

X

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1961 - 66

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 8th March, 1966

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 2.30 p.m. o'clock today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., (*Speaker*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Health, and Community Development*); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (*Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries*); Mr. W. R. COWARD; Mr. R. StC. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. G. V. BATSON, (*Chairman of Committees*); Hon. N. W. BOXILL, (*Minister of Communications and Works*); and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (*Minister of Trade and Labour*).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret to inform hon. members that no Minutes are available for confirmation today.

I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Accountant General, Accounts and Statements for the month of July, 1965, as prepared by that Officer.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I am commanded to lay the Draft Estimates for the financial year 1966-67.

I should like on behalf of the Government to ask that hon. members be prepared to deal with the Estimates as from next week and that they reserve three days, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, or whatever time may be necessary to complete consideration of the Estimates for 1966-67. Members will therefore be given a week to scrutinize the various points on the Estimates and be ready as from next Tuesday to commence consideration, so that working night or day we can complete consideration by the end of next week. (MOTTLEY: Provided!) There is no proviso. Those are my instructions.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, provided the Estimates are laid today; because if we have not got them in our hands at least a week ahead, we could not justifiably do justice to them. That is the proviso we were talking about.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that copies are on the premises at the moment, and it is merely a matter for the Marshal to supply a copy to each hon. member.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I thought I had made myself very explicit. I said I was commanded to lay the Draft Estimates for the financial year 1966-67, meaning that the Estimates are here to be circulated.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid it is only now that the equipment is working properly.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of the following:-

A Resolution to place the sum of \$219,819 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1966-67, Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, No. 6, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to approve the advance from the Public Treasury of the sum of \$8,269,900 to be defrayed from Loan Funds and placed at the disposal of the Government to meet the expenditure during the financial year 1966-67 on the Capital Works included in the Estimates Part II - Capital.

A Resolution to approve under section 10 of the Barbados Harbours Act, 1960 the Annual Estimates of the Port Department for the year 1966-67.

On my own behalf, I beg to give notice of the following:-

A Resolution to place the sum of \$24,149 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1965-66 Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate No. 55, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Public Treasury and to appropriate the same for the service of the Island for the year ending on the thirty-first day of March, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-seven.

A Bill to provide for the establishment of a National Stadium Corporation to stimulate, facilitate and improve the standard of athletic, aquatic and other sport and for matters incidental thereto and connected therewith.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolutions:-

A Resolution to approve, under section 10 of the Barbados Harbours Act, 1960, the sum of \$13,040 required to supplement the Annexed Estimates of the Port Department for the year 1965-66, as shown in the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to approve the sum of \$4,000 from the amount of \$77,400 provided in the Capital Estimates 1965-66 under Head 2, Communications and Works iii Water

Supplies Item 25 - Replacement of Mains be used for the laying of a main from Sedge Pond to Bawden's School and the note relating to that Item be amended accordingly, 2.50 p.m.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to give notice of the following:-

A Bill to validate certain Acts of the Irrigation Board to repeal the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Labour Welfare and Irrigation) Act, 1953, to provide for the vesting of property vested in or held by the Irrigation Board, for the transfer of certain functions of that Board and for matters consequential thereon.

A Bill to amend the Waterworks Act, 1895.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply to deal with the money Resolutions of which notice has been given here today.

NOTICE OF REPLIES

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 66/1964 asked by the hon. junior member for St. John, is now ready;

Also, Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 75/1964 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Philip, is now ready.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 61/1964 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, is now ready.

QUESTIONS

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Has Government bought any more private properties since Culloden Farm?

If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Minister state how many, and the cost of same?

Mr. WEEKES: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is the Minister aware of the number of children whose eyes are in very bad condition, and who have been on the waiting list for approximately a year without receiving either treatment or glasses?

If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Minister devise a scheme whereby the children can be examined without delay?

If the answer is in the negative, will the Minister make a full inquiry into this important matter?

Mr. WEEKES:

2. To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is the Minister aware of the danger to health and damage to property of the small number of residents of Greaves Hill, St. Philip, caused by the fumes and dust from the plant at Mangrove Crushing Site?

If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Minister state what is being done to remedy this state of affairs?

Has the Minister received complaints from any resident of this area in connection with this matter?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, the Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Public Treasury and to appropriate the same for

the service of the Island for the year ending on the thirty-first day of March, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-seven, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, the Bill to provide for the establishment of a National Stadium Corporation to stimulate, facilitate and improve the standard of athletic, aquatic and other sport and for matters incidental thereto and connected therewith, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill to validate certain Acts of the Irrigation Board, to repeal the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Labour Welfare and Irrigation) Act 1953, to provide for the vesting of property vested in or held by the Irrigation Board, for transfer of certain functions of that Board and for matters consequential thereon, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, the Bill to amend the Waterworks Act, 1895, was read a first time.

ORDER SUSPENDED

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16, 18, 40 and 45 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: This is very unfair. I thought that the hon. acting Leader of the House before he moved the suspension of those Standing Orders would have come and had a word with me. When you are going to take away certain rights from hon. members, you generally come and have a word with them about it.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to apologise. The hon. senior member for the City arrived a few minutes late, and I did not think of it then.

3.00 p.m.

On that premise, I feel that we are not acting in any way contrary to the regulations which have been agreed to. Subject to anything which is considered to be of major importance by any of the Opposition members, I beg to move that those Standing Orders be now suspended.

Mr. SMITH: The hon. member has apologised and said that the hon. senior member for the City came into the House a bit late, but I was in the House even before the hon. member came in. The Hon. Minister means that so long as the hon. senior member for the City was not here, there was nobody else who should have been consulted. I was in here and I feel that I should have been consulted in the same way as the hon. senior member for the City would have been consulted. I have business on the Order Paper under "Private Members' Business". If the Hon. Minister is prepared to make provision for me to deal with my Resolution, then I will agree to his proposal; otherwise I cannot agree to it. I feel that the hon. member has overlooked me. I may be a little too small, and the hon. senior member for the City came in a bit late.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I could never overlook the hon. member. He is not small either physically or mentally. As far as this matter is concerned, I am quite willing to agree to his suggestion, and to deal with whatever matter he thinks fit should be dealt with in the interest and for the benefit of the people.

The question that Standing Orders 5, 14, 16, 18, 40 and 45 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister agreed that he would allow me to deal with my small Resolution under Private Members' Business as I would be agreeing to the suspension of the Standing Orders. If he is now going on to deal with Government Business, what would become of my Resolution? Will it be taken under Government Business? I have honoured my agreement and I do not know what the hon. Minister will do with his agreement.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will recall what I said, it was that Government Business would be taken and I asked that Government Business be taken under the provisions and provisos which were mentioned earlier. I said that Government Business would be taken with the proviso that hon. members would be given an opportunity to deal with any matter with which they wanted to deal under Private Members' Business.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, would I be in order to ask that my Resolution be taken now?

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion which is now before the House is that Government Business be taken at this stage. The Hon. Minister is proposing that as soon as Government Business has been concluded, the Government members will remain in the House for dealing with such Private Members' Business as is required to be dealt with. Did I correctly understand the Hon. Acting Leader of the House?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Yes, Sir.

Mr. SMITH: But it is now time for the consideration of Private Members' Business. We can deal with Private Members' Business now and then go on to Government Business. There is no certainty that Government members will remain in the House to deal with Private Members' Business. If the Hon. Minister is willing to honour the agreement on both sides, he would allow me to deal with my business now. Members of the Government will remain in the House now, but you cannot make them remain to deal with Private Members' Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is neither Government's time or Private Members' time. This is subject to a motion being carried or not carried, as the case may be. A motion that Government Business be now taken has been duly made and seconded.

The question that Government Business be now taken was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

LEAVE TO TAKE CHARGE OF ORDERS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of the matter standing in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, at today's meeting.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is asking leave to take charge of the matters standing in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted. *(After a pause)* There being no objection, leave is granted the Hon. Minister to take charge of those Orders.
3.10 p.m.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day is to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Island.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into

Committee of Supply, and that it be an instruction to the House while in Committee to deal with the money Resolution for the sum of \$24,149; also a Resolution to approve, under Section 10 of the Barbados Harbours Act, 1960, the sum of \$13,040 required to supplement the Annexed Estimates of the Port Department for the year 1965-66; and also a Resolution to approve the sum of \$4,000 from the amount of \$77,000 provided in the Capital Estimates 1965-66 under Head 2 - Communications and Works iii Water Supplies Item 25 - Replacement of Mains - be used for the laying of a main from Sedge Pond to Bawden's School and the note relating to that Item be amended accordingly.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I ask the Hon. Acting Leader of the House whether he has given consideration as to whether the Resolution to approve under Section 10 of the Barbados Harbours Act, 1960, is not an abstract Resolution? It has just occurred to me. I am not making any ruling now.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, that appears to be an abstract Resolution, but in reality we are seeking leave at this stage to have it dealt with. This may be the appropriate time to raise that point, even though it may be an abstract Resolution, because unless Your Honour rules at this stage, it may be difficult to secure leave at a later stage.

Mr. SPEAKER: As I am at present advised, this is an abstract Resolution, and accordingly I so rule.

The question that Mr. SPEAKER do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply and that it be an instruction to the House while in Committee to deal with the Resolution for \$24,149, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1965-66 No.54

Head 17 - Premier - Home Affairs - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, the note is very explicit. The amount originally voted has proved to be inadequate on account of the increased use of telegrams and overseas telephone calls especially in connection with the arrangements for the visit of Her Majesty the Queen to the Island.

Hon. members will recall that the amount of \$12,000 was provided in the current Estimates under Head 17, Item 20 to meet the cost of telegrams including Telex Communications and overseas telephone calls. Expenditure to 31st December, 1965 was \$1,041.34 as compared with \$7,354.94 for the same period during the last financial year leaving a balance of \$958.66. Bills amounting to \$1,819.39 for the month of December, 1965, have been submitted to the Government for payment, and it is necessary to seek supplementary provision to settle these bills and to meet payment of expenditure for the remainder of the current financial year.

The increase, undoubtedly, has been caused by the telegrams and overseas telephone calls in the urgent dispatch of Government business, and, in particular, in connection with the arrangements for the visit to this Island of Her Majesty the Queen. That is the explanation in so far as the first item is concerned.

With respect to the second item, the note given to hon. members is that this amount is required because of the necessity to make a terminal payment in lieu of leave salary to Mr. P. H. Stevens, formerly Town and Country Planning Officer ended on the 19th December, 1965, and a terminal payment in lieu of leave salary may be paid to him at any time within five months of this date. The necessary investigation has been carried out by the Government Department, and the Chief Establishment Officer has ruled that the payment should be met from Head 20, Item 1.

The provision in the Estimates is \$9,715, and the Town and Country Planning Officer has stated that the available

funds are insufficient to meet this additional expenditure. Following is a breakdown of the commitments against this item: total salary of Town and Country Planning Officer for a period of resident service from 1st April, 1965 to 19th December, 1965 - \$6,972.83; terminal payment in lieu of leave salary for a period 20th December, 1965 to 14th May, 1966, three years and two months contract service at 45 days per year plus three days travelling time \$3,917.32, making a total of \$10,890.15.
3.20 p.m.

I just mentioned Sir, that the total provision is \$10,891, leaving a deficit of \$1,176.

I beg to move that Head 17 stand part.

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

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

HEAD 20 - TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING

Head 20 - Town and Country Planning - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I have already dealt with the item under this Head, I beg to move that Head 20 stand part.

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

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of \$4,176 do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1965-66 No.53

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is for the sum of \$4,831. The amount of \$22,300 was provided in the Estimates for 1965-66 under Annexed Estimates, Post Office, Item 1, Overtime Pay. This provision was supplemented by the sum of \$16,473 by Resolution 16/1965, Supplementary Estimates, No.30.

The Postmaster General has reported that on account of (a) the necessity for members of the staff to work longer hours to cope with the unanticipated increase in the volume of Christmas mail, and (b) the new method of calculating overtime rates whereby a part of an hour is now regarded as an hour, further supplementary provision of \$4,831 will be required to meet expenditure to the end of the financial year.

The record of the number of postal packets handled in December, 1965, as compared with December, 1964, is not yet available, but an indication of the increase in mail will be evident from the fact that revenue from the sale of stamps and customs duty collected increased by \$15,789 and \$2,073 respectively in December, 1965.

The comparative figures for 1964 and 1965 are as follows:-

In December, 1964, the revenue from the sale of stamps was \$128,388. In December, 1965, the revenue from the sale of stamps was \$144,177, an increase of \$15,789.

In December, 1964, the revenue from customs duty was \$63,486 and in December, 1965, it was \$65,559, an increase of \$2,073.

As a result of that, you will see that the Post Office is doing fairly well for itself, and I therefore beg to move that this Supplementary Resolution for the sum of \$4,831 do now pass.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, in the Addendum to the Resolution it is stated that this amount is required owing to the necessity for members of the staff to work longer hours to cope with the unanticipated increase in the volume of Christmas mail, and (b) the new method of calculating overtime rates whereby a part of an hour is now regarded as an hour.

Can you tell us what category of workers do you pay overtime rates to? Can you give us some detail? The question of the increase in volume of Christmas mail has always been anticipated.

(A VOICE: But this year it was over and above previous years.)

As I understand it, this has been so for some time. Any part of an hour is calculated as an hour. This is what I had to deal with when I met the representative of the Trade Union on behalf of workers at the City Council.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am not in this particular matter because we of the Trade Union do not represent these workers; but what the Addendum says is what it is. This is a new method by Government.

May be, the people in the Post Office have requested that they be paid overtime on the same basis as other people and not on the flat rate as was done before. I know that at the Customs Department they pay people overtime rate at so much per hour while some of them get a fixed rate. That is because some may be working for much more than what the overtime rate would be.
3.30 p.m.

I believe that this is a new method, so that they must have arrived at a new method of giving this remuneration. This is nothing that they have negotiated other than with the Postmen's Association itself.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the question asked by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, there is the period from April to November, 1965 (a) clerical staff, 1,783 half-hour periods at \$2.00 per hour for which no payment was made, \$1,783; (b) porters and messengers, 142 half-hour periods at 75 cents per hour for which no payments were made, \$53.25, making a total of \$1,836.25. Estimated expenditure in respect of overtime to 31st March, 1966, is arrived at as follows: (a) actual expenditure from 1st April, 1965, to the 30th November, 1965, \$17,035.77; (b) expenditure for December, 1965, \$19,169.95. Amount due to clerical staff for the period 1st April, 1965, to 30th November, 1965, \$1,783; amount due to porters and messengers, \$53.25; clerical staff, 875 hours at \$2.00 an hour for two months \$1,750.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not want all that.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I would like the hon. member to ask his question again.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I really wanted to know about this new method of overtime rates. The Addendum to the Resolution states in paragraph (b) that overtime pay is required because of the new method of calculating overtime rates whereby a part of an hour is now regarded as an hour. I wanted to know if you have the same calculated method for the Clerks and postmen at fixed rates. Sometimes the amount was less than the actual salary or more than the salary, and I wanted to know if you have a new method altogether. I appreciate the fact that any part of an hour must be considered as an hour, but you have various categories from the Postmaster General back down. You had a fixed rate for Clerks at \$1.20 an hour or what not in relation to the salary. It may be above or below the salary and that is what I wanted to ask.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, as I understand the hon. member, he wants to know if the rate for overtime

is geared to the relative pay of the worker. To that question, I would say "yes". If a man is a porter, he gets overtime as a porter, and if he is a clerk, then he gets paid as a clerk.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is not what I asked. I thought that the hon. senior member for St. Peter had put it straight. You have a fixed rate for Clerks and so on. Now you say that you have a new method of calculation, and I am asking if this new method of calculation applies to the Clerks in the Office or to the Postmen. I have heard something about this; I have heard that persons in the category of Clerks in respect of overtime payment were actually getting less than some of the people whose salaries were beneath those of the Clerks.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is trying to confuse the Minister of Communications and Works because the hon. member asked for a breakdown of the expenditure. (Mr. MOTTLEY: No, no.) The hon. member could only be speaking of expenditure when he asked for a breakdown.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. The hon. member has misquoted me. Asking for a breakdown would have been an entirely different thing.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, most positively and decidedly the hon. member asked for a breakdown and he wanted to understand how this amount of money was arrived at.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I asked for the overtime rate in the various categories.

Mr. WALCOTT: No, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member asked for a breakdown of the expenditure. He asked precisely to be informed as to how this amount of money was arrived at. He wanted a breakdown. Then the hon. member said that he wanted to know, in addition to that, about the new method of calculating overtime pay whereby part of an hour is now regarded as an hour. The hon. member began to answer the question himself by saying that this is nothing new and that it was something normal. I pointed out that this is new for the Government because it is stated how it is done. Paragraph (b) of the Addendum to the Resolution sets out that overtime pay is required because of the new method of calculating overtime rates whereby a part of an hour is now regarded as an hour. That means that it was not there before. A part of an hour is now regarded as an hour. It means that 61 minutes is now regarded as two hours, but prior to that, sixty-one minutes would have been regarded as an hour plus whatever the minute was in the context of things. It would mean that if you had overtime based on ten times sixty-one minutes, the expenditure would be ten times as much as what it was before. If that was not given, it would mean that you would lose an hour with the loss of minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is nothing to do with me, but I understand that they have had a change in the overtime rates. If I am not mistaken, I think I saw something explaining that the new method of overtime rates had been arrived at in some Resolution. That was a Resolution dealing with some other Department. I take it that what we are doing now is only a follow-up of that Resolution. Overtime rates have been agreed upon for people in the Service and all Departments would have to re-regulate the overtime rates, because an hour or any part thereof is to be regarded as an hour. The hon. member is getting confused.
3.40 p.m.

What I would like to explain to the hon. member is that when you get time and a half or double time, it has nothing to do with salary or quantum. This says that they are now calculating overtime rates higher than they did before, and that is responsible for the increased expenditure, and the Addendum shows that the new method of calculating overtime rates is that part of an hour is now regarded as an hour. That is why I say that there is some confusion in the hon. member's mind, and he has to separate this new method of calculating overtime from saying that if a Clerk

is to get overtime rates based on time and a half on salary or double time on salary or he gets a fixed rate, whatever the rates are per hour, any part of an hour would be regarded as an hour as against any part of an hour previously not being regarded as an hour. That is how I understand the Addendum.

Mr. MOTTLEY: In one breath the hon. member who has just sat down said that I am suffering from a confusion of mind, and in another breath he says I am trying to confuse the Minister. May I be permitted to put it as plainly as I possibly can? In the new method of calculating overtime rates, a part of an hour is now regarded as an hour. This does not seem a new method, because in dealing with the Trade Union it was brought home to me that this was to be the method; but for people in this category this is the Government's new method. I have received information and it is a fact that persons in the category of Clerks working overtime at Christmas received less, because of a fixed rate, than a Postman and other persons working with mail, although the rate of the former may be \$2.40 an hour. That is the point I was trying to get clear, and I asked the hon. member if he could tell us if this method has been changed. Figures were given to me to show that a Clerk working for overtime last Christmas received less, because of the rate so fixed by some regulation, than persons over whom he was in charge. I should like the hon. member to say whether the same rates exist for such people, and I think I am entitled to ask that.

Mr. WALCOTT: I do not go around listening to these things, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member started off by saying that somebody gave him information and it is a fact. If it is a fact, how is the Minister going to change a fact? The question therefore becomes a rhetorical question, because if it is a fact and the Minister does not answer in the way the member requires, he is going to say that it is not true. Now I do not believe the hon. member himself knows as much about it as that he is a bit confused as to what the person told him, because what the person might not have told him is that Clerks are not allowed to earn more than a certain amount of overtime as compared with other men working under him; but a Clerk gets a higher rate per hour as overtime than a postman or somebody lower down. The hon. member read the rates per hour, and I should point out that they are not fixed on a basis like the Trade Union's overtime, because our rates are fixed either double the normal hourly rate or time and a half; but from time immemorial the Government's rates were fixed for everybody, whether they be Postmen or Customs Guards. At the Customs a man was given so much per hour not related to his salary; so to work for more money or less money would depend on what the salary range is.

The point the hon. member is raising, Mr. Chairman, is a negotiating point for the persons concerned, and there should not be any dissatisfaction now because the Civil Service has an Association, and this change was probably as a result of representation by the Union. We do not take any credit for that any more than we take credit for being the forerunners of overtime rates, but I do not want the hon. member to get this matter confused with the idea that a Clerk working the same number of hours as a Porter in the Post Office gets less money than the Porter. You cannot establish that unless you know the rates, and the person would only be confusing you, because the rate for a Porter is different from the rate for a Clerk. A Clerk and a Porter, therefore, do not work for the same thing, and the Clerk's hourly rates are not lower than a Porter's rates. There may be higher rates or lower rates *pro rata* your salary; but it does not mean you are working for less money, though it might seem as if the Porter is working for 75 cents an hour while the Clerk is getting 50 cents an hour; but it is not so.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member seems to think I do not understand what I am saying. It was drawn to my attention that the rates were fixed. I hope the Minister will believe that I am not trying to confuse him. A Clerk working six or eight hours a day for five and a half days a week gets \$140 a month and gets a fixed rate of overtime not in keeping with his salary; but you may get a supernumerary

Postman working for two or three hours overtime who gets more than the Clerk who is in charge.
3.50 p.m.

Therefore the Supernumerary works for more than a Clerk who is paid on a fixed rate. This is all I am saying. What I have just asked is, if the new rates remain the same I believe the rates which are paid to supernumeraries are in keeping with the new wage rates today. I am sure that the Hon. Minister will do well to know these things. I am saying what was told to me and I know that it is a fact. (A VOICE: That is a statement; it is not a fact.)

What I did ask was if the rates payable today are the same rates as those paid to the supernumeraries now.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, as far as I see here, what the Resolution is dealing with has absolutely nothing to do with Supernumerary Postmen. As far as overtime rates which are set out in this Resolution are concerned, as the hon. senior member for St. Peter pointed out, if you were paid before for an hour and a half, you will now get paid for two hours for that period of an hour and a half. What we have done now is to bring the method of payment for overtime in line with what it is today. That is to say, if a person works for any part of an hour he is paid for an additional hour.

I see nothing here about supernumerary postmen which the hon. senior member for the City was dealing with. I see here that we are dealing with Clerical Staff, Porters and Messengers. A supernumerary Postman is neither a Porter nor a Messenger. This Resolution has absolutely nothing to do with supernumerary Postmen. There is nothing on this file mentioned about either a Postman or a supernumerary. If the hon. senior member for the City is saying that supernumerary Postmen are drawing more money than Postmen, I see nothing here about that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I have not said so. I was dealing with overtime. There is a fixed rate for persons working in the service.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I take it that the Hon. Minister has answered the question.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is not right. You cannot take that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I take it that the Hon. Minister has answered the question.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You cannot take that. I am entitled to ask the Hon. Minister a question and he has to answer.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister has answered the question.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You cannot tell me that I must sit down and say that I take it that the Hon. Minister answered the question. We are trying to get matters straightened out. That is my business.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that the hon. senior member for the City can get that matter straightened out in here. I believe the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is confused over the matter. He went on to talk about supernumeraries. Let me tell the hon. member this. If you take on a supernumerary, he is not in a permanent job. He has not been taken on in full and you want him to come on to work during the Christmas season and so that you can send him out to work on a Sunday. Therefore, you have to arrive at a rate that can make it attractive for a man to work for a number of days. But Postmen have to work all the time. You can call it overtime, but it is a method for rewarding a man for doing a job.

If the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is seeking information, he has to seek it precisely. If the hon. member wants to know the rates, I think the Hon. Minister should have the rates. As a matter of fact, the Hon. Minister read back something at a rate of 75 cents an hour. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition has an unfortunate habit that when

he finishes speaking, he begins to speak and that is why he does not hear anybody. The Hon. Minister said that some groups are paid 75 cents an hour. I thought that was the information which the hon. member was seeking. He asked: what are the rates which you are paying as overtime? When you speak of supernumeraries, that is a new business.

The question of taking on supernumeraries is really a question of paying people for overtime because you only need them at Christmastime and peak periods. There is some internal regulation in the Post Office which clarifies the amount of overtime pay for the Clerical people. I think what is their problem is that they have to come and ask for votes.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition may not be aware that some members of the staff in some Departments are not entitled to overtime as such and I do not think it applies to certain members of the Post Office. Overtime is negotiated for them. I am not aware of who are the people that are eligible for overtime in the Post Office, but some of them are called upon to work overtime and they are not entitled to overtime pay. For example, the Postmaster. You have to know who are eligible to receive overtime rates from a departmental point of view.

There are some people in the Waterworks who do not get overtime rates. All the Supervisors in that Department may not be entitled to overtime as a condition of employment because their work may not involve them into coming out to work at night. But the workmen who work on that job are entitled as well as some of the Supervisors who hold executive positions.

However, I think that information can be easily obtained.
4.00 p.m.

The supernumeraries come in on the basis of being paid for working at Christmas, and they may certainly work for more money than a Clerk. It all depends upon the rate which you are paying for the supernumerary job.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, exactly what the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said is what I was going to tell the hon. senior member for the City when I rose just now. The hon. senior member for the City says that he knows that some of these people are getting more than what others are getting. I cannot say if that is true or not, but I will look into the matter. However, I will tell the hon. member that I would not be surprised about that, because the Postmen who are on the staff may have pension rights which would be unlike the supernumeraries who work this year and who may not work next year. I believe that difficulties are being experienced in getting people to do the job.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, that is the answer which I should have received ever since. The explanation which has been given by the Hon. Minister seems to be quite reasonable to me. If a man says that he will work for eight hours overtime and he can only draw for four hours overtime, whereas another man who is working alongside of him will draw money for working eight hours overtime, that will cause unrest. The Hon. Minister has quite rightly said that he will investigate the matter, and that is what the position should be.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1965-66 No. 55

MENTAL HOSPITAL

A Resolution for the sum of \$24,149 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, the next Resolution is a Resolution to place the sum of \$24,149 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1965-66, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, 1965-66 No. 55 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution. These items are all in respect of Head 39 - Mental Hospital. Under Item 142 - Clean-

ing. Water, Light and fuel - the sum of \$28,000 was voted in the current Estimates, but this amount has proved to be inadequate owing to the payment of outstanding bills from 1964-65 amounting to \$2,133.75, and the increasing cost of natural gas and electricity. This sum of \$5,262 is required to supplement this Item. The next Item is Item 43 - Furniture and Equipment. Under this Item, we are asking for a supplementary vote of \$7,000. This is due to the fact that unforeseen expenditure on the purchase of two boilers and the replacement of certain items rendered the provision under this Item inadequate. As regards Item 44 - Medicine and Medical Apparatus - the amount voted in the current activity of the Outpatient's Clinic, the expenditure under this Item has been greater than anticipated, and this amount of \$8,297 is required to supplement the provision. The next Item is Item 47 - Uniforms. The sum of \$3,165 is required to meet the deficiency which has been created under this Item by the payment of outstanding bills from 1964-65 amounting to \$1,620 and the increase in the cost of materials. The last Item is Item 49 - Maintenance of vehicles. Under this Item, the sum of \$425 is required to supplement the amount voted. The note points out that the unsatisfactory performance of the Mental Hospital's vehicles has resulted in higher maintenance costs. These are all supplementary votes. When the Estimates are laid, it is not possible to estimate the expenditure to the last dollar and, for that reason, we have to come here and ask for these supplementary votes in respect of the Mental Hospital. It seems to me that in the foreseeable future the amount will have to be increased. I beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of \$24,149 do now pass.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, while I am in agreement with this Resolution, I should just like to draw the attention of the Hon. Minister to the first part of the Addendum which deals with Item 42 - Cleaning, Water, Light and fuel. The Addendum sets out that the provision under this Item has proved to be inadequate owing to the payment of outstanding bills from 1964-65 amounting to the sum of \$2,133.75 and the increasing cost of natural gas and electricity. As I have said, Sir, I am in agreement with this Resolution; but merely because I have had to deal with Estimates, expenditure and the like in respect of local Government, I am a bit worried as to how these things are done here. It says in the Addendum: "the provision has proved inadequate owing to the payment of outstanding bills from 1964-65 amounting to \$2,133.75". It does not say "owing to the outstanding bills." 4.10 p.m.

The Minister knows that nobody in this country can pay outstanding bills unless he has money available; so when you put down "owing to the payment of outstanding bills", it means that you have paid outstanding bills which you should not have paid out of the amount which was voted in the Estimates to do something else. In other words, you voted a certain amount of money for the Mental Hospital, and you paid outstanding bills from it without coming to the Legislature. I wonder if the Auditor General passed that expenditure, I would like the Minister to explain this, because the custom would normally be to come and say that you have outstanding bills to be paid, and you would vote a supplementary amount, making the outstanding bills part of the Resolution. You have now said that you need this supplementary provision owing to the payment of outstanding bills. I wonder how the Auditor General has passed the payment of outstanding bills when there is nothing for it.

Mr. WALCOTT: Again, Mr. Chairman, I am really shocked to hear the hon. member asking these questions. He is Chairman of some sort of Committee, as you must have read. All this means is that the bills might not have been submitted before 31st March. The Addendum says that provision under Item 42 - Cleaning, Water, Light and Fuel - of Head 39 Mental Hospital has proved inadequate owing to the payment of outstanding bills from 1964-65 amounting to the figures stated, which means that when you were calculating the Estimates, you calculated for the current amount; but there is nothing to prevent the Auditor General from passing a bill submitted on or after 31st March though it should

have been in by the end of March. In the Estimates for the following year money would be voted for the various Heads, and though your bill would be late, so far as payment is concerned, you are entitled to it when you submit your bills; but you have to wait until the Estimates are passed. The bill submitted may be for expenditure under a particular Item, and the bill would be paid for that Item. If you have a vote of \$10,000 for making tables for the Hospital in the current Estimates, and there is enough money before the amount is exhausted for the settling of other expenditure incurred already, the Auditor General is not going to object to paying that bill. It is not a new expenditure, but something the Government owes somebody and therefore the money is going to be paid to the person. What it does, however, is reduce the quantum which you had. If money lapses, you do not put it in the Treasury and say it is lapsed money and budget differently, because the money is a current amount. What I do not understand is that this has been done here so many times and the hon. member is now questioning it. Sometimes in a year we pass a special Resolution to deal with a bill that is there to be paid in view of the fact that they do not have the money to pay the bill in the current Estimates, and as a result you had to have another Resolution. What is surprising is that the hon. member is Chairman of some Committee and he would not exercise his right. (Mr. MOTTLEY: You do not come when summoned.) I do not know if it is a two-man Committee. I do not sit down on a stone and wait until the hon. member calls a Committee, because it looks awkward if he is Chairman of a Committee not to exercise his right by calling a meeting to do these things, and is waiting until there is a meeting of the House to do them, because he has been a member too long to acquire this elementary practice. I will say it is childish and elementary to pry into these things.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Before the Hon. Minister replies, I should like to say that the hon. member seems to think that he is the only person who knows about preparing Estimates, but the Minister will agree with me that in preparing Estimates you must have an amount for sundry creditors from which certain bills are paid. The hon. member raised the point of my being Chairman of some Committee, but I had a very difficult job to be appointed Chairman, and after the appointment, there was the question as to whether I should call that Committee. In preparing your Estimates you should have included the amount for sundry creditors for 1964-65 and there would have been no necessity for telling us that you had to pay outstanding bills from the 1965-66 Estimates, for the simple reason that everything ordered at the Mental Hospital must be ordered with a purchase order which is entered in a book; so if you have \$10,000 to spend on any particular item, even if the people did not send in their vouchers, you would know from your book-keeping, unless something is wrong, that you ordered \$9,000 or \$10,000 so that when you prepare the Estimates, you would include that amount for outstanding bills. The Hon. Minister who has had training as a bookkeeper in his Solicitor's examination would know that what I am saying is correct. That is the way the Financial Secretary has been holding up everything he comes across. I am not objecting to the expenditure, but I am saying that these items have already been paid.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, there is a great deal in what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has propounded, but I am grateful to the hon. senior member for St. Peter for having explained certain points for the Government side on the matter. It seems as though it is absolutely essential to give the hon. member the detailed reasons for asking for this supplementary provision. 4.20 p.m.

Under Item 42, Cleaning, Water, Light and Fuel the sum of \$28,000 was voted in the Estimates. This Item has been supplemented in each of the last two financial years. In 1964-65, the sum of \$25,400 was voted and it was supplemented by \$6,953 to make a total of \$32,353.

The actual expenditure on this Item included the payment of a Bill amounting to \$2,133.75 outstanding from 1964 to 1965. The average monthly expenditure for the last two quarters was \$2,453, and the estimated expenditure

to the 31st March was based on the average. It is considered that the supplementary provision of \$5,262 would be adequate to meet the expenditure to the end of this year.

That is the sort of explanation which I have here in the file. If hon. members want me to give that sort of information as regards the other items, well, I can give them.

(A VOICE: No.)

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of \$24,149 do now pass.

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

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

On motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of three Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON in each case, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

NOTE TO ITEM 7 OF HEAD 3, PART 2, AMENDED

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the day stands in the name of the hon. senior member for Christ Church and it is to move the passing of the following Resolution: A Resolution to amend the note to Item 7 of Head 3 of Part 2 - Capital of the Approved Estimates for 1965-66 by the substitution of the word "provision" for the symbol, comma and figures "\$56,418".

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is for amending the note to Item 7 by substituting the word "provision" for the symbol, comma, and the figures "\$56,418" appearing in the note under Head 3 of Part 2 - Capital of the 1965 - 66 Estimates.

The Addendum sets out:-

Under Item 7 of Head 3 of Part II - Capital of the 1965-66 Estimates an amount of \$334,857 was revoted for the completion of the New Hospital Project. This revote included the amount of \$56,418 for erection of Ambulance Garages, Workshop, Resident Architect's Office and Maternity Out-Patients Centre which has proved insufficient. Inasmuch as there are savings under this item as a whole, it is proposed to amend the note to the item by substituting the word "provision" for \$56,418 appearing in the note to this item in the Estimates, so that further expenditure may properly be incurred in the completion of these works.

The position is that work has actually been started and of the amount of \$56,418 which has been voted under Head 3, Item 7, of the 1965-66 Estimates, the sum of \$21,283 was allocated for the erection of ambulance garages, workshop, Resident Architect's office and Maternity Out-Patients centre.

The Director of Public Works has submitted the estimates for the works and in these estimates he has set out:-

"Garages with gabled roof and concrete floor, not surfacing well, 2,368 square feet at \$10 per square feet = \$23,680;

Drivers' room with flat concrete roof = \$5,508;

Mechanical Engineers' Office with flat concrete roof = \$4,788;

An area of land in front of the Garage to be finished in colas 1,800 square feet at 50 cents per square feet = \$900 making a total of \$34,876.

As I have said, the work was started, but it has been discontinued because the provision of \$21,283 was insufficient to complete the work, and the additional sum of \$13,593 is urgently required to complete this work before the end of the financial year.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

4.30 p.m.

RESOLUTION re ESTIMATES OF THE PORT DEPARTMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Resolution to approve under Section 10 of the Barbados Harbours Act, 1960, the expenditure required to supplement the Estimates of the Port Department for the year, 1965-66, as shown in the Schedule to this Resolution, be taken as the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day now stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works:- To move the passing of the following Resolution:- Resolution to approve under Section 10 of the Barbados Harbours Act, 1960, the expenditure required to supplement the Estimates of the Port Department for the year 1965-66, as shown in the Schedule to the Resolution. The Hon. Minister may proceed.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the amount of \$50,000 is provided in the Annexed Estimates - Port Department, Item 28 - Overtime - and that amount is to meet the overtime fees for the Established, Unestablished and Casual Staff Department. On the 20th January, 1966, new rates of overtime for the Port Department were agreed upon and they became effective from the 1st April, 1965. Payment in respect of overtime was made from the 1st January, 1966. Following the introduction of these rates, the overtime fees have been revised as follows:- Arrears of overtime to 31st December, 1965, \$8,827.28. The actual expenditure to the 12th February, 1966, was \$45,812.60. Estimated overtime from the 13th February to 31st March, 1966 - Established Staff for two months, \$4,900; Unestablished and Casual Staff for seven weeks, \$3,500, making a total of \$63,039.88. From the revised expenditure of this \$63,039.88 must be deducted the current year's provision which is \$50,000 and this requires an amount of \$13,039.88 to the end of the financial year. In view of the facts which have just been set out here, I beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of \$13,040 do now pass.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

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

ORDER POSTPONED

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the request which I made earlier today, I am asking leave to deal with the Resolution that the sum of \$4,000 from the amount of \$77,400 provided in the Capital Estimates 1965-66, Head 2 - Communications and Works (iii) Water Supplies, Item 25 - replacement of mains, be used for the laying of a main from Sedge Pond to Bawden's School St. Andrew, and that the note relating to that Item be amended

accordingly. In fact, I beg to move that this Resolution be taken as the next Order of the Day.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day therefore stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works:— To move the passing of the following Resolution: Resolution to approve that the sum of \$4,000 from the amount of \$77,400 provided in the Capital Estimates 1965-66 under Head 2, Communications and Works (iii) water supplies, Item 25 - replacement of mains, be used for the laying of a main from Sedge Pond to Bawden's School, St. Andrew and that the note relating to that Item be amended accordingly.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, in the Capital Estimates for 1965-66, the sum of \$77,400 was provided under Head 2, Communications and Works (iii) water supplies, Item 25.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: We have not got any copies of this Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: ((After conferring with the Clerk.)), I have been instructed that copies of this Resolution have not been circulated to hon. members.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: In view of that fact, Mr. Speaker, I will have to discontinue with the Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is pursuing the proper course.

QUESTION TIME

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Question Time be now taken. I may say that I am not in a position to answer questions which were asked of the Hon. Minister of Health. The Replies were laid last week, but hon. members were not in their places and I promise to give the Replies to those Questions next week.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time, 4.40 p.m.

I am advised that the Replies to the following Questions have been duly laid: Nos. 61, 66, 74 and 95.

Question No. 61, stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas.

QUESTION re LACK OF PROPER GUTTERS IN ST. THOMAS

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, the Question reads as follows:—

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware of the danger the residents of the Shop Hill area in the parish of St. Thomas are exposed to, because of the lack of proper gutters constructed along the road?

Will Government explore the possibility of accommodating the said people by constructing gutters in the abovementioned district before the rainy season sets in?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows:—

"No, Sir.

The slope of the road enables water to flow freely; and with the existing drainage facilities in the area, it is considered that the possibility of flooding after a heavy downpour of rain is remote."

Mr. SPEAKER: Parliamentary Question No. 66 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. John, but he is not, I am afraid, instantly in his place, and I will allow that to stand over until next week.

Parliamentary Question No. 74 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Philip who is in his place.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, if you will recall, I intimated just now that though these two questions have been laid, they are not available at this moment. They were available last week when they were laid, but hon. members were not in their places; I will ask that they be deferred.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will allow them to remain on the Order Paper.

Parliamentary Question No. 95 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas.

QUESTION re NUMBER OF SUPERMARKETS

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, the Question reads as follows:—

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

1. Is Government aware of the vast number of Supermarkets opening throughout the island?
2. Is Government also aware that such an abundance of Supermarkets is driving the small shop-keepers out of business?
3. Is Government further aware that small shop-keepers are not allowed to purchase direct from the agents, and as a result their margin of profit is somewhat reduced?
4. Will the appropriate Minister go into the matter with a view to protecting the small shop-keepers from any unfair competitions?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows:—

"The attention of the Honourable Member is drawn to the statement made by the Honourable Minister of Finance in this House on 30th June, 1964, during the course of his Budget Speech, particularly to the first two paragraphs on page 7 of the printed report.

The Government's policy of encouraging co-operative effort in as many aspects of the island's economic life as possible is designed to strengthen the economic position of the lower income groups and the Government is convinced that small shop-keepers can do much to protect and improve their own position by such effort. Already two supermarkets are being run by Co-operative Societies, and more and more small retail shop-keepers are seeking advice on co-operative organization from the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries."

Mr. SPEAKER: There are no other Replies laid which, so far as I can see, can conveniently be dealt with this afternoon.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, it may well be that hon. members of the Opposition whether official or demi-official, can now proceed with their Private Members' Business. I beg to move that Private Members' Business be now taken.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

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

RESOLUTION re HOUSING OF INMATES AND
STAFF OF ST. ANDREW AND ST.
JOSEPH INFIRMARIES

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 8 be the first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business.

Mr. HOLDER: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: This Order is to move the passing of a Resolution re the housing of the Staff and Inmates of the St. Andrew and St. Joseph Infirmaries.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is one on which I do not think I will have to do much to convince hon. members. It reads as follows:-

"WHEREAS the Northern District Council has decided to remove the inmates and staff of the St. Andrew Infirmary to the St. Thomas Infirmary;"

At the time when this Resolution was introduced, the inmates of the St. Andrew Infirmary were still at that Infirmary, but they have since been removed to St. Thomas, and those at the St. Joseph Infirmary are still pending. The Resolution continues:-

AND WHEREAS provision will soon be similarly made for the staff & inmates of St. Joseph Infirmary,

AND WHEREAS large sums of money will be involved in the housing of the inmates and staff of both Infirmaries,

AND WHEREAS consideration should be given to the hardship likely to be thrown on the relatives wishing to visit the same inmates, hardship caused mainly by the inadequacy of cross-country public transport,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Government be asked to provide a part of the old General Hospital building for the purpose of housing the same inmates and staff, thereby making it easier and cheaper for relatives and friends wishing to visit inmates, especially since it is more convenient to travel by public transport from St. Joseph and St. Andrew to the old Hospital and back.
4.50 p.m.

Now, Sir, as everyone knows, it is very hard for one to get across the country from any part of this island. The inmates of the St. Joseph Infirmary will be housed at the St. Thomas Infirmary. I feel that it is the intention of the authorities to do so from an economical standpoint; but at the present moment, as it stands, it is not costing the administration anything less by removing the inmates of the St. Andrew Infirmary to the St. Thomas Infirmary because they have to furnish quarters for the nurses, and at the moment it is costing \$60 per month by way of rent to house the nurses. Although you have to go to that extra expense to house the nurses, the other employees, such as the cleaners and the washers, are still meeting it difficult to get from St. Andrew to the St. Thomas Infirmary by way of cross country.

The Government now is gearing itself to take over Public Assistance. If that is so, it would be easier and cheaper to administer if they housed these inmates in part of the old Hospital because it is central, and the majority of them are more scattered around the City. It is so much easier to get his transport from any part of the country to Bridgetown.

Mr. Speaker, you will find that there are workers from every part of the country working in Bridgetown. You get them coming from St. Lucy, which I believe is the farthest, to work in Bridgetown. You get them coming from as far as Pie Corner. I was down there last Sunday and I was told - it

was surprising to me - that they do not suffer for bus transport from Pie Corner. I asked what was the fare and they told me that it was 30 cents to Bridgetown.

Persons who travel from Pie Corner to Bridgetown will find it very difficult if they have to travel from Pie Corner to St. Thomas. I am only trying to point out the situation as regards travelling across country. You will have to think in terms of the relatives of the inmates who are placed in these institutions. Those who go into the St. Joseph Infirmary and who will now be transferred to the St. Thomas Infirmary come from as far as Foster Hall, and most of their relatives would of course be living around Foster Hall.

I am sure that bus transport would be of no use to the individuals up there because the visiting hours may not be suitable; and if relatives or friends have to visit their people who would be housed in the St. Thomas Infirmary, it would mean that they would have to hire a motor car. You get a motor bus coming from Bathsheba to Bridgetown, and there is a bus leaving Bridgetown going to St. Thomas; but the bus going to St. Thomas may leave before the bus coming from Bathsheba gets to Bridgetown, and it would mean your spending a whole day around in Bridgetown or your going to the extra expense of hiring a motor car.

The people whom we are talking about are the poorest type of people because there is no one who is in a position to go to a private doctor who would be going into these institutions. It is only those people who really cannot do better that go into these institutions. It may be a mother depending on a son or daughter who is already burdened with children of his own, and just for protection and care, their relatives would have to allow them to go into these institutions. However, at the same time they would like to pay them a visit at least every Sunday.

I would be very glad if the Government would go into this matter and see that it would cause no unnecessary expense on the Government, but that it is going to cost more to the taxpayers whose taxes are already high. You will have to budget more money next year for the upkeep and erection of buildings at this institution because you will be abandoning the St. Joseph Infirmary, but at the same time you will have to extend your building at the St. Thomas Infirmary so as to house the inmates from St. Joseph. You will also have to extend your buildings to house the staff; so you will be spending more money. I do not see where it will cost the taxpayers anything less by housing the inmates at the old hospital.

Sir, I feel, if the Government cannot see fit to house these people at the old Hospital now that they have the available buildings there, that they should allow them to remain where they are because you certainly would not have to budget for the upkeep of quarters any more than what you have already at these institutions. No sooner than you effect the removal, you will have to undertake more expenses to house the inmates and staff.

At St. Andrew, it is costing \$60 per month to house the nurses only, not the entire staff, because the cleaners and washers have to go home after they have finished working each day. I do not know how many nurses are there, but already the taxpayers in the North are heavily hit, and they are not in a position really to carry this big lot of taxation, for the simple reason that the Government is buying or taking up some of the properties in the area, and the Northern District Council is losing taxes as a result. You can take as an instance the Scotland Industries, the Soil Conservation place and all those other places which the Government has taken over. The Council is losing revenue as a result; and the more revenue they lose, the more taxes the taxpayers would have to pay.

Now, with the removal of these inmates, the taxpayers would have to pay a lot more.
5.00 p.m.

As I said just now, since the Government is geared to take over Public Assistance, it will mean that it will be easier to handle it from this end than by having these in-

stitutions scattered all over the country. I am sure that you will be doing the inmates and the relatives of these inmates a service if you were to remove them down here. I can quite clearly see that from a strictly economical point of view, the Government may have sought to amalgamate these institutions. By doing that, they found it cheaper than to run them separately; but at the moment I cannot see where it will be cheaper to run them because you have the facilities at St. Thomas already and you only have to move into them, I daresay the Councils have an ambulance, and they can easily acquire another van for the purpose of transporting the relatives of the inmates to these institutions. I feel that there is an easier way to handle the matter. How much more you would have to look for in respect of the housing of the staff and the inmates? I do not know if any of the staff has been laid off because of the amalgamation. I am not in any way unhappy about the qualified nurses because we can do with more qualified nurses at the Hospital; so that it will not be a question of putting the nurses out of work, but it will be a question of dealing with the inmates.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that I will have to do any more talking on this Resolution because the position has been clearly set out and every hon. member of this Chamber is reasonable. He can see reason in that it would not cost the Government anything more to bring these people to Bridgetown. The question of cross-country transportation has always been a difficult one, especially in Barbados. It is more difficult to get from Belleplaine, St. Andrew, to Rock Hall, St. Thomas, than it would be to get from Belleplaine to Bridgetown. I feel that the time has come when we have to centralise these places. Just now you are paying taxes at the various Treasurers' Offices in the country, but it is easier for the taxpayers to pay their taxes in Bridgetown than having to go across the country to pay them to the various Treasurers. It is easier to get from Cane Garden, St. Joseph, to Bridgetown so as to look for a relative than to get from Cane Garden to Horse Hill. Sir, with those few remarks, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the motion for the passing of this Resolution. Taking this Resolution in all of its aspects, the proposer has brought many things before the House this afternoon. The amalgamation of the Almshouses has been a long process and it is now taking effect. I have seen that the Northern District Council has taken individuals from the St. Andrew's Infirmary to St. Thomas, and it is also expected to do likewise with the inmates from the St. Joseph Infirmary. The hon. mover of the passing of this Resolution who is a member of the Northern District Council, would be quite au fait with these things. I feel that now that the opportunity has been given, I should wholeheartedly support this Resolution which has been brought forward by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. If there is a suitable building at the Old Hospital which could be used to house the inmates, I do feel that it would be far better to use this building for the purpose of housing these inmates than to merge these people in the Infirmary at St. Thomas. Knowing the Infirmary at St. Thomas as I do, I am sure that the Government will have to go in for some expenditure. I can see that it will cost the Northern District Council a great deal of money in order to get things suitable at the Infirmary at St. Thomas.

If you take the statistics as to the number of inmates who will be going to the Infirmary, you will still have to think of the other things. If these inmates are housed at the St. Thomas Infirmary, their relatives and friends from the different parts of the island will be faced with great difficulty in visiting them. The bus service extends all around the island; but there is no proper cross-country bus service, as far as I know. If you travel by No. 3 route you will have to get off the bus and walk for a distance of two and a half miles so as to get to the Infirmary in St. Thomas, and it is the same thing if you travel by No. 2 Route; whereas if you have a building at the Hospital where you could house these inmates, everybody from all over the island would be able to travel easily to the Hospital and visit their relatives. It would be a very easy thing for the relatives of those people who are in the Institution to be able to visit the inmates. I happen to know that one of the things which the people who

are in these Institutions cherish is looking forward to having visits from their relatives.
5.10 p.m.

I do feel that hon. members should support this Resolution when they take into consideration that people who are going to look for their relatives and friends are placed at great inconvenience by having to take one bus to Bridgetown and then another to get to St. Thomas and finish the journey by walking. They may not be people who have motor transport as many of us are blessed with today, and this Resolution is pleading for the poor unfortunate people of a certain age who have been unfortunate to be in a resting home.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I must say that I have listened with great interest to the speeches which have been made by two hon. members who have just sat down, and more especially that of the last hon. member who is very seldom of the frame of mind to make such lengthy speeches. I would like to congratulate him for his efforts on this occasion. It would seem that he was rallying himself with the Hon. Mover of the Resolution in criticising at this stage the 1965-68 Development Plan which was considered and passed in this Chamber, together with the 1965-66 Estimates, not to mention the various arrangements which have been agreed on and which have been brought to the attention of this Chamber so far as the old Hospital buildings are concerned. The hon. members spoke in complete innocence or with no regard to the Development Plan as such and the Estimates for 1965-66.

Now, the policy of this Government has been made clear by the former Minister of Health, Local Government and Community Development who is at present Minister of Trade, Labour and Tourism. I think he made it clear during his tenure of office that the policy of Government was the centralization and consolidation of these services - I refer to the Infirmaries - and he drew to our attention many months ago that in the interest of consolidation, integration and centralization there were certain plans whereby the inmates of St. Andrew, St. Joseph and St. Thomas Infirmaries would be centered at St. Thomas, and the inmates of St. Peter, and St. James would be brought to the St. Lucy Infirmary. For that reason there are certain supplementary Resolutions which will be passed in order to cope with the increased number of inmates at the respective institutions. After probably six or eight months, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and the hon. junior member for St. James are moving and seconding respectively a Resolution which is not normally allowed in principle because it cuts across something which has been agreed to on the floor of this Chamber. How can you entertain that sort of action? The policy of the Government is set out in the Development Plan 1965-68, and the 1965-66 Estimates contain certain provisions so far as the Infirmaries are concerned; yet two hon. members can at the end of the financial year be putting up a case for the inmates of the St. Joseph infirmary. The hon. junior member for St. James did not make it clear whether he was speaking for the inmates of the St. James Infirmary, but, in any case, he is supporting the Resolution; so I presume he is speaking for the St. Joseph inmates in contradistinction to the St. James inmates.

It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. members are not doing their parliamentary duties effectively or efficiently, or they fail to remember what has been agreed on in principle, for which provision has been made financially many months ago. What I am wondering, Sir, is whether the Government can at this stage support a Resolution of this nature. The St. Thomas Infirmary has been extended to cater for the inmates from St. Andrew and St. Joseph, and the infirmary at St. Lucy has been extended to cater for the inmates from St. Peter and St. James. These are some of the proposals of the Development Plan which was approved many months ago. In so far as Public Health is concerned, Mr. Speaker, there will be in another week or two a take-over of this service.

I should like to draw to the hon. member's attention that the Hospital Buildings Committee has made certain recommendations, and the buildings in the Hospital com-

pound have been allocated for several different purposes, including a Nursing School for the training of nurses. The Tercentenary Ward will be converted in the foreseeable future into a Training School for nurses, and the old Ward "A" and Ward "E" Chattel buildings will be converted for housing for Student Nurses; so to suggest that we have a lot of buildings in the Hospital compound lying empty and idle is not correct. We have in that compound now the Social Security Department, the World Health Organisation, the Pan American Health Organisation, the Sports Department, the Social Welfare Department, the Electrical Department, apart from the Ministry of Health and Community Development, and the Ministry of Education. To say, therefore, that the Hospital buildings are not allocated or used is really not paying any attention to what has been happening on an everyday basis. The hon. member would see, therefore, that the Hospital buildings are not available as such. They are very useful and beneficially utilised by way of providing accommodation for Government Departments, thereby effecting large savings for Government in having to provide suitable premises for Government Departments as done formerly. The buildings provide accommodation for a multiplicity of Government Departments which were strewn all over the City and in streets and alleys; so the hon. member can write off the Hospital buildings.

The suggestion in so far as improving transport facilities may be a good one, and it may well be that the Hon. Mover of the Resolution has a good case. I will do whatever lies within my power to see that certain transportation facilities are given in order to accommodate the relatives of those inmates of St. Joseph Infirmary or their relatives is concerned; we have to think of the interest of the community in the maintenance and upkeep of the average inmate at the infirmaries.

5.20 p.m.

I think it is to the order of \$10 a day. It is as much as that. I think the hon. member would agree that since this Government has come into power and since the standard of living has been raised and more money has come into circulation - we are not saying that the Welfare State has come into being; it has not actually got so far - there are fewer inmates in these institutions than there were years ago. In trying to bring about centralization we are not doing any harm at all. We are aiming at efficiency for the inmates and giving them better attention. We think centralization would help them more, and the taxpayers would not be called upon to pay more. Today we are thinking of centralization, integration and consolidation whereby you would get better treatment and improved services.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, sometimes some of us who claim to be representatives of the people really do not merit being called representatives. If we represent people, we must know what is going on around us, and we should not come in here to speak on what we know not of.

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph and the hon. junior member for St. James came in with this Resolution, and they have supported it, asking for the establishment of a home for the Indigent and Infirm and otherwise Incapacitated in the compound of the old Hospital. The hon. members ought to be aware - and if they are not aware, I do not see why they should represent people - that the entire compound of the old Hospital is now occupied by offices which the hon. senior member for Christ Church just mentioned, and the Hon. Minister has even omitted to mention that right on the same Hospital site provision is made for a dormitory for students who will be doing their clinical courses in medicine as from next year. Another section of the Hospital compound is used temporarily for the Social Security Offices, and these offices are actually occupied. To suggest that these buildings or any building should be used to house the inmates of St. Joseph, St. James or any place is utter nonsense.

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. As far as I remember, I do not think that in my speech I said anything about the inmates of St. James, St. Peter or St. Lucy.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: It is strange to have a representative of the people fighting a case for inmates of an Infirmary which he does not represent and not fighting the case for the inmates of the Infirmary which he represents. That shows the inability, ineptitude and otherwise of the hon. member.

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. When I spoke on this Resolution, I began by saying that the amalgamation of these almshouses in the North was always in view from the time that local Government came into power, and it was mainly because of transport difficulties that it did not come about. I do not have to get up in here and talk of St. James, St. Lucy and St. Peter when I see that amalgamation is coming along. You can come from any part of the island and go to Bridgetown, take a bus and go to St. Lucy and look for your relatives.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has gone far beyond the point of order. He has now travelled all over the country.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: It is alright for relatives of inmates to come from the country to Bridgetown and then go to St. Lucy; therefore, what is wrong with people from St. Joseph coming to Bridgetown and boarding a bus and going to St. Thomas?

There are people who do not like to see progress in a community. In the modern way of thinking, there is no room for the destitute to be living in rooms with sore-footed people and people of that sort. We are trying to improve the standard of living of our people who have to go to these Institutions, and here you are getting some people trying to retard progress. The policy which has been already agreed to by this House - you get some hon. members saying now that it should be changed just to suit the whims and fancies of perhaps someone who cannot think.

The hon. junior member for St. James said that it would be additional expense on the Northern District Council. Only one who is ignorant of what is going on would make that statement because the Northern District Council has not spend a cent on this venture. This was done by the Public Works Department by a vote from this Legislature to which the hon. member agreed; but those hon. members agree to things which they know not of. Perhaps they were sleeping when the matter was dealt with in this Chamber. They agreed to the extension and the renovations made at St. Thomas Infirmary, and today after the renovations and extensions have been already completed, they are asking us to make other arrangements for the inmates of St. Joseph or the inmates wherever they want to bring them from.

5.30 p.m.

That is what you call representing people! Do you want us to waste the taxpayers' money at St. Thomas by providing housing accommodation for these people elsewhere? When we do that, then they will tell us that we are wasting the taxpayers' money. Sir, you do not know how to please these people.

The hon. member is pleading for these old people who are in the Infirmarys. This is a question of vote-catching; but you cannot catch votes by this Resolution because the people are interested in the promotion of progress and not in retarding it. As far as I am aware, the buses pass the St. Thomas Infirmary every day; and if the relatives of the people of St. Joseph were in a place and those people were interested enough in their relatives, they would be making a sacrifice to see their relatives. I would like to ask the hon. member how many of the fulltime inmates in this Institution are visited by their people. It is common knowledge that there may be the isolated case where once or twice a month a member of a family may wish to see his grandmother at the Infirmary, but I ask: How often is this done? Let the hon. member search the statistics of those who go to visit the people in the Infirmarys. I say that if people are interested in their relatives who are in the Infirmarys, they would not mind the inconvenience to which they may be put in going to see their relatives. If I were living in the

parish of St. Philip and I was interested in my relative who was in the Infirmary in the parish of St. Lucy, I would go down there to see him.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is no other hon. member who is desirous of speaking on this Resolution, the hon. mover may now exercise his right of final reply, if he thinks fit to do so.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who has just sat down has referred to this Resolution as something which is vote catching. I would throw out the challenge to him now. Since he called this Resolution vote catching, let both of us be found nowhere in our constituencies and do nothing at all in the coming elections and find out which of us will find himself in this House. I challenge him to let both of us do nothing at all at the coming Elections and see who would find himself back in here! The hon. member tried to attack the hon. junior member for St. James by saying that the hon. junior member for St. James is trying to support this Resolution in respect of an Infirmary which is out of his constituency. The hon. member talked all around and he has not mentioned the parish of St. Andrew yet. He has called St. Joseph, St. Lucy and St. Thomas, but he has not called the parish of St. Andrew yet.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I have not mentioned the parish of St. Andrew because I have no case to fight for the people of St. Andrew. I am quite satisfied with what is being done for the parish of St. Andrew.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

Mr. SMITH: The hon. member says that hon. members of this House do not know what they have agreed to. He said that the Public Works Department spend money on the St. Thomas Almshouse in renovating it and making it ready for these inmates. If that is so, why has the Northern District Council been called upon to pay the sum of \$60.00 per month for Nurses' Quarters at Rock Hall? Where is that \$60.00 a month coming from? Is it coming out of the hon. member's pocket? The hon. member does not know what is happening.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has misquoted me and said that I said it does not cost the taxpayers of the Northern District Council one cent. (Mr. SMITH: You said so.)

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member make his point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I said that the renovations and additions to the St. Thomas Infirmary in order to make accommodation for the people of the other parishes, have not cost the Northern District Council one cent. Money was voted here for this purpose and the work was carried out by the Public Works Department.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a point of elucidation.

Mr. SMITH: The hon. member has not made any point of order. He believes that he is a "Kiaki King" and he is not even a good one. He said that these renovations have not cost the Northern District Council one penny and he does not even know that it costs the Northern District Council the sum of \$60.00 per month for Nurses' Quarters. The hon. member can do as he likes at the Public Works Department - and why did he not make the necessary preparation for the Staff up there and prevent them from knocking about and looking for somewhere to sleep? This is not a matter of catch any votes; you are dealing with the poorest class of people. You cannot remove the inmates from the St. Joseph Infirmary yet. The hon. member says that he has done all, but why did he not remove the inmates from the St. Joseph Infirmary? What is he waiting for?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order.

Mr. SMITH: I have not misquoted the hon. member; so what point of order can he be rising on?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister has risen on a point of order and I must hear what he has to say and deem whether it is a point of order or not.
5.40 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I hate to interrupt hon. members when they are speaking, but the hon. member is making so much capital out of what the Government is waiting for that I must reply. The Government is at present working on the first stage of taking over the functions of Local Government with respect to Health and Roads, Street Lighting etc. in the south. The second phase which includes infirmaries and so on will be dealt with in October when we get to it. We are dealing with one phase after the other in chronological order so that things can be done effectively to provide improvements for the staff and inmates to enjoy certain facilities therefrom.

Mr. SMITH: The hon. junior member for St. Andrew said the Government has spend money and has done everything for the inmates at the St. Thomas Infirmary. Since doing that they have moved one set of inmates and I am asking why they do not move the others. They do not have to wait until October. Wherever you take these inmates, they will be well cared for; so it is not a question of where you are taking them: it is a question of the inconvenience that you will be causing the relatives of these people. The hon. junior member for St. Andrew asked how many people go to look for their relatives, but I would say that they do no more than he would have done. He would not go and look for his relatives if they were in the Almshouse, because he is too high up now. There are people who are residents of these Institutions because they have nowhere else to go, but there are others who are sick and people go to visit them; those are the ones I am talking about. I am drawing to the Government's attention the hardship that will be created on these people, and I believe the hon. senior member for Christ Church has seen it, because the moment that he agrees that there is a hardship in the transporting of these people, that shows that I have made out a case for these people. If the Government is going to put a van at the disposal of the people, all well and good because the hon. member has informed us that the Government has uses for the buildings at the Old Hospital compound.

The Government has issued the green light to move these people, but they have not said one word with regard the visiting of these people. It is my duty as a representative to ask the Government to consider it, and any honest, intelligent representative would do what I have done. It is not catching a vote after a matter of twenty-one years like a little "nay nay" piece of idiot. After twenty-one years I am not afraid, nor am I quarrelling and saying I am not going to represent a particular constituency no matter how many single member constituencies you are having. If I have to catch a vote now, Mr. Speaker, they should not allow me to do so. My hands should come together and let the votes fly all around them and I will not get one. He is just a little "frightie" talking about catching a vote.

To come back to my point, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member asked what is wrong with a person taking a bus from St. Joseph to town and then taking another to St. Thomas. There is nothing wrong in that at all, but as I have said, owing to the movements of the buses at scheduled times, one would have to spend much time hanging around in town to catch a bus, especially on Sundays when they do not run every hour or half an hour. That is what I said, but I do not know if he was listening; but the poor little fellow...

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is not referring to any other member of this House as a poor little fellow.

Mr. SMITH: I am not referring to any member because all are rich.

Mr. SPEAKER: I just wanted to be sure.

Mr. SMITH: They are all rich, but some are not rich in political knowledge. The little suckling thing is getting up and trying to tell an old stager something.
5.50 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not sure what the hon. member is getting at. A poor little suckling thing getting up! Where? Not in here.

Mr. SMITH: The Hon. Minister said, "what is wrong in someone taking a bus?" The Hon. Minister did not say taking a bus from St. Andrew to Bridgetown and then to St. Thomas. To walk from St. Andrew to St. Thomas coming up through Swans is a good job.

Anyhow, Sir, we would be able to see how many of us would come back in here. The hon. senior member for Christ Church replied as a Minister should. He gave us reasons. He said that the place up there will be used by nurses. The point which I raised relative to the difficulty of getting transport, the Hon. Minister said that he would see about that. No sooner than he said that, he admitted that something was wrong, and if you give him his own way, he will remedy that. The Hon. Minister is one who has political sense. He is no little suckling thing. In other words, the Hon. Minister has got all his mother's milk. Look at him and you will see! Look at his face and at his neck! Therefore, when it comes to that, the Hon. Minister has replied and I thank him for his replies.

If the compound of the old Hospital will soon be utilised, and he will see to it that something is done by way of transportation to help those people, I am not going to fight because he would be remedying the same thing which I am complaining about in this Resolution. It is not a question of the inmates as inmates. It is the relatives of the inmates. If you take the inmates from St. Joseph and carry them down here, they will be well cared for. If you take them from St. Joseph to St. Thomas they will be well cared for, but it is a question of the relatives of the inmates. Some of us only know these people when we want a vote. We do not think that we come from among them. But I know them. I have not come down; I have come up. If there is one who can write a book on what is called hardship, I can. There are some who are too great. They never expected to raise \$800 a month, and now that they have raised \$800 a month, they have forgotten all about from where they came.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that there is nothing in this Resolution about \$800 a month.

Mr. SMITH: I will continue. If the hon. member called it vote catching, I will catch the votes from the people. Some of us have to pay very dear for them; so I am catching mine. The hon. member is paying me a compliment when he says so. Some members have to buy theirs.

Mr. Speaker, I will not go any further with this Resolution. It is clearly worded and I have done my duty as a representative of the people. The Hon. Minister of Health said that he would do all in his power to help. If you see a hardship, you should call the Government's attention to it. I am only trying to raise the distress flag before you interfere with the people from St. Joseph. The inmates from St. Andrew have gone down to the St. Thomas Infirmary already. I have to care for my own, and before they go for those at St. Joseph, I have raised my distress flag. The Hon. Minister of Health has answered me. If I do not die and go to Heaven, I will be telling the people in St. Andrew what has been said here this afternoon and what has not been said.

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

NOES: Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Hon. N. W. BOXILL, Mr. LOWE, Mr. CORBIN, Mr. COWARD. - 7.

AYES: Mr. HOLDER, Mr. SMITH.

Mr. LYNCH: I abstain.

VOICES: The hon. member cannot abstain from voting.

Mr. SPEAKER: When I require advice from hon. members, I will ask for it and I am sure that they will give it.

I am afraid that our Standing Orders do not permit any hon. member who is in his seat to abstain from voting. Standing Order 37 (7) states:-

When a Member's Name is called by the Clerk at a division, the Member shall answer either by voting for the "Ayes" or for the "Noes". A Member shall not answer in a manner inconsistent with any opinion which he may have expressed when the votes were taken collectively."

Will the hon. junior member for the City of Bridgetown reply in accordance with Standing Order 37 (7) to the Deputy Clerk when he again, as I now instruct him to do, calls his name?

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, what am I now voting on?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is now called upon to vote on a Resolution moved by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, which Resolution stands in his name and is Order No. 8 of Private Members' Business which is on page 9 of the Order Paper in the right hand corner.

Mr. LYNCH: I vote "Aye".

Mr. SPEAKER: I am advised that three hon. members have voted "Aye" and seven hon. members have voted "No". Accordingly, I declare this Resolution not to have passed.

ORDER POSTPONED

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the hon. junior member for Christ Church: Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Barbados Mutual Life Assurance Society Act, 1851. The hon. member is not in his place. This is the last Item under Private Members' Business.
6.00 p.m.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS CONCLUDED

Mr. SPEAKER: I have not had any intimation that any hon. member has availed himself of the offer of the Acting Honourable Leader of the House to proceed with any other matter under Private Members' Business. In that event, I assume that no further Private Members' Business is sought to be dealt with this afternoon.

RESUMPTION OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be resumed at this stage, now that Private Members' Business has been concluded.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE UTILISATION OF \$4,000 FROM SAVINGS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Resolution of which notice was given earlier today, be taken as the next Order of the Day. That is a Resolution to approve that the sum of \$4,000 from the amount of \$77,400 provided in the Capital Estimates 1965-66 under Head 2 - Communications and Works (iii) Water Supplies, Item 25 - Replacement of Mains - be used for the laying of a main from Sedge Pond to Bawden's School, St. Andrew, and that the note relating to that Item be amended accordingly.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day therefore stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications

and Works:- To move the passing of the following Resolution:- Resolution to approve that the sum of \$4,000 from the amount of \$77,400 provided in the Capital Estimates 1965-66 under Head 2 - Communications and Works (iii) Water supplies, Item 25 - replacement of mains - be used for the laying of a main from Sedge Pond to Bawden's School, St. Andrew, and that the note relating to that Item be amended accordingly. I have been instructed that all hon. members have now been circulated with a copy of that Resolution.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, in the Capital Estimates 1965-66, under Head 2 - Communications and Works (iii) Water supplies, Item 25- Replacement of mains - the sum of \$77,400 was provided for the replacement of mains as follows:

- (a) Highland to Hillaby;
- (b) Paragon Road, Christ Church; and
- (c) Oistins to Maxwell, Christ Church,

and the note to the Item states that this sum is to replace the old and corroded mains in these places. The Chief Engineer of the Water Works Department has reported that the programme of replacement has been completed and there is a saving of \$10,000 under this Item. Permission is now being sought by means of this Resolution to expend the sum of \$4,000 from these savings to lay a one-and-a-half inch pipe, four thousand eight hundred feet long, along the road from Sedge Pond to Bawden's School in the parish of St. Andrew. The main which existed along this section had to be abandoned because of land slides. It is now proposed to utilise this \$4,000 for the laying of this main from Sedge Pond to Bawden's School, and since they do not get an adequate supply of water there, this replacement is intended to improve the conditions in that area. In view of what I have just said, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, in supporting this Resolution, I would like to draw to the attention of hon. members of this House, an iniquity which has been perpetrated for many years. The object of this Resolution seems to be to replace rotten and corroded mains with new mains. My experience is that when a main which happens to pass next to the home of someone who gets water from that main, bursts, the house owner who lives nearest to the main is sent a bill for the repairs of that main. Sir, to my mind, that is highway robbery in more senses than one. I would like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister that many members of this community object to this type of charge, that those who happen to get water from a main, when that

main, whether through age or through some road accident, bursts, they are sent bills for the repairs of that main which does not pass on their property. I would like to draw that matter to the attention of the Hon. Minister at this time, and also to the amount of public dissatisfaction which is caused by this particular charge which the Waterworks Department indulges in for which the Minister himself is not responsible because it is an old standing practice which could well now be stamped out.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the Hon. Minister exercises his right of final reply, I want to be satisfied that there is no other hon. member who wishes to contribute to this debate. *(After a pause)*. Apparently there is no other hon. member who wishes to contribute to this debate, and therefore the Hon. Minister may exercise his right of final reply.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I must thank the hon. junior member for the City for the statement which he has made. I can assure the hon. member that I will investigate that statement and if the position needs rectifying, I will draw it to the attention of the Cabinet. This may be something which has been taking place in the days before I came on the scene. If the statement is correct, I think that some steps will have to be taken in order to discontinue this iniquitous practice.

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

6.10 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this now concludes Government Business. I am again reminding hon. members that it is the intention of Government to deal with the Estimates and the Appropriation Bill at next week's sitting commencing on Tuesday, 15th, at 12 noon. Hon. members will have one week to peruse and investigate matters connected to the Estimates and be prepared to deal with the consideration of the Estimates and the Appropriation Bill on successive days, meaning thereby Wednesday, Thursday and, if necessary, Friday until they are concluded.

I therefore beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 15th March, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

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

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

6.17 p.m.