I still say that we must look very carefully at the trade balances which after all are going to be affected by those things. We are going to bring in less and the tourist dollar is going to be worth less in our own market. We have to look at the trade balances, we have to look and see whether Barbados can truly afford to take the step which it took with so much universal commendation, which it took with the approbation of the public all proud that Barbados appeared to be doing well enough to afford a dollar at 50 cents in the American dollar.

A very important point was made here and I hope the Press can take it because nobody in the Press has yet seemed to understand the deep and fundamental distinction between your support currency or your relation commendation and the

rate at which you should set it. People seem to think that there is only one step involved in going from sterling to dollar, and over and over again we have seen it, Tony Best in the Nation and commentators in the Advocate, the cartoonist in the Nation, go to the dollar, but there are two steps. You go to the dollar for stability and you choose at what point you go to the dollar for economic balance. You do not have to go to the dollar at any particular rate, and that is something that has to be made totally clear. A man is only ignorant if he says go back to the pound or if he characterises any argument relating to the exchange rate of the Barbados dollar as advocating a return to the pound. There are two separate questions entirely different. You can set exchange rates in relation to sterling, in relation to the dollar, whatever. If we had wanted we could have stayed with sterling but say that the Barbados dollar would go up three dollars to the pound and it would fluctuate, but it would still have a higher value. If we had wanted we could have gone to the dollar and say that it would stay at the same value that it was when it was still with that of the Eastern Caribbean. This move to the dollar was a proper move. It could have been done without letting the merchants know, but it was a proper move.

Now, the cost of living. I am trying to wind up, Sir, but there is so much conversation in here that I really am finding it difficult to deal with this matter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair has not heard conversation, the Chair is listening to the debate and the address of the hon. member.

Mr. ADAMS: Thank you, Sir. I hope I have given the Chair some food for thought. Next time you are in Welchman Hall, St. Thomas I hope to hear some good economics on the platform, because I must commend you, Sir, you only talked economics the last time you were there. It was bad, but at least it was economics.

The cost of living. The cost of living has remained roughly speaking, I suppose, stationary for most of this year, and a lot of credit can be taken for this by the Ministry indicating that it is its own wise measures that have created this. I have already dealt with and will not repeat myself with movements in international trade, but I want to deal with a particular item which is rice. Rice by itself forms very nearly 1% of the cost of living. Let me look it up just to be absolutely sure. Since we are a community that buys a lot of rice, rice is given a heavy – not 1%, Sir, the reduction in the price of rice by itself

amounted to 1%. I beg your pardon, Sir – but the reduction in the price of rice by itself reduced the cost of living by 1%.

5.10 p.m.

Anyhow, Sir, I will have to try to remember. I am talking about rice. The price of rice has been reduced by around 11 cents per pound. That by itself contributed to several points reduction in the cost of living. It contributed, I believe, to about a 1% reduction in the cost of living, because rice is a major component of the index, and documents have been circulated in Barbados saying that the Barbados Labour Party opposed the Government when it said that the merchants were making too much money on rice, and opposed reduction in the price of rice. This is obviously a wicked and outright lie, and I think that at least one of those documents is now before the courts as the foundation of a libel action, therefore I will not talk too much about it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, can't you hear anybody else talking now; the hon. member for St. Lucy, the hon. member for St. Michael West and the hon. member for St. Michael South Central?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am hearing loud asides. I would like to draw hon. members' attention to Standing Order No. 28 where it says that hon. members on their feet should be heard in silence, and I would hope that hon. members on Government side would adhere to the appropriate Standing Order.

Mr. ADAMS: Now this 11 cents reduction in the price of rice is being presented as money which the merchants were receiving and money which the Government made them take off, and I have not seen in all the correspondence between the merchants and Senator Taitt any proper explanation of how the price of rice went down. I have not seen anybody tell the truth about it, that in fact the Government was imposing a cess, a tax on rice which sent it up to over \$20 a bag and that comes out at about 11 cents a pound, and that the reason why the price of rice has been reduced is that the Government has removed or reduced the cess; that the 11 cents were not going into the merchants' pockets, that the price of rice was fixed by the Government and the merchants had to pay this cess on rice sales back to the Government, and that the Ministry of Trade received this money and that the David Seale who is so quarrelled with and criticised and attacked and Geddes Grant.....nobody would say that Geddes Grant

are the supporters of the Government; you only know that David Seale supports the Opposition.....and the other rice importers every month had to make out a cheque to the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Trade for the 11 cents, 9 cents, 13 cents, I believe it may have reached at one stage, which was Government cess on rice, and that the reduction in the price of rice is due to the Government removing the tax. Nobody has said that. Nobody has said that the cess went up after revaluation so that the merchants would not get the advantage of the higher price, but the public could have got the advantage. (*Asides*) You catch at too many things. I know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that some people do not like to be called mullets, but certain people are mullets; they catch at the first thing they hear. The Government had three choices with rice. When the dollar was revalued, it could have reduced the price of rice or it could have charged a cess. In fact it had three choices. It could have let the merchants make the extra money. No political party with which I am familiar in Barbados has ever consciously taken a decision to let merchants make extra money, and I am saying that quite unequivocally no matter what the members of my party would tell me about the other side, because members of my party will tell me "look how they let K. R. Hunte sell this for that and so on and so on." I say it is out of ignorance this happened because I know from hearsay the decisions which were taken when we were in power. Never forget that when rice was four cents a pound my uncle was Price Control Officer, and I believe the hon. member for St. Michael West can tell you how he used to deal with Brydens and the others when they came in with their fancy figures trying to import flour, if his memory goes back to war time days.

I have a little knowledge of hearing about this for many years. But there were these three choices. You rule out the one of letting the merchants make the extra money. Rice is not the kind of commodity on which that decision is taken. In other areas of the economy where there is no price control you cannot help allowing that to happen, and the merchants made a lot of extra money on revaluation, fortunes in some cases. I am talking about \$100,000 and \$150,000 in a matter of a couple of weeks accruing to individuals; but that decision was obviously not considered in the case of rice; so the other two decisions were, reduce the price of rice or leave it where it was and let the Government take the extra money, and the Government took the extra money. People had to pay 54 cents a pound for rice for a year and a half longer than it was necessary. First there were arguments that the better grade rice would soon come from Guyana

and you paid the cess in order for the Ministry of Finance to purchase the higher grade rice. It never came. Then there were the arguments about the Venezuelan rice, about the cess having to be left to deal with the Venezuelan rice, and all that has happened is that the Government was drawing an excess profit on the import of rice to this country, and the Government has now decided to give it back to the people. It should never have drawn it in the first place, and I want this to settle once and for all the chit chat about reduction in the price of rice and the brilliance behind the conception of reducing the price of rice. The Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Trade was receiving the people's money, money that had come out of the pockets of everybody who bought rice for a year and a half, and the Government has done nothing when it decides to give up that income by way of cess.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the question be now put under Standing Order No. 36.

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

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, the hon. member did not rise on a point of order.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: No, I did not. I rose and moved the motion.

Mr. ADAMS: Nobody else has spoken, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is that

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, the question has not yet been proposed.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let the hon. member take his seat.
5.20 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It has been drawn to my attention that the hon. member for St. Thomas is now proposing a motion. (*Asides*).

Mr. ADAMS: Thank you, Sir. Hon. members must calm themselves and do not set unreasonable precedents in here. I have not proposed a motion. Nobody can second a motion that has not been proposed.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let the hon. member take his seat. (*Asides*)

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: The hon. member for St. Philip North seconded it and reserved his right to speak.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. *(Pause)*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am consulting with the Deputy Clerk of Parliament.

Mr. WALCOTT: I would like you to hear my point of order. We have precedence over the Deputy Clerk. The Deputy Clerk must come after members of the House. Standing Order 36(1) states that: "After a question has been proposed, a Member rising in his place may claim to move 'That the question be now put'; and, unless it appears to the Speaker or Chairman that such motion is an abuse of the rules of the House, or an infringement of the rights of the minority, the question 'That the question be now put' shall be put forthwith and decided without amendment or debate." The Deputy Clerk does not have to advise you on that.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Order 24 says: "A question upon a motion or amendment to a Bill shall not be proposed by the Speaker or the Chairman unless such motion or amendment has been seconded...." *(Asides)*. Can I be heard in silence? The hon. member for St. Philip North purported to have got up to second the motion in the middle of my speech. If you read the Standing Order relating to interruptions, you will see that there is no rule whereby one can interrupt in order to second. You can rise and second and reserve your right to speak, but you cannot rise to second before the proposer of the motion has finished. Anybody who gets up in the middle of a speech and says "I beg to second" is out of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member has made his point. Let the hon. member take his seat.

Mr. ADAMS: Thank you, Sir.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. We are well aware that the hon. member is allowed to make a second speech; but he cannot make a second motion to debate something on which he has already made a motion. *(Asides)*.

Mr. FORDE: On a point of order, Sir. There has been an amended motion being proposed before this Chamber. In my submission each member in here, except yourself, being in the Chair, has a right to speak on that motion. *(Asides)*. Mr. Deputy Speaker, may I appeal to you that I can be heard in silence?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am warning members on the other side that a member who is on his feet speaking has a right to be heard in silence. I will accept addresses from hon. members standing in their places. That goes for every hon. member of this Chamber.

Mr. FORDE: According to Rule 36(1), in my submission you have a duty to safeguard the rights of the minority. In my submission, as soon as an amendment is moved in this House each member has a right to contribute to the motion which is before the House regardless of what other members may think of its value or lack of value. On the amended motion which has been proposed, first of all there has only been a speech coming from one member; and in my submission it must mean that other members who wish to contribute to the debate on the amended motion should be given an opportunity to do so.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like to rule on that point of order. As far as the Chair is concerned, since the amendment has not been seconded, as I was so advised by the Clerk, the debate is not on the amendment to the amendment. The debate would have to be on the first amendment. *(Asides)*. It was not seconded. That is my ruling and the debate goes on on the first amendment because the proposed amendment to the amendment has not yet been seconded. If it were any other hon. member than the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition I would have called on the hon. member to take his seat already because he has expired his 30 minutes and yet has not made a motion and has not given time to have it seconded. My ruling is that we are still on the amendment to the motion and until the hon. member's amendment is seconded, we are still on the amendment.

5.30 p.m.

It is within the discretion of the Chair whether he is satisfied that the debate has been exhausted on the Resolution before the House and if the Chair is so satisfied he will accept the closure motion. At this stage the Chair is not satisfied that the debate is exhausted.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. From your ruling, from what you have said, Sir, then the hon. member who is now speaking is out of order to be speaking longer than half an hour because he is no different from any other hon. member and the rules really do not give any latitude for any person who has already spoken in a debate to have more than the prescribed time, and he has spoken in the debate already.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Thomas, on this amendment is speaking for the first time on the amendment. There have been several hon. members who spoke on the amendment.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Sir. You have said that the amendment on which he

is speaking is the amendment that was moved by the Hon. Prime Minister; so therefore that is the only motion before the House. So he could only speak on that; so no motion was made to amend that, so he would be making a speech on that and if he has already spoken on that, and all of the members over there, he would be in no different position from the others.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like to point out clearly that all hon. members over there have already spoken on that motion. The hon. member for St. Thomas proposes to make an amendment to that amendment; and the hon. member is now making his speech on that — on the first amendment.

Mr. ADAMS: The hon. member should really take note of the Standing Orders. There is a difference between 31 and 32. The Leader of the Opposition has a general exemption in 32 but he does not have in 31. If you were a practising lawyer — I do not mean you, Sir — if hon. members who are shouting were practising lawyers they would notice there is an 'and' in 31 that does not exist in 32, and the 'or' in 32 has a disjunctive effect that it does not have in 31, and no member of the Opposition has spoken unlimitedly on this debate except me. Now there is a difference in the wording. You see what I mean by 31 and 32, Sir?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order. He is not the first speaker for the Opposition. The first speaker, whether it is the member for St. Peter, St. James, can speak unlimitedly. If he is after he has half an hour just like anybody else. That is all it is. Read it. The hon. member for St. Peter when he speaks first, can speak at length, and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition — either/or — if he fails to exercise his right then he sacrifices it and can speak for just half an hour.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let the hon. member take his seat please. When I came to the Chair I was of the impression that the amendment moved by the hon. member for St. Peter, or proposed to be moved, was already seconded. This is the impression I was given; that is why I allowed the hon. member to speak unlimitedly. It is my view that in 32 where it refers to the Prime Minister, the Minister of Finance, the Leader of the Opposition or the member speaking first on behalf of the Opposition will have unlimited time. It is my interpretation of this Standing Order that, where mention is made of the Leader of the Opposition or the member speaking first on behalf of the Opposition in a budget debate or reply to a budget debate, there is a different Shadow

Minister for the particular subject other than the Leader of the Opposition, and the Leader of the Opposition allows that person to speak first. It is my view and my ruling that if the Leader of the Opposition wanted to exercise this right to speak unlimitedly, he should be the first person to speak on this Head; and therefore I now direct that the Leader of the Opposition should discontinue his speech because he is not the first speaker on this topic. That is my ruling.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, I still have to make the motion.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is my ruling. The hon. member cannot say one further word on this debate in this House with this presiding officer in the Chair. Let the hon. member take his seat. I have ruled. Let the hon. member take his seat.

As far as the Chair is concerned there is no amendment because the hon. member cannot have his cake and eat it too.

My ruling is final and there is no amendment to the amendment.....

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have ruled on this matter.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of privilege. I believe the Clerks at the Table are there to guide those who sit in the Chair.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let the hon. member take his seat. Let me make it clear. In this Chair when I sit in it I preside and my ruling is final and there is nobody who will question my ruling except by a substantive motion.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, about a third of the way down my speech I said I moved that in the third line, such and such words are deleted. Therefore it has been moved whether.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let the hon. member take his seat.
5.40 p.m.

If the hon. member moves it. All hon. members over there spoke on the Resolution. I have already ruled that there will be no debate on that motion because it was not properly put. The hon.

member, according to my ruling, has spoken longer than the hon. members who have spoken.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, I really want to say something which is not intended to add any fuel to fire. I am aware of all the remarks, all the points which Your Honour has made. I happen to believe that the first "or" is disjunctive and the second conjunctive, but that is a legal point which the Chief Justice would have to rule on, because "and/or" is used in the first paragraph and it is an accepted canon of construction that where you use "and" and then "or" it must be disjunctive, but "and".....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of privilege,.....

Mr. ADAMS: Just give me a minute, Dipper.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: He is only repeating himself.

Mr. ADAMS: But I am leaving out that.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member should call me by my title which is the member for St. John, my constituency.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER rose.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let both hon. members sit.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would just ask the hon. member to address me by constituency, Sir, that I am proud to represent.

Mr. ADAMS: Now that is only my opinion, Sir, your opinion prevails, but bearing in mind the possibility I was very careful, because hon. members on this side were telling me "move the amendment," "move the amendment." I moved the amendment before my half hour was out, based upon your ruling yesterday, because I said to myself, if it is ruled that I must speak first in order to claim unlimited time, I don't agree with it, but I have to abide by the rules, I cannot speak for more than half hour before moving the amendment, and based on your ruling yesterday that when the amendment is moved you are on a new motion, I said to myself, half hour you have to move the amendment in and then I will be the member speaking first on behalf of the Opposition and therefore will have unlimited time. I went to some pains to bring myself within what I thought was every possible

construction of the rules, and if the record is examined it will be found that I did move before half hour was out. I repeated the amendment. It will be found that, and I then continued on the basis that I was speaking first, otherwise nobody could speak first on an amendment like this on behalf of the Opposition. If I am going to move it I can only become the person speaking first by introducing the motion. Now the motion has been moved, but what the rules say is that it shall not be proposed from the Chair until it has been seconded. There are two stages in a motion. It can be seconded or not, like the motion to remove the strangers yesterday, but it cannot be proposed until it is seconded, but this motion is in the condition of a motion which was properly moved within the proper time limit of a speech, and then the mover became the person speaking first on behalf of the Opposition and had unlimited time.

All these matters have been foreseen, I don't wish to be contentious or quarrel with anybody, because I can see, Sir, that you are doing absolutely what is correct according to your view of the Standing Orders. I deeply and honestly in my heart believe that you are trying to give the correct interpretation of the Standing Orders, therefore all the facts have to be placed before you. I moved the motion in my half hour and I have continued to speak on it since, and it is my submission as a matter of privilege that when I sit down another hon. member will be able to second it if he so chooses, and no doubt other steps will be taken. I have done everything to conform with every ruling that the Chair has given. It cannot be held that the Speaker was wrong in letting me speak on, because I moved it. I said in the third line I am going to move.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member is now repeating himself. Let him take his seat.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of privilege, Sir, I just want to get the record straight. I have been in here 25 years, I think I am superseded by the hon. member for Christ Church East and the hon. member for St. Michael West. This is the first time in my parliamentary career that I have heard the Chair threatened that it will be a matter for the judges of the law courts. I want to get this straight. No judge of my court in this island, the Chief Justice or anybody else, can challenge the ruling of the Chair made inside this Chamber.....

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of privilege, I am not challenging you, Sir.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You said that. The Chief Justice cannot come in here and tell us what to do, he can tell you what to do over there but he will have to say in his place, and to say that he can rule on whether "or" is conjunctive or disjunctive. I will leave this Chamber if the Chief Justice ever threatened to trespass inside here, and on a point of privilege in this House let it be known that no judge in this island can interpret the Standing Orders of this House in any way.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of privilege, Sir, I am very sorry if I have given Your Honour that impression. (Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The Chief Justice would have to be silent. Not in here, he would have to leave the island first). Sir, I want to make it clear if Your Honour has taken that interpretation, that what I was saying is that judges deal with all these nice points of "and/or", these delicate points, that in here we cannot accept that. I am not suggesting other than that.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member has made his point.

Mr. ADAMS:.....and I absolutely refute any suggestion that I am suggesting the Chief Justice can overrule you, Sir. I said that would have to be point for the Chief Justice. It is a very nice, pretty point, but it is not a point for in here, but I went on to say that we do not go into the canons of construction in here.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member has made his point.

Mr. ADAMS: I said I accept your ruling.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I have not, Mr. Deputy Speaker, made a contribution to this debate.

Mr. FORDE: On a point of order, Sir, I move to second the motion proposed by the hon. member for St. Thomas — the amendment — and I reserve my right to speak on it.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member for Christ Church West is still insisting on something and I would like to draw to Your Honour's attention, and to the attention of the hon. member, Standing Order 28(15): "No member may speak more than once on any proposition except —" and then the exceptions are listed. Then it goes

on to say in Rule 17: "A member who has spoken may speak again when a new question has been proposed by the Speaker or Chairman, such as a proposed amendment, or a motion for the adjournment of the debate or a dilatory motion."

A proposition by the Speaker or the Chairman is not an intention in your mind, a proposition by the Speaker or the Chairman is a proposition that is proposed and seconded and he is putting the question, and somebody rises to speak. That is when you can speak again, on a new proposition. It is time that we begin to play the rules by rules and these are not any "Tom Harry" rules, and I think that it is time that members realise this. I want the hon. member for Christ Church West to be clear in his mind that there is no way that these rules can permit any member, whether it is the Leader of the Opposition or anyone else, to speak twice in a debate in this House unless it is on a new motion that is proposed, and therefore it is quite clear the hon. member should check on these.

5.50 p.m.

I think these Standing Orders really do not always require a lawyer. In these things I feel quite competent to help Your Honour and the Clerk if assistance is needed, but I do not think hon. members need to press you in this. It is not a proposition before the House. They have had a day of it; let them gracefully accept the ruling and bow out without carrying this any further.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have made a ruling that we are at present dealing with the first amendment to the Resolution. Despite the fact that the hon. member for St. Thomas has contended that he proposed during the course of his address an amendment to that amendment, it is my view that if an hon. member has already spoken on the motion that I have drawn to hon. member's attention has been before the House, that the only way a proposal made by the hon. member for St. Thomas could be seconded is if it were seconded by someone who has not yet spoken. (*Asides*) I am giving my ruling and I would like to be able to speak uninterrupted.

It is my view that it could only be seconded by someone who has not yet spoken on the original motion. I will give the reason. The ruling has been that we were speaking on the original amendment. The hon. member has been told to take his seat on those grounds, hence what is before the House is still the original amendment. For that original

amendment to be changed to the proposed amendment by the hon. member for St. Thomas, someone who has not yet spoken could get up purporting to speak on the original amendment and second that, then it is my view that this would be the amendment before the House. That is my ruling. The proposal before the House is the original amendment and the hon. member for St. Michael South has risen, and I suppose he is rising to speak on the motion. Let the hon. member proceed.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I rise to support the motion....

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, the hon. member can only rise to speak if he is seconding the motion by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is not so. The hon. member can speak on the first amendment.

Mr. HINDS: Not when an amendment has been made.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: But the amendment has not been seconded.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, is it not implicit in your ruling that what I have said about moving the amendment before the end of half an hour is correct and that therefore I can still go on to speak, although clearly I am not getting a seconder?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member appears to be questioning my ruling. I have already made my ruling and I am not going to entertain any further discussion or points of order on my ruling. If the hon. member would like to question my ruling, let him bring a substantive motion and it will be debated. Let the hon. member take his seat.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, for what cannot be understood is that I do not question people's rulings. I am asking what the ruling was. I have asked Your Honour if Your Honour would hear me out if it is not implicit in your ruling that in fact I moved the amendment.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I said I am not entertaining any queries on my ruling. I have already ruled. I think I was quite specific and clear.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the motion as amended that is being considered by this House and it reads as follows:

"That this House takes note of the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals presented by the Minister of Finance and commends the Government for the sound measures taken to reduce inflation and to ensure the continued economic stability of the country."

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what is happening is that all members on that side of the Chamber have spoken on this particular matter and now they are trying to find some type of device to have a second bite at the cherry, and trying to prevent those of us on this side who have not yet spoken on the issue from speaking, namely, myself, and they have invited me to join in this debate, and trying to prevent the hon. member for St. John from replying to the points made in this debate. That is what has been happening, and while they are making the slogan "No tricks in '76", they are trying all the tricks in the book to prevent us from putting the case for the Government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the amendment that is before this House which has been moved has been done on this side in order to make that particular motion made by the hon. member for St. Thomas more acceptable to this Honourable Chamber, because what has been happening is that under the guise of what appears to be a simple, neutral and innocent motion "That this House takes note of the Budgetary Proposals" the Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for St. Thomas has tried to condemn the whole policies of the Government of this country and to cast all types of aspersions on the conduct of members of Parliament including members in this Honourable Chamber, and has tried to give the impression that there is widespread corruption and mismanagement of the affairs of this country, and now they are trying to use all types of devices to prevent us on this side from replying to those particular charges. But we are going to reply to them.

Let me first of all, as Minister of Health, welcome the proposals in this Financial Statement for removing the sales tax on drugs and pharmaceutical products. As you know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, pharmaceutical products and similar preparations are necessary for the promotion of health and for combating disease, and any measure taken to make such products more readily available to the people of this

country is welcome. We are all users or potential users of drugs; I take the point that the hon. member for the City says she does not use drugs, and I commend her on her perfect state of health and hope she continues in that state; but most of us are users or potential users of these pharmaceutical preparations and I would like to commend the Minister of Finance on the steps taken to remove the sale tax on drugs so that these will become more readily available to members of the public as they need them. There has been some confusion in this country about the retail sales tax, who pays it and on what products it is levied.

6.00 p.m.

I would like to read out a list of those products which do not come under the provisions of the Retail Sales Tax. Fertilisers and pesticides are exempt from the payment of sales tax, and so are building materials, stationery, newsprint, seeds, commercial and capital equipment, food and alcoholic beverages except sold in restaurants, goods sold in bond except sales of live poultry, gasolene, diesel, kerosene, gases, industrial sewing machines — quite a range of products necessary for the day to day living of the people of this country or necessary for industrial development are exempt from the sales tax.

It is on this basis that we welcome the proposals exempting these products from the provisions of that Act. I would like to say that contrary to what has been said on that side, the provisions of this Act are introduced in order to assist the revenue of this country and to meet the purposes of development, and were not introduced by any wicked Government as they try to give the impression.

Of some 124 countries surveyed by a member of the International Monetary Fund, some 71 had a sales tax in one form or another levied at various points of commerce and the exchange of goods. These were levied not only in developed countries, but also in developing countries; so we have got to get these matters straight.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the other matter which I want to refer to relates to the question of the loan contract signed on behalf of this Government by myself on the 8th April. I have been invited by the hon. member for the City, as well as by the hon. member for St. Thomas to make a contribution on this particular matter. The member for St. Thomas stated that I recently became Minister for Health, thereby implying quite correctly that certain details surrounding this development had already been

worked upon before I came into the Ministry of Health.

Let me say this much. Water is a prime necessity to this country. It is a necessity for the life and health of the people and not only for the purposes of what you call the culinary arts, but also in other areas of life such as bathing, washing as well as taking away household and industrial waste. So, water is a precious resource of this country, and it is absolutely necessary that we maintain a very high quality of potable water so that the health of this country can be protected and disease kept at bay; because if that water supply is not maintained at acceptable measures of purity, then a number of illnesses and diseases can occur to the people of this country, including typhoid fever, dysentery, polio myelitis, cholera, infectious hepatitis and other diseases; and it is important, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that these facts are realised in order to judge the action of the Government in taking the steps that have been taken.

Now, these diseases are also possible if waste water is not carried away from houses and industrial plants in a most effective and efficient manner. We must find modern means for the disposal of the waste which occurs in our households and in our industrial plants. It is clear that throughout all of the years that this country was existing we have never set up a sewage system. Such a system has never been implemented in this country; and it is in order to prevent the possibility of an outbreak of illnesses or diseases, and maintain the good health of this country that the Government decided that it would enter into an arrangement whereby such a system could be financed.

A sewage system is a capital project, and it is the policy of this Government to try as far as possible to support capital projects by funding from external agencies; because capital projects by their very nature are such that not only the present generation, but future generations will benefit from the particular capital installation. That is why we tried to seek the financing of such projects from international funding agencies and also on a bilateral basis from friendly Governments.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it was on the 8th April, 1976 that on behalf of this Government I signed a document entitled "Loan Contract Between Barbados and the Inter-American Development Bank, Sewage System for Bridgetown," and the Second related document entitled "Agreement for Technical Corporation Between Barbados and the Inter-American

Development Bank." The purpose of these two projects was to ensure.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA: If the hon. member would give way. I beg to move that Standing Order No. 6 be suspended for the remainder of the day's sitting in order to regularise the situation.

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

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

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Yes Mr. Deputy Speaker, this particular loan is for the sum of — and I want to quote in Barbados dollars — \$19,400,000 to be provided from the Inter-American Development Bank at an interest rate of 2 per cent under very favourable terms to this country — a repayment period of 35 years with an eight year grace period before commencing repayment of the principal. In other words, for eight years there will be no repayment of the principal but only interest will be paid during that period.

Let me repeat. The Inter-American Development Bank will loan this country a sum of \$19,400,000 (Bds) to be provided for the installation of a sewage system for the central area of Bridgetown; and the Government of Barbados will contribute \$7,844,000 (Bds) to that particular project. The area to be sewered will be some seven or eight square miles in Bridgetown, and some 32,500 persons, including 5,500 who are residents of the City of Bridgetown stand to benefit from this particular scheme. It will include the treatment plant for the treatment of the sewage. The period of the project is expected to be some three and a half to four years, and we will be taking steps to see that this project is finished as soon as possible.
6.10 p.m.

The contract makes provision for a joint Authority to manage the water and proposed sewage system of this country, and this particular provision for a joint Authority is in keeping with modern methods of managing the provision of water and the removal of waste water from modern communities. So this is an entirely modern measure of providing for the health of the community; and I would like to say that some 70% to 80% of the water supplied to household and other industrial establishments is discharged from those establishments in the form of waste.

Now why a joint Authority? Why the combination of the Water Authority with that for

sewage? We consider that the use of water is a continuing thing. Any modern system must collect the water from, in the case of Barbados, the ground water reserves, take it to the particular community, treat it so that it is acceptable and potable for the community, lead it to the households, and other industrial plants and then take it away in the form of waste in which you have the industrial or human waste dissolved in the water; and all of this must be done in a way to prevent the outbreak of the diseases to which I made reference.

Now I want to clear up a number of matters here. The contract makes provision that over — let me be accurate on this. I quote from Section 509 of the contract: The borrower shall take the appropriate measures acceptable to the bank to ensure that the rate charged for the supply of water, whether by the Waterworks Department or the Authority, and the rates charged by the latter for the provision of sewage service shall be gradually increased in order that within three years of the completion of the project and during the life of the loan, such rates produce revenues at least sufficient to cover all operating expenses of the water supply and sewage system including those relating to the administration, operation and maintenance, and to the extent possible, depreciation, taking into consideration the recommendations resulting from the Technical Corporation Agreement in financial and tariff matters, etc. In view of the foregoing, such graduated rates shall be presented to the bank within thirty months of the date of the loan contract.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, one of the requirements for this loan was that the Ministry of Health should submit to the satisfaction of the bank some type of schedule suggesting how the sewage work would be paid for or be self-sufficient over a period of time; and the Ministry of Health submitted those proposals and these were accepted by the bank, and I want to take this opportunity to reject any suggestion coming, and to refute statements and suggestions by the member for the City of Bridgetown and by the member for St. Thomas that there is any intention on the part of this Government to raise the water rate to pay for the sewage system in this country. The proposals that we have submitted and which have been approved by the bank, accepted as the basis for discussion and further proposal in terms of the Technical Corporation Agreement made no mention whatever of any increase or proposed increase in water rates.

We have been dealing with the cost of the sewage, that is the sewage work; that is what we

have been talking about and our proposals have not been in relation.....

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir. The hon. member is reflecting on the speeches made by the member for the City and myself by suggesting that we have misled the House in saying that there are going to be water rates increases. Will the hon. member not agree that in fact the agreement calls for the increases?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No point of order.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am saying that the proposals submitted by this Government to the Inter-American Development Bank have made no reference at all to any increase in the water rates, and we have proposed that the sewage rates and other revenue coming from that plant would be sufficient to cover the cost of the sewage operation. So that on that particular bill there will be a charge for water rate and there will be a separate charge for sewage, and there is nothing on that side that is going to get us, or certainly get me to say — that is what they want; some commitment that there would not be any increase in water rate or that the water rate would be increased. I am not going to commit myself to that because contrary to the power that the Leader of the Opposition and the member for the City of Bridgetown are trying to give me, I have no power or authority at all to raise rates for water in this country.

It is the policy of this Government to keep utilities such as water at as low a cost as possible consistent with the efficient supply of the service. There is nothing in this Agreement which is going to indicate to this Government that you must take the rate for water which was being suggested — that the rate for water will be used to subsidize the rate for the sewage.
6.20 p.m.

Mr. FORDE: On a point of explanation, if the Minister will give way, as I understand the submissions made on this point, there is an undertaking for a gradual increase within a period of time. The hon. member has spoken about his powers as Minister of Health, but what about the collective responsibility on the part of the Government?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let me just make this point. The hon. member has risen on a point of explanation. The hon. member would have to refer to something in the speech which he made, he can only rise on a point of explanation if he is explaining something in the address which he made, but the hon. member has not been in that

point of explanation simply referring.....(Mr. FORDE: I haven't finished, Sir). The hon. member has been talking about collective responsibility in respect of this, the hon. member would have to draw attention to the specific point which he wants to explain if he rises on a point of explanation and if the hon. member gives way.

Mr. FORDE: Sir, the point of explanation.....

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Sir, I would like to.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There are two hon. members on their feet.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Sir, I would like to continue my speech, we want to get through this business. I did not interrupt the hon. member.

Mr. FORDE: The point I was making is this, Sir. Part of the submission I made in my speech is that with the position as it is, and having regard to these agreements, there must be an increase in taxation in one way or another, including water rates. As I understand it, on the basis of collective responsibility, are we given an undertaking now that this will not take place?

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Technical Corporation Agreement makes provision for a study of the rates to be applied in respect of these services under the new Authority. Let me quote from the particular Agreement, because the Bank itself, not that this Government would surrender its sovereign rights to an international agency, the Bank itself recognises that the recommendations of the consultants who will carry out this study are not binding on this Government or on the Bank, and either party is free to make whatever comments and reservations or observations on the particular recommendations of the consultants on that particular study. So in all cases we have tried on this side to bring a modern system to this country for the protection of health, the prevention of disease in this country, and we have taken steps to secure funds at most concessionary and reasonable rates so that this particular facility and the benefits from the system can be brought to this country, but what do we get from that side? Now I want to characterise the contribution of the member for St. Thomas.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member has one minute more.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: The member for St. Thomas and the member for the City, trying to wean the allegiance of the people of this country from this Government, and one would have thought that instead of looking at the benefits to be derived from this particular system the only thing that they can raise is a non issue about the increase in water rates instead of talking about the benefits which are going to come to the people of the City of Bridgetown, and I will charge that the member for the City of Bridgetown in this whole issue has not once raised and spoken of the benefits that are to come to the residents of the City of Bridgetown as a result of this particular measure, but they are merely looking at some type of criticism which they can level at this Government rather than looking at what can be of benefit to the people whom they temporarily have the honour to represent. That is the extent of their interest in the City of Bridgetown; I will have a lot more to say on this particular matter, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but I would like to conclude by saying that in this particular provision we have made an amount, I believe, of some \$300,000 available for loans and grants to persons in the low income brackets in the City of Bridgetown so that they can have in-house installations, that is, the installation of water systems, so that they can be connected up with the sewers, and we will be providing them with facilities so that they can have the benefits of modern water and plumbing systems.

This particular project is meant to relieve a number of matters which have for years gone unattended in the City, and it is part of our programme for the regeneration and rejuvenation of the City of Bridgetown. And let me in my final point say this. It is uncharitable and unworthy of the Leader of the Opposition, the member for St. Thomas, to indicate that this is a system which is only for the merchants of Bridgetown, because this sewage system will receive sewage from any part of the country, and the plant will receive any raw sewage for treatment. That sewage now goes and is dumped at various points in the sea and at other places.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, he says it is unworthy, but the hon. member should surely not misrepresent what I have said. I was speaking of where they will be connected by the pipes in the sewage plant, but he is speaking of a different thing, that people can bring buckets, can transport buckets to the treatment plant. Nobody in Welchman Hall, St. Thomas, can have a pipe, they will have to carry it down in buckets to the treatment plant. He shouldn't say I am unworthy in suggesting

that only the people in Bridgetown will get it, I was speaking of the piped sewage.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: And I would like to make this point. The people of St. Thomas, if they have to make use of the services of the plant, will benefit from this particular system. This is why I say it is unworthy for anyone in 1976 to get up and suggest that a health system can be cut off and can be considered as being only for the City of Bridgetown. Health in this country is one and indivisible. You cannot say that because a system is set up in Bridgetown that it will not have benefits for the whole of this country, because disease is spread through the air, through the soil and through the water. People come into contact, and thousands of people come into the City daily, not only those who reside in the City, so this will be a benefit for the whole of this country and it is something for which this Government should be commended for having taken this step to bring about this system of improvement for the people of this country.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I shall be very short in making my contribution to a debate which has obviously gone for a number of days, and a lot of words have been passed on a number of matters related to this particular debate. I would like just to refer to the situation that we saw during this debate, the situation as regards the members of the Opposition, and compare that with the position which they have adopted on other occasions in this Chamber when we were discussing economic matters.

6.30 p.m.

I would like, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to just refer to the situation that we saw during this debate, the situation as regards the members of the Opposition, and compare that with the position which they have adopted on other occasions in this Chamber when we were discussing economic matters.

I am sure, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will recall that not too long ago when the members of the Opposition, I refer particularly to the Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for St. Thomas and the hon. member for St. Philip North, during the discussion on the current estimates, when reference was made from this side about the economic growth which took place in this country during the 1960s, said quite glibly and I suppose it was said in as strong a manner as possible that this had absolutely nothing to do

with the leadership or with the policies of this Government, but that it was as a result of the world economic situation, it was a situation in which the world was undergoing economic prosperity and therefore as Barbados was part of the world Barbados enjoyed its share of that prosperity.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we now have the situation during this debate where we see the Opposition has taken another position. The world from 1973 or thereabouts has been going through a very serious economic crisis. You will recall the serious situation in oil; you will recall that the world has gone through and is still going through a serious economic situation, people have been laid off and unemployment has risen considerably throughout the world. We in Barbados are still part of the world and I am submitting to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we therefore will have to have our share of the problems so that whereas I am not attempting to excuse anything that could possibly have been done to cushion some of the shock — I am not saying that attempts have not been made and that we have not succeeded — we must take our share because we are part and parcel of the world, and it is as a result that we will feel in Barbados some of the strictures and will experience some of the difficulties and problems which are experienced in other parts of the world. With the problems which have been identified, unemployment, under-employment, the fact that the tax base has got to be widened and taxation has got to be raised in order to keep our services going and to ensure that life in Barbados continues at a reasonable level, what you are going to find is that all the blame is being heaped on the heads of the Government. I really want to find out, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what is really the position of the Opposition. It is extremely difficult for me to understand this kind of situation.

I think we have to be very clear, we have to be logical and we have got to be able to appreciate the niceties of an argument when we are involved in an argument, and what I find is that too often there is always the issue that the Opposition has contended that it is their role to oppose and oppose; nothing at all done for the benefit of the country they want to support; they want to oppose it provided it is put forward by this Government, so that this is their role.

Let us just examine one measure which was included in these Budgetary Proposals. Again I find it very difficult to understand certain members of the Opposition on these. The members of the Opposition claim, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that they had been asking the Minister

of Finance to remove the tax on drugs. I do not think that they have been the only people who have been making this kind of request. However, you found that last Friday in his capacity as Minister of Finance the Prime Minister gave the assurance that the tax on drugs would be removed. Do you think this was accepted by the members of the Opposition. We heard yesterday the hon. member for the City making a fantastic statement that the masses do not use drugs. I am in a little difficulty, Mr. Deputy Speaker as to really who now form the masses. I used to think before yesterday that the masses of this country were the working people who generally speaking were the people on the bottom rung of the economic ladder. Since the position was taken up by the hon. member for the City, it would seem as if I would have to change my interpretation of the masses, because I cannot for the life of me believe that anybody in his right senses could make that fantastic statement that the masses do not use drugs. When you examine the drugs which are exempted by this taxation measure, what you are saying now is that no credit is being given for this although you were claiming some time before that you wanted to get this tax removed, and now that the tax is removed the members of the Opposition and particularly the hon. member for the City do not want this. So what is the position of the Opposition? I find it very difficult to understand this. Am I to understand that the position which was taken up by the hon. member for the City that since the masses do not use drugs is that we should have allowed the tax to remain because it would be a tax on the rich people?

Miss MILLER: On a point of order, I will not be misrepresented in here. I said that it is a fact that the people who constantly use drugs are in the minority and I am glad for them that the sales tax has been lifted from drugs, but I am sad for the rest of people in Barbados who have found no relief under the so-called budget. Do not let the hon. member misrepresent me. He can misrepresent the people in St. Lucy, but he is not to misrepresent me in here.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have seen and heard the hon. member for the City on more than one occasion, and I am convinced that the toilet paper that she talked about yesterday could have been put to good use at the end of her speech, because she has a facility for making charges and statements and when she is caught and when the foolishness that she often speaks is pointed out to her, she gets up and says she did not say that. It has happened in the House on three occasions and this is another occasion. I will say this, Mr. Deputy

Speaker, that it is strange that the Hon. Minister of Health speaking before me laid the same charge against the hon. member and she said nothing about it. It may be that I have gone on her a little too hard and I am really sorry about that. (*Asides*). You give me a little trial and you will see if I am a little boy or not.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is really amazing, and I do not like people taking up this kind of position. We have got to be clear about what we are talking, and I would hope that the members of the Opposition would really clarify their position before they get up to speak because you will find that they contradict each other. It is no advantage to them to have them contradict each other because we are going to use Hansard, and I am sure Hansard will record what the hon. member for the City has said and will show that she said very clearly that the masses do not use drugs, and we will use it in the campaign.

6.40 p.m.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker I would like just to refer to two aspects of the Budgetary Proposals which I think are of fundamental importance, and I do not think that any of the other speakers made reference to them. I am referring particularly to the establishment of a National Productivity Council and the establishment of a Sugar Industry Authority. These two measures, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to my mind are of far reaching importance to this country, and particularly the National Productivity Council.

Now, Sir, as you are aware, the Barbados Workers Union has been calling for a National Productivity Council for a number of years, and even if we have not had the privilege to be named, we recognise the tremendous value to the country of having labour, management and government sitting together and discussing the problems of the country; and I would hope that the talks which will be forthcoming and the ideas put up would be paid attention to, and that some action would be taken on them.

I would hope that some attention will be paid in the not distant future to introducing the concept of workers' participation in enterprise. This is very important; and if we are going to be talking in terms of industrial democracy within the society, then my contention is that workers' participation must form one of the foundation stones in this. I hope that this is one of the areas which will be looked at and studied and embarked on as soon as possible.

On the question of the establishment of the Sugar Industry Authority, I am sure that all of us

will agree with the Hon. Prime Minister that there have been a number of Boards looking after the Sugar Industry, and this measure will consolidate all of them into a Sugar Industry Authority and the Authority will have powers which will enable it to carry out its duties and functions as efficiently as possible, and investing in the Sugar Industry the monies held and the way it is given to farmers or the sugar workers, so that we will have a consolidated body and get the benefit of a consolidated approach to this particular matter.

I, Mr. Deputy Speaker, would hope that in the not too distant future we will see the benefits of these measures. I am sure that people throughout the length and breadth of this country will appreciate the relief given by the removal of the sales tax on various products; and contrary to what the hon. member for the City said, the majority of people in this country will be able to benefit from the removal of the sales tax on drugs because everybody uses some aspect of drugs.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker. (*Pause*).

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order. I just want to report to the House that I made an application and was unable to get an answer about the broadcast of speeches of hon. members. Now I see that the lights are on.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, perhaps I can assist the hon. member. It is very clear to this side of the House that there has been a concerted attempt made by putting a motion as a curtailment of the debate. I would like to draw that to Your Honour's attention.

Mr. ADAMS: What motion has been put and what debate curtailed? Everyone has spoken except the hon. member for St. Michael South East.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: There have been a series of amendments.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Two hon. members are on their feet. Let me hear the point of order.

Mr. ADAMS: Only one amendment has been made and that is by the Prime Minister.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition spoke at length on the second occasion and purported introducing an

amendment to the amendment on which I am now concluding debate. The hon. member complained about a lack of exposure to the television cameras, I wish to report here to Your Honour that the transformers of the television cameras were sabotaged during today's sitting after they were removed from this Chamber to the members' ante room. The police have been informed, and the transformers have been taken away. I just wanted to let him and you know that there are other persons who may not be interested in letting the general public see and hear what transpired on Friday evening. I rise therefore to wind up the debate on the amended motion which was moved by me.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: That is the third point of order.

Mr. ADAMS: I have not interrupted the hon. member's speech. It is a reflection on hon. members when he speaks of something being sabotaged in the members' ante room. I have not been to any ante room today. It is an unfortunate reflection on members of the Opposition to make any smear on members of the Opposition committing sabotage in the members' ante room.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am merely making a statement of fact. I did not accuse any hon. member. This is a room to which all members of the House have access and which members were present in today.
6.50 p.m.

Members of the Opposition were there today, members of the Government were there today and members of the public were in there today. Since I am not in charge of the Criminal Investigation Department I can make no contribution to the solution of the particular incident.

The motion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, reads as follows: "That this House takes note of the financial statement and budgetary proposals presented by the Minister of Finance and commends the Government for the sound measures taken to reduce inflation and to ensure the continued economic stability of the country."

Now the reason why that motion was made by me, it is a motion of the Government. The hon. member for St. Thomas who is the Leader of the Opposition accused me of immodesty, but the only reason why that motion was made by me as he very well knows because he made

several enquiries of His Honour the Speaker as to whether there was going to be such an amending motion, as far as I have been informed and as a Constitutional lawyer he would be aware that the only way that the Government could get the right of reply on his motion was if a motion was made on this side and if that motion was made by me. This is not an attempt to blow my own trumpet. The facts in Barbados speak for themselves. It is not necessary for me at any time to blow my own trumpet; there are no walls of Jericho to crumble any more, we have already stormed the commanding heights of the economy and the walls have already crumbled.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the motion as amended came in for some criticism by a proposed amendment put by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition in which I will now give him the opportunity of ventilating his grievance. He purported to delete the word 'commands' to change it to 'condemns' the Government, and for some other amendment which he made and which became a critical motion of the Government which was not entertained because it was not seconded.

As the hon. member for St. Lucy pointed out, two or three years ago – I cannot remember the precise year, I think it was in 1971 or thereabout – the Opposition said that the Government could not take credit for the buoyancy of the economy; and I understand from the hon. member for St. Lucy that even comparatively recently they repeated that when everything was going well, that the Government could take no credit because general world conditions before the fuel crisis in 1973–74 were particularly buoyant, world trade was increasing and therefore Barbados was merely getting the spin-offs of that general resurgence and buoyancy in the world economy. The hon. member for St. Lucy then contrasts the attitude of the Opposition at that time with the attitude today when they say that the depressed state of the economy which we have just successfully negotiated was not due to the depressed international situation and general world recession but was due to the mismanagement of the economy by Government in general and – I do not know whether they said it explicitly but certainly – by the Minister of Finance in particular. That has been the whole gravamen of the thrust of the debate made by the Opposition during the past two days.

Speaker after speaker, and every single one of them spoke and everyone of them said that the Government was responsible for the perilous state to which we had come, preaching the

politics of distress, trying to make everyone unhappy that they did not know when the roof was going to collapse and when the whole country would be brought to a further state of peril. That is a very good political statement to make on the eve of an election. Everything that was said in here during the past two days was said not so much in answer to the proposals which I made in my speech on the 30th July, 1976 but with one ear carefully tuned towards the electorate. I am not criticizing them for that. I should like to say it is the major preoccupation of the Opposition because they all have their private undertakings, they are not engaged in the business, the difficult business of running a developing country like Barbados, like my Ministers and I have to be engaged upon day after day. They have their lawful private undertakings and therefore they can indulge in the luxury of criticism which is the peculiar prerogative of an Opposition party.

So I am not criticizing them for making political speeches; I am not criticizing them for that at all, but to pretend at the same time that their speeches are not political and that they are the saviours of mankind and that they are saving this Island from corruption to the extent that the Leader of the Opposition was not only heard, he was seen and he was watched by multitudes in this country. The expressions of sympathy on his face which appeared to me — my impression of course might not be the impression which he conveyed to the multitudes of people, of venomous impression which he conveyed when at that time he was attacking at least one of my Ministers of Government — could only lead you to the impression that they were not so much concerned about the economic state of the country but they were concerned, as one member, I think it was the Hon. Minister of Education put it, more concerned with character assassination than with dealing with the issues which confront....

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir. This debate will not continue quietly and at the high level which we expect from the House of Assembly if hon. members get up and accuse others of character assassination. That is the first time that those words have been used in here, and I ask you to ask the Prime Minister to withdraw the words 'character assassination.' I passed 'venomous', I passed the implication on the motive of the Opposition that we were not attacking the economy, but I will not sit down even in the interest of a quiet debate and allow it to be said that any member of the Opposition was guilty of character assassination, and I ask that those words be withdrawn. They are a

reflection on hon. members' motives, contrary to the Standing Orders of the House.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not know what the.....

Mrs. EASTMOND: On a point of order, Sir. I would like to associate myself with those remarks.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You do not associate.....

Mrs. EASTMOND: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There are two hon. members on their feet. I have not yet ruled on the point of order by the hon. member for St. Thomas. I would suggest to the hon. member for St. John to couch his expressions — (*Asides*) there is no one who can tell the Chair how to rule — in more acceptable language.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Although Your Honour has not asked me to withdraw the words "character assassination," I will withdraw them, but the Hon. Minister of Education spoke about political assassination and at the end of his speech he said "character assassination" and it was not objected to then, Sir, but if the hon. member accepts, since it was repeated several times "political assassination" and he thinks that that is a more pleasant form, then I will say "political assassination." He accepted it from the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, so he will accept it from the exalted plains of St. John. 7.00 p.m.

The alacrity with which the Hon. Leader of the House accepted the challenge, a gauntlet which he had thrown down in debate after debate on budgetary proposals, pointing out that in the Mother of Parliaments the Leader of the Opposition is capable of rising to his feet immediately after the Chancellor of the Exchequer has taken his place and replying on something which he was quite prepared to do, and he was given — although there was some mistake as to the interpretation and it was subsequently cleared up, and I will not have the media of this country perpetuating misunderstandings that they know have been cleared up — he was given the option of replying immediately or not replying immediately, and also of speaking again in his capacity as shadow Minister of Finance.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir, I do not want to keep rising on a point of order, but if statements which misrepresent the proceedings of the House are made and are contrary to what I have said, I am misrepresented. I was only given the privilege of speaking again in here the afternoon and the privilege of speaking a second time only arose by reason of the amendment or by reason of the rules of the House on the original motion. The Government has not given me anything in that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Point of order made.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Point of order No. 5, Sir. The hon. member was quoted by me on Friday, 30th July and I conceded his point, it was a very weak point, that he wore two hats. The interesting thing is that I have never had the privilege of seeing the hon. member in a hat. He has such a distinguished forehead that he doesn't like a hat, but he wears two hats, one as Leader of the Opposition and the other one as shadow Minister of Finance, and I told him here, I believe in your presence, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that he could even speak twice if he did not want any misunderstanding, but what I was actually saying before I was interrupted on the point of order was this, that I should have been cautioned by the alacrity with which the hon. member rose to his feet to reply immediately, coupled with the fact that he claimed, and I have no reason like other hon. members to doubt him, that he did not even open the sealed envelope which I had handed to him on arriving at the House before the session commenced, that he was prepared to speak without even having seen the economic survey which was numbered separately as a separate document, and the budgetary proposals which are numbered separately as a separate document from 1 to 18 or 1 to 19. They are both numbered separately.

The reason why I mentioned this is that during the course of his speech, in the very early part of his speech, the hon. member claimed that I began in the middle and I pointed out to him that there were two documents and if he had done himself the courtesy of examining these documents before he would have seen that there were two separate documents.

A great deal of heavy weather has been made about the failure of the Government to produce what was called an economic survey. There were not many economic surveys, and

they certainly did not come annually before I took office as Minister of Finance some 15 years ago. Economic surveys have to be based on certain statistical information, and in the absence of verifiable statistical information they are of no value even to Government Ministers, Government Departments, Opposition members, or the business community. It is not always possible for us to publish an economic survey in each and every year, but for the past two and a half years at least we have had the Central Bank of Barbados, which is an organ of the Government of Barbados, created by this Government of Barbados, bringing out an annual report and a financial statement which contains an even more complete survey of the economy than the slim volumes that we have attempted to bring out from year to year under the title of economic surveys.

In addition to the annual report of the Central Bank which the Leader of the Opposition referred to as the Bible, they have referred to during the course of this debate as the Bible, in previous debates in this Chamber as the Bible — and I certainly congratulate them on saying that at least one publication of the Government of Barbados has the air of the gospel about it — but the Central Bank of Barbados brings out also a quarterly report and you will see in the annual report which is submitted to me that sometimes I have had a little preface commending the contents of the annual report to the general public and to all and sundry, so if you now have a Central Bank with a staff which is much larger than the staff which I had in my Ministry dealing with matters of exchange control and so on, a staff of nearly 100 persons, highly qualified, better paid than the average public servant, doing the work that we tried to do with the limited staff at the Ministry of Finance in bringing out these economic surveys, I do not really understand the stricture which is being levelled against the Government by the newspapers that we have not brought out an economic survey. But what I did on this occasion is to make a review of the economy and present that as a separate document to the House, and then I presented my budgetary proposals on the 30th July on the floor of this House and laid the document at Tuesday's session.

7.10 p.m.

I just want to get it perfectly clear that I am looking very carefully at the necessity of bringing out an economic survey as such, and I do not really apologise for not having brought out an economic survey because there is nothing in the Constitution of Barbados, there is nothing in the

Financial Administration and Audit Act or the Rules made thereunder which says that the Minister of Finance should bring out an economic survey or even a development plan. But from the time I took office, the Government has presented development plans to this House and on no occasion of the quadrennial presentation of those development plans outlining the capital productive projects which the Government contemplated embarking upon for the ensuing four year periods has there been a disagreement or division in this House on the development plan. The development strategy of the Government is set out in the development plan. For anyone to say that a Government has run out of ideas before we have run out of the development plan for 1973-77 is pure unadulterated nonsense, because right now we are working on projections for 1985 for the development of the economy of this country. We are looking that far down the road. The next development plan of course, Mr. Deputy Speaker, will be 1977-81, but there are certain aspects of development to this economy which cannot be compartmentalized into any four year period development plan and must necessarily run over and spill over into the next development period. So I just want to get that position clear.

When one hears people, whether they be clerics or otherwise or members of the Opposition saying that the Government does not have ideas, our ideas which are inspired and informed by the mandate given to us by our annual conferences and by our Cabinet are formulated in the development plan, and these development plans are for four year periods, and we are now coming towards the end of a development period. But as I said in the preface or the introduction, I cannot remember which, of the 1973 development plan, development planning is a permanent essay in the traditional mood. It is not something which you can compartmentalize and which at the end of the development period all the works projects come to an end and you begin to start on something else. The planning for the Deep Water Harbour, the planning for the Community College, the planning for the sewage system of Bridgetown, the planning for the water system of the whole Island of Barbados, the physical development plan for Barbados has taken about seven years to formulate. It is ready today and will be laid at the next meeting of the House. It has had several hearings before a high judicial officer and it has had to be redrafted. We have removed the proposal for the spine road as not being particularly relevant to our situation at this point of the century in Barbados. All of this is a continuous exercise in planning which we undertake. When

we come in here with the Annual Estimates, the Estimates are merely to get the machinery of Government turning over so that the real work of Government which is planning the economic development and the social engineering of the community, the mere payment of public servants and they are there to see that the development plans are continued, that the educational services are continued, health services are maintained and so on.

Now the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I may deal firstly with the banks, accused the Government of not being firm enough with the commercial banks. He accused us of allowing the commercial banks to charge high interest rates, and a series of other strictures were levelled by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition against the banking system in general. Now I wish to draw certain things to Your Honour's attention. For the first time in the history of Barbados the commercial banks are being inspected by a local authority, that is, the Central Bank. For the first time the commercial banks are not free to invest local funds abroad. The Central Bank permits them to hold just enough funds in foreign accounts to cover their current transactions. The commercial banks are forced to sell to the Central Bank all the foreign exchange they receive — this never used to happen before — above what is needed for their current transactions and the Central Bank which is under the control of the Minister of Finance is the judge of what is necessary for their current transactions. The Central Bank is owned by the people of Barbados and in this way they are able to obtain returns on investment from foreign exchange holdings on the island, whereas the commercial banks used to have these returns before. That is one of the reasons why the Central Bank has been able to earn higher profits than we used to get when we were members of the Eastern Caribbean Currency Authority, and we used to get a share of the currency profits from the Eastern Caribbean Currency Authority.

Now another method in which the Commercial banks are controlled is that the commissions which they charge on sales and purchases of foreign exchange are being fixed by the Central Bank. They cannot charge what they like like some of the hotels charge, and we are controlling the hotels. As a matter of fact, if the hotels continue to abuse the privilege which we give them of accepting foreign exchange, that privilege is going to be removed because hotels are paying people as low as \$1.90 for the U.S. dollar when the market rates are probably eight or nine cents higher, and the returns which the hotels show to the Commissioner of Inland

Revenue would not necessarily disclose the percentage profit they would have made on foreign exchange, but we are looking on that very carefully as well. The earnings as a result of this control which we have on the commissions which are charged on sales and purchases of foreign exchange by the commercial banks have been reduced from 15% of their total earnings in 1974 to 13% of their total earnings in 1975.

Another way in which we control banks is this: the Central Bank through intervention in the Treasury Bill market, that is by going in and making bids for 90 day Treasury Bills, has forced the commercial banks to accept Treasury Bills at rates in accordance with supply and demand of money. Now because of the liquidity in the commercial banking system over the last year, Treasury Bill rates today by commercial banks in Barbados are now the lowest in the Caribbean except Trinidad and Tobago, and I say this without any fear of contradiction whatsoever, because the rates of Treasury Bills in Barbados are now something like 4.4% as compared with 3.9% in Trinidad and Tobago. It is the second lowest in the Caribbean. Now two years ago when the Central Government needed short term finance and went to the Treasury Bill market, we were being forced by the commercial banks to pay 11% and sometimes 11½% on Treasury Bills and we have forced the Treasury Bill rate right down by intervention by the Central Bank from 11% and 11½% and I believe they went as high at one stage as 12% down to 4.4% which is about the average rate of the bill issue.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of elucidation, if the Prime Minister would give way, would the Prime Minister agree and perhaps explain that at the time at which he is speaking when Treasury Bills were at such a high rate that I made a point of saying that they should be lower and the Ministry of Finance put out a Press release saying that if they reduced that would be to ask the commercial banks to subsidise the operations of Government?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No point of elucidation in respect of this debate.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: If the hon. member for St. Thomas and I were having a friendly discussion outside, if that were possible between the two of us, I would answer him, but I do not think it is appropriate during the course of a reply by a Minister of Finance to report to an intervention of that nature. So the hon. member, if he wishes to question me outside on that, we can have a discussion as financial experts

or whatever he chooses to consider ourselves, something which the hon. member for St. James has not vouchsafed to either one of us so far as I can see, or let us have a discussion outside as Central Bankers and we will deal with the matter. But I do not think I can reply to that because that is a self-confirming kind of intervention where the hon. member is asking me to confirm that he said something which would mean that he had the gift of pre-science or that he was a sage or something like that, and I really cannot tax my brain in the middle of a discussion of this nature to go back to verify if what he is saying is accurate or not.

7.20 p.m.

It is not that I doubt the hon. member. It is that I am not in a position now to investigate. Now we are dealing, of course, with the accusation that the Government is allowing the commercial banks to do as they like. In April this year, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the commercial banks were directed to lower their loan and mortgage rates for the first time in the history of this country.

What I can say to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is this: directing the commercial banks to lower their loan and mortgage rates can only come after you direct them to lower the interest which they pay on fixed deposits; and soon after you do that, you can direct them to lower their loan and mortgage rates. As the hon. member was implying, they could also argue that the cost of money to them is such that it would not pay them to lower their loan and mortgage rates as long as their foreign rates were higher; but it is a different matter altogether when one is dealing with the treasury bills; because we put out a tender for treasury bills and you bid; and we accept the lowest tender.

In other words, when the commercial banks individually or collectively — well they are not supposed to operate collectively because it is against the US anti-trust legislation; but the non US banks can have a certain amount of collaboration or collusion and say we will keep the treasury bills rate high and we will bid, let us say 10 per cent. We wish 10 per cent on our money for 90 days.

The American banks are not supposed to enter into any such agreement, as it is against their anti-trust legislation; but the point that I am making is that the hon. member could not be so correct because we cannot intervene when we are inviting tenders. We cannot invite tenders and dictate. The only way we could successfully do it was by intervention in the market by one of the

Government agencies itself; and that pre-supposes that it was a particular Government agency, which in this particular instance happened to be the Central Bank of Barbados which has enough liquid assets to make the intervention and so force the treasury bill rate down by their intervention. Treasury bill rates cannot be done by edict, because we are asking people to lend you money, and they say I will lend you money at this rate of interest. Now, if you want to lower their rates, the only way you can do so, I contend is by intervention which has effectively taken place.

Now, another way in which the banks have been controlled is by the Hire Purchase Credit Sale control Bill which was passed by this House and the Other Place last year to regulate consumer instalment credit; and the preliminary work is now being carried out by the Central Bank to implement the terms of the Act. To sum it all up, Sir, and to end on that particular part of the criticisms, the reply, Sir, is that more has been done during the past three years to control commercial banking in Barbados than has ever been done in the total history of Barbados before.

We had no Central Bank before, and once we got the Central Bank which has not apparently met the approval of the Opposition forces — I am not necessarily speaking of the members of this House, but certainly some of the members of the Other Place made speeches which are only susceptible of explanation on the hypothesis that they were either opposed to the establishment of the Central Bank, or they did not understand what central banking was all about; and I do not think that I need say any more about that. I do not wish to exacerbate any feelings which may have been generated at that time.

I will now pass, Sir, to the employment factor which was dealt with by the hon. member. I wish, with your permission, Sir, to pass to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition the 1975 United Nations Year Book; and he will find in Part 10 all the statistics which they have published for 1975 on employment in their member countries, including Barbados. The reason why I do this, Sir, is because the hon. member seems to take a kind of strange satisfaction in quoting statistics to demonstrate that unemployment in Barbados is running at a rate of 28 per cent and over; and he purported to be quoting a report from the United Nations Organisation.

Now, during the time intervening between his statement and today's sitting, I have been in

touch with all the United Nations agencies. We have made an extensive search in the Ministry of Finance and Planning, and we can find no request being made by the Government of Barbados or a report on employment in Barbados; and the United Nations can not give an official report to the Government of Barbados, other than the year Book unless invited to do so.

The strange thing about the UN surveys and reports is that although a host Government may invite United Nations experts to come and conduct a survey or carry out a report, that invariably the information which they secure for the publication of that very report is information supplied by the host Government. Naturally, all the agencies for the gathering of the necessary statistical data would necessarily have to exist within the compounds of the country itself rather than outside. No statistical survey could be carried out in this country unless the Government of Barbados requested it, authorised it, or carried out the survey itself.

The last reliable survey we have which will give us any valuable information on employment levels was the census carried out in 1970. Any information which is published by any agency of Government or any foreign agency will necessarily have to come by a calculation of the number of people who leave jobs and the number of people whom you can ascertain are looking for jobs; and these conclusions are not necessarily statistically accurate. They are approximations.

What we have been doing here in Barbados during the past year or so is to carry out a sample household survey in order to try and arrive at a slightly more accurate picture of the level of employment of this country. The first thing I wish to say is that I want the Leader of the Opposition to take the UN Year Book. It is the only report that I could find, and it is the latest copy of the report which makes any reference to the population of Barbados. If he turns to Page 10, I am sure he is going to get a shock; because it shows completely erroneously that unemployment is at the ridiculously low figure of 1,900 persons, which has to be absolutely ridiculous and which I reject out of hand. It appears that what the compilers of the Year Book were doing was to take the report of the number of persons who had registered for employment in the Labour Officer.

7.30 p.m.

The statement by the hon. member is completely and utterly misleading and he said it on two or three occasions. I would also like to know to which United Nations Report he was

referring because it is obviously misleading and it certainly does not support his case and no one can reply on it. The hon. member said he had a UN Report. I said the only thing that we could find was the Year Book which is published by the ILO which is an associated agency of the United Nations Organization. They deal with labour and employment. All the statistics are in there, and I could not reply on that because they have obviously taken the wrong kind of statistics. You know what distressed us on this side of the House, Mr. Deputy Speaker — I am still asking the hon. member to tell me to which Report he was referring; but what distressed me.....

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir. How does he mean he was asking the hon. member to say to which Report he was referring? I referred to a Report in the hands of the Government. It is clearly not this Report. This is all I can tell you. This Report states — the Prime Minister is complaining of the statistics in this Report. The statistics are given under Code 4. I looked up Code 4. Code 4 is statistics supplied from the employment office of the Government concerned. So the statistics of which he complains were supplied by the Government of Barbados; and I said that the Government of Barbados does not always give accurate statistics of unemployment, and I have no intention of breaching any confidentiality relating to the report. I said and I still say that there is a Report in the Government's hands in which figures of 26% to 28% extended unemployment figures are given.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the hon. member or members on that side could quote from an agreement which they claim was a secret agreement between the Inter-American Bank and the Ministry of Health and nobody on this side said that they would prosecute them for breaches of the Official Secrets Act, I give him the assurance — I myself would welcome to see this Report because the United Nations have no knowledge of it and no department of the Government over which I have the honour to preside has any knowledge of any such Report, and a Report could only be a report carried out at the request of the Government of Barbados. Now he says that if he told me what this Government Report was it would be breaching confidentiality. I did not ask him or any of the other members who spoke on that side, who gave them the copies of the Agreement made in the Ministry of Health, so why should I on an occasion such as this when I am seeking information, not on who gave him the Report — I am saying we do not know of its existence. But to get up here and say that the Government of Barbados — I myself said that the figures in that

ILO Statistical Year Book could only be completely misleading and could only have come from taking erroneously figures of persons registered for employment at the Labour Office. It is not that my Ministry supplied; this is what they went and took up without going to the proper source which would be the Statistical Office in my Ministry.

However, I am saying that unemployment in Barbados is too high and it is probably around 13.7%. I wish to read some figures out which we have in the Ministry. He said that the total labour force in Barbados was 62,000, and it is ridiculous to suggest that. The labour force in Barbados is 85,000 or thereabouts. The hon. member for St. Thomas also said that the persons registered as employed and self-employed under the National Insurance Scheme was 141,000. Now that could not be correct because the persons — which means that the labour force is even bigger than he says that we claim it is. The persons registered at the National Insurance Board are persons who have had jobs. We do not register unemployed persons at the National Insurance Board. We register self-employed persons.

I think he must be registered. I am registered as a self-employed person. I pay national insurance as a self-employed person although I am employed by the Government, but I do not come under the scheme as a worker in that sense; I have to register as a self-employed person, and I forget what the premium is; over \$300 or \$400 a year I have to pay. I do not pay by the week because it is a nuisance, so I pay it in two instalments in advance.

The interesting thing is that the hon. member quoted statistics from the National Insurance Board that he did not have to get from anybody surreptitiously, and he said that employed and self-employed was around 141,000. I wish he would not interrupt me. He is not attempting to but when I quote I am quoting purely from memory of what he said; but yet he was attacking the Government saying that the figure which we gave out of the labour force being 85,000 is an erroneous and misleading figure.

Now I said before that the only reliable base date is 1970 Census, and these are the figures for the employed work force in 1970. In 1970 there were 83,981 persons in employment. In addition to the 83,981 there were 7,813 persons who did not have jobs who were looking for jobs. If one adds, Mr. Deputy Speaker the figure of 83,981 to the figure of 7,813 what one gets as result of that addition the labour force of

Barbados which then would be something like 91,000 persons in 1970.

7.40 p.m.

That is the labour force of Barbados which then will be something like 91,000 persons in 1970; those who are working and those who are looking for jobs, so you have to add the two together. The population of working age now is a different thing altogether, because I think as the hon. member pointed out, you couldn't add in people like students of secondary schools and housewives who cannot be considered as people who would be looking for jobs or not looking for jobs they are well off and so on. The population of working age would be all those persons between the ages of 15 and 65 regardless, the ones in hospital, the ones who want work, those who are working and those who are self-employed, but the labour force is comprised of those who are employed and those who are looking for jobs, and that was 91,000 and those are the international figures. That was done on a personal house to house survey, so I am saying that is the accurate base year that we can rely on.

I will not break down the labour force as it then was in 1970 into its component parts but today, being 1975, there has been not a real substantial increase in the working population. It is now something in the vicinity of 92,000 or somewhere round there, not 67,000 as the hon. member said. We have in the narrow space of three months as a result of the sample survey two conflicting figures for the total labour force, that is, the people who are employed and the people who are looking for work, and therefore we have obviously got to go back and do a much more accurate survey. I mention this in all fairness because at one time, three months ago, we came out with a figure and we are trying to find out where the discrepancy is, of approximately 101,000, and then we came out with a figure of 105,000, so you have the 92,000, 101,000 and the 105,000.

If we take the highest figure of 105,000 in the labour force, it will mean approximately that what we have said it is, that the highest figure of the total labour force, that the unemployment in Barbados is probably 13.7% around that figure. I do not mind the hon. member quoting something which probably was given to him by mistake, I can only assume that the hon. member made a genuine mistake, but he repeated it and he kept on repeating how Barbados had 28% unemployment. It is Jamaica that has 28% unemployment and some of the Lesser Antilles, but if we had 28% unemployment in Barbados the revolution to

which some of them are so much looking forward would have taken place a long time ago. Not in Barbados, not 28% unemployment, but, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the thing that distressed us on this side of the House was when the hon. member mentioned, in his own inimitable fashion stressed, that the unemployment figure in Barbados was over 28% every single member on the opposite side of the House on the Opposition benches, to a man and to a woman, or to two women, cheered vociferously as if it was some cause of congratulation for the Opposition that the unemployment in Barbados was so high, or proving the Government was wrong.

What we are saying is figures mean nothing, we think that more than 5% unemployment is bad for any country by any standard. We are not proud of 13.7% unemployment, but I am shocked, horrified, flabbergasted and disgusted that members of this Hon. House should cheer because somebody says there is 28% unemployment in this country, and I challenge them to come and show me where 28% unemployment is in this country. But they were trying to demonstrate that this Government had run the country of Barbados into the ground, that we did not know what we were doing, that from a high figure of expectation of 28% unemployment round the time when I said by 1976 I would look forward to having full employment. I cannot remember what year it was, it may have been 1971 or 1972, but from 1972 when I said that I looked forward to full employment by 1976, that far from getting full employment we had actually increased by some diabolical and sinful act, wicked devices on the part of the Government, unemployment to 28.7% instead of the 8% or 9% that it was before the recession. That was what distressed me. That is what we are concerned about, that they should take such a delight and actually cheer like the ranks of Tuscany.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, these employment statistics are going round and round. On the figures that the Prime Minister has given us, if the work force is 105,000... (*Asides*). A point of elucidation, because all of this is challenging. I am going to tell him, I do not believe there should be any embarrassment. An Indian gentleman from the United Nations was attached here in 1975 and did an employment survey for the Statistical Department. It is his figures which are 26 to 28.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Would the hon. member choose to tell me the name of the Indian gentleman and show me his report?

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, he can go and apply to his Statistical Department and get it, but on the figures he has given of 105,000, if unemployment is 13% of 105,000, it means that over 92,000 people are in work and I don't believe that is true.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Is this a point of order, Sir? What he believes or does not believe?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member is on a point of elucidation.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I don't think I have interrupted the hon. member once when he was speaking, and now he is even talking at the same time the Minister of Finance of Barbados is speaking.

Mr. ADAMS: I am sorry, Sir, I do not want to cause anything.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Even now.

Mr. ADAMS: But I am on a point of elucidation and he has given way. (*Asides*).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let hon. members adhere to the appropriate Standing Orders of this House. The hon. member had made his point of elucidation.

Mr. ADAMS: I haven't really, Sir, because the point is this.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is the opinion of the Chair that the hon. member has made his point of elucidation.

Mr. ADAMS: The point being that 105,000 will mean that the unemployment is 26%.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let the hon. member for St. John continue his address.

Mr. ADAMS: If the labour force is 105,000 then the unemployment is 26%.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let the hon. member take his seat.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: If the hon. member will remember, that is not any point of order at all but you have ruled, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on this I said that according to the sample survey we had two conflicting things and we are recycling the figures now. We had a figure of 101,000 approximately in the labour force and 105,000. One of those figures is incorrect, but even assuming the higher figure to be the labour

force, the maximum number of people that there are who are capable of working, according to the survey which is consistent through the six month period, there is no discrepancy there, the people who are actually at work, both self-employed and employed, number about 92 to 93 thousand, and it comes out with a figure of about 13.7%. I have not worked it out. If the hon. member tells me that is wrong and that means that there are 93,000 people working and 105,000 in the labour force, therefore that is an unemployment figure of 28.5% or more, he is a better mathematician than I am. I never claimed to be a mathematician, that is the kind of mathematics he learned and therefore I would have to bow to his superior knowledge of mathematics.
7.50 p.m.

I said that if he is correct, but if he is incorrect then I would have to lose all respect for the hon. member because on my feet it does not look to me as if the difference between 93 and 105 could give you 28% unemployment. Even now the hon. member is persisting in this business of 28% unemployment in Barbados, and even now the members of the Opposition are still cheering, taking pleasure and comfort in the fact that they have a leader who can say with impunity that the unemployment in Barbados is 28% and this is the kind of expectations which they have for the people of this country, that they hope they have 28% unemployment, because if they do not have 28% unemployment, then there is no justification for them.

Mr. FORDE: On a point of order, the hon. member cannot impute that hon. members are happy about the state of unemployment of 26% or 28% or even 5%. The hon. member must not misrepresent the cheer from whatever quarter it has come. Nobody has said so.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No point of order. Let the hon. member continue.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: This is about the 8th or 9th point of order. I am glad that one can see the kind of thing we have to contend with in this Chamber. Even the behaviour outside. Anyhow I will leave the employment business alone because the hon. member still thinks that even giving him generously a labour force of 103,000 and with 93,000 employed that that represents 28%, well it is clear that he has got 28% on his brain and there is nothing that anyone can do to shake him from this belief, and they take aid and comfort and a kind of special delight in wishing to feel that the unemployment in Barbados is 28%, and I repeat that because they cheered. No cheers uttered in

this Chamber during the course of the debate were more vociferous than the cheers which greeted the statement that unemployment in Barbados was 28% of the labour force.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in dealing with the banks the Hon. Leader of the Opposition took the opportunity to make reference to the establishment and licensing of an institution which has been described as the Alleyne Mercantile Bank. I regret that during the course of a debate on Budgetary Proposals that personal

attacks directly were made on Ministers of Government or a Minister of Government and indirectly probably on the Minister of Finance in the discharge of his duties as Minister of Finance, and it is for this reason that I will have to read into the record a letter which was released by the Hon. Attorney General and just leave it at that. This letter was addressed to me informing me that the Hon. Attorney General was sending this release to the media, and I will make it a document of the House. I will not read the introductory letter, but I will make that also a document of the House.

Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow
Prime Minister,
Prime Minister's Office,
GOVERNMENT HEADQUARTERS.

On Friday the 30th July, the Leader of the Opposition Mr. J. M. G. M. Adams in a speech made in response to the Budgetary proposals presented by the Minister of Finance in the House of Assembly, made certain statements which contain derogatory imputations against me. During the course of his speech Mr. Adams made reference to certain cheques drawn in my favour by Mr. Sydney Burnett Alleyne.

I deem it necessary to present to the public facts surrounding the drawing of the cheques in my favour in order that the people of this country may determine how ill-conceived and unfounded are the charges of Mr. Adams.

The Leader of the Opposition first made reference to a cheque dated 5th March, 1975 drawn in the sum of \$5,000. I wish to state that discussions were held with Mr. Alleyne with regard to a development which was proposed to be carried out on lands situated at Payne's Bay in the parish of St. James and belonging to my mother Mrs. Odessa Marion Moe who is unfortunately incapacitated having suffered amputations of both her legs.

Mr. Alleyne introduced me to a firm Higgs and Hill of the United Kingdom members of which visited Barbados. They examined the site of the proposed development and I outlined the proposals to them, among whom was Mr. Nicholas Taylor, formerly Commissioner for the Eastern Caribbean in the United Kingdom.

In addition a local Surveyor Mr. Harold Went was invited to carry out surveys in relation to the said proposal.

The cheque referred to was issued against the initial expenses incurred for the purpose of the proposed development.

The following photostat is a copy of a letter sent to me by a firm of Architects and Planning Consultants in connection with the said proposals.

This is how this photostat reads:

Hubbard Ford & Partners**Architects and Planning Consultants**

67 Church Rd Hdve BN 3 2Bn 0273779191 Telex 87323 — FSI Brighton Ford

H Hubbard Ford FRIBA FRSA
 David Lawrence ARIBA
 Svan Hoyer MAA ARIBA
 Patrick Hubbard-Ford ARIBA
 John Innerdale DipArch FRIBA
 Professor Anthony Goss
 FRTPI DipTP(Lond)ARIBA
 Roger Heaman BArch ARIBA MIMH
 Gordon Roberts FRIBA
 William Morling ARIBA
 Eric Winters MBE ARIBA

Associates

Donald Ashdown ARIBA
 Richard Woodall DipArch ARIBA
 Robert Goldspink DipArch ARIBA
 Brian Moore MSAAT
 Brian Shorman MSAAT

Partnership Secretary

LN Robinson

15 August 1975

Wo/H/H9012

Dear Senator Moe,

TWO APARTMENT BLOCKS AT PAYNES BAY, BARBADOS

Further to our letter of 29th July confirming our appointment, I understand that there is now some delay in connection with the Heywoods Development project. As we agreed to link our submission to you with the presentation of the scheme to the Alleyne Mercantile Bank, I should appreciate your comments on the programming of our work for the apartment blocks. Perhaps you may wish to discuss the situation with Sidney Alleyne, but in any case I will await your further instructions.

Yours sincerely,

Richard Woodall
 Hubbard Ford and Partners

Senator George Moe,
 Torwood,
 Erdiston Hill,
 St. Michael,
 Barbados,
 West Indies.

Mr. Adams clearly acted on hearsay further suggested that I received in cash from the said Sydney Alleyne regular subventions of \$600.00 each.

I wish to point out that on the 16th day of June, 1975, the Alleyne Mercantile Bank leased from my mother Mrs Marion Odessa Moe other premises situated at Payne's Bay in the parish of St. James at the rent of six hundred dollars per month.

Indeed the previous lessee Mr. Lisle Seymour King of Glitter Bay Terrace, St. James and the said Sydney Alleyne together discussed with me arrangements for the termination of Mr. King's lease.

The following are photostat copies of relevant extracts from the said lease between Mrs. Marion Moe and the Alleyne Mercantile Bank.

I thought it best, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to have the whole Lease attached, and a photostat copy of the complete lease will be made a document of the House along with the other documents, as I do not think hon. members would want me to read

the whole lease. But it is signed by Mrs. Marion Odessa Moe and witnessed by Mr. G. C. Moe. (*Asides*) He witnessed for both parties.

In accordance with the practice followed whereby rent due to my mother, incapacitated as she is, is paid either to my brother or to myself on her behalf, two cheques each in the sum of \$600.00 were issued to me to cover rent for two months. Another cheque issued to cover rent for a further two months was referred back to me by the bank on which it was drawn.

The Lease was accordingly immediately determined.

The above facts show clearly that the matters about which Mr. Adams chose to suggest base motives on my part were of an entirely private and strictly legal nature and in no way connected with the discharge of my functions as Attorney General of Barbados.

There is still freedom of contract in this country and my family and I are entitled like any other citizen to enter into lawful business arrangements with any other national be it Mr. Sydney Alleyne or Mr. Tom Adams.

The statements made by the Leader of the Opposition in the House although irrelevant to the Budget presented by the Prime Minister are still protected by the cloak of parliamentary immunity and I unfortunately have no redress in the Law Courts against his sinister attack on my personal reputation. Mr. Adams should either unreservedly withdraw his unfortunate slanders and innuendoes or have the courage to repeat them in writing or in public so that his veracity may be tested by an appropriate tribunal.

GEORGE C. R. MOE
Attorney-General and Minister of External Affairs.

2nd August 1976.

That is the letter which I received, and I make it a document of the House together with the covering letter which I received from Mr. Moe which I mentioned and the lease.

8.00 p.m.

Mr. ADAMS: If I may briefly elucidate, I did not intend to have any debate on this letter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member can only rise on a point of elucidation if the hon. member who is speaking gives way.

Mr. ADAMS: I have a point of order too. If you want me to take a point of order, I will take it. On a point of order, Sir.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not think that a point of order is any longer necessary. I have been trying to find the letter when he said that I was shuffling my papers.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I hope that the hon. member appreciates, as Your Honour no doubt appreciates that the debate was unnecessarily protracted and that I have approximately only about 27 minutes left in this debate. This is now the tenth intervention which has been made since I have been on my feet.

Mr. ADAMS: Obviously Your Honour will take off time for the interventions. Perhaps the Prime Minister does not come into the House often enough to know that this is like a football match. You take time off for injuries and interruptions. He need not worry about that. He cannot sit there and impute things to me — slanders and innuendoes to me. I have just mentioned them. What I say is that acting clearly on hearsay, evidently it has not been cleared to the Attorney General. Technically I

could ask the Prime Minister to withdraw those statements. As I have said, acting on hearsay it has not been cleared with the Attorney General how the payments in cash arose.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member is making another attack against the Attorney General.

Mr. ADAMS: I am not making any attack.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let the hon. member take his seat. Let the hon. member for St. Thomas complete his point of order.

Mr. ADAMS: There are three distinct things in that letter which are breaches of order — hearsay, slanders, using the Clerk of Parliament all of those things at one time or another — if you refer to Erskine May's. I am asking that they be withdrawn. What I am saying as a matter of hearsay is that the cheques themselves bear some evidence that they were changed for cash.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member has made his point of order.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: What I find particularly distressing about this whole matter is that the hon. member is recalcitrant. We have heard a statement that the hon. member can refute if he wants to about hearsay. One would have thought that he would have investigated before. This is probably hearsay — a telephone call which he made after he had made his speech in this House to Mr. Lisle King at approximately 9 o'clock on Saturday, 1st August, 1976. (*Aside*). Can I give the substance of it? Is it admissible? "Did Mr. King rent the Mermaid Shop?" Mr. Adams: "From whom did he rent it? How much rent he paid? If he stopped renting the shop, was there any reason why Mr. Moe would receive the \$5,000 from Mr. Alleyne?"

This is prior to the visit on the second occasion by Mr. Adams and one Aaron Truss to the Mermaid Shop at Sunset Crest at approximately 3 p.m. on the 2nd August. One would have thought that these visits and verifications would have taken place before the speech on the 30th July; but the counter action to hearsay is taking place afterwards and questions asked. "Did Mr. King know that he is presently renting Mr. Moe's premises? Did he know how long they were renting it? Whose house is it at the back of the present boutique? How long was it there?"

Mr. Adams asked Mr. King, if he could borrow any cheques which he, Mr. King, wrote out to George Moe. Mr. Adams also asked questions about other members. (c) A telephone call by Mr. Harold Hoyte to Mr. Lisle King on the 2nd August, 1976, time, 5 p.m., asking similar questions. That is all.

If the hon. member is going to object to any of that as being hearsay I will withdraw. He did not interrupt me. I gave him the opportunity. Now, the point that I am making is this: If one is responsible, and you have a brother at law, a member of your profession, and somebody presents you with some document susceptible of more than one explanation, any conscious person would take the trouble of checking to find out what the true nature of the transaction would be before coming in here and making allegations such as those which were made. In the middle of all of this, when his voice rose to a crescendo and the most venomous demeanour was assumed he then talked about Watergate and about the Minister of Finance. Let me make the position clear.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order. I am venomous? I could only hear that George Moe was going to court for rent and that the \$5,000 was back rent. This was all I went to check. The \$5,000 was back rent. That was said at the Cabinet. You asked, Mr. George Moe why he took a cheque, and why he did not take cash. (*Asides*).

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I will have to ask some of my classical colleagues on my right to translate for me the words *ibi res ad sunt quid mihi opus est verbis*. I think it was Cicero. I may be wrong, because I am not an expert on classics. I was exposed to them but like so many others who have been exposed to education I have survived the exposure. I still seem to remember some of the little things which I learnt.

I am saying that here you have a member of your profession, and because he is not in the same particular party, you come on the floor of the House and before the general public and make these accusations in here today and yesterday. I understand that what he was saying is that here is the Minister of Finance carrying out investigations into this institution.

Now, Sir, my investigation was not a CID investigation. The Banking Act states that certain duties are laid on the Minister of Finance; and any time that a duty is laid on the Minister of Finance I try to the best of my

conscience to discharge that duty, whether it may be friend or foe. As a matter of fact if you happen to be my friend you are likely to undergo a greater scrutiny than if you are a foe. I suggest that Mr. Sydney Alleyne from his pronouncements, since he is going to destroy the Government of Barbados, is more in the way of a foe.

Nobody knows what he is. I remember that the Principal Crown Counsel and not the Attorney General — there are 23 or 25 Crown Counsel working in the Attorney General's Chambers — I do not know that the Attorney General at any time saw that file. As a matter of fact, sometimes files are marked "For the Attorney General". This one was singular in that it was marked "Principal Crown Counsel", because invariably when a file is marked "Attorney General", the file comes back with a tag "For the Attorney General", signed by the Crown Law Officer.

Now, I am assuming that if there was any suspicion that anyone was trying to induce any member of the Government or anyone connected with the Government to do something, you must ask what were they trying to get them to do; because in this particular case the Alleyne Mercantile Bank was not asking for a licence. They were protesting all the time, as the Principal Crown Counsel confirmed, that they were not carrying on a banking business. I happen to know that this is correct, not only because the Principal Crown Counsel said so, but because the Act says that banking business means receiving money from the public on current accounts or other similar accounts or paying and collecting cheques drawn by or paid by customers, and making advances to customers, and receiving money on savings accounts from the general public repayable on demand or after not more than two months notice. That is banking business.

So, they were saying that they were a development bank, a mercantile bank. They were not interested in receiving any deposits from the general public. They were interested in getting institutions together to finance certain projects. We said to them that since you are not carrying on a banking business, please take down the sign "bank" and just operate as a company for development or whatever you are supposed to be doing.

8.10 p.m.

My submission to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is, that far from wanting something done they

did not want anything done at all, and the innuendo which was made is unfortunate that around the same time as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition said that we were investigating the bank and the Ministry of Finance, that the Attorney General himself was having business transactions — the Attorney General is free to have any business transactions with anyone, as he pointed out, as long as it is a legal transaction. Had the Attorney General himself been asked to advise on a matter and he had seen that file, then he could say, well, I am not dealing with this matter because I happen to know about this institution and I do not find myself a competent adviser. No such conflict ever arose. That is all I want to say on that particular matter.

The other employee of the Government of Barbados, a former Minister is not in the Island and I am not going to go by hearsay evidence. I am not in a position; I am saying I am not in a position if accusations are made of people who are out of the country, to make any representations on their behalf in this House because the person is not here to give me a full and true account and accurate account of what the transactions are that I could pass on to the Chamber. It is absolutely ridiculous to ask me in a situation in three days' time or four days' time to come back — we do not transact business by telephone on matters of this kind.....

Mr. FORDE: On a point of order, Sir. If the hon. member will give way. What I said was that the hon. Cameron Tudor, the High Commissioner for London is a servant of the Crown coming under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of External Affairs and in circumstances such as these the Ministry must investigate under what circumstances he would have received money from the Alleyne Mercantile Bank. What enquiry has been instituted by the Government on this point?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: If the hon. member wants to know, the Ministry will investigate. I would say more, because since the Ministry of External Affairs is under the Attorney General, my Ministry will investigate; or I will ask the Public Service Commission to investigate, if there is anything to be investigated. So I do not think the hon. member need worry about that because all I am saying at this juncture is, I am not in a position — I am not here to speculate, I do not know anything about it. As far as I can see, any person can write cheques to anybody else providing it does not conflict with their duties, and that is what we have to investigate.

I do not know what is the basis of this thing. I do not know if the cheques are genuine, whether they are not genuine, or otherwise. Therefore all I wish to ensure the hon. member for Christ Church West of is that I am in no position to assist, but I will be in a position to assist with the Attorney General; and I regret that merely because the seats of some of the members in here, probably including mine — I understand that a man of stature, little bigger or smaller than the hon. member for St. Joseph is challenging me. All of our seats may be in jeopardy, but I am saying, merely because a member's seat may be in jeopardy that is not sufficient justification to come in here and indulge in political — the accepted word is political assassination. Mr. Speaker, I will say no more about that.

Now some exception has also been taken to the fact that international institutions have had something favourable to say about Barbados. I wish to quote — now this is not a secret document. This is the Inter-American Economic and Social Council Report, the ad hoc group on the economy of Barbados.....

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I will make this a document of the House, Sir. Reference was made to the IMF Report and I am making this a document of the House. No. 11.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir. In the light of the remarks made in the letter from Mr. George Moe about the Leader of the Opposition, is it

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member would rise on a point of order in connection with a comment made by the hon. member for St. John. The hon. member rises and he begins to deal with something which is passed. I will not accept that as a point of order. Let the hon. member take his seat.

Mr. ADAMS: Do you mean I cannot ask about Mr. Tudor?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let the hon. member take his seat. The hon. member is dealing with a Report from the United Nations and that is the last part of the hon. member's speech. If the hon. member had said something which calls for a point of order on that portion of his address I would accept it, but he goes back to something that was passed ten minutes ago.

Mr. SIMMONS: Sir, on a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let me hear the point of order from the hon. member for St. Philip North.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: This is interruption No. 12.

Mr. SIMMONS: Sir, the document which was made a document of the House had to go through a certain amount of signatures by the Clerk. We have only just seen it, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That does not mean that a point of order could rise from that at this stage. The hon. member for St. John has made it a document of the House. If hon. members want to discuss that, they can bring in a substantive motion to discuss it but I will not entertain a point of order on that. I would only entertain a point of order if it emanates from a statement made by any hon. member speaking, immediately it is made.

Mr. SIMMONS: So long as Your Honour will allow substantive discussion on it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let the hon. member for St. John continue to address the Chair.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Interruption No. 12, Sir. We will soon have a baker's dozen.

I am quoting, Sir, from the 1976 Inter-American Economic and Social Council Ad Hoc Group Report on the economy of Barbados. Just a short extract which I wish to quote at this stage, but the whole Report will be made available to members of the House. "The ad hoc group learnt of the substantial progress made by Barbados in obtaining lower rates of price increases in 1975. In effect, the December 1974 to December 1975 increase in the retail price index was 12.3% down from 36.6% in the same period one year before. Although these favourable results were in good measure determined by trends in import prices, Government fiscal, monetary and exchange great measures contributed significantly to the attainment of greater price stability."

The reason why I quote this is that today during the course of the debate the Leader of the Opposition spent a considerable amount of time trying to establish that the Government had made no contribution, or little contribution, if any contribution at all, to the lowering of the rate of

inflation and the reduction in prices. He made a few typically sarcastic remarks about the Minister of Trade, Industry and Commerce but what he was trying to say was that the Government had nothing to do with the reduction in the cost of living. Government is responsible for everything like high unemployment, but here is the Ad Hoc Group of the Economic and Social Council — the names I could read if hon. members would like to know the names of the persons who were at that review. There were people from the Inter-American Development Bank; there were eight — I will have to say seven because one of the representatives from the Inter-American Development Bank was our own Mr. Charles Skeete, and there were seven other. There was the President of the Economic and Social Council and a few members.

8.20 p.m.

There were the President of the Economic and Social Council and a few members, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development was represented by four persons, the International Monetary Fund was represented by two persons, the FAO was represented by Mr. Hortiz, the Economic Commission for Latin America was represented by two persons, and the European Economic Community was represented by Mr. Andre Louall. Then there were observers from the United States of America, the Permanent Membership of the OAS and the General Secretariat of the OAS. There were observers from those three organisations.

These are the persons who said that although the favourable results were in a good measure determined by the trends in import prices, for which apparently we are not responsible obviously, that Government fiscal, monetary and exchange rate measures contributed significantly to the attainment of greater price stability. I should like to make our position clear. We are concerned about the management of the economy of this country on the principle of the maximum social advantage in the allocation of the resources of development of this country for the benefit of the citizens of Barbados. We are not concerned about the petty personal ambitions of politicians either on our side or on the other side, and we will continue to do our duty to manage the economy of this country through good weather, through bad weather, through economic crises and through times of boon and through times of recession to the best of our ability, and I can say in our performance, in our dedication to our principles of providing equality of opportunity and a higher and better quality of life for all the citizens of Barbados, that we have a record of which we may be justifiably proud,

and there are no gibes, there are no insults, there is no slander emanating from the other side — although sometimes we wonder if democracy is worth this kind of price, the expense to our personal feelings and the assault on your intellect which takes place in this Place, whether we are justified in maintaining our position.

Mr. FORDE: On a point of order, the hon. member has accused the other side of slander emanating from that side. I refer Your Honour to Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice, the 18th Edition, at page 434 where to accuse another member of Parliament, or members of Parliament, of slander is unparliamentary, and in those circumstances I would ask Your Honour to rule that the remarks must be struck out of the record.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let the hon. member for St. John withdraw the word "slander."

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: He didn't ask that, he asked that it be struck out of the record.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair should control the debates of the House and I am asking that the words complained of be withdrawn.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: In so far as I say emanating from the other side, I withdraw those words unreservedly, but from any quarter whatsoever, from Bridgetown, Speightstown, Oistins or Martin's Bay will deter us from our task — not that we will get any from Martin's Bay, Sir — of managing the affairs of this country to the best of our ability and in the interest of the community as a whole.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the words proposed to be added stand part. I think that the motion was moved already and seconded. I beg to move that the question be now put.

The Question "that those words be there added" was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. A. MORRISON, Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Hon. F. G. SMITH, Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES, Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Mr. W. R. LOWE, Mr. WALCOTT, Mr. E. E. GREAVES, Mr. J. B. SPRINGER and Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD — 12

Noes: Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Mr. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. W. C. B. HINDS, Mr. H. deB. FORDE, Mr. C. L. BOLDEN, Miss B. A. MILLER, Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS and Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND — 8

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

8.30 p.m.

Ayes: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. A. MORRISON; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Hon. F. G. SMITH; Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. F. L. WALCOTT; Mr. E. E. GREAVES; Mr. J. B. SPRINGER and Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD – 12.

Noes: Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS; Mr. L. S. CRAIG; Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; Mr. H. deB.

FORDE; Mr. C. L. BOLDEN; Miss B. A. MILLER; Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS and Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND – 8.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this concludes Government Business for today's Special Sitting.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This House has already been adjourned until Tuesday, 10th August, 1976, at 12 o'clock noon.
8.33 p.m.