

THE

# House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1971-76

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

*Tuesday, 6th July, 1976*

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.10 p.m. o'clock.

### 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); 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, M.A., (Leader of the Opposition); 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); Hon. P. M. GREAVES, B.A., (Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance); Mr. H. deB. FORDE, M.A., LL.B.; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, (Minister of Communications and Works); 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.*

### PAPERS PRESENTED

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:—

The Representation of the People (Expenses) (Amendment) Regulations, 1976.

## GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$135,653 from the Consolidated Fund and place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1976-77 Part 1 — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1976-77, No. 11, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$9,261 from the Consolidated Fund and place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Annexed Estimates 1976-77 as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1976-77, No.10, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

### PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICE

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

*Whereas* the present location of the Speightstown Boys' School renders it unsuitable for the purpose of modern education;

*And Whereas* existing traffic conditions impose a heavy strain, physically and mentally on teachers and pupils alike, who work in this School;

*And Whereas* its close proximity to the highway is a constant source of danger and a threat to life, momentarily;

*Be It Resolved* that this Honourable House urges Government to take immediate steps to have the matter relating to the said School investigated, with a view to re-siting same and to making more and better provision for the carrying out of its educational and other functions.

## REPORTS OF SELECT COMMITTEES

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, there are a few Select Committees which were appointed, and in some cases the time for them to make their reports has expired. I beg to move that in each case where the time has expired, that the Select Committees be re-appointed, and that the same members be the members of the respective Select Committees.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, before the question is put, I would like to make a couple of comments about these Select Committees since there are three important Bills before them which came out of Private Members' Business. It is important that we should get these committees functioning.

As regards the Select Committee appointed to consider and report on the Bill to incorporate the Bishop of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Bridgetown-Kingstown, a meeting was called last week and I was the only member present. A few weeks ago a meeting of the Select Committee to consider and report to the House on a Bill to revise the law relating to defamation, malicious falsehood and criminal libel and to provide for related matters was called. I was unfortunately out of the island. On the second occasion I turned up and there was no member of that Committee. I know that the Government has at long last decided on its own views as to libel laws and is working on a review of those laws; but I think that the public should know that this Bill before a Select Committee was introduced in this House since the 23rd September, 1975, and up to today we cannot get this Bill out of Select Committee.

I introduced the Bill, and I consider it the most important Bill. It was passed on the second reading without anybody objecting. If the Government had any views on it at that time they should have expressed them; but I expect that as part of the election technique there will be all sorts of things apparently being done by the Government.

At this stage I am appealing to members of the Select Committee to let us get this Bill forward as soon as possible, otherwise, I will have to ask the Speaker that it be referred back to third reading and the Government make up its mind on it one way or the other. On the occasion when I was absent I sent a message to

Mr. Clerk pointing out that there was an amendment which I would wish.

The other Select Committee is on the Motor Vehicles Insurance Act, and in that again there is an important amendment to deal with concerning voluntary passengers who are being carried in vehicles and in respect of whom there needs to be no compulsory insurance at the moment. This is a Bill in the public interest, and I am asking the Select Committee again to try and meet.

The other one is the Marriage Bill. On that, I believe that I did not turn up on two occasions. On both occasions I was out of the island, and the Hon. Leader of the House very kindly invited comments from myself and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. I am doing a redraft of a section in the hope that the Select Committee will deal with this very soon; but even that does not have the same urgency as the other ones to which I have referred a moment ago. I hope that Select Committees will function rapidly so that these Acts can be on the Statute Book before the prorogation. If the prorogation is to be next Tuesday, then we cannot get them on the Statute Book; but I would hope to be here and reintroduce them after the elections.

## OBITUARY SPEECHES RE THE LATE J. E. BROME.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, although we are a little late, I think that it would be only fitting at this time to pay tribute to the passing of the late Mr. Joe Brome of "Chantilly", St. Leonards Avenue, Westbury Road, who was buried last Monday. Mr. Joe Brome, as we all know was a man seized with great knowledge of things Barbadian, and was a specialist in the field of Journalism where he performed a very outstanding role. He worked at the Advocate Newspaper for a period of 39 years, for part of which he was Assistant Editor.  
12.20 p.m.

Many tributes have been paid to the late Mr. Joe Brome in many places, both in the Other Place and in the Press and it is hardly necessary for me to elaborate at this stage on that particular aspect. Yet in truth and in fact I would say that the eulogy given by Mr. E. L. (Jimmy) Cozier contained many fine aspects in relation to the services rendered by Mr. Joe Brome during his long years of service as a journalist, and I certainly feel that many of the points raised in the eulogy can be more or less incorporated in my remarks.

Mr. Brome served not only as Reporter and sub-editor of the Advocate and the Daily News but he has also served here in this Parliament as a Senior Indexer from February 1970 up to the time of his death, and he has rendered very constructive and useful service in that respect in that we have our indexes fairly up to date, for the amount of work that he has done. He has made a good contribution in that respect and a proper system has been introduced, thanks to the assistance of Mr. Chandler.

I feel, Sir, that Mr. Joe Brome has been so close to this Chamber that it is only fitting we should pass a Resolution to pay tribute to his work and memory and also to pass a regular Resolution of condolence to his widow and relatives.

I beg to move that this Resolution be passed. "Be it resolved that the Honourable the House of Assembly place on record the very deep sympathy at the death of Mr. Joe Brome, a great journalist and former Indexer of Parliament, and

*Be It Further Resolved* that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to his widow and sorrowing relatives.

Dated this 6th day of July, 1976."

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, associating the Opposition with the Resolution which has been moved by the Leader of the House, we too should like to pay tribute to one of Barbados' great Journalist, and I think more important, one of Barbados' great Barbadians.

Joe Brome was a man distinctly Barbadian in character. He has spent almost all of his life in this country, travelling abroad very little but within the Barbadian context, assimilating everything there was in the world at large for him to assimilate. I believe that I can do him justice by quoting from the words of a great friend of his, Mr. George Brancker, one of the Clerks of this House; and a tribute I think that is significant for the sincerity with which it was written. He says, and I adopt these as my words; "Joe Brome kept close to whatever of significance occurred at any level of Barbadian society. He regarded himself as an interpreter, an analyst, an examiner of events, not as a propagandist. His approach to his work was not subjective, and the objectivity of his judgments was one of the hallmarks of his writings. He

wished and wrote for the upliftment of the community."

A little later he also said "Joe Brome's intellect was as large as he. There was nothing petty about the man. He had a withering forthrightness about him. Joe had read widely and he absorbed the experience of his associations. He was tolerant, but never suffered fools gladly."

I think those are correct words of the man. I myself met him when I was a young school boy at Harrison College and like so many of us in the fifties and late forties, drew on his knowledge of journalism to improve the College's newspaper and magazine The Collegian and the Harrisonian; and busy as he was at the Advocate, being the *de facto* controller if not the *de jure* controller of the Advocate he always found time for little people such as we were in those days, and he gave willingly of his knowledge and of his assistance, and where he himself could not help he always found somebody whom he could recommend to help us in our needs.

Many of us of that generation learnt a lot from him. I am sure that persons like Mr. Fabian Holder, and Mr. Ben Corbin who is now in charge of Compton Corbin, and people like Mr. Harold Hoyte, Mr. Fred Gollop and Mr. Asquith Phillips, if I may mention some of the people interested in journalism at the time as young people, we benefited considerably from his assistance. I would like to say that there is an aspect of the journalist as represented by Joe Brome that one should really use this occasion to comment on. Journalists are still among the very lowly paid professionals in our community. Joe Brome suffered immeasurably from this. At no stage of his employment with his former employers to whom he gave so many years was his pay commensurate with the work load or the responsibility which he carried, and I think it is a blot on multi-national and foreign ownership of our newspapers that in his late years in particular the Thompson newspaper chain did not see fit to recompense those years of service by at least an *ex gratia* payment which would have saved him from the financial stringencies which governed his life in the last few days.

That is probably one of the strongest arguments that we can have for localization of the Press — and I am not talking about nationalization of the Press or Government ownership of the Press. Joe Brome was not the sort of man to beg his bread. He was a proud man in many ways and I believe that although he

died a poor man he has still died a great man; and I trust that one of these days when the history of journalism is being written in this country, that he will get his suitable and fitting tribute.

It is true to say that in his later years at times he was assaulted I believe, from both sides, all sides, by all sides of his political friends disagreeing with some of his judgments but even when he was criticised by politicians of all sides, I think none of us could possibly end up at enmity with him.

12.30 p.m.

We may not have agreed with his judgement on every event, but we had to accept the sincerity with which he wrote, and I would like to say that for me personally it is a great tragedy that someone so knowledgeable, someone so truly and greatly Barbadian passes from the scene without any proper record of his life or lifestyle, and I should hope that journalists, politicians, statesmen and people who contribute to this community would begin looking at writing their own autobiographies so that we can have the social history of our country properly mirrored in their own writings and documents.

Mr. SPEAKER: I, as Speaker, associate myself with the remarks and support the Resolution.

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

#### ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Replies to Questions No. 96 and No. 107 asked by the hon. member for St. Michael North East are now ready.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. James had written me on a matter of privilege, and I have investigated the matter concerning the question of misreporting of the proceedings of the House which appeared in the Advocate-News of Thursday, 10th June. If the hon. member wishes, in accordance with Standing Order 76, to give notice he may do so now.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, I take it that when I give notice of this I can debate it.

Mr. SPEAKER: No, you cannot debate it, you have to move that it be sent to the

Committee of Privileges. Standing Order 76(3) is very clear on that.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, I was under the impression that a motion of privilege takes precedence over all other business, and therefore I would debate this and then move that it be sent to the Committee of Privileges. That is my understanding, Sir, that I may raise the matter and then move that it be sent to the Committee of Privileges. That is my understanding of the Standing Order; if you may direct me.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Standing Order 76(3) says, "If permission is given by the Speaker under paragraph 2 of this Order, the Member may raise the matter at any time before public business is commenced and move that the matter be referred to the Committee of Privileges."

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker,.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: May I on a point of order state that Standing Order 76(4) says: "There shall be no debate on a motion under paragraph 3 hereof, but if the Speaker decides that a *prima facie* case has been made out, he shall rule accordingly and refer the matter to the Committee of Privileges." There can be no debate on a matter of privilege.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I believe we will have a very interesting day. I wrote you in connection with this matter and after examining the facts you have allowed me to raise the matter. After I have made out a case, then you should determine whether it should go to the Committee of Privileges or not. I do not know why the Prime Minister is trying to tell you what to do; I do not understand.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order. The whole rule is quite clear. It is clear that the member moving the motion can speak for 15 minutes, and it is equally clear that no other member can speak, because there can be no debate, but I do not know really why the hon. member for St. James should be worried. Standing Order 76(6) says that no member may speak for more than 15 minutes. It is a clear indication that who moves it can speak, and 76(4) says there shall be no debate, so nobody else can speak, and I respectfully submit that that is the member's privilege, to speak for 15 minutes on why it should be referred to the Committee of Privileges.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the Speaker decides that a *prima facie* case has been made out.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Just on a point of order, Sir, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition jumped from 76(4) to 76(6), but supervening in 76(5) which says that if a matter suddenly arises, that clearly could not be referred back to 76(4) which says that there shall be no debate, and he is smirking over there as if he has pulled a fast one on you. The hon. member should not try to do that kind of thing. There can be no debate, it is only when something suddenly arises in the course of the debate that you can have any discussion on the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is my interpretation.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: And your interpretation is correct. No debate means no speech by anybody; how can you have a debate by one person?

Mr. CRAIG: No, Mr. Speaker, how do you mean no speech? Mr. Speaker, on the 10th June, 1976 the Advocate-News reported — and I shall read this out to you, which is a motion of privilege — in the issue of the newspaper, the Advocate-News, published on Thursday, 10th June, 1976 there appeared on page 1 columns 1 to 4 an article under the caption: “*Heated exchanges in House — TALMA: Standard of debate shocking.*” I am enclosing, as the letter goes on, herewith a copy of that newspaper. This caption purports to be a report of the debate of the Hon. House of Assembly on Wednesday, 9th June, 1976. The article states in the second paragraph —

“Mr. Talma’s remarks came shortly after the House almost broke up in disorder when the tempers of members of both sides flared during a heated debate on the interpretation of the Standing Orders which govern the chamber’s procedures.”

Mr. Speaker, it is not true that the House almost broke up in disorder. The Minutes of the House of that meeting show that on the motion of Hon. C. E. Talma, seconded by Hon. G. G. Fergusson, the House adjourned without division or debate on the motion until Tuesday, 22nd June, 1976 at noon. At no time did Your Honour or Mr. Deputy Speaker state from the Chair that the House was approaching a state of disorder, or grave disorder, which latter expression appears in Standing Order 40(9).

The article continues in the third, fourth and fifth paragraphs:

“Deputy Speaker Mr. DaCosta Edwards diffused the explosive situation with firm rulings, expunging from the records contributions from Communications and Works Minister Dr. Rameses Caddle and Deputy Leader of the Opposition Mr. Lionel Craig.

Both members had risen to speak on a government resolution after it had been agreed to in the Committee of Supply and progress had been reported by the chairman.

The Deputy Speaker ruled that the members had breeched the Standing Orders but although he had allowed the members to rise on Points of Privilege, their contributions should be stricken from the record.”

The clear statement in the third paragraph that Mr. Deputy Speaker isolated remarks of the Minister of Communications and Works and myself as matters to be expunged from the records of the House is inaccurate. The implication continues in the fourth and fifth paragraphs. The records of the House will show all members who had spoken on points of privilege during the period of the debate, which is presumably the subject of the article, should be expunged from the records of the House.

The eleventh paragraph of the article states:

At the *sotto voce* urgings of Mr. Talma, Chairman of Committees Mr. Russell Lowe put the question and progress on the resolution was reported to the House.

*Sotto voce* urgings are not part of the debate or of the proceedings of the House, and it is wrong to suggest, particularly with reference to the occasion under consideration, that the question was put in any way inconsistent with the stage of the debate or of the proper duties and responsibilities of the Chairman of Committees. 12.40 p.m.

I am drawing to Your Honour’s attention this blatant breach of the privileges of the House. I am only requesting leave to raise this matter under Standing Order 76 in keeping with what is set out in this letter. I made my position quite clear when I wrote you this letter seeking the right to bring a matter to the attention of this Chamber. It is rather unfortunate that I was dragged into this type of misreporting by the *Advocate-News*.

Mr. SPEAKER: Now, I am aware that you have raised the matter, and I am complying with Standing Orders. I will refer it to the Committee of Privileges. There will be no debate in this House today on this matter.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, have you referred the matter to the Committee of Privileges? I was under the impression that the person complaining about the matter should move that it be referred to the Committee of Privileges, but not that you should move it. That is my interpretation of the Standing Orders. I would like Your Honour's ruling on this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: My ruling is that there will be no debate allowed on this matter today, and you will have to move that it be referred to the Committee of Privileges. Make the motion. (Asides.)

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to have any argument with any members on the other side. What do I understand, Mr. Speaker? I wrote you a letter stating what I would like to raise on a matter of privilege. Must I come in here and simply say that I beg to move that this matter be sent to the Committee of Privileges without telling you what transpired and what caused me to raise the matter? I am the person involved, and I would have to express how it affects me. I would have to draw the attention of the Chamber to the misreporting in a daily paper.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir. Although there should be no debate on a motion, if the Speaker decides that a *prima facie* case has been made out, he shall rule accordingly and refer the matter to the Committee of Privileges. Clearly, Sir, the member is entitled to draw a *prima facie* case to Your Honour's attention. I would draw to your attention, Your Honour, the ruling given by Speaker Maxwell in a matter dealing with CBC when the CBC misrepresented something that I had said in here. I took it up, and hon. members voted against the referral to the Committee of Privileges, with the honourable exception of the members who sit on this side and the hon. member for St. Michael South, the very honourable exception of that member on the Government side. You even voted against it, Sir, but Mr. Speaker Maxwell said that a *prima facie* case had been made out, nonetheless, based upon the representation which I had made to him, and he ignored the vote and referred the matter to the Committee of Privileges. To make out a *prima facie* case, an hon. member must tell you what the facts are, and I think you have very properly allowed him to read the letter, in my

humble submission. I myself thought that the letter contained all necessary matter for Your Honour to rule on, but I would still respectfully submit ... (Laughter)

Sir, this is not a laughing matter. If hon. members on the other side think that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is going to the trouble to read out a carefully worded and thought-out letter to the House is a matter for mirth, then they do not take the House of Assembly seriously. I may be able to grasp what is in the letter, but it is not every hon. member on the other side who would see the point right away. No wonder they are laughing! (Asides.) Sir, the Prime Minister is making fun at you.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is he? Not at me. We will soon find out who is making fun.

Mr. ADAMS: I am submitting that the hon. member should be allowed to say in a few sentences that a *prima facie* case has been made out, and Your Honour can rule accordingly.

Mr. SPEAKER: Standing Order 76(4) is quite clear. I want all hon. members to realise we are in here and we are working according to Standing Order 76(4):

"There shall be no debate on a motion under paragraph 3 hereof, but if the Speaker decides that a *prima facie* case has been made out, he shall rule accordingly and refer the matter to the Committee of Privileges."

I have ruled accordingly, and I refer this matter to the Committee of Privileges, according to 76(4).

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, are you saying that you have referred the matter to the Committee?

Mr. SPEAKER: Take your seat! The question is that this matter be referred to the Committee of Privileges.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Either Your Honour rules that it be referred to the Committee of Privileges, or that ...

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order. I got up on a point of order just now and you told me to take my seat. Call on the Leader of the Opposition to take his seat, too, Sir. What is this? This is a joke.

Mr. SPEAKER: Take your seat!

Mr. CRAIG: I got up to address you just now, Sir. You told me to take my seat without hearing anything from me.

Mr. SPEAKER: I was speaking.

Mr. CRAIG: You had already finished speaking.

Mr. SPEAKER: You cannot tell me when I am finish speaking. I know when I am finish. Take your seat!

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order. Are there not two clearly separate procedures? First of all, one in which there can be no debate. A distinction must be drawn between a debate, which is argument addressed to the House. That is what a debate is. The hon. member addresses his remarks through the Chair to the House in order to persuade hon. members to take, or to desist from taking, a particular course. That is separate from stating a point of order, or addressing remarks to His Honour the Speaker to persuade His Honour the Speaker to exercise discretion one way or another. The remarks addressed to Mr. Speaker to convince Mr. Speaker that there is a *prima facie* case can never be a debate because the remarks are not addressed to the House. The debate takes place between members, and remarks addressed to the Speaker are remarks addressed to the Speaker. Are there not two procedures laid down? One in which members are invited to vote on the referral following the motion, and the other where the Speaker decides that such a motion is unnecessary, and just refers it?

12.50 p.m.

Mr. Speaker Maxwell after taking the votes refused to accept the verdict of the House which included Your Honour and he referred it notwithstanding the adverse vote.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, my understanding of this is that when I wrote you this letter it was to give me the right to raise this matter, and then I would have to come in here and address you so that you could make up your mind if this should go to the Committee of Privileges or not. I was in here for ten years and I have never yet seen a motion of privilege raised in here and Mr. Speaker says he has sent it to the Committee of Privileges. I have been in here on several occasions before being a member and have witnessed the proceedings of this House, and I have never seen that, but if you so rule I shall abide by your ruling. I am skillful enough in here to say what I have to say and I may do it in a

manner that may cause some exchanges. Surely you do not seem to be yourself; you are not really the Speaker today. I do not know if you had a hard week-end or....

Mr. SPEAKER rose.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member wrote me a letter, and as he stated, he wanted to read it and find out whether a *prima facie* case has been made out. I have read it and a *prima facie* case has been made out. There is a Standing Committee of Privileges and I am referring it to that Committee.

The question is that this matter be referred to the Committee....

Mr. WALCOTT: The Standing Orders should be adhered to, and I should, on a point of order, like to draw your attention to Standing Order No. 76 which says —

- “(1) A motion directly concerning the privileges of the House shall take precedence of all other public business.
- (2) Any Member desiring to raise a matter under this Standing Order, shall first obtain leave of the Speaker who shall determine whether the Member is entitled to raise the matter as a question of privileges.”

So if Mr. Speaker receives a letter and agrees that the hon. member can raise the matter of privileges, he can only raise it in the House, and I humbly submit that the hon. member has the right to raise the matter if you have granted him leave.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: If I may say a word, Sir, I agree with what the hon. member who has just sat down has said. It would seem to me that having written the letter setting out the grounds for a breach of privilege and Your Honour having considered the matter, the hon. member is perfectly in place in substantiating or corroborating his statements made in the letter in order to raise the matter on the floor of the House, and then he should of necessity make a motion. The motion has to be made by the member who raised the motion of privilege, but having made the motion and it having been duly seconded, no other hon. member is entitled to speak. That is where paragraph (4) comes in. A *prima facie* case has been made out already in that Your Honour is satisfied with the terms of the letter to raise the matter. The hon. member

has the right to raise it and corroborate and set out what he wrote about which he has done. Now that he has done that and everybody is of one opinion, he merely has to make the motion now and it has to be seconded.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is what the Standing Order says and I agree with that. A motion will have to be made for it to be sent to the Committee of Privileges.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, we seem to be really on different wave lengths. Where am I to raise this matter? I would like to raise the matter of privileges which you have given me leave to raise; so tell me where to raise it? Am I to go to the Advocate and raise it or should I raise it in here? I will sit and await your ruling. Where am I to raise it?

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the Committee of Privileges which is a Standing Committee.

Mr. CRAIG: I asked to raise this matter of privileges, not before the Committee of Privileges. The Committee of Privileges is the jury. I am prosecuting. You tell me where to raise the matter.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Standing Order No. 76(3) is very clear. If permission is given by the Speaker, which you have given, under paragraph 2 of this Order, the Member may raise the matter at any time before public business is commenced and move that the matter be referred to the Committee of Privileges.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, you have ruled that it cannot be raised in here. Tell me where to raise it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The matter has already been raised by the hon. member for St. James.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, do not let the Prime Minister get there and urge you to do nonsense. The Prime Minister's head is very hot and he will get a bath today from me. If he is urging you from that side you should ask him to speak in undertones. Tell the Prime Minister not to interrupt hon. members on this side or the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Prime Minister is not directing the Chair. You have raised the matter and I am waiting for the motion.

Mr. CRAIG: Shall I proceed, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: Do you understand that a motion has to be made?

Mr. CRAIG: I am going to move, Mr. Speaker, that this be sent to the Committee of Privileges, and in so doing I want to state that my reason for sending it to the Committee of Privileges is that on Thursday, 10th June, the Advocate-News reported that the....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has started a debate.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, I am telling you that I am moving the motion that it be referred to the Committee.....

Mr. SPEAKER: There shall be no debate. That is my ruling.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, bear with me. If the Leader of the House gets up to move that this House go into Committee of Supply, he would have to say why.

Mr. SPEAKER: He does not have to.

Mr. CRAIG: Let me put it the other way around. The Prime Minister is going to move a Resolution for \$250,000. Has he got to say why he is moving it and the reason that the money is going to be spent? Do you mean he can get up and just move the House into Committee of Supply? Mr. Speaker, I am going to move that you be sent on a Parliamentary Course.  
1.00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to move that you resign on a parliamentary vote. I will move that because I cannot understand what you are telling me. You are telling me that I must get up here and say I beg to move that this motion be sent to the Committee of Privileges and sit down? No Sir. I am going to have my rights in here. I am going to say why I feel that it should be sent to the Committee of Privileges, and then you can rule whether it should be expunged from the records of the House or not.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have said that there shall be no debate on this.

Mr. CRAIG: I am on my feet.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is like the first reading of a Bill. There shall be no debate.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member must abide by the Speaker's ruling. Rule 76(4) states that a prima facie case is a decision of the Speaker, whether the Speaker is right or wrong. A prima facie case is not a case that you are

arguing. A prima facie case is what you are presenting, that these things were printed in the Advocate. It cannot be argued here. That is the whole idea.

Mr. ADAMS: Your Honour says that we must abide by the rules. You must also abide by your own ruling, because Your Honour had already ruled that this be referred to the Committee of Privileges. I agree with the Leader of the House that the correct procedure is to get up, talk about it and make a motion. Your Honour then has the discretion to put the motion or refer it. That is the only possible construction that can be placed on Rules 3 and 4; and since you have said that it should be referred to the Committee of Privileges, I do not see how anybody can get up now and move that it be referred to the Committee of Privileges. If Your Honour says that a prima facie case has been made out, that is an end of the matter, Sir, in my respectful submission.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, if you will agree with me, we could have avoided all of this because I set out to explain to this House why this should be sent to the Committee of Privileges by moving that it be sent there and getting someone to second it. I want to get the matter settled.

I do not follow you, Sir. You told me just now that I could move that it could be sent to the Committee of Privileges. Now that I get up to explain why it should be sent, you are saying that there should be no debate. This would have to be an address or a lecture. A debate can only be when an hon. member gets up to speak and you can say then that there shall be no debate on this. I am addressing the Chamber, and when you observe someone getting up to speak after me you can decide that there can be no debate on this because you are satisfied that a prima facie case has been made out and that it should go to the Committee of Privileges. It appears that you do not want to hear me at all. You are saying that you read a letter. How do I know that you did not just only looked at it and paid no attention to it? If I have to make out a case why it should be sent to the Committee of Privileges you will have to allow me to explain.

Mr. SPEAKER: According to Rule 76(4) I have decided that a prima facie case has been made out, and I as Speaker have decided that the matter should be referred to the Committee of Privileges. That is according to Rule 76(4), and I abide by that.

Mr. CRAIG: You called on me to make a motion. You have decided to send it to the

Committee of Privileges. What must I do? Now you turn around and tell me that I must make a motion that it be sent. What am I to do?

Mr. SPEAKER: Because there can be no debate, and according to the Standing Order, that must be done.

Mr. CRAIG: But you told me that I must make a motion. Do you want to take all the powers in your hands and send it to the Committee of Privileges? Mr. Speaker, no Prime Minister can send it to the Committee of Privileges. The House has to agree that it should go to the Committee.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about orderly behaviour and observance of the ruling of the Chair and the Standing Orders. I want to make my position absolutely clear and what we have decided is the correct procedure. I could give my own personal feelings on the matter. A member of the Opposition has raised the matter, and quite rightly Your Honour has allowed the hon. member to read out the contents of the communication which was addressed to you.

He now says that he should be allowed to give reasons why it should go to the Committee of Privileges. You have intimated to him that you consider that a prima facie case has been made out; and therefore, having done so, the member can make a motion. In the House of Commons, in what they call the Mother of Parliaments, no matter which member raises a matter of privilege, whether it is the Government side or the Opposition side, it is the Leader of the House who makes the motion and there is no debate. It is not the person who has brought the matter to the Speaker's attention.

When he says that nobody over here can tell him what to do, this is what happens in England; but we have our own peculiar Standing Orders which give a member the responsibility for making a motion. If he does not want to make a motion please let us get on with the people's business. The people are waiting for their money. No matter what is said in here, and what politics are going on in here, the people are waiting for their money and that is what I am here for.

Mr. CRAIG: I am sorry the Prime Minister took it in that light. He is the head of the administration of the country, and you, Mr. Speaker, are the head in here. If you have no intention of allowing me to address the Chamber on this matter I will not fight with you because I will still have the opportunity in these very debates to get up and say what I have to say.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member making a motion?

Mr. CRAIG: I am finished with you and that.

#### SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, there are many items, urgent items, under Government Business to proceed with. I am asking for leave to suspend certain Standing Orders. I am afraid that I did not have the opportunity of consulting with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition on this, but I believe that he will accede to this request on the usual understanding.

I am asking leave to suspend Standing Orders 6, 16, 20, 42, 43 and 44 for the remainder of the day's sitting on the usual understanding that in case the Opposition has anything urgent that they want to deal with before they leave here, it will be dealt with.

1.10 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member objecting?

Mr. FORDE: I am indicating to Your Worship, the Speaker, the Opposition's views. On the last occasion we got a similar indication when we asked for an appropriate time at which Private Members' Business should be dealt with. There are various Resolutions which we would also like dealt with today....

Mr. SPEAKER: May I interrupt? The Hon. Leader of the House has just said that any desires of the Opposition he will comply with. I thought the hon. member did not hear that.

Mr. FORDE: I heard that, Sir, but I want to know if there is a time at which the Leader is going to state that he is prepared to take Private Members' Business.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Am I to understand the hon. member to say that they were denied the opportunity on the last occasion we sat? Am I to understand that? Well I am not aware of that, to be very candid. I am not aware that hon. members of the Opposition wanted to do something which they were denied the opportunity of doing. If that is so I am very sorry. But on this occasion today, if they say so, the matter will be dealt with, maybe around 5 o'clock, if that is a convenient time.

Presumably around 5 o'clock but it would not be dealt with indefinitely, you know. It would not be dealt with from 5 p.m. till 8 p.m., or 9 o'clock. It will be dealt with from 5 p.m. to 6.30 p.m. or something like that

because you will have more time than is normally allotted in the Standing Orders. I just want to make that clear. The question of limitation will arise. It may be from 5 o'clock to 6.30 p.m.

*The Question that the several Standing Orders referred to, be suspended for the remainder of the Day's Sitting was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

#### RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE CONDITIONS APPLICABLE TO UNESTABLISHED STAFF

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, Order No. 1 stands in the name of the Hon. Prime Minister. To move the passing of a Resolution to provide for the conditions applicable to unestablished staff and Casual employees and their classification and rates of pay with effect from 1st April, 1976. This is the last of a series of Resolutions dealing with casual employees and unestablished staff.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1 is the first Order of the day.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, this is the outstanding and last of the Civil Establishment Orders dealing with the wages and salaries of the unestablished staff and the casual workers and their classification and rates of pay which have come into effect from the 1st April, 1976. I want to make the position clear. A lot of people do not care or understand. I made this Order on the 11th June. All that is waiting, according to law requirements is that there should be affirmative approval of the House before the money can be disbursed. The Order has been made. The law permits the Minister in charge of Establishments and the Minister of Finance to make the order and I have made the Order; and all of this debate is a lot of political jargon as far as I am concerned.

The only effect that this can have in here is to prevent people from getting their money, because there is no Commissioner from outside, there is no Lord Chancellor of Great Britain, there is no High Court in Barbados, there is no Constitutional authority anywhere in the world that can prevent a Government from paying money to the employers of this Island or make the taxpayers pay more than they can afford to pay. I like to put these things in their proper perspective; and all of this talking about collective bargaining and all that kind of thing — because it is an election year everybody now wants to out-Herod Herod. Everybody is to get

more but they do not say from where the money is going to come. (*Asides*) I wish I knew; but I know that the people will be paid once we are permitted to pay the money, but we cannot go on indefinitely like this, looking after one section of the community when we have a large percentage of unemployed young and not so young people in this Island.

This order was made on the 11th June and we are only prolonging and protracting this pay unnecessarily so that everybody can get on the record so that in a few months or whatever interval of time supervenes from now they can say 'well I was asking for money', like some of these people who are taking trips abroad; and I make a prediction here now that some of the officers — not the members of the Barbados Workers Union — but some of the officers who have been shouting so loud for more pay and rejecting the Government's offers, will be on an aeroplane very soon drawing all their pay out of the Treasury; when they are telling their membership to reject the pay they will be drawing the pay and going on extended training courses abroad because immediately they get into these positions they get all kind of privileges and so on at the expense of the taxpayers. I know what I am talking about. I am Minister responsible for Training and I know what I am talking about; and that is as true as John 3, Verse 16. You can take it from me that I am going to make a check, as I have a right to; to see how many people are going to leave money in the Treasury after the end of the month of July. I make a prediction that the same public officers who are now telling their rank and file to reject the Government's offer, they will not be leaving their cheques or vouchers in there one day after the Accountant General has notified them that their pay is ready.

So let us get the thing in right perspective. I have been in this Chamber off and on for twenty-five years and I know when people are politicking and when they are serious, and when they are really interested in the people. I have said before, we are all of us here on the basis of universal adult suffrage. You know what that means? That in the kind of structural society that we have, the people who are not well off are in greater numbers than the people who are well off; and therefore our constituency and our field has necessarily got to be based to the masses of the people, therefore we as politicians must at all times when we are being honest, try to do things in the interest of the masses of the people, but when we do not have it in our power to do things we can

always say that we would have done more than they — but when we have it in our power to do things we have to look at the realities confronting the Island including the economic situation with which we are confronted and surrounded.

I am going to make the position clear. I said here, I think a week ago, that if we had the surpluses that the Government of Trinidad and Tobago have, when they, the unions, came and asked me for 100% increase I would have laughed at them and I would have told them 'you think I have forgotten that this is election year? We have money to burn and I am going to tell your members that you have only asked for 100% and I am going to give 150%'; but knowing the economic situation of Barbados, knowing that this is the first time in our history within living memory that — as a matter of fact, the deficit on current accounts without the salary increases in the financial year 1976-77, that is this financial year, the deficit, that is what you do not have and you do not know from where you are getting it, is more than the total Government revenue in 1961 when I took over. The deficit alone is bigger than that on current account.

1.20 p.m.

The deficit therefore on the current account, when you add what we have decided that we will try to find to pay the people, is more than twice that amount because it is over \$50 million, and then add that with the deficit on capital account it would be \$100 million, and we have always borrowed money for capital, used our savings, borrowed a little money and expect posterity to pay for that, but you cannot expect posterity to pay for consumables, that is, things that will not be there tomorrow, that is what you pay out in salaries and you have no jurisdiction or control over.

Ever since I have been in office we have pursued a principle of granting larger increases at the bottom, percentage wise, than we do at the top. If there is anybody who is an expert on salaries who feels very strongly about it, you ask the member for St. Michael West, because it was precisely on an occasion when the then Government decided to give specific increases to certain high ranking officers in the public service of the island and nothing at all to the Key Scale workers, the unestablished staff, non-established staff and casual workers that I crossed the floor. When I say I crossed the floor, I cannot remember if I physically crossed the floor, I was sitting over there, but I decided to part company with them and I said I would not be a

companion of dishonour. I said Governor Savage did not have any vote for the constituency that I had the honour to represent. That was a specific occasion, nothing for the people down below, \$200 a month more for people like the Colonial Secretary, the Surgeon Specialist at the hospital and so on, and that was the occasion when I parted company, so you do not expect that I am getting besotted in my old age and that I have gone now the other way and I would be looking for money for the people at the top and nothing for the people at the bottom.

We have pursued a consistent principle of giving a larger percentage increase down below, and as a matter of fact, I think I said in my original introduction of the Civil Establishment Orders, on the very first one, the General Order, I said that whereas in Jamaica they are hoping for a ratio of 10:1 by 1980 we have already achieved in our public service structure a ratio of 8:1 in 1976-77, and that the average throughout the Commonwealth Caribbean and in most of the industrialised societies, with the exception of the Scandinavian countries where there is not much difference in the wage levels, it is something like 15:1, and I gave an illustration of what I meant. That if a man at the bottom of the scale — their lowest worker, say a cleaner or someone like that, a completely unskilled and non-technical person — was getting \$200 a month, then you would expect somebody at the very top of the civil service to be getting more than \$1,600 a month, and you can go through this revision and reclassification and you will see that that is the principle which we have pursued, and what we have tried to do in this is by the increase, the greater percentage increase at the bottom of the scale, to narrow the gap between the people at the top and the people at the bottom.

We are all egalitarians. We believe in equality, but at the same time let us clearly understand that there will remain differences in income levels in any kind of society that you try to create, because people who have had to postpone the benefit of earning immediately in order to go through long periods of study and tutelage and that kind of thing, when they qualify, like medical people, they have to be compensated for the seven or eight years they did not earn anything at all. Far from earning they were dis-saving because their parents or the Government or somebody was spending money on their training. A person who leaves school right away and gets a job cannot expect to get the same salary as somebody who did not go straight to work but had to spend seven or eight years training, and this happens in every kind of

society, so I am not promising anybody that the cantonniers are going to get the same salaries as Parliamentary Secretaries or the same salary as the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Lands and Housing or in the Ministry of Communications and Works. That is a consummation that I do not think any of us devoutly seek or expect to be realised within our lifetime, because wherever you go, even in the command economies; as a matter of fact, my understanding is that in what they call the command economies, the totalitarian states, particularly in the Soviet Bloc, that the discrepancies between the people who are manual workers and the people who are technocrats are even greater than they are in the western democratic societies. That is, a very great differential is put on the ability of these people by way of fringe benefits, housing, salaries and so on, than the manual worker obtains.

We are giving national awards in industry this week, and we like to encourage people to work hard, but when people work hard they should be compensated. In the Soviet Union they had a man called Statenov, and he was supposed to be the greatest production worker, and he worked till he dropped dead, almost 16 hours a day, and do you know what they gave him as the greatest production worker? They gave him a medal no increased pay, they gave him a big medal and put up a statue in some square in Leningrad or somewhere like that where he was working, and the word "staccato" has now passed into the English language for somebody who works like a mule for no reward whatsoever. We expect that when people work in Barbados they will be rewarded, we do not want any staccanovites here, we give awards in industry for people who have worked well because we expect them to be compensated. We expect people to be paid for the work which they do, but we do not expect to pay them for work for which they are unwilling, unable and reluctant to do, but unfortunately we cannot discriminate on the basis of production in the public service. People get these increases regardless of whether they work diligently or not, so I want to get the whole thing in its proper perspective.

As far as the casual workers and the unestablished staff are concerned, the Barbados Government has succeeded in narrowing the gap between the people who are in the lower strata wage and salary wise and the people at the top. I think the differential is now something like 8:1. The second statement which I made positively is that the Jamaican Government issued a statement that they are working for a 10:1 differential by

1980. We have achieved 8:1 in 1976-77, with the overall average, from my inspection and from the inspection of other people working with me, moving from 15:1, and there are very few countries outside of the Scandinavian countries which have managed to achieve this kind of differential, because you will find that in the wealthy industrial societies there are some people who are super rich and they are working for big corporations and get salaries which are astronomical when compared with what the people in the lower echelons of Government manage to obtain.

I do not wish to prolong this debate unnecessarily, Sir, because I think that we will merely hear a repetition of arguments which we have heard before, but I should only like to say that in so far as the key scale, the unestablished, the non-established staff and the casual workers are concerned, one always has to remember this when comparing their wages and conditions of employment with those in the private sector, that they are entitled to certain benefits which people in the private sector are not entitled to. You know, things like sick leave and so on which are not the same in the private sector or in very few areas at the work place, and that they do have a certain amount of security of employment, and backed up in all of this of course we have the National Insurance Scheme. In so far as these increases are concerned, we will take immediate steps to make sure that the retiring benefits of those persons who are not any longer eligible, who joined after the amendment was made, not any longer eligible for casual workers pensions, that the maximum in the National Insurance entitlement will be moved up so that if it is \$100 a week now, and in the light of this revision a person retiring is entitled to full benefits would fall beyond that because we would move the maximum up to a suitable level whereby all the unestablished staff and casual workers will be covered.

1.30 p.m.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that, and reserve the right to speak at a later stage.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this has been a long debate in its many parts. These Orders were made, I believe, on June 11, and this is well nigh three weeks that they have been debated. At the very start of my speech, I would like to make it absolutely clear, for the benefit of those whose duty it is to report the proceedings of this House

to the public, that in no way can speeches in here delay the payment of these monies. The only way we can delay it is if we vote against the Order and annul the Order. The Order is already made and is already law. This is what I clearly understood...

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I read out the Civil Establishment Act. The money cannot be paid out until it is approved by this Chamber; therefore, if we go on debating this for another three months, it cannot be paid out until it is approved.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point made.

Mr. ADAMS: I challenge the Prime Minister to find anything in sections 1, 2, 7 — I beg his pardon, Sir. The subsection does not apply to any provisions where the provisions refer to qualifications. Although one may read out an Order and read out the word "provisional"; gloss over what the Interpretation Act says a provisional Order is in any case, let us make it quite clear that hon. members of all sides of the House are speaking in these debates, that the debates have gone on from week to week rather than from day to day like the Estimates, and that, if the Government felt that there was some danger that their time-table of payment would be interrupted, the Government would have conducted these Orders between a Tuesday and a Friday with continuous sittings of the House, or a Tuesday and a Monday, or as the case may be. We sat a Tuesday, a Wednesday, a Friday, and then adjourned for a subsequent occasion.

Now, we have heard another speech from the Prime Minister. He, perhaps, is the authority on repetition. He starts off by talking about officers and Training Schemes, and none of them are going to leave money in the Treasury. His speech was so garbled that it took me a long time to think about it. Why should anybody leave money in the Treasury? It is their salary. I have not heard of any public officer who said that he is opposed to pay rises. It is not like hon. members in here who vote against pay rises for Members of Parliament, some on principle relating to the necessity of a rise, others as to the means by which the raise was achieved. I have never heard any public officer say, if he does not get all the money, he is not going to take any. I cannot understand how the situation with Public Officers leaving their cheques in the Treasury could arise. This business of the Prime Minister being the Minister responsible for Training, and he is going to read and see which of the NUPW

officers take a Training Course — if they are entitled to take a Training Course, then they are entitled to take a Training Course.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I know already, but I said I would wait and see if anyone leaves the cheque in the Treasury, because they told their membership to reject the Government's offer. When you reject something, you do not accept it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point of clarification.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, this is relating to rejecting money left in the Treasury. I am looking forward to seeing the debate in here. The Prime Minister may or may not be in this Chamber when the debate comes off, but I am looking forward to seeing the debate, if Members of Parliament should ever have another raise of pay, and we will hear something then about rejecting money in the Treasury. It is my intention to see to it that, what I believe is called the "Cooke Island Clause" is put into any new Bill about raises of pay for Members of Parliament that all those who vote against it do not get the raise. I am looking forward to seeing that. Absence will not permit you to get it. You will have to vote positively for it. People will learn not even to leave the country when the pay-rise debates are coming on. All of these arguments about none of them are going to leave the money in the Treasury are not arguments worthy of a great debate on the personal emoluments of Public Officers.

Now, I made a point on the last occasion when this matter came before the House which, evidently, was so technical as to be beyond the mastery of the Reporters, and for that I have to plead guilty. I could see the Prime Minister's guilt more obviously upon that occasion than my own. I think that may have been an occasion of not seeing mote in either person's eye in its proper perspective when we then spoke. The point which was then being made related to the Government's ability to pay. I am not going to go into the percentages of expenditure, I am not going to go into projections, I am just going to make a very simple point. The Government pleads that it is unable to pay the increases. It pleads that it can only afford increases of less than 35%. I say that quite deliberately because the overall increase has to be less than 35%. In fact, the overall increase, if it is \$25 million is about 30%. It is in the region of 30% to 31%, and it is to be noted that the Prime Minister's figures have been challenged by the experts of the NUPW. They say it will not cost so much. On the basis that the overall increase is only going to be a 30% increase on

present emoluments, then present emoluments, Sir, according to my calculation, is \$87.6 million. This does not appear in the Estimates. For some reason or other those responsible for preparing the Estimates have ceased to publish total figures for personal emoluments. I never believe these things are by accident, Sir, but I do not believe that you can make any rule that members of the House cannot calculate them. I work out that total emoluments including the Port come to \$87 million, but the Public Service itself will come to rather less than that. The total emolument in the current financial year would be about \$86½ million. (*Asides.*)

Well, the Prime Minister is shaking his head and saying \$70 million. I would like to believe it is \$70 million, because \$70 million would greatly support my argument. If it is \$70 million, then the Prime Minister has a very bad case. I have gone to the trouble to add up the figures in the Estimates and I make it \$87 million.  
1.40 p.m.

I would be glad to accept his figures and argue with him on that basis because he has no case. If you are paying \$70 million, you should be able to give a 50% increase at least. (*Asides*)

Mr. SPEAKER: May I remind the Hon. Minister of Finance that he has the right of final reply? I want to hear the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. ADAMS: I know you want to hear the Leader of the Opposition, but if you say it too loudly, Sir, the sweets may not come home. If I commented on that exchange my comment would be that it is disgraceful that the Prime Minister who is introducing the Civil Establishment Orders does not know how much they amount to in the current financial year, because from his seat he says \$70 million and the Estimates make it \$87 million. You will have to doubt all his arithmetic and all his arguments if he is so mistaken as to what the figures are. I do not know that I would come into a debate to argue on percentages, figures and raises if I did not know the basic figure. I am sorry I told him; I should have left it at \$70 million and contradicted him in due course in the manner to which he has become accustomed during his years in Parliament. Anyhow it is about a 30% increase over-all. If it were \$70 million, the extra \$25 million as a matter of commonsense would be getting on to 40%. It is a 30% increase but the revenue has increased 51% since the last pay increase. It is a very simple concept.

In 1973/74 the estimated revenue was \$120.75 million; in 1976/77 the estimated revenue is \$182.48 million. It has gone from \$120 million to \$182 million which is a 50% increase in revenue, and it is out of revenue that you pay the public servants; so when the Government says that it cannot pay, what it is admitting is that despite a 50% increase in revenue it is unable to meet the pay bill for the public servants at a level no higher than a 30% increase, therefore in this area of 20% is where I say there is still room for negotiations. The Government has to explain why it is unable to pay. Never mind the simplistic arithmetic of the hon. member for St. Philip South who will tell you that materials have gone up also and so on. Everything has gone up and so has the Government's ability to pay for everything. That is the point. Now the estimated revenue of \$182 million will also, I think the Prime Minister will agree, be increased by virtue of the pay increases. It is not a flat cost to Government of \$25 million; it is a net cost to Government of perhaps \$18 million; that is only my guess. I do not believe it is really known except by subsequent observation what percentage of the increase the Government anticipates recovering by way of increased revenue, but it should be as low as \$18 million and it could be as high as \$20 million depending on the exact point in the salary scales at which people's tax liabilities occur, but this has never been explained by the Government how their ability to pay has been so badly impaired despite the increase in revenue since the last pay increase.

There is another point I want to make. The Prime Minister has given a lot of figures about increased Government expenditure. This is of course election year and you must anticipate a high increase in Government expenditure no matter what the Government's financial position. I read that Senator Moe in another Chamber has adopted wholesale, lock, stock and barrel the Labour Party's plans on legal aid. I see a Reporter has given the greatest publicity to Senator Moe's statement on legal aid. I just want the public to understand that election time is not far away. Senator Moe's statements on legal aid have no more or less validity; all they can be is expressions of pious hope as those of the Opposition. The Senator has accepted in virtually the same terms the proposals which I put forward in 1972 and have repeated in every Estimates since. He has used the same language that appeared in the 1966 Election Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party about giving legal aid to assist in affiliation cases and in family matters; a policy ten years ago of the Barbados Labour Party is adopted in every particular, but of course

Senator Moe perhaps commands the political confidence of the Reporter in question and the Reporter in question does not find it possible to give a subjective analysis upon the basis of arguments long on record when he presumably was still at school and wet behind the ears, but we see large headlines in the Advocate. I am glad they are publicising our policy, but they will cost money and presumably impair the Government's ability to pay or restrict the Government's ability to pay greater increases than these.

These are the things we have to look at, and the Prime Minister has said we have old age pensions, you have the bus fare subsidy for one year until January if this Government remains in power. I heard a Minister on the other side asking if we are going to put it up to one dollar. Do you mean you are conceding already?

Mr. SPEAKER: I have no intention of putting up anything.

Mr. ADAMS: You would not be in it. We have heard that all these are going to amount to increases of \$50 million. The Prime Minister is speculating on that. I am saying that all this talk about the Government cannot pay, all this talk about \$50 million having to be raised in revenue, all this talk that the Government is justified in rejecting the arguments of virtually every workers' organisation in this country can be satisfied in the minds of the public and of this Honourable House only by letting us have a full and frank exposure of the Government's financial position and what means the Government intends to use to find the \$50 million which the Prime Minister tells us is the present gap in current revenue. In other words, I am saying that before there is any dissolution of the House there must be a budget, and I am making a call here and now for a budget to be presented in this Parliament as is customary. There has been no budget since 1974 when there was a supplementary budget in November. We have gone all through 1975, half-way through 1976 and indeed into the last three months of the five years since the last election. We have not had the accounts; we have not had an economic survey. We only have to take it on guess what the gross domestic figures are, and I make no apology for joining the queue.

1.50 p.m.

Unless we have an economic survey, a budget, we cannot go and stand up as men and face them in a general election. Of course the blame would not fall on me, except by the yard fowls of the Democratic Labour Party so industriously engaged in writing letters under

pseudonyms to the Advocate week after week. It will not fall on the members of the Opposition; but I would say that we are all guilty when an example like this is set.

We are guilty because it is on all politicians that the opprobriums of the actions of a few ultimately reflect. When you read ELC (Jimmy Cozier) coming out in his true colours as he does every election year — he admitted to me night before last “Yes, I am a high conservative, yet I prefer the devil I know to the devils I do not know.” Let him deal with his own devils. As far as I am concerned, we are all devils to him, but his devils are on that side. When he speaks of all politicians being the same and by implication wicked, it is the DLP’s devils rather than the BLP’s devils, and he is reflecting exactly what I am saying that when one politician is disgraced all are disgraced.

When one aspirant who is a doctor gets up on a platform and talks about his patients health, the parentage of members on the other side, their sexual behaviour, the relations of members on the other side and discusses the sexual deviations of members on the other side, my goodness, he cannot even look over his own shoulder. He discusses which and which drunken man he gave more liquor to in Baxters Road and what he said to him, during their wining and dining — he with ginger ale, I am sure, and the drunken man with a little rum in his — what he does is that he disgraces everybody in here as well as the medical profession.

Mr. SPEAKER: I was looking to see if there was anything about doctors in here.

Mr. ADAMS: I am sure that among the casual workers you will find people whose health necessitates attendance at Enmore. Employees in hospitals and these key scale workers, when they hear a doctor get up on a platform and say that he gives drinks to a drunken man for political purposes they might feel that the doctors are over paid and that they are under paid. They may very well feel that they should be telling the people who go into the hospital that if that man was talking about the Prime Minister or any other hon. member he would talk about anybody, so do not go to him. When you have these disgraceful scenes, it reflects on everybody.

I am therefore asking the Prime Minister in his position as head of his party to let his final act of stewardship be to bring down an economic survey for 1975 and bring a budget and let the country know how we stand. We are calling for that. I do not believe that the dissolution will be long delayed, but you will know, Sir, that this is

only a matter of joy in the hearts of the Opposition. It should be a matter of joy in the hearts of all of us; but let us see to it that this is the last act dealing with public expenditure, the last act of responsibility on the part of the Prime Minister by bringing a budget to Parliament.

For some time, as you know, I have dealt with departments under the Prime Minister and the responsibilities which are departmental rather than political. For example, the duty of the Accountant General to report to this House every month on the state of the accounts. I believe that the last time when I suggested that the Accountant General should be sent home if he could not find his way to obey the law which says that you should be no more than one month in arrears in reporting to the House of Assembly, and he was 22 months, he has kept the wolf from the door and since that time he has brought, I believe, the accounts to the stage where I think that they are only four, five or six months in arrears.

However, Sir, I notice that we would not have had in our hands during this debate the accounts for the month of May, 1976 so that we could know the Government’s revenue for the first five months of this year and to be able to see the truth when we hear arguments that the Government is unable, because of a shortfall in revenue of \$X million. That is all we have to go on is the Central Bank’s statement that it was a \$22 million surplus in December and the Prime Minister’s statement that there will be a \$50 million deficit when these wages are paid out.

There are two parameters — I think that is the favourite word nowadays — within which we can operate at the present time, and the Accountant General continues in his breach of his duties in hamstringing hon. members in a debate like this. I do not know what powers we have. Perhaps we will have a chance to propose to the next Speaker that the Speaker should have power to summon Civil Servants who are in breach of their duties to report to Parliament — to summon them as a matter of privilege of Parliament and to punish them for contempt if they do not carry out their statutory duties to the satisfaction of hon. members.

Now these figures were mentioned. The Prime Minister’s \$50 million one way and the Central Bank’s \$22 million the other way. I want to caution hon. members. I do not want to become too contentious, but I must give a caution not to accept at face value the statements

which have been made in this debate today that the Prime Minister had to go to Governor Savage to tell him that he was leaving the Labour Party because they would not agree to pay the workers enough.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. I have never said that I went to Governor Savage. Governor Savage did not appoint me. I do not go to anybody. I do not recognise their authority or jurisdiction over me. The people who elected me have jurisdiction over me.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point well made.

Mr. ADAMS: In those days he did not go to the Governor he used to go to E. K. Walcott, I believe at the Rock. I am hearing for the first time today — I am a keen student of the recent history of Barbados. I have read Dr. Cheltenham's great and powerful thesis for which he got his Doctorate of Philosophy on politics in Barbados. I have read the pathetic words — I have them here in my briefcase — of Mr. C. L. R. James in 1960 when he said that incredible as it may appear, members of the Democratic Labour Party were taking tutelage from the high conservatives, including Mr. E. K. Walcott, and that at the next election will be making common cause with them, words which were utterly rejected by those who were then in charge of the Barbados Labour Party — to their misfortune.

I have read all of the minutes of the meetings of the Barbados Labour Party's Parliamentary Committee which was attended by the now Minister of Finance. I have read them carefully and nowhere in any of them do I recall the now Prime Minister saying that it was one of the bones of contention with the Barbados Labour Party which had caused him to leave that Party was that the key scale workers were not given an increase. I would have accepted those words from the hon. member for St. Michael West. I would believe that if this had ever happened, that the member for St. Michael West would have raised it on the floor of the House, or indeed I believe that when on many occasions he and I have spoken about events of 20 to 25 years ago, that I would have had some clue about it.

2 p.m.

I just cannot accept that this is a valid argument, but it has as much in it as Mr. Belfield Searles' words which were not spoken in the debate on Sharkville in 1960. There is as much in that aspect of the Prime Minister's argument as there was in what he said about Mr. Belfield Searles.

Now, Sir, you have to have your own standards, you know. You cannot be running behind people all the time to say 'we are better than they or we are worse than they.' In Jamaica, it is well known that there is a wider gap between rich and poor than there is in Barbados. There are people in Barbados who I believe are currently engaged in making an analysis of it. There are people who say that the Jamaican gross domestic product appears very large because Jamaica has an extracted industry, foreign owned, whose profits and earnings are divided through by the Jamaican population and therefore go to swell the appearance of the standard of life in Jamaica; but that if you analyse net disposable incomes in Jamaica you will get a figure which is not much greater than that of Barbados and is worse distributed.

These are things about the Barbados economy which were true when the Barbados Labour Party was in power and which are true now. These are not things that have come lately. Ten to one ratio and an eight to one ratio are things which the Prime Minister has taken counsel on during the last week but they are not things that have only happened in the last week. These are things that have been in existence for twenty years. Barbados indeed has been notorious in a good sense for the fact that the spread of income has never been as exaggerating in this country as it has been in many underdeveloped countries, and indeed it has always approached the conditions of Scandinavian countries. It cannot be said for one moment that the approach, for example, is real when Cabinet Ministers get \$400 a month. (ASIDE) Six hundred dollars a month. That cannot be said for one moment.

You could make a selection, for example, of wages in many Eastern European countries and Communist countries where, as I have said, coal miners get better pay than doctors but none of them get very much. I do not know whether the Prime Minister also has these figures, but it happens. The managerial class in Russia probably does have a greater spray compared to its workers than the managerial class even in Barbados. All of these things are no arguments against giving the public servants money. The fact that you are not giving Permanent Secretaries very much more money is no argument against giving a watchman money. These are the points. The fact that the Permanent Secretaries are fewer, that there is no competition for their positions, that they have less pull because they do not want to be too much in the National Union of Public Workers, they feel that they are above being dictated to by persons below them in the scale of Government, those facts — because you can take advantage of

twenty people or thirty people, that does not lead to the conclusion that you are not taking advantage of 10,000. You are taking advantage of all.

What you have to look at is that 12% of a salary of \$1,500 a month is \$180 a month, where 35% of a salary of \$45 a week is only \$60 a month, but the man earning the \$1,500 a month and the man earning the \$45 a week, they still have the same stomachs, and the same number of children to send to school, and they still have the same basic necessities of life; so when you give a man in the top scale an increase which is enough to cover for him all the increases in basic items that make up the retail price index, you are putting forward no argument when you say that he is getting a lesser percentage increase than the people at the bottom. When he gets \$180 a month more he is able perhaps to feed himself as a single person out of the \$180 a month but the 35% increases at the bottom of the scale cannot feed anybody. You also have to look at the base to which the percentage is being applied; and the Permanent Secretaries are getting enough to maintain them comfortably as far as the Items embraced in the retail price index are concerned, with the rise in that index. All they may be losing is an opportunity to travel, or whatever the case may be. Just like lawyers; lawyers are suffering these days. (ASIDE) And the doctors.

Sir, it is being intimated to me that at this stage I should move that further consideration be postponed and that the Sitting be suspended for the luncheon break.

Sir, at this stage I beg to move that this sitting be suspended for one hour.

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

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

*On Resumption:-*

Mr. SPEAKER: The Sitting is resumed. When the sitting was suspended the Leader of the Opposition was addressing the Chair. If he so desires he may resume.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I will not be long in winding up. Sufficient to say it has been a long debate in which many points have been made by hon. members on all sides, but I would urge once again on hon. members that the argument of lack of ability to pay rings somewhat hollow. The Government's revenue has

gone up by more than half, we have not had a budget since November, 1974 to know the true financial position of the Government of Barbados and this island of ours, and the Government must justify the statement that it is unable to pay by producing a budget at the earliest opportunity. It is not enough merely for the Prime Minister to say "I say we cannot pay." Unless facts and figures are produced hon. members must be pardoned if they treat the statement with the same caution and indeed the same disbelief that we have been forced to treat so many of these statements in recent months and recent years in Parliament.

The figures are there for all to see the substantial rise in revenue over this period, that is, the period of financial stringency for all in Barbados, for consumers and taxpayers alike. It therefore behoves the Government to give some indication of the true state of the country's finances and give some guide as to whether the Treasury is really empty as the Minister of Finance says. It is when he says that the public servants cannot expect to receive more than these relatively small increases which we are now offering to the casual workers.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, when the Prime Minister introduced this Resolution he made a broad statement about the people waiting for the money. I do not have any apologies to make about this matter, because in so far as the Civil Establishment Order is concerned this method of financing money increases was the subject of a very long debate when the Civil Establishment enactment was introduced in this Assembly, and it caused a very long and bitter debate when the late hon. member for the City of Bridgetown, the late Hon. A. E. S. Lewis, indicated what is today now a fact, that we were in fact dealing with a money resolution, and we had a long drawn out argument with the then Leader of the House who was the father of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, and he was opposed to the idea of treating a money Bill in the same form as you would treat an abstract resolution. For that reason you are treating a money resolution in this form as if it is an abstract resolution, when in truth and in fact you heard the Prime Minister say you can pay out the money. It is not an abstract resolution, it is a money resolution, but you are dealing with a money resolution in the House and therefore you can only speak on it when you are in the Chair, Mr. Speaker, and you are going to speak on it once.

That is in so far as the parliamentary aspect of it is concerned. The substance of this matter is such that unfortunately I cannot deal with it in

the same manner as the Leader of the Opposition, because I am more concerned about the industrial character of this matter than the political character of this matter, and the Hon. Prime Minister said that because it is at election time this is the position. I would like to make it clear that these matters so far as some of us are concerned have nothing to do with the election. In 1973 when the last revision of salaries was made there was no election, so it was not a question that you were awaiting the election to ask about this, there was no election in 1973. What I would say today is that the accident between 1973 and 1976 finds you in an election with this, that since 1973 there has been an unprecedented rise in the cost of living unmatched by anything that has happened in Barbados in that three year period for whatever the reasons were, but this is something you have to make redress, unfortunately. Some of us have to pay attention to these matters, and let us examine what you are talking about.

You are not talking about any people who go in to draw any money from the Public Treasury and get in any aeroplanes, you are talking about a person now who is in receipt of \$46 a week at the bottom, and there is no point in telling me a person who is working for \$46 a week is not in need of the money, he is in need of the money, but we are saying that he is in need of more money than you are prepared to pay now or to offer, and I am not going to be caught in any stupid rambling argument, because you are not going to give it now, you are going to delay somebody. There are too many people who write and talk in this country about incomes and things of this sort and know nothing about what they are talking. Nor am I going to talk about that point the Leader of the Opposition talked about, the revenue balances. The revenue balances have absolutely nothing to do with this argument, bringing in revenue balances now is drawing a red herring across the trail. These people you are talking about you cannot talk about any revenue balances now, so I am not going to be caught in any talk about revenue balances. What you have to examine is to look at these people point by point.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, I am not in any way quarrelling with the hon. member's argument, Sir, I did not talk about revenue balances, I spoke about the revenue, not about the balances. The Prime Minister spoke at a different stage about the liquid balances and a lot of untrue statements about \$12 million and so on, but I have not spoken about the balances, I just spoke about revenue full stop.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point made.

Mr. WALCOTT: I want to be very clear in these matters. I am not going to be caught up in the argument because I do not get this cross talk. Whether the revenue had risen 50%, 1%, 2%, I am not going to be caught in that argument that the percentage of the rise in the revenue is going to be a criterion on which you are going to base an increase, because you cannot and you will not get as increase in public expenditure on wages and salaries based on the question of the amount of the revenue or the expenditure.

As I said before, the public servants are part of the society in which they live. You cannot isolate the public servants from the society in which they live, you cannot put them on the outside or on the periphery and have somebody else in the centre. That is why I say you cannot negotiate in Parliament; Parliament is a body for ratification and not a body for negotiation. When you examine the people in the various categories and you know what you are dealing with, we are passing a Resolution here and the Resolution relates to the Order that applies to the Unestablished Staff, that applies to people in Category I, and when I read this Resolution it said it is to give effect to the decision of the Government arising out of negotiations with the workers' representatives regarding revised wages for the unestablished and casual employees of the Government. The additional cost of the revised wage is estimated to be \$5.45 million in the year 1976-77 and \$7.3 million in the year 1977-78. We are dealing now with people from Category I, Category II, Category III, Category IV until you get to Category XIII. An analysis of what we are dealing with.

3.25 p.m.

A person in Category I, who is a maid, a janitor, a porter, or a washer — these are people, and I am going to relate them so that the House will understand what is happening. The people in Category I now receive a salary of \$46.00 a week. The people in Category II receive \$54.00 a week. The people in Category III receive \$56.00 a week. The people in Category IV receive \$61.00 a week. The people in Category V receive \$66.00 a week. The people in Category VI receive \$70.00 a week. Let us analyse that. These are the people who represent the bulk of the people we are talking about. When you look at \$60.00 a week and you see that the highest rate now being paid is \$105.00 a week for one or two persons. One of these persons is working at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. The wages are \$70.00 or \$75.00 a week.

Now, do not let us mix up this matter with any Permanent Secretary. Do not let us mix up this with any Parliamentary Secretary. Do not let us mix up this with any Minister. It would be an unpardonable sin on my behalf to agree to these proposals as against what we have submitted to the Government. I can clearly show that they are not as good as what exist in this community already. It must be noted that these will be the salaries until 1978. You cannot tell me about the people waiting for the money. We submitted proposals since December, and we said that we wanted them from 1st April, 1976. When you examine what you are paying out and to the number of people to whom it is being paid, you will have to ask yourself what happens to the man in Category V or in Category VI.

Mr. Speaker, Category V is the army of Lorry Drivers, Artisans, Electrical Assistants, Head Groundsman, and so on. Category VI is the Meter Repairer, Auto Electrician, Coxwain Driver, Leading Seamen, Engine Driver, Electrical Assistant, Mechanic, Fitter, Welder, Artisan, Gang Foreman, and so on. Our proposal on behalf of these people was that what you now propose in 1976 — we wanted \$95.00, but we accepted what was being offered. We had figures of \$89.00 and they offered \$89.20, \$83.20, \$83.60, \$76.00, \$68.00, but we made no problems about odd cents. We accepted it in the first year as a compromise, but in the second year this is our position. When you look at the same man, who is a Lorry Driver in Category V, we say that \$105.00 a week as against your \$98.00 is not enough. There are Drivers who are getting more than \$98.00 a week now. This man will have to wait until 1977 to get that wage, and he will have to remain there until 1978.

There is no point in talking about people in the economy. When I hear people talking about income, wages and prices, I say that they do not know what they are talking about. In Barbados we do not have any restrictions on any person investing money and getting any income. Mr. Speaker, if you buy 10 houses, or if you own 10 pieces of land, there is no restriction and you can become a millionaire in a year from the income you receive. Those of us who hold strong views about money and the relationship of money will know that you cannot single out the lower section of the community for a restrictive position so far as income is concerned, and say you have an income policy. You cannot have an income policy, when you tell me that my salary is restricted.

My efforts surpasses many of the people in this country. I hear some of them are making

\$80,000, \$90,000, and \$100,000 a year. For doing what? For disguising their incomes. Some of them are living above their means and not paying income tax. They can disguise things for income tax purposes, and there is no means of restricting their income. How are you going to tell me that you have an income policy where no incomes are being restricted. The investment door is wide open, and what do you find? Unearned money can gain more than earned money, and you are making no distinction. You have to make a distinction in a community like this between the earned and the unearned.

How can I go out and face anybody tomorrow? The employers of this country would like to be able to find that the trade union movement would underwrite a wage claim. The rent for Government houses went up by 40% since the last revision was made. Examine the rent that you can get in Bridgetown or anywhere in Barbados. In St. Michael more houses are rented than anywhere else. What kind of house do you expect a man working for \$80.00 a week to live in? What do you expect will be the rent? It cannot be less than \$15.00 or \$20.00. How much must he spend on food? Should rent supersede food? Without taking into consideration children, and you cannot see a community rotating without a fresh generation coming into the community. I am not making any provision for children. I am not making or putting up any hypothetical case. How can you expect any of us, who carry out agreements from day to day to find that you have an increase in wages and a wage-index movement that is superior to what the Government is offering to these people at the lowest sector, to accept this?

When we go out into the wider areas of town, we find that the Government is the biggest single employer, but the Government is not the only employer. Collectively, there are more people employed in Barbados than what the Government employ. We must get that clear in our heads. The labour force in Barbados is bigger than the Government's total labour force. Sometimes when we are talking about wages with the Government, some people believe that the Government labour force is the biggest labour force in Barbados, but it is not. It is the biggest single employer. The Government is the biggest employer any part of the world because there is only one Government. You must not believe that because you are the biggest employer in the world, you are paying out the biggest wage in the world.

3.35 p.m.

If you run your services you have to pay for them because the people have to pay you for them. My examination of these proposals. Mr. Speaker, is that the Government was given reasonable proposition, and I will say that the people in the lower sectors should by any method — not by the method of how much money you have — should be paid.

*Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair. Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.*

The amount of money you have has to be budgeted for at all times, and if you are spending \$12 million this has to be a matter of policy. What do you consider you are going to spend on people who represent the greatest industrial labour force in the sector of Government? I heard the Prime Minister speak of people getting on aeroplanes, but I have said here that even if I were looking for a vote I would not be afraid to say it to the Civil Servants that this is ten years of independence and there is absolutely no justification for any developing country to follow a colonial system that existed thirty or forty years ago where public servants are given leave passage on the basis of leaving their homes to go to the United Kingdom or anywhere else on any guise as a condition of employment. It is nonsense; it is a colonial service gimmick. It is something that the expatriate servants place on our people because they were coming here, and therefore as a matter of parity the ones here accepted and followed it, and after 10 years I would say that you cannot ask these people who are now working for \$50 and \$60 a week, and this is what you are asking them, to underwrite. You are asking them to underwrite a condition of employment in the service that you cannot give them, a condition that they are not entitled to, and you are asking them to underwrite within a system something that is alien to their country and something where they cannot get a holiday with pay to go to Bathsheba. They would have to get on a bus and pay. You give those who are better off and with better salaries a passage to the United Kingdom, and these are the same people who by the condition of their service get more opportunities.

There is not a permanent secretary in Barbados, and I make a categorical statement who has not travelled out of Barbados on behalf of the Government at least twice per annum by the very nature of his employment. He gets an opportunity to go out, so you do not need to write that in. Would it not be outrageous to write into a contract of the Barbados Workers' Union as a condition of employment that they would have to give me leave passage? I have not had a

holiday in 13 years. When I leave the country and go away on behalf of my organisation, I have not gone on holiday and I have to come back home. It is therefore a question of responsibility.

I feel, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we are shying away from a base that is very essential to our basic foundation. In a community like ours, I do not see how any of us can look through this Civil Establishment Order and believe that when we pass these salaries we are not underwriting unfair and unreasonable wages, wages that the private sector would like to exploit. I hear in going around and even from the other side that workers would have a very difficult time in future. If you have a glaring situation like this where the 35% in the first is what the cost of living happens to be — we proposed that and the 60% which is 25% over that represents an additional amount in the second year to buttress it — and the Government could not agree to that, it is not any question now of how much you have in the budget, it is a question that you regard this as too much. Look at the wages; look at what you are asking for a carpenter.

I want to deal with these skills. Too much talk is being made nowadays that when you give a man a job you make a gift to the man, but he has no input to put into the enterprise. I have heard a lot of talk about a small businessman. I am not against any small businessman, but what do you mean by a small businessman? What is the demarcation of a small businessman? Is a small businessman a man who is going to earn an income of over \$50,000 a year and in the same community where \$50,000 is regarded as a norm you find it very tedious to give a man a \$100 a week for a skill? How can you justify this paradoxical position where a small businessman can earn \$50,000 a year but a small working man cannot earn \$100 a week? Something is wrong with our thinking and our approach. It does not matter how long we went to school or which school you went to. What is important is that he is offering a skill, he is offering something to industry, he has an input.

Some months ago I heard some nonsense being spoken about bus drivers getting \$100 a week. You heard this blatant ignorance that a bus driver was getting more than a boy or girl who had three or four or five or six "O" levels. I did not believe I could live to hear that sort of thing coming from the lips of people in Barbados making the odious comparison between someone who has reached the end of his working life in a fixed employment category where there is no promotional grade and a boy or girl who at the beginning of his career would be working for a

salary where at the end of his career he could be the owner of a bus company. We are so snobbish in our outlook that we believe that the only criterion for working for a decent wage is to tell a person the school you went to and how many "O" levels you have. I will never be able to support that. We will never be able to condone that or to join with anybody who believes that the criterion for paying wages is to tell him where you went to school rather than the skills you have to put into the industry, the labour you have to do, the dedication you have, and the poor man must sweat and bleed because he is no more than a beast of burden and he must perpetually live in a world of inferiority.

3.45 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is things like these that make me feel that 30 years of public life have been wasted when you come to more or less the evening of your days and find that the new generation that has risen up is infinitely more or just as difficult as the generation that you had to meet. When I came in here 30 years ago I had to meet this sort of thing. A rock fell down on a house in St. Thomas and the lawyers gave all the legal trappings that you could not order anybody to do anything for the woman, because their social consciences had not been pricked at the time and they said that it was an act of God.

Today what do I hear? That a man or woman who is now working for \$60 a week — and we had to be pleading as if to open up Fort Knox that you have to bring this economic argument to give them something that they could live on, otherwise they would have to eke a life of misery, and therefore you have dilapidated housing and you have bad social conditions which will go on and multiply because you do not intend to increase and produce a wage earning class with high purchasing power.

The purchasing power of the worker, it is said, has been reduced since the oil crisis, and if the purchasing power has been reduced, you have to bend over backward to give them a higher purchasing power. You cannot ask them to tighten their belts. When you talk about a wage freeze where will you start the wage freeze from? There was a clown I listened to on one occasion. I am waiting until he comes forward in the next election. He wanted his party to freeze wages at \$50 a week. Some of them now want political honours, but they wanted a wage freeze. When the showdown comes, which side will you be on.

I do not make any bones about it. As far as this is concerned we have made our position crystal clear. These were negotiations that have been going on for months. I will never vote for wages like these or I will have to resign from the Barbados Workers Union tomorrow. We signed 76 agreements last year. When our character is being smeared by talking about selling out, we know how to negotiate. I am saying that we are not going to be caught in any trap in asking for something that you cannot justify. We can justify what we are asking for. We know that what we asked for was reasonable. We know that the Government could pay these wages in the first year and in 1977 without doing any harm at all to this country.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let the hon. member wind up.

Mr. WALCOTT: Yes. I was saying that \$2 million more to these workers would make no big difference. The Government wastes more than \$2 million annually. I am going to make a prediction. At the end of this year the Government is going to finish with capital work not completed, with an amount of money not spent exceeding the amount that could have been paid to these people.

So the question is what you want to do. I am aware of that. I cannot support a wage decision that leaves the worker — leaves the carpenter, leaves the fitter and all those basic industrial workers in a position which you will call a wage freeze.

I know some misfits in this community drawing \$50,000 or \$70,000 a year and living at the well's head and they want cheap labour to underwrite this thing. I do not subscribe to that. Some of them want to set up too many little businesses at the expense of the workers. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am in favour of more employment, but I am not in favour of cheap exploitation. These rates could have been paid to the workers without any injury to the Government whatsoever, but they would have brought a lot of solace and a little cheer into the lives of those whose sole income goes into consumption. All that they can do is to turn back their income into the community in which they work and live.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is my first opportunity to speak on these Resolutions, but what worries me considerably

are the statements made by the Hon. Prime Minister on numerous occasions which now bear directly upon these negotiations. For the past years we have heard the Prime Minister say how buoyant the economy was. He has called Civil Servants an army of occupation, and now at this stage I understand that he is saying that there is no money in the Treasury to pay the wages; but this cuts directly across the Prime Minister's own statement a few months ago when a Bill was passed in this very Chamber, and when the Prime Minister said that the object of the Bill would be to make it possible for persons to move from private enterprise into Government and vice versa, and bringing with them the necessary skills and expertise.

Now there is no man in this country within his proper senses who this week or this month will decide to leave private enterprise to go into Government; but there are now many people who will seek to leave the Government service to go to private enterprise.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: We are dealing with casual employees.

Mr. BOLDEN: There will be casual employees, technical employees and everybody who is employed by the Government. Do you really think that the people who work for the Ministry of Communications and Works will stay in Government when they could go to plantations or drive buses and get \$150 a week? It is the Prime Minister's own argument that the basis of the whole legislation was to move personnel from private to public enterprise and vice versa. That has been destroyed by the method of legislating for the salaries of Government employees, including casual workers.

Two weeks ago in this very Chamber when I challenged the ex Minister of Communications and Works about money which was not spent under Highways and Transport, he said that when he went to the Ministry he found money there that had not yet been spent. Now, the last speaker has confirmed that at the end of the Government's financial year there will be money remaining in the vote which has not been spent.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. I want to get the record straight. I could not be confirming something that has not yet taken place. I was making a prophesy.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it all boils down to the same thing, that Government will have some money which has been voted, which could have been spent and has not been

spent, and therefore workers are entitled to more money. I agree with the hon. member on this. When the hon. member says that the workers' purchasing power has been decreased since the oil crisis, I go one step further. The oil crisis came first, and from then on the purchasing power had been decreasing; but then the 5 percent sales tax aggravated further the situation because for every dollar the worker spent he spent \$1.05.

3.55 p.m.

So his purchasing power has been further decreased by the example which I have just quoted. Therefore you cannot take the casual worker in Government and say that he has a different standard of living or he purchases his groceries at a different shop with different prices from the person who works in private enterprise who would be in the same category. Therefore you cannot differentiate between the two. Government cannot hope to get efficiency when they do a thing like this because we must realise that every human being out there will be thinking. He will say my compatriot who works in private enterprise is getting X salary per day and doing a similar job, but because I work for Government I am getting X minus ten therefore I must not produce as much as my counterpart in private enterprise. Then you hear the Prime Minister talking about an army of occupation; and the Prime Minister himself came into this Chamber and said last time that he was giving them the raises because he expected more work from them. But I will tell you something. The present situation is that you will get less work. The workers will be dissatisfied; they will not produce and as he himself has said, it is very difficult to get rid of one of these workers, for what you will find is that your total expenditure will increase, your production will decrease and in the long run the country generally will suffer from bad administration, and a bad application of a policy which will create this situation among the people in this country.

As it stands now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, many of us wonder how a worker in Government will react. A back-pay now will be something beautiful but backpay will only last for a week or two.

You yourself know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the last backpay paid in the sugar industry, overnight it disappeared because the workers had created such debt that all they could have done was to pay off what they owed and they had nothing left to show an enjoyment of the backpay, and this is what will happen now.

Discontent will step in the week after any money is paid.

Now I think that the situation adopted by Government is a very bad one indeed. You cannot at one stage say you believe in free negotiations between registered trade unions and employers, and when it comes to yourselves you say that you will legislate. We on this side have always complained about Government treating itself different from any other employer in this country. A typical example, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the Severance Pay Act. You passed the Severance Pay Act but you exclude Government from the provisions of that Act, and in these modern days when Government treats itself as any other employer, this Government has consistently excluded itself from the provisions of all Acts passed in this Parliament.

The casual employees are in this position that even if they are dismissed tomorrow they cannot get severance pay irrespective of the cause for dismissal. Now I had a staggering example over the week-end. A man who worked in Government and then went to Parks and Beaches who went away on holiday, came back to find a letter dismissing him while on holiday, but he cannot apply for severance pay. The Government must not exclude itself from the provisions that govern any other employer. Government is an employer and it has its category of workers as a private employer outside has got its own category of workers. And this is where the union – and I challenge the General Secretary of the Union – this is a fundamental issue and he should take the issue with his own party. The General Secretary is always coming in here talking about ILO conventions. If his party does something like this he should be bold enough to tell his party 'we now part company, you go your way, I go mine.' because this is something fundamental. This is not a temporary stage. This is something that will last through 1976–77, 1977–78.

Workers throughout the country will be affected by this, and when you hear the members of the Opposition saying that employers in Bridgetown, particularly these foreign employers, talk about cheap labour in Barbados, you have got the basic ground work laid by Government because Government has legislated, not negotiated – Government has legislated certain wage rates which it says is appropriate for workers in this country. Therefore when a foreign employer comes to Barbados and he says 'I pay this as a salary' he has an example at which to look by saying 'the Government of Barbados has legislated

these as appropriate salaries in this year, what more do you want me to pay?' That is the situation that you have got to watch, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The Government cannot now say that it is not the proponent of cheap labour in Barbados because they have legislated for it.

'When we complain of the sweat shops and you talk about industry in Barbados, if this is the way the Government hopes to increase its industrial workers in this country, well therefore we know all of them will be working for substandard wages, and there is nobody who can complain about it now.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am sorry for those people out there. I know as well as the world that many of them have got debts so high that the slight increase given them will not alleviate the situation. I know of examples of people coming into court; they got credit from two or three places, and you know what they tell you? 'Well, Sir, I am getting \$50 a week, I have a wife, four little children and I cannot manage more than so and so'. But you can't be hard on them. They want the simple amenities of life as anybody else; they want a little radiogram, they want a little fridge in their house, and they want a nice bed. They have to take them on credit; but because they are Government workers it does not mean that any store in Bridgetown is going to reduce the price to them. The prices will be the same to the Government workers as it is to the worker employed in private enterprise. But one thing we can say is that the Government of today has set a standard of wages for persons in this category because the casual workers in Government are equivalent to the workers who work on the various industrial estates like Grazettes, the Harbour, Wildeys, and any employer now I am sure, these employers will employ the trick that ISL employed when they were at Seawell. Terminate the employment of half the employees one day, laid them off, and said, go home for two weeks, there is no business, and bring them back as trainees, give them a trainee's salary and start them back at a salary equivalent to what Government is legislating for today; and I tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that you will find this happening – last December there was one employer down at the Harbour who terminated the employment of all the employees at the 15th December.

4.05 p.m.

He said if they want back the jobs they could apply when he opened in January again, and half started back as new employees. As a new employee you have to take the wage he offers because work is very scarce in Barbados,

and you will find they will get a wage rate...(Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: And very casual).... and very casual. I agree with you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, work is very scarce and very casual and therefore the new system of employment in Barbados will be the one created by the Government of the day, that is, a wage rate which the Government says is appropriate for you today despite the cost of living, and that will run throughout all the industries in Barbados.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am glad to state that I too will be voting against this Resolution. I should like to deal specifically with some of the points made by the Prime Minister today in introducing the Resolution. Some of them were made in a mood which at the beginning struck one as being slightly aggressive, no apologies whatsoever given, but almost a view of his powers under the Civil Establishment Act and no doubt so far as the unchallenged Leader of his Party, but it is an attitude that I regret very much which has been creeping into the political life of the country, or to be more correct, which has crept into the political life of the country for some time now, that is, that once one person says so it is so, and I can only interpret the Prime Minister's opening remarks in that light.

He said that all that was necessary for him to do was to bring the Order here, that he signed the Order since 11th June, 1976 and this House is holding up the civil servants getting their pay. I think the Prime Minister must be told he has the wrong concept of his power. Parliament has allowed him as Minister of Finance, subject to Parliament's approval, to make a provisional Order and Parliament must have intended at that time that that Order would be debated in this Chamber, and it is a wrong attitude for him to adopt, if he means it seriously, to give the impression that a debate in Parliament on as important a thing as the level of wages of the workers in Barbados, particularly the less well off workers, can be pushed aside and referred to in the frivolous manner in which he did. It is open to this House to vote against this Resolution, but we have seen the attitude taken by the majority of members on the Government side that the Government is right regardless of whether it is wrong or right in terms of social justice, and I am afraid that political lines are so drawn in the country that you cannot expect members of the Democratic Labour Party, except people who are strongly based in unionism long before I was born to adopt any other attitude than to vote with the Government on this measure.

Even although the Minister may feel that he has the majority of his party members with him, he must understand that it is no argument in this House to bring the resolution before the House on the basis that "I have signed the Order since June 11, 1976, you can talk as long as you like, I say so and it is the law of the country." That is an attitude that I have seen the Prime Minister develop more and more particularly since he won 18 seats in this country, and I am appealing to the people in Barbados to watch their politicians very carefully and for Heaven's sake do not put too much power in any of their hands by numbers or otherwise, because you have occasionally to cut down people to size, so he understands that he is no bigger than the working class in Barbados. That is what he must understand, and to come in here with the attitude that he has signed the Order and therefore we are wasting time by debating it is a wrong attitude, and a person who has come up as he has in a prior socialist tradition should know much better than that. I am surprised at his attitude on that point as an opening of the debate for the money. He said we are prolonging the debate and that therefore he was looking forward to the officers drawing their money and going on extended training courses.

I want to deal with this cheap — I am sorry, Sir, that may be unparliamentary — I want to deal with these arguments that have no substance as arguments. How could the Prime Minister introduce something as important as the standard of living of the working class for the next two years and almost light-heartedly say as a justification that he wants to see if there is anybody who is not taking this money, as though that is some justification that these are proper wages to pay workers. Of course if a man is only going to earn \$60 a week and he is so badly off he is going to take any increase you give him. The Prime Minister's attitude is symptomatic of the well known phrase, a trite expression, "beggars can't be choosers." That is all he is saying to the workers, you are beggars, I control the purse strings, I have the majority of members of the party behind me and I say you are going to get your money when I say you can, and how much I say you can. That is the attitude he has taken on a matter of this nature. Of course the workers will draw whatever money is given to them, because they are not bringing the country to a standstill, what else can they do?

I would like to say that I admire the responsible attitude taken by the Unions in this instance, including the Barbados Workers' Union and the National Union of Public Workers, as well as the Teachers' on the attitude to these

negotiations. It is open to them to call a strike, but they are as conscious if not more conscious than the Prime Minister of the long term effects which a national strike would have on the economy of this country, particularly if it started with the public service and spread to the other tentacles of the Barbados Workers' Union. A strike is not a thing a Union Leader would recommend lightly, but if the Prime Minister does not change his attitude he will find despite what powers he thinks he has that one of these days the Unions are going to stand up to him to the ultimate and he will be a much more sorry man than he is at the moment.

I regret his attitude in introducing this sort of resolution, to take this attitude on matters of this nature. He has made some boast about narrowing the rate between different categories of workers in the public service and he says it is now a national average of 8:1; in other words, the people at the top are eight times better off than the people at the bottom in terms of salary. For the man who is getting \$100 then, there are others who are getting \$800, and that is the average.

4.15 p.m.

Now, Sir, I have come along and found in this country that there have been some classifications that are amazing to say the least. I do not always like to bring personal history into the debate, but having been born poor, as I think most of us have been, and being lucky to be educated and, probably, to be adopted out of the position of poverty, if I had to make the choice between living a short life and being poor, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would give up at any time poverty and choose the short life. (*Asides.*) You might have both. Poverty is a serious thing.

I have had the experience of going to school with one suit, no shoes, seeing boys as well as myself eating a loaf of bread with a sugar cake in the centre of it. People have had the experience as well as myself of having to share potatoes without anything to go with it during the night. These are conditions of poverty that, despite what the Government tells me, are still existing in Barbados. These conditions are still existing today despite the School Meals that we are getting, which have alleviated the problems. I go through my constituency and other constituencies and see the poorer classes living in conditions that will hurt all of us — particularly those at the top — and I am not satisfied that we are moving fast enough towards levelling the wide inequalities that exist in this society.

I know that the system of democracy under which we operate is such that it is very difficult for Government, either in the Government or in the Opposition, to advocate radical measures. Sometimes the very people who you are trying to help will cry "Wolf" at the first radical step you may try to take in Government. I cannot, for the life of me, see where at present in Barbados the two main political parties, at least in terms of philosophical content, are wedded to the concept of equalising opportunity, it has taken us the number of years it has taken us to rule out the inequalities in this society.

I agree with the strictures of the hon. member for St. Michael West. We are producing a new breed of Black elite who are only radical in terms of business when they want to be radical because they are inefficient, and when you examine a lot of them you will see the position. I have listened to some of them on television. They are not genuinely interested in removing the concept of the elitist from the Society. I believe in a genuine elite in efficiency, regardless of whether it is the efficiency on the factory floor, or efficiency in Parliament, in Government, or anything else, but I cannot understand the concept that is being preached, as the hon. member for St. Michael West says, by the new elite Black, White, young, small businessman who cannot concede of a movement towards greater worker participation.

Government must set the example in this sphere. I regret very much this level of wages. Let us take the increase for the casual worker in Category I. In 1976 this worker is now going to be paid, what must look like a mighty sum of some people, \$60.00 a week. He is going to have an average, as far as I can see, earning of something in the region of \$3,224.00 a year. Mr. Deputy Speaker, on 1970 wages alone he is now getting less than \$1,700 a year, because, as I read last week in the Central Bank Report, the worker who was making \$2,400 a year in 1970, by the rises in the cost of living and the effect of inflation, if in 1974 he was making \$3,400, he would still only, in terms of purchasing power, be going around with \$1,700. He was 20% worst off. We have not kept up with the increases in the cost of living, and people at the lower end, the Key Scale workers, in this country are worst off than they have been in 1970. That is why it is necessary not to put any freeze on people at the lower end of the scale in this country.

I believe that all the people at the top can hold strain if they have to hold strain, but not

the people at the bottom in the same context. I also believe that if you are going to talk in terms of a wage policy, you will have to examine the type of dividends which are being paid in Barbados seriously. You will have to examine the people who are getting rent at a high level. You will have to examine the professional salaries and professional earnings including the lawyers, as one member would want me to say. I see it on the face of the hon. member for St. Michael South West. You have to examine also the doctors and see whether they can afford, in the context of 1976, to be charging the sort of fees we have seen being charged in the community. This is absolutely necessary. Any Government that is Socialist and is looking at the policy must begin to look at that level. You cannot begin to look at the man who is at the lower rung of the ladder for whom the price of chicken backs will go up the same. The price of rice will be increased the same, and he will have to pay the same 5% sales tax. He cannot afford the luxury of a mortgage, and still he is the man who is being kept down.

I like to say these things, Sir, because before I came into this Parliament there was a lot of talk about where I stand and what I stand for. I want to make it quite clear that I have never been in doubt in my mind of where I stand and what I stand for. Having been born from a father and mother that did not have anything, and knowing what it is now to have something, I can only stand for moving everybody who does not have anything right up in this community. I cannot stand for anything else. I would never like to see either myself, my children, or anybody else return to the type of poverty that one understands.

Now when I talk about this matter the hon. member for Christ Church South Central will know what I am talking about. We were born in the same area in the same circumstances. He knows the sort of conditions that I am talking about. It hurts me in Barbados to find that there are still a lot of people, and we still have to convince some of the young business people, some of the modern, middle class, that it is wrong for some people to be living on Chivas Regal, Champagne, with luxury motor cars and the annual holiday with others not being able to afford an air fare from here to Culpepper, if we had to get there. That is what is really bothering me about the society. I would have hoped that Government would have been setting the example in this sphere.

It is a fact today that, even for these categories of workers in private enterprise, the

Barbados Workers' Union in particular, which is the only union here that represents a wide cross-section of the community, has managed to negotiate better terms by private negotiations. I hope and pray that nothing the Government has done will affect the attitude of some employers in this country. I work for some of them, too. I do not agree with them always. I cannot agree with them on some of their attitudes, but I hope that the union will not be weakened in being able to negotiate still, and that this is not cited as a precedent by people who know better in the community.

Now, part of the argument here is the ability of the country to pay, and I think that that has been dealt with by hon. members on both sides of the House. It is unfortunate that wages negotiations come in an election year. Do you know why it is, Mr. Speaker? Regardless of the Prime Minister's talk about how bold he is to come into this House, he is deeply conscious of the election implication of his action.

4.25 p.m.

I believe he has pitted his position this time on appearing as the national leader up and above it all who has the interest of Barbados so much at heart that he had to restrain this army of occupation, the civil servants, and of course he would have calculated that since it is only the civil servants by and large whom he is going for, that there is not much political capital to be made on the other side in talking on this issue. I think this is one of his value judgements. If we were not negotiating wages in an election year and we were able to look at these matters as they should be, I think you would have found that negotiations would have gone on longer and we would have been able to get a package more beneficial particularly to the people at the lower rung of the ladder. But the Government obviously like any Government wishes to keep in power and I believe that the Government is reading the lines that the middle class has a lot to say in elections and they are very conscious of that particularly in some constituencies. (*Asides*) It may be a surprise, and therefore they are more conscious of the soundings from the cocktail parties than they are conscious of the soundings from down the long gaps and across the pastures.

I have discussed these wages in my constituency and I have had mixed reactions. The typical middle class person will tell you in reacting to this, well he has to look at the position from Government's ability to pay; but the old lady who has about seven or eight grand children and one worker in there will tell you,

Mr. Forde, we cannot live on this, and you have yourself to look around and see the conditions and judge for yourself what you think is fair play and justice in this community. I cannot agree with this level of wages in the community. I am not one of those who is sold to the idea that unemployment will be increased if you give higher wages to the workers in this community. Where I think the Government has gone wrong, and I have said this before in the House, is that we have slavishly for the past 15 years followed the Puerto Rican model of development, and we are paying too high a price to create one new job in Barbados. I am at present, Mr. Deputy Speaker, trying to work out for myself the amount that we have spent per job to create a new job in Barbados in the last 15 years under the guidance of the I.D.C. and the Barbados Development Bank, and I am sure that when the figure comes out the cost to the taxpayer will be so much that we would rather have spent out money on another exercise in allowing the workers themselves with their own research and ability to have gone into new industries in this country.

Let us look at Datacraft. Datacraft comes in here and gets a luxury of a tax free holiday and it closes down and 200 people are put out of employment, and I get some pious statement about Standard Memories taking them over. The same thing happened with I.S.L. There is no participation by the people who are putting the greatest input into the matter and their jobs are gone overnight, it does not matter if they have hire purchase commitments, and their children must go to school. None of these matters are considered; they have gone and that is the end of the matter in this country.

I am urging the Government, regardless of who forms the next Government of the day, to look seriously at the type of development in Government and private enterprise here so that in the future in Barbados we are able to see workers being able to share in the wages, and in the enterprise just as public servants should share much more in the development of the country that comes back by means of taxes, and so that the worker's job would no longer be a matter subject to the whims and discretions of employers, but he must have a stake in it. I am a self-employed person, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I suppose I can work when I choose, and if I am not employed by one person, the next person would employ me; so I have security of tenure. But the carpenter, the labourer, what security of tenure has he got, particularly the casual employees? What the hon. member for St. Joseph said is quite right. We have got in this Parliament and changed the Acts in such a way that a casual

employee can today be dismissed or lose his job in the Government service without any entitlement to even severance pay. I was told the last time I raised this matter that it is a hypothetical situation, but it is a realistic one which exists, and the Government should try as soon as possible to make sure that their positions are really improved in the situation which exists.

Now the Hon. Minister said that in relation to casual employees it is the Government's intention to see that they get the maximum of national insurance benefits on their retirement, but I think they should be no less well off than any other worker in Barbados, and they are entitled regardless of whether employed by Government or not to have the full benefit of the severance payment legislation in their favour. I am calling on the Government not only to raise the maximum that is allowable to them as a pension under national insurance pensions as casual workers, but for all categories of workers in Barbados, — the national insurance funds can bear it — if not, increase the contribution which is coming from the employer. I want to see Government do things like that. I do not mind the words that are being professed. The Government will tell you that they are willing to do all sorts of things, but you will see them take fourteen years to achieve it. Whenever we make a statement here the Government justifies their actions very frequently in this way, saying that the Labour Party did not do it before 1960 or they have been working on it since 1961. Both of these are non-arguments in 1966 and as far as I am concerned in 1976. I am not interested in what the Barbados Labour Party did in 1961 or prior to 1960. I am more interested in what we are going to do for the balance of the life of this Parliament and those of us who are returned for the future. I am interested in the things which have been left undone and to be done in the future and not to cry over spilt milk of the past years or anything that has been done in the past, and I do not think that that type of argument gets us very far in this House. I am more interested to know what pace Government is going to quicken for the development of the casual and key scale workers in the country than to hear that if I look at the deficit now it is more than was the whole budget in those days.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are lots of reasons for that, so that is a non-argument as far as I am concerned. It may be true but it is no realistic comparison; it does not prove anything at all. What does it prove? You can say that the level of taxation in those years was not as high as it is today when you take into account the land tax and the sales tax and the revenue being

produced. It is attractive political argument thrown out for people who cannot think and rationalise the position, but if you could rationalise the position it does not mean anything. It is like telling me that people who were getting \$6.00 in 1960 were in 1966 getting \$12.00. So what! You have to look at so many incongruables and assumable units of account to see if their position has worsened or increased, and if they have increased the rate at which they have been advancing.

I see people being lectured on ways of advancing, but you cannot advance them if you get disparities and pay them \$60 a week no matter how attractive the word "advance" may be today. What the Government must recognise is that between 1971 and 1976 they have got a younger group of people who are no longer going for catch phrases. I recognise that the Union is aware of this; they are not interested in catch phrases. Talk to them and you will see.

4.35 p.m.

In this country we have unemployment staring us in the face, and what really have we done for the last 10 years to answer it? We are told that we are going to create 2,000 new jobs over the next two years. That is 600 over a year with nearly 8,000 people unemployed. People are not going to accept that. There was this big headline about 2,000 new Government jobs in two years.

The people are interested in your performance. They are not interested in hearing about the oil crisis this, and the oil crisis that. They are interested in knowing how you will minimise the effects of the oil crisis. That is what the debate in the country is all about.

I am asking the Minister seriously to consider what I think is a breach of the principle of collective bargaining, whether the Minister accepts it or not. I also ask the Government to adopt a different attitude on this. Last week I was glad to hear the Prime Minister accept at long last the Union's suggestion for a National Economic Development Council. It has taken him four or five years to accept that suggestion. I hope that it does not take him four or five years to make it a living reality, and to act on the suggestion and recognise that no matter how brilliant he is — and there are many other brilliant people in this Parliament and outside of this Parliament — that no matter how strong politically he feels that he is, he is fallible and he ought to listen to people who can give him advice and ideas on how he should act, and he might really go down as a great statesman.

I am appealing to him in the last days of this Parliament to be really more amenable to suggestions coming from other people. If he had done this, probably some of the problems that we have had, we would not have had. The Workers Union has given points of wisdom. Any of us, on any side of the political fence — no matter some of the cross talk we hear — must recognise its contribution, and I would have hesitated 50 times if I was the Prime Minister to come in here with legislation without listening to their advice and trying to accommodate them wherever I could. I think that he has some guts to do it; but he might end up a skeleton without the guts after all.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, surely my colleague who has just sat down made a rather passionate speech and an appeal to the Minister of Finance. He did not come on very strong at the end because he said he would be looking forward to seeing how the Minister was going to provide these 2,000 jobs over the next four years. I differ with him on that. I do not see any Prime Minister, not that one .....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. member deal with the Resolution?

Mr. CRAIG: I am dealing with it, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like the hon. member to confine his remarks to the Resolution before the House.

Mr. CRAIG: Are you going to tell me how to lead up to my speech? When you are over there sitting down rambling and ranting nobody can tell you anything!

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member will please take his seat. The hon. member will withdraw that statement.

Mr. CRAIG: I withdraw "rambling and ranting." When you are trying to address the Chair then.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member will withdraw that statement in a manner .....

Mr. CRAIG: I withdraw it. I withdraw "rambling and ranting".

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. member take his seat? The hon. member will withdraw that statement in a manner that is befitting to this Chamber as long as I am in this Chair, otherwise I will use my authority.

Mr. CRAIG: I withdraw the statement that you complained of, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Would the hon. member please leave the Chamber?

Mr. CRAIG: I am not going out of the Chamber, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I am not going out the Chamber.

*Mr. CRAIG left the Chamber.*

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I would like your Honour's guidance .....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the hon. member questioning my ruling?

Mr. ADAMS: I am asking Your Honour's guidance. I can't speak? I can't make a point of order?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You have spoken on this Resolution. There is nothing that was said that calls for a point of order. A point of order is an order where someone says something which is incorrect and you have got up to correct it.

*Mr. L. S. CRAIG returned to the Chamber and took his seat.*

Mr. ADAMS: With great respect .....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will not be entertaining a point of order.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am not entertaining a point of order from the hon. member for St. Thomas.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let the hon. member leave the Chamber for the remainder of the day's sitting. (*ASIDES: Call the police.*)

Mr. ADAMS: No. The Police will carry me out. You are telling me I can't get a point of order in here? I can't rise and ask for a point of order. Are you telling me that a point of order can only be made if I have spoken or if I am correcting something? Have you taken leave of your senses? (*ASIDES*) Call the Police! Call the Police! You are telling me I can only make a point of order if I have spoken, that before I make it that it can't be done? Look! I am not staying in here man. You want a riot in here now?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Adams, please leave this Chamber for the remainder of this sitting.

Mr. ADAMS: Don't call me Mr. Adams in here. If you want to name me, name me. Don't

call me Mr. Adams in here, Joy. He has not given any ruling. There is no Mr. Adams in here. (*Asides*) On a point of order.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am submitting to you .....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please take your seat.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was addressing the Chamber on the Resolution which now stands before the House which is to approve the decision of the Government arising out of negotiations with the Workers' representatives.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, may I rise on a point of privilege? May I be heard on a point of privilege?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will you please take your seat? I named the hon. member for St. Thomas. Will Mr. Adams please leave this Chamber for the remainder of the sitting, or I will have the appropriate Resolution made.

*Mr. ADAMS rose.*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I named the hon. member for St. Thomas.

Mr. ADAMS: But you still have to obey the rules.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will not be entertaining any address from the hon. member.

Mr. ADAMS: But you will have to obey the rules.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I named Mr. Adams. You were named.

Mr. ADAMS: If you read the rules you will understand exactly what has to be done.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am not arguing with the hon. member. I have ruled.

Mr. ADAMS: You can rule anything in here then?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: As long as I am in the Chair.  
4.45 p.m.

Mr. ADAMS: Do you believe you are going to put me out to help Happy get me out? You idiot! You are fighting your brother's cause from the Chair?

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am appealing to you. Don't let the public have it to say that you took this opportunity to fight your brother's cause. I am appealing to you to follow the rules.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I should like to draw your attention to Standing Order No. 40, and if you have made a ruling so far as the hon. member for St. Thomas is concerned .....

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, how come the hon. member for St. Michael West can make a point of order and I can't make one? Nothing has happened. How can he make a point of order? How can he address you on the rules when I could not address you on them?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: All hon. members take their seats. I advise this Chamber that the hon. member for St. Thomas has been named.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member has been named, but you cannot .....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If you are going to move a motion relating to Standing Order 40 I will entertain it.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: You cannot rise on a point of order .....

Mr. HINDS: You don't tell me when I can rise. I am rising on a point of order .....

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not going to give way to you .....

Mr. HINDS: You must give way on a point of order .....

Mr. WALCOTT: I will not because I am on a point of order. I cannot give way on something that I am on. That is stupidity; gross stupidity .....

#### SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I suspend this Chamber for ten minutes.

The sitting was accordingly suspended for ten minutes.  
4.50 p.m.

#### ON RESUMPTION:

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before the House was suspended for ten minutes I named the hon. member for St. Thomas.

The Chair now awaits the formal motion to be put for suspension of the hon. member.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, .....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There will be no debate.

Mr. BOLDEN: I am not debating that. I am on a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: An hon. member was named .....

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member will take his seat.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, you did not name the hon. member for St. Thomas. You did not name him. You said 'Mr. Adams.' There is no Mr. Adams in the Chamber.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The record will show that the Deputy Speaker named the hon. member for St. Thomas. The record will show that the hon. member for St. Thomas was named.

Mr. BOLDEN: No. You said "Mr. Adams, I name you."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member has been asked to leave the House and he is not in the Chamber at the moment.

The question is that this Resolution do now pass.....

Mr. CRAIG: No, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Now there we are again, Sir. I heard an utterance from the Leader of the House saying put the question. Rather than you looking to your left and to your right to see if any other hon. member is desirous of speaking, 'put the question.' Sir, we have no idea as to what you are about. I understood you came in to give a ruling on all of these things.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Thomas was asked to leave the Chamber for the remainder of the day's Sitting. He is not present in the Chamber. I take it that he has left

for the remainder of today's Sitting. In the circumstances we will go on with the Resolution.

Mr. HINDS: What Resolution, Sir?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Resolution that was before the House.

Mr. HINDS: That's all right, Sir. The Civil Establishment Resolution?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr. HINDS: Thank you very much indeed, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I take it that the hon. member had already spoken of this Resolution. The hon. member for St. James was speaking on this Resolution.....

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, have you curtailed the speech of the hon. member for St. James? Did the hon. member for St. James have an opportunity to speak? Did anybody from the Government side move that the Resolution be now put? Mr. Deputy Speaker, these are fundamental things in the rules of Parliament which must be obeyed.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. member take his seat.

Mr. BOLDEN: All right. Time is longer than rope. That is all I have to say. Time is longer than rope.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. James was addressing the Chair.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have listened over the past days, whereby the Government had set out to deal with a number of Orders for the purpose of negotiations between the Government and Government employees. I listened, Sir, with some degree of attention on some occasions and on other occasions surely I did not.

Listening to the Minister of Finance, Mr. Deputy Speaker, giving a historical rundown of the Barbados Labour Party and also, Sir, a rundown of what legislation they passed over the years, the \$200 million which they are bringing in as against the \$20 million which we brought in.

5.05 p.m.

I heard of the amount of the increases the old age pensioners had over the last 15 years, from \$2.15 to \$13.00. I heard a lot of these things; hold strain. I heard the Minister of Education making a plea on the floor of the House that he must have more money.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order, I did not say I had to get more money, I said I wanted the public to know that I was not overpaid at the present moment, so don't come with any foolishness, I can say so anywhere. I never said I wanted more money.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, I must apologise to the hon. member. I would say then I heard a plea from the Minister of Education stating that he was under paid.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Again that is not true and the member for St. James was one of the people in here who argued for more money.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the hon. member for St. Michael South Central speaking on a point of order?

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, I heard a plea which I interpreted as the Minister of Education not being properly paid and that he is a very hard working Minister at \$2,800 per month, but we have the battle today where we have been appealing to the Prime Minister's better sense of judgement to examine the man at the bottom, not the man at the top. Since he himself is prepared to hold strain I would have thought that the top civil servants and the Ambassadors at \$3,000 a month and tax free allowances would have been also asked to hold some strain, but for the man at the bottom a battle is going on for a nippy \$18 per week more. A shameless Government led by a shameless administrator.

When we had to deal with the resolution for \$47,000 to bring the Queen down here for one day there was money in the Treasury. (Hon. C. E. TALMA: Not one day). A week then, \$47,000 on a little tour to do what the Hon. Prime Minister's wife could have done, or the Governor-General's wife, Lady Scott, to open Parliament, but today we are hearing the Minister of Finance saying that he cannot afford what the Unions are now asking for the small man, the man at the bottom, and when one examines even the Chairmen of the Boards picking up \$400 or \$500 a month for going there one evening a month to sit down, you find people out there in the road in the hot sun breaking their backs, and the Prime Minister has

put up a battle here to give those unfortunate people who supported him, backed him and made him what he is today, what the Unions have been asking.

I say this to the Unions. It is regrettable that in a small country like Barbados you must have so many Unions fighting for one single thing, a better way of life for the small man, because you will never see the Permanent Secretaries join the Union nor the members of Parliament. When you had the salary increases in here for the members of Parliament I remember Cameron Tudor, the Ambassador to the United Nations, came in here and said, "let me hear what you boys want," and the member for St. Peter told him in the dining hall, "I would have to hear what you fellows are getting first." I am quite sure the member for St. Michael West would recall that the Leader of the House said to him, "let the member for St. Michael West deal with it because he is much closer to the Prime Minister than I am." There is one thing I have to say about the Union. I have a wonderful admiration, a rather high regard for a Union, I do not care who is the Head of the Union, when the occasion arises the Head of the Union and my colleagues are going to be locked in real battle, but what I do not understand is this. I heard the member for St. Michael West making a speech from the Barbados Workers' Union balcony and he said that with the raising of a single finger he can bring the country to a standstill. That was during the Clarke and Tucker strike, and on this occasion negotiations broke down between the Minister of Finance and the Barbados Workers' Union and I have not heard of one single public meeting, neither did the country come to a standstill, and that is where I take a little different view of the Union's movement in this particular case.

This voting with the Opposition or against the Government is not putting any cotton wool across my eyes, because I know if this was an industrial dispute in this country between any of the merchants in Bridgetown or between the people in commerce, you would have heard the people at the Port being called out, Seawell Airport workers would have been called out, Cable and Wireless workers would have been called out, all of them would have been on a one-day 'go slow' strike, but nothing on this occasion for the unestablished workers in the Government sector.

I heard good speeches made in here warning the Prime Minister that he was taking a

very dangerous step, and I have no doubt in my mind, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this is going to be the pattern for the people in commerce in this country, that whenever there is a call for a raise in salaries for the workers and the people decide to put up a stout-hearted defence the industrial sector of this country will be disrupted.

5.15 p.m.

I would have looked forward on this occasion to see the Barbados Workers' Union in the forefront of this battle, and not only come in here and make speeches. This is why the union, or the heads of the union, or the people who are in control of the union will have a bit of suspicion from me. Not a single word from the balcony of Unity House, or from the balcony of the Barbados Workers' Union.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. If you permit the hon. member to say that he views me with suspicion, I will be rougher than he. He cannot view me with suspicion; he is not worthy to do that; he has to withdraw any reflection he makes on anything I have said in here. He says that he views me with suspicion. If he is making any reflection on the hon. member for St. Lucy or myself, he will have to withdraw that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am sure the hon. member for St. James is conscious of the Standing Orders of this House. The hon. member has objected to....

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will withdraw the remark so that the debate can go on. I withdraw the remarks complained of by the hon. member, but I said the leaders of the union. I was not referring to the hon. member for St. Michael West. On this question of getting rougher, the hon. member for St. Michael knows that I am a rough house.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. There is no other leader who came in here and voted. The hon. member for St. Lucy and myself are the only persons who can come in here and vote. There is nobody from the NUPW who can come in here and vote, so you are only referring to us. We are the only persons who spoke on this matter in here, so you know that you mean us. Do not be afraid. If you mean us, you must say so. You were not in here. I do not have to be afraid of anybody, so why should I be afraid of you? Why should I or anybody? I do not have any criminal record that I have to be afraid of.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, if I touched the corns of the hon. member for St. Michael West,

I will buy a little corn cure and put on them for him. I am not touching his corns. They are too soft, and I would not do that. What I am concerned with is all of the nonsense which I heard the Prime Minister in here with. For 2½ hours he addressed hon. members.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. members cannot refer to a speech made by any other hon. member in this Chamber as nonsense.

Mr. CRAIG: If you want me to withdraw it, I will do so. I am not going to argue with you. I will argue that out with you outside the Chamber. You look as though you are on a bad wicket today. Do not tell me that I cannot refer to a speech made by an hon. member in here as a speech that I consider is nonsense. A dog-eared speech, a waterwashed speech. You know that, too, Sir. The point I am making is that I have heard the twisted argument in here about Government revenue and hon. members comparing 1961 with 1976 and indicating that a Police Constable drew \$40.00 a month and he will now be getting \$400 a month. I have heard about Head Teachers working for \$100 a month in 1961, and in 1976 they are going to get \$1,500 or \$1,000 a month. That is a twisted argument, and it is not fair, for the simple reason that the President of the United States of America does not earn the same amount of money in 1976 as he was earning in 1961. The school fees in 1961 are not the same as the school fees in 1976. This is technological advancement throughout the entire world, and Barbados is a part of it. They have taken this twisted, bogus argument about what is now paid to Civil Servants, and are now comparing what was paid in 1961 and what will be paid in 1976. That is nonsense.

Now what we are charging the Government with is mismanagement of the country's economy and of the \$200 million they boasted about. With \$20 million we were able to build the Deep Water Harbour, which the Prime Minister referred to as something built by Barbadian labour. That is a credit to the Party and to the people of Barbados as a whole. You have these twisted arguments in here about casual workers getting \$16.00 a week in 1961, and the Barbados Labour Party did nothing. They are taking what the casual workers will now be getting and comparing it with what they received in 1961, Sir.

Sir, I cannot see how the Government can sit down and examine the cost of living and relate it to what they would like to ram down

the casual workers and small men throats. A 14% increase to a civil servant is something like \$240.00 a month more. Compare that with what was paid in 1961, Sir. The casual worker is at the bottom of the scheme earning \$46.00 a week, and he will go up to \$60.00 a week. With the cost of living as high as it is, what can they buy with \$46.00 a week nowadays? You are putting the people into a worst economic position that they were in in 1961. We have always charged the Government with the mismanagement of the country's economy.

I heard the member for St. Michael West in here today making what I considered to be a brilliant speech. He also made a good speech last week. Of course, that is when you know the subject with which you are dealing. I would hope that he would stick to the subject he knows all the time. What I would have liked to see is a stand taken outside to bring the same Prime Minister to his bending knees and let him understand that it is the people who put him there, and he is not a King or Lord in this country. He walked in here and said that they would have to take the money or leave it in the Treasury. I think you will agree with me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that even if he had decreased the pay of the workers in this country, they would still have gone to the Treasury to draw the money because they have to eat, drink, and provide clothing for themselves. It is nonsense to talk about the people waiting for their money.

Sir, we are begging the Prime Minister to go back to the bargaining table with the unions and examine what is the position. Do not argue that the country's economy cannot bear certain things. It is known that the country's economy can bear certain things for certain people, while the man at the bottom remains at the bottom with no hope. The rich become richer, and the poor become infinitely poorer, Sir. I heard the Minister of Health attempting to convince this Chamber that the Country's economy cannot bear the increase which the Government is prepared to give to workers of this country. I heard an attempted speech; one which was empty and completely out of character in here supporting the same Prime Minister who had the gall to get up in here one day and say that he did not know that Members of Parliament had an increase in their salaries because he was out of the Island. He is the Minister of Finance in charge of the country's economy, or finances, and not a single cent can come out of that Treasury unless he agrees to it. He is the Chairman of the Cabinet, and all we are hearing are a lot of bogus arguments because they have

nothing in common with the small man. The small man must be snobbed, pushed around, abused, and treated badly all the time by the Government, and all that they have contributed to this country over the years is immorality. Wherever you look you can see no proper standards. They have brought nothing more to this country during their regime from 1961 until now. The standard at every conceivable level in Parliament, outside, in the Civil Service, and wherever you look there is always something you can point to. Look in the newspapers and you will find that \$200,000 has gone from the Housing Authority; in another Department there is \$150,000 missing, and \$2 million has gone another way, while this Government sits idly by.

5.25 p.m.

When we brought a Resolution charging mismanagement at the Housing Authority, the Prime Minister got up in here and defended it stoutly and it took five years and the Nation for them to come out and say there was money missing at the Housing Authority and a young man was drawn before the Law Courts. These are some of the things you have done in 15 years. There was nothing during our period that you can go and point your fingers at. You have had a Speaker that became bankrupt during your 15 years in Parliament, and now it comes to giving the small man an opportunity to make peace with the world financially, the Prime Minister comes in here and says that the country cannot afford it, and yet is talking about creating 2,000 jobs a year. We have heard so much of this from the Prime Minister so often, that I do not believe anything that man says. I have no respect for him and I have always told my colleagues on this side that I have no respect for the man's ability, because he has nothing in common with the small man, and a classic example today is this Civil Establishment Order.

I am going to vote against this but I am appealing to the other side. I do not agree with the 25%; I support the Union's claims on this. You only have to examine the cost of living carefully in relation to what these people are earning today. You are giving the top Civil Servants some \$200 a month more and the cantonnier or casual worker is getting \$13 or \$14 a week more, and that man has to go into the same supermarket and buy the same goods at the same price. My only regret is that Barbados is so small that all these workers and civil servants to my mind should be under the umbrella of one union. That is why I think the Prime Minister is on a fairly good wicket in carrying out this behaviour. He knows that some of the civil

servants are not members of the N.U.P.W. You find one set of Transport Board workers belonging to the N.U.P.W. and some to the Barbados Workers' Union. Some of the people at the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board are with the Barbados Workers' Union and some with the N.U.P.W.; so he can divide and rule, and knowing within himself that many people have looked at civil servants with scorn because of their behaviour in their jobs, that is why they have not got sympathy that another worker outside would have if they had a case of this nature. It is a serious thing he has done in bringing a Resolution of this nature and telling the people of this country that they must accept it or leave it and that he is prepared to use the money for another purpose. The Dean said that his days are numbered. In another couple of weeks we will have him in the scale, and I am not so sure that I am going to see a lot of these faces in here maybe including yours, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in speaking on this Resolution for the casual employees and unestablished staff employed in the Government Service, I really would first like to say that any person who has followed the position which has been taken by the Opposition in this matter and related it to the position taken by the chief spokesman for the Opposition in 1973 when we were discussing the Resolution to determine the classification of unestablished and casual staff and to fix the rates of pay of unestablished staff, the person who spoke on behalf of the Opposition at that time was the hon. member for St. Peter, and one must really question the sincerity of the Opposition. One does not know whether this is being done at this time from the point of view of having a genuine interest for the cause of the unestablished staff or if it is really being done from the point of view of making a political point.

If you were to examine the position then, you will see the amount of sneering remarks which were made when we were bringing into effect an agreement which was made to establish a five day working week, and you have to read the debate get the whole feeling which was then demonstrated and obviously the points which were made by the member for St. Peter. As you realise, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when there are elections around the corner some of us have to try to make it appear as if we are representing the interest of the small man, because they obviously are in greater numbers in any particular constituency.

Now this is a matter on which a lot of dissertation has been given relative to the various positions which have been taken up in this

situation. I do not think that I would want to go through the whole series of arguments which have been advanced to substantiate the claim which has been made on behalf of the casual and unestablished staff which we are discussing here now. It would however be important to me to bring to the attention of the Chamber the number of factors, because I think it is important when we are considering this particular matter to state once more the way in which those of us who have been associated with the negotiations feel about this particular matter.

We are discussing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, wages for people who are as it were, at the bottom rung of the economic ladder, the people who are not earning large sums of money who have large commitments and large families to look after, who have got to spend almost every cent that they earn and sometimes more on providing themselves and their families with food, shelter and clothing, the basic things of life. If you were to look at the question of shelter and the fact that a lot of these workers are in a position where they have got to be renting, if you could use the rent of the National Housing Corporation as any guide, you will see what I am talking about, because I think the lowest rent in the National Housing Corporation is somewhere in the vicinity of \$10 per week, so that if we are going to take the wages which are being offered here in the first year for the lowest category of worker, you will see that it works out to about one-sixth of the total weekly earnings of one of the workers in Category I. These are start situations and start realities that we are looking at.

What has been said in this particular matter is that one must pay greater attention to ensuring that people at the bottom get what is considered to be a reasonable wage, the kind of wage which would enable them to live in a better position than they have been living in before. It is for this reason therefore that the Barbados Workers' Union when it submitted proposals and indeed when it had to compromise on the proposals which it put up based on the negotiated situation, came to the conclusion that a 60% for the two-year period was a percentage increase which the Barbados Workers' Union was prepared to settle for, and in this particular category it was divided on the basis of 35% in the first year and 25% in the second year for people earning wages up to \$100 per week.

5.35 p.m.

When we compare this with the wages which are being paid in sectors similar to that of casual workers, we do not consider that this was too far

out of line. As a matter of fact, in some instances they compared favourably; but I would want to say that in a number of other instances they were below what was being paid in the private sector. That, therefore is the crux of the matter, and we are saying that the position is still that the Barbados Workers Union is not satisfied with the level of wages offered to this particular category of workers.

The hon. member for St. James raised an interesting point. In his ranting and raving style he indicated that at least he questioned the reason why the BWU did not call up a strike and to use his words, bring the Prime Minister to his knees. Later, towards the end of his speech he provided the obvious answer. I would have thought that when one gets up to take part in the debate it is a pity to hear the number of inconsistencies which are contained in the speeches of some hon. members.

Towards the end of the speech he said that he felt that the Prime Minister was on strong ground because Government workers were members of a whole set of unions. Some of them were members of the Barbados Workers Union, some of the National Union of Public Workers, some of the Barbados Union of Teachers and some of the Barbados Secondary Teachers Union who were representing various groups of workers. So when the Prime Minister saw the lack of unity which existed in the ranks of workers, it provided him with an opportunity to do what he has done. So it is essential to point out that the BWU is a real organisation composed of real persons. We live in a very real situation, a very real world; and there is no one, whether in the Opposition or not who can dictate to the Executive Council of the BWU any position that it is going to take in any particular matter. When we make a decision on any particular matter, we make it in the light of the facts which are placed before us, because we do not intend to go into any situation where, when we examine all the facts, they do not merit a particular line of action. To say that this matter was not discussed or ventilated is simply untrue, and of course is a very stupid point to make. I want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker....

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Deputy Speaker on a point of order. If the hon. member would give way. I believe that the word "stupid" was used. When the member for St. James was speaking he referred to the speech of one of the other members as containing nonsense. In the same way that he was asked to withdraw the word "nonsense," I will ask that he withdraw the word "stupid." It has the same essential connotation.

Mr. E. E. GREAVES: I was not referring to the hon. member for St. James. I did not mention his name specifically. So I do not know what the hon. member for St. Philip North is talking about; but I think that it is obvious that the disunity within the ranks of the workers in the Government sector is one of the contributing factors to this particular matter; but that does not mean that the Barbados Workers Union took up this position. You have to recognise that the National Union of Public Workers – and I do not want to spend any particular time on them or pay any particular attention to them – but when we in the BWU were negotiating on this matter, the NUPW took up the position that they were more interested in getting members than really trying to deal with the industrial relations situation.

We deal with the private sector and also the public sector, and we have at our disposal a whole range of wage levels and all the wage increases which have been gained by the BWU in the private sector and in the same public sector. There is a relationship between all of this because we have better information at our disposal than I would dare say even the Labour Department or the Statistical Service whose responsibility it is to collect information on the movement of wages and salaries in this community.

We therefore adopted what we considered to be a reasonable position based on the situation of workers in all of the other areas. So one has got to take exception any time that the character or reputation, whether of the hon. member for St. Michael West or myself, is brought into disrepute in dealing with this particular matter. We made it unmistakably clear even before we came in to this House to speak on these matters that we would not support this because we could not consider that agreement had been reached, and we did not consider that the wages which the Prime Minister was bringing to the House of Assembly were the kind of wage increases which the BWU would like to see paid to the various workers whom we represented in the Government sector.

This is therefore one of the important fundamental points which I think should be made in this debate. Now, on the question of striking, the strike is a weapon which you would recognise that the Barbados Workers Union has used sparingly in this community. We have been in situations already where we could have caused a lot of industrial unrest and discomfiture within this community; but the BWU is a responsible organisation. I am sure that there is not one person in this community who will say that the BWU has irresponsibly used the strike weapon because we realise that we play a highly

responsible role in this community, a role that we will continue to play. Therefore we have got to weigh the whole set of circumstances before a decision is taken. It is not a decision that is taken by any one person or any two persons. It has got to be discussed and the workers have got to be consulted.

I think that we must recognise when we are talking in terms of an increase in the wages of casual workers that we must bear in mind that the cost of living has gone up; I want to stress that in these negotiations the cost of living is not the sole factor used in arriving at wage increases; because if it were so, when the cost of living falls, as is being suggested in some other areas, now that the cost of living has apparently taken a dive, then workers wages should be decreased accordingly.

We have the fantastic argument being advanced, and we have to recognise that there are a number of groups in this community who attempt sometimes to negotiate in the Press or attempt to argue their case with the public before they reach the negotiating table with the BWU. There are two classic examples. One is that of the hoteliers whose agreement will be coming up for renewal at the end of this year, and the other is the Barbados Sugar Producers Federation whose agreement for renewal will also be coming up. They are adopting a stance where they are trying to fight their case now. We have not even begun to examine their analyses but they are already fighting their cases; but I want to make this point very clear that we do not use the cost of living as the only yardstick; because if this were so, as I was saying earlier, then when the cost of living is reduced considerably, we would not have been able to get the kind of increases that we got for the workers at the bottom at that time.

5.45 p.m.

On those occasions and in those years when the cost of living was rising, let us say, at the rate of 4% or 5% per year we were getting increases well in excess of that – 25%, to give you an indication, because we were concerned at that time with moving those workers who were getting \$20 and \$25 per week, into a position – at one stage if I remember correctly, we felt that no worker in this community should work for less than \$1 per hour, and this was the norm that we set, at least the objective we set as a minimum, and we were able to use that as a floor on which to build other workers; and we moved this floor up because we adjust our position as the wage levels increased, and obviously as the whole set of circumstances surrounding negotiations increased.

The question, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of the ability to pay, a factor which has been highlighted and which has been discussed in this particular manner is another factor; and as has been pointed out the people who are working in the Government Service are providing a service; they are providing a service for the community and a service which the community is already paying for, and a service which the community will have to pay more for if the service is needed; and furthermore you have to recognize that the Government as an employer and as one of the largest employers in the community must continue to provide jobs and job opportunities for people who are coming into the job market. This is very, very important, and therefore more and more the Government will find itself being called upon to provide more and more jobs for people within the community, and if this is the case, then the Government will not only be involved in setting the norm in ensuring that the workers who are employed within the service are paid a decent wage of which it can be proud and also a wage which the workers who are employed by the Government can live on as a reasonable standard of life, then we would consider if this is not done, that the Government is not doing justice to itself or justice to the community, because in the matter of negotiation and wage levels generally speaking, the private sector takes the lead from the Government.

As I said earlier on, this does not mean that the wage levels in the private sector are the same or are as identical with the Government sector as you might think because there is a differential in a number of areas; but when we are going to be looking at the people who are involved from category one to category thirteen, these are the people that we are talking about.

We do not consider that the rates that we have asked for are rates which could not have been given. After all, if we were to take the rate which was asked for category one of \$73.60 in the second year which would take that up to the end of the agreement as compared with the Government's offer of \$70, and in category two of \$84.48 as compared with \$80, and in category three of \$90.88, as compared with \$85.20 in category four and so on, \$98.56 as compared with \$92, you will see where the differential exists; in the second year of the Government's offer the increase did not go beyond the region of 52% and in the Barbados Workers Union we had come to a decision that we would be prepared to accept an increase of 60% based on the arrangement that I mentioned earlier on, 35% in the first year and 25% in the second year; and it

is indeed a sad situation which has arisen where we have not been able to get an agreement on this, because as I said, the position which we put was a reasonable position; we still consider it is a reasonable position and we are still of the firm view that the Government should accept this position as a reasonable position and pay the workers in these categories the rates that we have been asking for. I have not been able to calculate it but I doubt very much this would really impose any tremendous additional burden on the taxpayers of this country. When you take into consideration that these people are also taxpayers; it is true that they may not be the heaviest taxpayers in the whole work force in this community, they are not among the heaviest taxpayers, but at the same time they do pay taxes and the higher the wage level is, obviously more taxes they would pay; and further-more they are people who have got out of necessity to spend almost all of the money which come into their pockets, and you know what happens, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when a situation like this takes place, because what actually happens is that because of the fact that they are spending their money it means that it creates a whole additional area of economic activity. They go in the City markets and they buy food, they buy clothing, they spend money on providing shelter for their families, those who can afford it, whether it is getting a loan from the National Housing Corporation in addition to what money they might have, in order to provide shelter for their family, whether it is in the area shelter, whether it is in the area of providing food for their family, whether it is in the area of providing clothing for their family, by doing this they are adding to the economic activity within the community. They are therefore assisting in providing more job opportunities, because if you have a community of people who are spending money, then there is more money turning over and hence more economic activity is taking place and consequently more jobs will be provided. I would therefore want to implore the Government once more to, even at this late stage, to have a second look at its position and to agree that the position put up by the Barbados Workers Union is a reasonable one and one which would be acceptable to workers in the key scale.

Miss MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have listened to a lot of very cheap argument in here this evening; cheap argument designed to mislead people. Some of it does not apply to me and I am not taking it on. I am not one of these people who have any highly paid civil servants in my constituency so that does not apply to me at all.

In the City my constituents are some of the lowest paid workers, where there are workers at all, because for instance, we have the highest unemployment rate in the City. So that a lot of cheap reasoning does not apply to me in the first place.

Another bit of cheap reasoning about what a man was working for in 1961 and what he is working for today in 1976 is not going to fool anybody today. People understand about the rising cost of living and people understand about inflation, people understand that inflation is not all important, people in Barbados understand that a lot of inflation has been manufactured here in Barbados. You have to look at what your dollar could have bought in 1961 and decide on what your dollar can buy today, bearing in mind how much of that dollar is going to be taxed out of your hand before the dollar even gets into it. When the dollar gets into your hand you have to bear in mind again how much is taxed out of it before you can buy bread.

This Government cannot come with cheap and easy argument in 1976 and expect to mislead people who have to scratch and scramble for a living every day. The Prime Minister when he introduced this must understand that his credibility is now blown. People no longer take him at his word. Week after week you come in here and it is done, so nobody is going to swallow that hook line and sinker now.

What I want to do in here this evening is to issue a sound warning not only to the people who sit on the other side but this is a warning for all of us, and appeal for all of us to take heed that the gap between those who are rich and those who are poor, between those who have and those who have not, is widening in Barbados.  
5.55 p.m.

The moral of the tale is to be seen in Jamaica today. Witness what has happened in Jamaica where the gap has widened to the extent that the two sides could no longer hear each other, and when those who govern allow the gap to widen to the extent that they are out of earshot of those who they govern, it means they cannot know what people feel, they cannot know what people want, they cannot know what people are in need of, and that is where the danger lies for us. We must not feel that because Jamaica is a thousand miles away and their economy is somewhat different from ours and their temperament as a people is different from ours that it can't happen here, it can happen here and I believe that it will happen here in my lifetime and in your lifetime, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if we do not heed....

*Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair. Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.*

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may proceed.

Miss MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was saying that we must take very serious heed of the widening gap between the haves and the have-nots, the rich and the poor in this country, because if we allow this gap to widen any further we are going to invite anarchy, chaos and violence as we see in our sister island. This is what is happening here with the Resolution before us. This is proof positive that the gap is widening; the poor remain poor and each day get poorer, the rich are getting richer.

These pitiful increases — and they are indeed pitiful — a man who earns \$75 a week, a man having a woman to support and maybe two or three children, and that is being conservative, a man who must pay rent, a man who is subject to the 5% sales tax, cannot be expected to eke out even what is described often by the Unions as a minimum existence. It is a physical impossibility and I honestly do not know, and I am not ashamed or afraid to say that I do not know, how some people live from day to day in this country. There are people over there who feel that if you say you do not know that you are ignorant, but I really do not know how people live, and we get in here with a lot of high sounding talk and a lot of cheap arguments coming from that side of this Chamber because we think we are doing people a big favour.

They must go back to the bargaining table, they must look at the true facts, they must look at what bread costs, they must look at what milk costs, they must look at rent and they must not fail to look at this widening gap. If we allow it to widen any further we are inviting trouble, we are preparing a recipe for disaster, and I urge very strongly that we look at these things a second time, that we reconsider and that in our reconsideration we bear in mind this gap of which I speak.

It is not that in here I am holding a brief for the people of the City of Bridgetown in particular on this issue simply because the people of Bridgetown come largely into the category of workers that we are discussing today, the casual workers. I do hold a special brief for the City of Bridgetown, but it does not mean that I am blind to the wider things, to the national issue that is built in to this. The people are the masters and if we are those people who are sent here to represent their interests allow this gap to widen

and entertain a lot of chit-chat in here that has nothing to do with the real issues, whether people eat, whether they have clothes on their backs, whether they have a roof over their heads, we will find that the people will take the law into their own hands and in the end it always lies in their hands, whether it lies by way of the ballot box or whether it lies by way of a weapon, but they will take the law into their own hands and do as they see fit. All of this is brought forcibly to me today because of what prevails in Jamaica and in other countries of the Caribbean, but Jamaica happens to be the one which is in a state of emergency today and that is why I quote it as an illustration, and because when I sit down and I look at these figures and I look at the salary which an adult working man, and a hard working man, is earning I am distressed and in some instances I am appalled because I know that he cannot exist.

I should be much obliged if all of this, what we call, chit-chat about what you were earning in 1961 and what you are earning in 1970 and in 1976 and how many meetings there were here with this Union and with that Union, and how many Unions there are, those are not the important things now, the important thing now is whether this is good enough, whether in conscience we can tell people we give them this knowing that it is not sufficient and knowing that in the national context we are courting a very dangerous situation if this thing is going to be perpetuated. It is going to have to come to a halt somewhere, and election year notwithstanding, we must still keep our heads, we must still look as objectively as we can — I know that it is physically impossible for some of us to be objective — but those of us who still retain that power must strive to look with all the objectivity we can summon at these figures, at life today in Barbados as we know it, and ask ourselves if the working man's interest that we claim to represent, notwithstanding the fact that this is election year, if in our consciences we do what is right, if this is what we might want for ourselves. In the end that is always the best question to ask, Mr. Speaker, would you wish this on yourself or on your child?

There is too much looking down at people like cantonniers and people like road sweepers and speaking of them as though they are a breed apart from us. They are no different from you, they are no different from me, and the same style of living you aspire to is the same style of living that they must aspire to, and if we set an example, we are all in this country living beyond our means, this country is living beyond its means.

6.05 p.m.

If we are aspiring to set an example of a style of life that we cannot afford, how then can a cantonnier or a scrubber at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital be expected to stomach such a situation as that? That is the warning that I wish to issue in here. All of us must be very mindful of the ever-widening gap. There is no machinery to my knowledge which will measure the gap and tell you this is the point at which people will rebel. It is something that comes upon you in the night, as it is said in a certain book. There is no way of gauging it. I suspect that this Government is too far removed from the true feeling of working people to even have a smattering of an idea of how soon a situation of anarchy will overtake us.

The results of the two by-elections this year, and looking at the manner in which the people on that side of the house behaved in those two by-elections, tell me that they are out of touch and they do not know what the people wish. They do not know what the people need, and since they do not know, I take it upon myself to issue the warning. If this gap becomes any wider, we are all going to fall into the chasm. Let all of those who have ears hear that.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to speak on this Resolution, but after listening attentively to the various speeches and realising that I am from the working-class people in this country, I live with them, I know their grievances, and I know their demands, I consider it is my duty to add my quota to this debate. Now, let us go back to the history of this country. We will find out that the casual worker and the unestablished worker of this country will have the origin of their wages dating back to the days of the plantocracy. In those days workers were actually semi-slaves. They would have to dig cane-holes at 8 cents per hundred, cane stumps at 4 cents per hundred, drains at 12 cents per hundred, and it is that kind of policy that the various Governments, from time to time, followed. It is a fact, Sir, that the average worker in this country makes his contribution in some way or other, and he contributes to the economy of this country; therefore, in arriving at a reasonable wage for him, we should at all times do our utmost to see that he, to a certain extent, is satisfied and is in a position to maintain his family.

While it is a fact that during the three terms of this Government, it has always seen it possible to give the workers in the lower category a higher percentage than the workers in the top bracket, it is my opinion that the time has come, and I do hope in the near future that we should have a close look and be in a position to reassess

the wide gap which presently exists. I would say — and this is not defending the Government — that it would be a very foolish Minister of Finance and Prime Minister of a country, especially at this time when an election is around the corner, and he could pay more money that he would not have done so. It gives our detractors, and especially the Opposition, an opportunity to make electioneering speeches on this important issue.

I feel, from the depth of my heart, that the Government cannot afford to pay more. If it were possible for the Government to pay more at this particular time, it would be a feather in our cap, and it would be a means of vote-catching. But because of the financial position of this country, and especially when the Prime Minister has intimated to this House that we start off with a deficit of \$20 million, while I am in sympathy with the workers in the lower category and I feel that if funds were available they would receive more, I would still say that the Government is not in a position to do so.

6.15 p.m.

Let us look at all aspects of the matter to give bigger increases at this time calls for more taxation, and I must admit that regardless of the improvement the Government can think about regardless of the improvement it brings about, it is known that certain sections of the community do not like to pay taxes, including myself and therefore we have to be careful. We have to realise that we do not want to find ourselves in this country as Grenada found itself not long ago not being able to pay the civil service of that country. We must also take into consideration that with this new system and reduction of bus fares, it does assist the working man especially those who travel by bus, and indirectly I would say that it is an increase in wages. When we consider that the working class man who has to travel by bus can now save approximately \$8 to \$10 per week and that he has not got to pay any income tax on that, I feel regardless of what others think that it is a subsidy and it increases his weekly earnings.

When we consider the many things which are being done to assist the poor, free water service for old age pensioners and free transportation for old age pensioners, we must realise that these are things which call for money.

Mr. Speaker, I am in deep sympathy with the casual workers and the unestablished staff and it is my fervent hope that the time will come very soon when this country will be in a better position financially to do something tangible to assist these workers in the lower bracket with a

higher percentage than they have received in the past. I want to say too that I am in sympathy with the Union as I am aware that they represent the working class in this country and that it is their duty at all times to defend the working class, and I want to say that to a certain extent I associate myself with some of the comments which they have made, but I ask myself one question; where must the money come from, and I will answer it: it must come from the taxpayers of this country, and I am sure that the members of the Opposition are aware that the taxpayers of this country are unable to carry a greater burden.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I happen to find myself speaking after the hon. member for St. Philip South, but one of the facts of the present situation is this: It is a very sad commentary to find that the Prime Minister, the hon. member for St. John, has been Prime Minister now for fifteen years, he boasts of being the first Minister of Finance that we have ever had, and after being Minister of Finance so long nobody, and I repeat, nobody in this country believes anything that he has to say when it comes to matters of finance. I go further; even some of his members on that side of the House do not believe what he has got to say. If we could believe what the Minister of Finance has got to say, we would not find ourselves in this situation this afternoon with this debate at all, and the members of the Trade Union who have been negotiating at the table with the same Minister of Finance have come in here and demonstrated in no uncertain terms that they too do not believe what the Prime Minister has had to say on this matter at all. The hon. member for St. Philip South wants to know where the money is going to come from. He says that we give the old age pensioners a free drive, we give cheap bus fares, and the heads of hon. members are being filled with this cheap bus fare issue and that is why the people cannot get any more money. You are telling them that you are giving a cheap bus fare, so you cannot give them more money too.

6.25 p.m.

The truth about the bus fares is that for each 25 cents you pay on the bus, the bus concessionaires will present a duplicate ticket to the Accountant General and they will get 50 cents for each ticket. So bus fares today will cost 75 cents and not 65 cents as before. (Hon. F. G. SMITH: Not true;) Let the hon. member get up and say it on the floor of the House. (Hon. F. G. SMITH: I will put it straight when you are finished.) Let nobody believe that the Government cannot pay these unestablished workers more. Some are getting \$46 a week, some \$54 and some \$56 at the highest.

The truth is that the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and the former Minister of Communications and Works must know that when you increase water rates 400 per cent at one time what you have done to the workers' wages. By what percentage have you reduced the purchasing power of your workers? As soon as you did that, some landlords have taken the opportunity following Government's example to carry up house rents. When this takes place, by what amount do you reduce the purchasing power of the money that you pay, the money for people to take home at the end of the week?

This Government must try to stop pulling the wool over the eyes of the people. There are a half dozen so called ambassadors walking about telling people all kinds of nonsense. They are saying that we give you this and we give you that; and mark you, whatever the Government gives you, even the \$10 million that they are planning to spend in this coming election to get back into power. (*Aside: Where will it come from?*)

Mr. SPEAKER: I am hearing asides. The asides are too loud. I must only hear the member for St. Peter who is addressing the Chair.

Mr. HINDS: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member must know that you must not fool the people any longer. In my constituency they have a list drawn up as to how much money canvassers are going to get to spend — one fellow \$2,000 another fellow \$3,000, one fellow \$1,000 and the other for \$800. I want to warn the people. (*Asides*)

Mr. SPEAKER: I have just spoken. Members on the Government benches have the right of reply. Let us conduct this debate in a proper manner.

Mr. HINDS: The Hon. Minister must be aware of this if he journeyed up to the Whim the night that he met all the canvassers; because one canvasser has got his girl friend to set up a shop at Black Bess, and she has been told that she must keep the shop well stocked because it must be adequate, when they start to use up the money because we are planning to eat them out and drink them out. Let them take warning. When they plan to spend \$10 million for the election campaign, it has got to come out of the taxpayers in some form or fashion.

That is why they cannot give the workers any more money now. They have got to try to keep the money to dish out at election time. That is the move behind it all. Members on the

other side are part of the Government. They intend doing all of this to corrupt people of this country at election time.

What is the Prime Minister now telling us? That he knows that not one of them will leave money in the Treasury. I cannot afford to do so. After 15 years this Government has brought these people to a state of penury and want so that they cannot afford to refuse anything that is offered by the Government. That is the trouble.

This is what they have spent 15 years doing, and they now plan at this time to ignore all the bargaining bodies. We talk about an increase, and the Prime Minister gets up as if he has about 14 or 15 black cattle. No, they will not be all black. They will pull the load that he puts on their backs to pull. That is how the Prime Minister sees some of them. Whatever load he puts on their backs.....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. You cannot allow the hon. member to say that the Prime Minister gets on as if he has 14 or 15 black cattle. The hon. member cannot impute improper motives to another member.

Mr. HINDS: If the Prime Minister owns 14 or 15 black cattle.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am ruling on this. I see nothing wrong with the hon. member saying that I have black cattle. I can have black cattle at my home or anywhere. He did not say persons.

Mr. WALCOTT: He was referring to hon. members.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do not argue with the Chair, please.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not arguing with the Chair. The member was talking about black cattle.

Mr. SPEAKER: Take your seat. I listened to the words used. I have been listening very carefully. No specific person was referred to. Any member can have black cattle. (*Asides*)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, all of this makes for a healthy debate. What we are saying is that the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance has been very careful to plan a programme that he has so reduced the working class people, and particularly those casual workers and unestablished staff, that whatever he dangles before them now, he knows that they cannot afford to leave it in the Treasury. He knows how

naked and starving some of them really are, how unsheltered and uncovered some of them really are. Some of them have already spent the few pennies they will get as back pay.

This is one good reason why he does not have to care about what anybody proposes as to what is reasonable. He is not concerned about bargaining. Whatever loads he puts on their backs they will pull it.  
6.35 p.m.

That is the trouble with this country, Sir. We have got to make a careful study; we have got to make a very careful study of this situation. I have not really turned to the Ministers on the other side. I have not really turned to them. Some of them are motherless, thank God, for very good reasons. You know a lot of auction sales are advertised from time to time, Sir, but I know the casual workers cannot go to those auction sales. Casual workers cannot get there; but what we have got to look at is this, that the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance with his proud boast all along, today he comes to you saying we have a large percentage of unemployed young people. Look, at the end of fifteen years the Prime Minister now knows this, and now sets about to make provisions for the unemployed young people; but how is he going to go about it? At the expense of the casual and unestablished staff. That is it. He has now got, on the eve of a general election, to be talking about the young people; but all along when he was not in power he told the young people to rebel. He told them they should rebel. I wish they would rebel in truth and in fact, Sir, and I know they are going to rebel on polling day. Oh yes, Sir. Whenever the votes are counted, Barbados Labour Party. Whenever the votes are counted. That is the way the people are going to rebel.

He has now, at this stage, come to the point of saying that you have a large percentage of unemployed young people. At the end of fifteen years in office is he not ashamed of this? What has he done in these fifteen years to provide employment for these people? The most that he has done is to provide avenues whereby half dozen of his friends — whereby half dozen people who are very close to him are all rich, living it up. Not one of the people who are very close to the Prime Minister is poor any longer. Not one of them. Not one of them who set out with the Prime Minister fifteen years ago, not one of them is poor any longer; but the casual workers now, the unestablished staff, if they have a little bit of electricity in their house, little water, one or two things that they were credited with from people about Bridgetown, these poor people cannot sleep

at night, with high blood pressure, low blood pressure, all sorts of pressures. That is a positive fact. These are the facts of life that we are talking about.

You hear the Prime Minister telling you now that we have got to face the realities and we have got to look at the economic reality. Economic reality? People all down Cats Castle, people are all about living in box houses, and the same Prime Minister goes down there. Not that he does not know. Nobody can tell you that the Prime Minister does not know. The Prime Minister in the by-election in the City pushed his nose up in the little holes in the places that the people live in, playing that he is going, helping people with a bucket of water from the pipe. All of this. These are the economic realities that I want the Prime Minister to face up to. These are the economic realities that the Prime Minister has got to face up to. You are making fun.

There is another Minister who is playing that he is going down in the City, playing he is going to do some knee cricket. Want votes? Yes. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, you are going to play with them you could bring water for them, you could wash them, you could bathe them, the people have made up their minds already. They have had enough. Fifteen years is good enough for this Government; they have now made up their minds that they are going to face up to economic realities that the Prime Minister has been talking about, on polling day. On polling day, Sir. You think of it; all the economic realities. You find some Ministers like the hon. Minister of Tourism going into Welchman Hall behind a shop counter playing he is going to open the Cokes and hand them to people. We have got to face up to the economic realities. He still feels that a Coke is a catch; a Coke coming from a hand like his. He thinks that means something to the people in Welchman Hall.

We are now hearing that our deficit on current account all this hifalutin language that does not mean one thing to us at all, does not mean one thing to the poor people by the eighteen mile stone in St. Peter, down by Cove Bay, that is what I am talking about. It does not mean anything to these people; they want money. If they work, give them money. Do not tell them anything about deficit and current account is now more than the total revenue; they do not want to hear about that. They want to know that when they go to Miss Briggs' shop and they carry a ten dollar note, that they can get a basket full of groceries and a piece of something clamp on on it; that is what they want to hear about and that is what they want. Something to

carry home to feed their children. They do not want any big hifalutin talk that does not mean anything to them when they have an empty pocket.

You play you are giving me an envelope, a big fat envelope, and when I look, O Lord, all the deductions, all the tax, and when I go and buy my little groceries, when I look, another five percent. They put on another five percent. Before I can get the little groceries to carry home and the little milk to carry home to feed my children — are you making fun? Mr. Speaker?....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not making any fun. I am listening to you attentively. I am pretty serious.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most serious issues that have come before this Parliament in years, and I am going to tell you something now, Sir. I would have thought that those members of Parliament who are trade unionists in their own rights — those members of Parliament — the area of disagreement is so great that it affects the blood, the sweat and the tears. Mr. Speaker, of these workers. You see them by the road side with the sun beaming down on their heads; you see them everywhere, but what do you find? The trade union tells you our proposals were just and reasonable.  
6.45 p.m.

They were just and reasonable, and when you find the Prime Minister not showing himself to be unreasonable, not at all, for he cares not whether the unestablished staff, the casual workers, live or die, whether they eat or drink, sip or sup, no business of his. Mr. Speaker, do you know what these casual workers are saying? That 15 years ago each one of them had their feet flat on the tar roads, some of them have raised a pair of pumps, some of them have raised a pair of sandals, but that is as high as some of them have got, about an inch high off the ground, but the Prime Minister has a six seater jet flying high. Now he tells you that \$66 is too much for some of them and telling people about drawing their belts. He means draw your seat belt because we are about to take off. He is talking about his six passengers, telling them to fasten their seat belts, because he is about to take off. He has created this situation and is about to run from it; that is what they must understand. He did not mention the seat, he only said belt, but we know he could only mean the seat belt, because he is not in the stream of suffering with these people. You will see the Prime Minister go into Dan Springer's meat depot and other places, but he is only going around to be sure to what extent people are really suffering, he wants to know this for himself so that when you

and I get up to speak we are not telling him something that he does not know but we are telling him about something he does not care about. That is the point at issue.

He has made absolutely no provision to cater to the needs of the people, but he tells you at one time they were an army of occupation, now you hear that you have a lot of unemployed people. How sincere can the Prime Minister be when he is telling you all these things? The hon. member for St. Philip South knows what it is, he has been able to tell you, he could have told you that these people have been throwing their little ten cents and twelve cents a week in a friendly society so as to get a little Christmas bonus. He knows what that really means, Sir. Some people do it all the years so that at Christmas some of them can buy a pair of shoes or stockings, and if these people have to go to this extreme, what then? Would he allow a Minister of Finance just to come and tell him the country cannot afford this and the country cannot afford that?

I remember the hon. member for St. Michael West in addressing this House remarked on the amount of wastage that the Government should be looking into to try to effect savings in certain areas. If the Government were to do this we maintain that we would not be now told that the Treasury has holes in the bottom. We would not be told this, we would now be told of every Government Department, hardly without exception — look at Barbados Feeds, all those hundreds of thousands of dollars, everybody taking it upon themselves to do as they like with all these Government Departments — do you mean all this at the expense of only the casual workers and the unestablished staff? Is it fair to these people? We are asking the Minister of Finance, although he tells you that you can talk till you freeze nothing you say in here can effect this Order, because he has signed it already, so you are only blowing a comb when you get in here now talking your head off, but what we are concerned about is that it is after 15 years that the Minister of Finance of this country finds himself with not one soul to believe a word he says when he tells you there is not a cent in the Treasury. He has advanced no just reason up to the present, he has given us no figures whatsoever, but all he tells you as he prints on the front page or on the back page of some booklet, "Advance with the Dems." They should really advance, but leave the Skipper behind.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must conclude his speech in two minutes.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, you said only five minutes more? That is a popular song. I believe

that the hon. member for St. Michael West and the hon. member for St. Lucy view this matter so seriously that I believe they know when they will resign membership of the Government Party. I don't want them to tell us or to do anything dramatic or spectacular, I believe they know their onions, as people say, in a matter of this sort, and when it can be seen that the Prime Minister as Minister of Finance being a party to these negotiations has been going on — but do you know the most important thing, Sir? The Addendum to the Resolution tells you that this is a result of an agreement arising out of these negotiations. It does not tell you that it was an agreement between the negotiating parties, it does not say this, that it was an agreement reached between the negotiating parties, it only tells you that it was the decision of Government, not an agreement arrived at in the negotiations, this is only the decision of the Government. In other words, that the negotiating parties are left outside the piling of grace and the Government has decided now to do this and to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot prevent the Prime Minister from holding the view which he now holds of certain members on his side of the House, but we venture to assure him that time is running out on the Government. The young people, the unemployed, the people who now enjoy the free bus rides, the old age pensioners, whoever, Government pensioners who have an increase, whatever it might be, all of this must be appreciated .....

Mr. SPEAKER: And time has run out on you too.

Mr. HINDS: I believe so, Sir. Once you have said it, Sir, I am quite satisfied when you tell me that time has run out, but I am sure that you know as well as I know that the ballot box will speak this time for the Barbados Labour Party.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to be long today as I am still suffering the effects of a bout of influenza, and at any rate my contributions have already been made on these Civil Establishment Orders, and the general references that I made last week still apply generally to this particular Order. I believe that within the next couple of days, if not weeks, this country will be littered with slogans "I came, I saw, I conquered," or "We came, we saw and we conquered." I believe that that will be one, if not the only DLP slogan on which they will hinge their bye-election campaign.  
6.55 p.m.

I have not broken and entered anywhere, but I believe, Sir, that we will see those slogans on the streets, and on the light posts and all over this country shortly. But how idle will that boast of sight, coming, and conquest be, when it is pitted against the fact that a Government cannot find \$2 million! That is what I understand is necessary to give the casual workers what the union wants. How idle will it be that \$2 million could not be found to give the casual workers, who are the worst off of all the categories of workers that we have debated in here during the last week or two. When we consider that these are the people who, perhaps, more than anyone else, have large families who are subjected to rent, because for the most part many of them cannot afford to have their own houses or homes, who have to eat and who have to be fed like each one of us be he casual worker, teacher, senior civil servant, lawyer, doctor, or Speaker.

When a country increases its water rates and at the same time boasts that the majority of the people in this country can afford to have, under their administration, running water in their homes, and then on top of increasing the water rates by 400%, each member of the community who shops has to pay the 5% sales tax on items which attract the 5% sales tax, and who have to pay in several areas which are developed the high electricity cost, then we will understand the plight of the people at the bottom of this society who are unestablished and who we call casual workers. Those people are affected by the cost of living in no less a way that people at another rung of the social and economic ladder.

Under this present Government, Sir, we have seen big business thrive. The hon. member for St. Peter refers to the ability of persons to buy their own private aircraft. We know that there are certain Middle Eastern types in this country who are close to the Government who have Mercedes Benz, and do not even get conveyances for people after taking their deposits. (*Asides.*) Do you want me to call some names?

Mr. SPEAKER: Again, the asides are too loud!

Mr. SIMMONS: We have seen the development of business in this country to the extent where there are monopolies and restrictive practices under this Government all to the economic disadvantage of the small man, of the worker, and the unestablished casual worker. I said last week that the Government needs to look at the whole economic management to consider the best possible means of reducing wastage and foolish expenditure. I am told. Sir, as a matter of

fact, I heard last week the Member for St. Michael West on one of these Orders mentioned that the Government should cut out wastage. It is all well and good for the hon. member to generalise, but if he is going to be severely critical of the Government to the extent that he is going to vote against the Government, then I would like him to go a step further and particularise the area of wastage. Unless he does this, Sir, I am not going to accept from him a blanket statement about cutting out wastage. He has to particularise the Departments which are wasteful, but in doing so he will create embarrassment for some of his fellow-members of the DLP. That is what I would have loved to have heard from the hon. member for St. Michael West. Which Department is wasting money? If he has done it today, Sir, I will apologise, but last week I heard him talk about wastage, but I did not hear him identify any areas of wastage. He mentioned it globally, Sir.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a matter of clarification, I spoke about public wastage. I was talking about the various areas and no specific area of public wastage. I was speaking globally. I said in the Public Service there was general wastage, whether it is paper, time or toilet paper. If you add it up and evaluate it, it will be a large sum of money. It is a question of public wastage, and it is more than the money we are talking about.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point of clarification made.

Mr. SIMMONS: That is what I was saying. The hon. member does not want to specify it, or to particularise the area of wastage. I wanted him to specify or particularise the areas of wastage. Mr. Speaker, you have heard us on this side specify the areas of wastage. You have heard us talk about the \$300,000 which was spent on a crematorium. The money was voted for and passed, and the Minister of Finance subsequently came here and said that it was a waste of money. I want to hear those things from that side, Sir. I want to hear them admit on that side that their sheet is not entirely white. I want to hear them admit that they may have made mistakes. If we are going to be objective and honest about this whole matter — I am using the word "honest" in a very loose way. I am not trying to say that anybody is dishonest.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, you cannot specify things and say blotting paper, toilet paper, and so on. The only area I specified in a big way was in the House of Assembly. I said that I would cut out eating, but I do not mean in the sense that you are throwing the food down the drain. I felt that members could pay for what they eat.

Mr. SIMMONS: I am with him on that, Sir. All I am saying is that he could have told us whether he would like to see Ministers, for example, taking as many trips as they have been takings over the last five years, or whether one particular Minister should feel that it is his right to have a suite when others can make do with a room, in a hotel and things like that? (*Asides.*) I know he is a sweet man.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am a sweet man.

Mr. SIMMONS: He is paid by the union, Sir. (*Asides.*)

Mr. SPEAKER: I am going to give everybody a chance to speak. I am not concerned with any brother-in-law in here. I do not have any, and I am not looking for any either. May I hear the hon. member.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of clarification. The hon. member will know that there are occasions — we are not talking about a sweet man — when a Minister should have a suite in a hotel where he can entertain people appropriately. The hon. member at one time was my guest. After all he was a national, living in London, and we should entertain some of our nationals not in the most impecunious circumstances, but with a bit of dignity and splendour.

7.05 p.m.

Mr. SIMMONS: I was the guest of the hon. member and he was my guest on the Sunday before the Independence Conference in 1966.

Sir, there is another aspect of the debate that I have heard which baffles me. Last week the Hon. Prime Minister was talking about wages that some of the civil servants enjoyed, if that is the word, in 1961, and what is proposed for them now in 1976, and subsequently the hon. member for St. Philip South repeated verbatim what he had taken from the Advocate which had taken it from the Prime Minister. There is a fallacy in that argument. The hon. member for St. Philip South cannot make that comparison unless he is prepared to go back and have me ask him what was he earning in 1933 under the conservatives; what was he earning in 1948, in 1951, in 1958 and right up to 1961 under the Barbados Labour Party, and then how much he earned from there under the Dems, because throughout the whole international economic order there was a worldwide increase in wages, and the fact that wages went up in 1961 and in 1966 and 1973 was only a progression keeping pace with the times. No country has stood still since 1961, but we are given to believe that Barbados did so fantastically well and was an exception to the rule that every country made economic progress over the years. So I want to

disabuse the mind of the hon. member for St. Philip South of that. I believe that the Prime Minister said what he had to say with tongue in cheek. I am not sure that the hon. member for St. Philip South understood the ramifications of what was being said.

It has been reported to me that some of the women who are on the unestablished staff and especially those who work by the road receive less wages than the men. If that is incorrect I am prepared to be corrected, but that is my information. I cannot see how in 1976 when both parties are now conscious of women's rights and the Government party not so long ago introduced a Bill in here designed to assist in the promotion of women's rights, and they voted for the Resolution introduced by the hon. member for Christ Church West earlier this year, they are prepared to countenance a situation where women receive less than men for doing virtually the same job. I believe that area of sex discrimination needs to be looked at.

Sir, the whole answer to this matter is that if the Government saw itself as a kind of large scale company it would have to take certain remedial actions. If a company finds itself at the end of the year unable to pay a high enough dividend, the company then has to look internally at ways and means of reducing waste, reducing expenditure, be it on advertising, holding back on certain inessential things with a view to making a proper profit so that it could pay a proper and deserved dividend. The same thing happens with a Government. The Government must ask itself whether there has been inefficiency and how best it can deal with inefficiency; whether there is wastage and how it can deal with that; cut back on some of these things.

I have said already that we have voted \$5.7 million this year for the Ministry of External Affairs; you have the I.D.C. as a separate unit going on bonanza tours and flying about on bazaars and all kinds of things trying to inveigle people to come and invest in this country and last year they could only create 340 new jobs in Barbados. Let us look at some of the External Affairs missions like in London, America and so on for which we voted \$5.7 million without even bringing into Barbados a proper ackee seed. It is a waste of money. We must behave as we are. We are an undeveloped people masquerading as westerners and highly developed people. That is what is wrong with us in Barbados, and until we realise what we are and try to cut our ambitions to suit the economic and social realities of life in this country, we are not going to make any

progress. We will always be complaining that we have not got money because quite simply we are living about our means.

Now I noticed some years ago when I was in London a television programme by the President of Tanzania, Mr. Nyerere and he said something which to me was very significant, that when he wanted to get experts to come to Tanzania or he wanted to send Tanzanians abroad to gain expertise from foreign countries, he never sent them to London, America, Canada or highly developed societies because they were not relevant to the situation in Tanzania. He preferred to send them to countries which shared the same kind of experience and had the same kind of economic problems as himself. That to me was a lesson in reality which Tanzania as the leading third world country in my view could well have given to each and every one in the Caribbean, Barbados notwithstanding, and we could learn oceans from that type of attitude. But everybody wants a Mercedes Benz and when that is not good enough you want your own aeroplane. For what? To create divisions in the society, to put in the minds of people that certain elements of the society can afford these things, but others are denied the avenues for this achievement? The result is that you will have a Jamaica on your hands. You will create social unrest and social deviates stemming from the frustration in people's minds, because you have given yourself over to lives of largesse and big living.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I shall not be very long except that I have got to clear up one or two wild and woolly statements made by members of the Opposition. When we came into the House to standardise bus fares we were accused of carrying out a political gimmick. When we come in to the House facing a realistic economic position, we are also criticised for not giving the workers who are voters what they deserve. I think the hon. member for Christ Church West will agree that like him I was born poor, and even although I have not attained his wealth, I think I have attained his independence of spirit, mind and intellect. Like the hon. member for St. Michael West I have been a trade unionist. I have studied trade unionism especially on both sides of the fence, and I think I am capable of appreciating the position.

Now I start out with two basic principles. One is that the Government in all its dealings in its labour relations should be a model employer. However, I think commonsense would explain that the Government in comparison to private enterprise is not exactly on the same footing.  
7.15 p.m.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I heard that too....

Mr. SPEAKER: That has nothing to do with what is before the House. Please take your seat. I do not want to hear any electioneering speeches in here. Please stick to the Resolution.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: All right, Sir. On a point of order. But be that as it may, I am not trying to go out of the Resolution, but I feel Mr. Speaker, that the Government party must be allowed to reply to these innuendos and insinuations. I could have interrupted him but I did not because I had my right to speak; but when I reply I would like to state categorically that the Government has no \$10 million to bribe the people in St. Peter.....

Mr. HINDS: What is the Minister denying? He does not know.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Please take your seat.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am glad for the exception. At least he has exonerated me from being a party to bribery and corruption; but I say.....

Mr. HINDS: I am not excusing him from this. I told this House not so long ago that he had received a gift of number plates and he went and paid for them after I said so.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: And I paid the money for the number plates.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Both members take their seats. The hon. Minister must keep his mouth closed while I am standing. I have not come in here to get an exercise for the Chair to stand, to sit, to stand.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: But I cannot help that.

Mr. SPEAKER: But you must sit, or you are going out from either side now. This is over-doing it. I want to hear something about this Resolution.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: But, Mr. Speaker, I would like to assure the member for St. Peter; I gave the man the cheque — I did not even know; I went to two places because I did not know who had sent them, and I paid him the cheque.

Now what I would like to say. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that even although the wages, as I said, cannot be accepted as princely I would like to assure the House that I personally shall be in the coming financial year, depending on the budget and depending on the out-turn of figures; I think my colleagues will support this — we shall do

everything to see if it is possible — because we just had some serious negotiations in Brussels and I think you will know and probably the member for St. Philip North will appreciate why members have got to go on trips, because we had a battle with the European Common Market to try to get a reasonable price for our sugar.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, when we had the windfall the Government gave. I think it was \$2 million to the union to help with their housing project; we gave the Minister of Housing \$8 million; the Opposition voted against this you know; the Opposition voted against money going in housing and money going to the Barbados Workers Union by the Minister of Finance to help improve the lot of the working classes, and the only member on that side who had any courage to vote with the Government was the member for the City then, and I think that is a tribute to him that he saw that the Government was prepared to do something for the working classes. (*Asides*) The time will come. As one member said, time is longer than rope and moon will run till day catches it true, true, true.

So we did something last year. We tried to improve the workers' housing by pumping money in the Housing Authority. We tried to alleviate the cause of the workers by giving money to the Barbados Workers Union for their housing scheme.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us be frank. I have accepted those two principles, model employer, workers' wages not princely; and I would like to assure the workers that if the economy of this country — and we have got to watch it. When I hear people talk and ignore the fuel crisis and this is a fact of life. Barbados came out of the fuel crisis better than some of the developed nations in this world.

7.35 p.m.

I think it is an accepted fact that when you look at the nations of the world — to quote Italy, Great Britain and African nations — Barbados under the Minister of Finance even although he was out of the island when the crisis started, came out remarkably well, and I think it is a tribute not only to him as Minister of Finance, I think it is a tribute to the Barbadian people that they were able to appreciate the economic position and responded so well, both the drivers and people who use petrol that we were able to survive. Everybody knows that last year we had a surprisingly good price for sugar; this year, as I have said before, we had to battle with the European Common Market — not only Barbadian Ministers — but all the Caribbean and

ACP countries realised this was a struggle and they had to stand up to the European Economic Community in order to get some benefits. In addition to that, we are going to get roughly about \$16 million under the Lomé Convention for development in Barbados. They do not tell the people about this, but they will tell them that the Government's battering and the Government's bargaining Barbados is going to get \$16 million for developing various fishery areas in Oistin and other areas. You do not hear about that, they are now talking about pure bread and fish.

Mr. FORDE: On a point of order, the Minister really must not misrepresent in a way the negotiations at Lomé. This was nothing to do with Barbados' direct bargaining. The provisions of the Lomé Convention which had 46 ACP countries always envisaged that all the countries would get. He is making believe that the Government bargained for something

Mr. SPEAKER: Point made.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Whenever you make a point with the Opposition they interrupt you because they do not want the people to know the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. (Asides). No, we did not take part, we are not signatories to Lomé. I could lend you my copy.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Hon. Minister addressing the Chair?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: The hon. member for Christ Church West is the only person in the House who knows about Lomé because he is the only literate one in here we are all idiots.

Mr. FORDE: On a point of order. I am not comparing my literacy with the hon. member's, nor am I becoming personal.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Mr. FORDE: Sir, I must make my position clear. The hon. member is being sarcastic. I do not encourage sarcasm. I may have said something to him *sotto voce*, but I am not saying the hon. member has not read Lomé but he is not interpreting what went on in the negotiations fairly.

Mr. SPEAKER: Your point is well taken.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: All I will say is that as a result of Lomé we are getting \$16 million for economic development in Barbados. I had a

meeting with the representatives, I am not talking through my hat — through my hair, because you are not allowed to wear a hat in here, the former Speaker was the only one who was allowed to wear a hat in here — but be that as it may, I just want to deal with the member for Christ Church West briefly, because he for a constitutional lawyer came up with a lot of theories.

If he knows the Westminster model, all his remarks about a Cabinet and about party allegiance and party voting, everything he has said goes by the board. (Mr. FORDE: Nonsense). It must go by the board. If the Government is defeated on an issue like this the Government must automatically collapse. This is a vital and important part of Government policy, so it is obvious to him that on a matter like this, having come to the House to seek approval it has to have the approval of the party, so it would not have been here at all, so when he is suggesting because everything the Government will. (Aside). I have been in here now five years and I have never met the Opposition united to say the Government has done anything. I think you will get a storm if the Opposition unanimously approves a Government Bill. Salaries is principally the only thing on which we get some unanimity. (Mr. FORDE: That is not true). How do you mean that is not true?

I won't deal with the member for St. James. I would like to give the workers of this country the assurance that my colleagues and I will carefully watch the economy of this country to see if the Unions' demands in the second year can be met. I think the Unions were asking for 35% in the first year and a bigger share in the second year, which is reasonable, and the agreement, as you know, Mr. Speaker, used to be a three year agreement and this is a two year agreement, which is a concession, and I agree with the Union, I can see the Union's point of view. I think any of us who go around and campaign, we do not need emotional speeches from the member for the City to understand, we go around our constituencies, we see our constituents daily and we know that they are suffering, the conditions of the houses and a lot of children, and they are very hard put to make a living. The Government is not insensitive or lacks objectivity. I do not think anybody here is like that. Look at the Minister of Agriculture, he is a grass roots man; they are no different over here. As a matter of fact, except for one or two exceptions, when you compare the upbringing and birth of some of them, some were born with silver spoons in their mouths and didn't have to pass through the hornpipe like some of the people here, so it is nonsense telling us on this side

that they are all of a sudden champions of the workers, because the Leader of this Hon. House has been with the working classes long before some of them were born. The Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Lands, all of us are working class people, and every day we come across the needs, the sufferings and the desire of people to improve their lot and to achieve their ambitions, but there is a limit.

I say it is a pity the budget is not here, even working from the deficit and the total cost, but I think if you have followed, Mr. Speaker, the history of this Party over the years, I do not think we could honestly be accused of being a party insensitive to the needs of the people. You only have to look on the Statute Book from 1961, and you do not even have to go that far back, all you have got to realise is that in 1961 the people of this country put us in power, in 1966 again the people put us in power, in 1971 the people overwhelmingly put us in power. This must be endorsement of the policies which we have been following. You cannot comment on the vote of the House in the last Session, you should not be allowed to go from 1971 the Opposition should never be allowed to comment on what this Government did prior to 1971 like you cannot comment on what happened in the last Session or in the present Session, because every Session we have got a complete endorsement as we will also get in 1976 from the people of this country, because we have seven volumes replete with legislation in the interest and on behalf of the working classes in this country. After a Government has been in power for 15 years the easiest slogan will be "time for a change," but to what? A change for hardship and deprivation? What change do the people of this country want? Just to change for change's sake? That is all they are walking around the country talking about, a change, when these Statute Books are positive evidence of a Government's commitment to the working classes of this country?

In this particular exercise, Mr. Speaker, we have not come up with what the workers need, or enough money to meet the workers' present ambitions and requirements. We know that. The Prime Minister, as he was accused by the member for Christ Church West, adopted no haughty attitude, because he is one Prime Minister in the whole Caribbean who drives himself, shops for himself, does everything for himself, so when it comes to a Prime Minister who is grass roots and who mixes with the working classes and knows their sufferings, not one of the members of the Opposition could at least say that he is one who lives in any clouds.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will advise the Hon. Minister that he has two more minutes.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: We accept on this side of the House that the wages are not princely and we shall endeavour, depending on the economy now that the recession is on the up and up, and the conditions throughout the world seem to be improving, I am sure even in the absence of the Minister of Finance that if the opportunity does arise he will review the wages of the workers to see if in any way he can meet and go further in the demands which the Unions and the workers make.

7.45 p.m.

I want to go clearly on record that I do not give way to any member of the Opposition. None of them has any greater love for the working-classes, or for the man in the street, or for the underprivileged, than anybody on this side of the House. All of the debates we have had here for the last few weeks on this salary revision, let them understand once and for all, and let the public understand that this Government by its behaviour and by its legislation, by its commitment, by its manifesto, is a party of the working-classes, and apart from the working-classes it is a party dedicated to serving the complete interest of all Barbadians that they shall have a better life and that they shall have their dreams and hopes realised through supporting this party which has served them well.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to reply to a certain charge that has been laid here this evening by the hon. member for St. Peter, and nothing more than that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it a charge made during the debate on this Resolution?

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: It was made during the debate on this Resolution. The hon. member for St. Peter, during his remarks in this Chamber, stated...

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Let us get our procedure right now. The hon. member can only get up and speak on the Resolution that is now occupying the attention of the House. If a charge is made against the hon. member or his Government, it is his bounden duty to get up and address the House on the Resolution and also make what comments he has to make. You asked him, Mr. Speaker, just now if he was speaking on a charge which he claims was made against him, or on the Resolution. I just want to get things straight. If you are on the

Resolution you will have all right to speak  
(*Asides.*)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! May I hear the Hon. Minister on this matter.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to appeal to you to protect me from that side. On the debate on this Resolution the hon. member for St. Peter stated that one of the reasons why the Government could not find the money to pay, or to meet the demands of the workers, was due to the fact that in reality they are paying 75¢ per ticket for bus fares and not 25¢. I would like to state quite clearly that such a remark can only be intended to mislead the people of this country and also to undermine the confidence of the people of this country in the Government and, especially, in the Minister of Communications and Works. The hon. member has stated that the concessionaires for each ticket that they present to the Accountant General are paid 75¢ and 50¢, which means in reality that the bus fares are 75¢, and that money could have been used to pay the workers.

I would like to say quite clearly that no concessionaire will ever have to approach the Accountant General to present any ticket. I would also like to state quite clearly that bus fares are not 75¢ and will not be 75¢ now, or in the very near future. The process of paying the concessionaires devolve on the recommendation of the Public Utilities Board last year when an inquiry was made into the circumstances attendant upon the increase of bus fares. That is the formula which we are using and that formula makes no relation whatsoever to individual bus tickets. The purpose of bus tickets in this system is to get a true relation of how much money the concessionaires, including the Transport Board in this case, get by way of the sales of tickets. We are using that formula, and I would like to invite the hon. member for St. Peter to take some time off and make himself acquainted with the formula which the Public Utilities Board laid down that would ensure that concessionaires got a fair return on their investments. To come now...

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order....

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order. Erase that from the records.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: I would just like to repeat for the benefit of the hon. member for St. Peter, because at some time he is capable of understanding things and at another time he is

incapable of understanding, and so on. During the Inquiry last year the Public Utilities Board made a recommendation which would justify or support that the concessionaires get a fair return on their investment and that is the formula we are using. I am not stating that the Public Utilities Board laid down the formula. We adopted it in full agreement with the concessionaires after discussing the matter with them; therefore, it is erroneous, misleading and mischievous to get up here...

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister is replying to the speech that I made, and he makes a remark of being mischievous. He is imputing that I made a mischievous statement, and I am asking him to withdraw it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister said something about being mischievous. That is unparliamentary in the context. That is all I am saying. Please withdraw it. He can continue, but he must withdraw that remark first.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: It was not mischievous, Mr. Speaker, but it was intended to arouse mischief among people who hear such a remark.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, you must call upon him to withdraw the word instantly.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am ruling in here. If all of you are getting tired you can let me know. I am not tired. (*Asides.*) You take the time from me. Do not rush things. I ask the Hon. Minister to withdraw the word "mischievous" because I have ruled it unparliamentary.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, I have withdrawn the statement that it is mischievous. I said it is intended to arouse mischief among the people of the country who hear the remark.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, he will have to withdraw that as well. The Minister is making himself a fool this evening.

Mr. SPEAKER: No. Now, I ask you not to make yourself anything. I would not say what you want to say. You must behave yourself. I would ask the Hon. Minister to make his speech, and I give him permission to do so.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Sir, the truth of the situation is that the sum of money which this Honourable Chamber has been asked to vote for and did vote has little or no bearing on the ability of the Government to pay or not pay, to

meet or not meet, the demands of the workers; therefore, I would like to correct that. I would like to state again that the formula which we adopt for paying the concessionaires has nothing to do with tickets except in the sense that they sell the tickets and derive part of the revenue, or part of the returns on their investment from the sale of the tickets. Bus fares are still 25¢, and in reality all Government is being asked for is to meet any difference which may occur as a result of the reduction in bus fares from 65¢ the maximum to 25¢.

7.55 p.m.

I would also like to point out for the benefit of this Chamber that so far, by the returns which have been presented to the Ministry of Communications and Works, there is every indication that as a result of the increased number of people who are now making use of the buses, the Government will have to pay very little of the money which has been voted this year to meet that subsidy.

Mr. SPRINGER: Mr. Speaker, it is very refreshing to see and be part of the atmosphere this evening as compared with earlier in the day. When one considers the amount of temperature and heat that was exhibited before lunch, we can only assume that hon. members needed that breathing space and refreshment.

Mr. Speaker, the speech by the hon. member for St. Peter. I must confess I have heard several speeches by him and the speech made today, if one is capable of forgetting that he is a member of the Opposition and that this is election year, it must go down as one of his more evangelistic displays, and it is regrettable that the system is not such that he will forever be on the Opposition benches. He makes such a worthwhile contribution there that I feel it would be a loss to the country if he were somewhere else. But taking all matters apart I am one of those people who believe, to begin with, that when you ask a civil servant who is the Chief Establishments Officer in this case to negotiate on behalf of a Government for increases for other civil servants, the fact that a civil servant has to negotiate for increases on behalf of an employer in one sense and for an employee in the same sense, the system is a wrong one, and some method has to be devised by which, whether it is a tripartite body, some organisation outside of the civil service and the Government should be called upon to do these negotiations. It is not fair to the Chief Establishments Officer to be negotiating for civil servants, and that entire system needs to be scrapped.

Now if I were on the Opposition benches obviously I would vote "no". If I were with the Trade Union I would vote "no", but I am a member of a party which says under the Westminster system that you have to support the party to which you belong and through which you were elected during the elections. I stand by that.

I do not believe in neutrality in human beings. Abstention to me is neutrality and I do not accept that human beings can be neutral. You have to be for or against. If you were walking down the road with a man and that man got into a fight and was being beaten and you stood up and watched, you wanted him to get beaten, and if you joined to fight to help beat the man who was beating him, you would be on the other man's side. Now I will say this: when you look at the wage scale at the bottom, even with the increases, if you gave these workers at the bottom an increase of an additional 60%, I do not believe it would be a princely wage, and I maintain that all the people in this country who are working for \$1,600 a month and over could be asked to hold strain. When you give a man working for that kind of money an increase, all you are doing is giving him more banking power; you have not increased his standard of living one bit. He might change his car more often, but he cannot live in a better house; he cannot eat more than a belly full.

I do not believe in beating old age pensions, but I would say that if a lot of people in this country who are getting reasonable salaries would go back and look after their old parents, a lot of the need that is knocking about among grand-parents of some of these civil servants would not exist. They can only call on the parents when they want them to baby sit for them to go to the cocktail parties, but if they would carry out their duties towards their older folk the Government would be called upon to do less for some of these people; but they do not meet their responsibilities. A lot of them think that these new salaries give them the right to go and live in districts and forget their old people, and I know that old people do not want much. When they reach the age of 70 years, a dress occasionally, a breakfast and a meal during the day and a little attention from their children make them very happy. If some of the children would spend \$10 a week on the parents, the parents would be happy; but they do not look back at all. They expect Government to stand the whole hog.

There are a lot of people who will talk about pensions for old people, but they do not look back at their older family, and some of

them have children and do not support them and the Courts have to be hounding them down. Maybe as the hon. member for Christ Church West says to me all the time, I can talk like this because I am what he calls a liberated politician. I will say this for him; if he did not believe in independence within a federation he would be on this side and maybe he would be liberated too.

Something has to be done about the way wages are negotiated for civil servants. That is the first thing that has got to be done. The Chief Establishments Officer is not the person to do it, and I have said already that it is time the people at the bottom stop letting the people at the top negotiate increases for them. I remember when the party on that side started the Civil Servants Housing Loans all the big civil servants went and took all the money one time and built some big houses and the people at the bottom could not get any because they put the people at the top to dish out the money.

8.05 p.m.

Every one of the heads of departments borrowed all the money, and in no time a half million dollars went. The people at the bottom could not get any. So much so, that you had to have two different types of loans, one for those at the top asking for a certain amount of money, and one for those at the bottom asking for a smaller amount; and unless something is done about this system, the people at the bottom will always get less than the increases which the people at the top get. From the figures alone — every time that it is done — this year, in 1973 and in 1971 it has been showed all the time that the increases which are given to the people at the top are always more than the basic salaries that the people at the bottom get.

It is time that you fixed the people at the bottom first, and let the people at the top try to convince the people at the bottom how they cannot live on \$2,000 a month. If I had a say I would increase all at the bottom. Let those at the top hold some strain. Nearly all of the people left the Labour Party because they only gave a three cents increase, a shilling a day. *(Asides).*

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. SPRINGER: Besides the question of wages, Mr. Speaker, there is an important factor that people have to bear in mind. There is something wrong in this country as regards increased production. People say that the public

service is worse than the people in private enterprise. I do not think that that is really true or fair; but we know that what has happened is that the public believe that people in the Government sector are not producing to the satisfaction of the taxpayers. The man in the street, Mr. John Public is not satisfied that he is getting 24 hours work out of the 40 hour week. To blame the man in the street alone is not fair because it happens right through.

I have said already and it has been borne out that you cannot call any of these offices at 20 past 8 and get the telephone to answer, and if you call at 3.30 you cannot get an answer either; and the lunch hours are the longest. They cannot get the public to feel sympathetic towards them because the public is satisfied that even at the old wages, they are still paid over what they produce.

I do not know what is to be done to motivate them; and the ones at the top are the most serious offenders. They have the habit that when they are at the top after four years they are looking for a job in private enterprise when they resign. They cannot work for the Government at 50 years, but they can go and work for DaCosta and Musson, for the Port Contractors and Cave Shepherd and all the big firms at the age of 55.

Unless there is a definite plan to motivate the people in the public sector to produce at all levels, the public is not going to be satisfied to pay them any sort of increases although we in Parliament know that what we can give at the bottom they cannot live on.

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

Ayes: Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. A. MORRISON, Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, Hon. F. G. SMITH, Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Hon. P. G. MORGAN, Mr. J. B. SPRINGER, Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, Mr. W. R. LOWE and His Honour A. DaC. EDWARDS — 11.

Noes: Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. E. E. GREAVES, Mr. L. S. CRAIG, Miss B. A. MILLER, Mr. W. C. B. HINDS, Mr. C. L. BOLDEN, Mr. H. deB. FORDE and Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS — 8.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this concludes Government Business for today's Sitting. I beg to move that the House do now

adjourn until Tuesday, 13th July, at 12 o'clock noon.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

*The Question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.*

8.15 p.m.