

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 22nd August, 1967

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12 o'clock (noon) today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C. F.Z.S., (Speaker); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (Minister of Health and Community Development); Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (Minister of Education); Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister of Trade, Tourism, Co-operatives and Fisheries); Mr. R. ST.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Hon. N. W. BOXILL, (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD, (Chairman of Committees); Sir G. H. ADAMS, C.M.G., Q.C., B.A., D.C.L. (Hon.), (Leader of the Opposition); Mr. C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P.; and Mr. H. B. ST. JOHN, LL.B.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret to say that there are no Minutes yet ready for confirmation.

I am advised that the reason for the delay is that certain Minutes are not completed; and until this is done the confirmation of Minutes will continue to be held up.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Minister of External Affairs, I am commanded to lay the Annual Report and Statement of Accounts of the Barbados Development Board for the year 1965-66.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Public Health (Transportation of Human Remains), Regulations, 1967. (See Section 101 (5) and (6) of Act, 1954-52).

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On behalf of the Hon. Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Minister of External Affairs, I beg to give notice of the following:-

A Resolution to place the sum of \$1,238 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1967-68 Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1967-68 No. 15 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to approve under Section 10 of the Barbados Harbours Act, 1960, the expenditure of \$700 required to supplement the Estimates of the Port Department for the year 1967-68 as shown in the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to place the sum of \$47,268 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1967-68 Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1967-68 No. 16 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On my own behalf, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the lease to the United Kingdom Government of the property known as "Sherbourne", at Two Mile Hill, St. Michael.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve an amendment to Item 129 of Head 46 of the Estimates 1967-68 relating to the provision of laundry equipment for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Prime Minister Minister of Finance and Minister of External Affairs, I beg to give notice of a Bill to authorise the Government to borrow from the Government of Canada for purposes set out in the Schedule a sum of money not exceeding \$250,000 (Canadian).

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the House that it is proposed to deal with this Bill later in the day in all its stages.

Also, Sir, it is my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply to deal with the Money Resolutions given notice of earlier today.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member say specifically which Resolution does he refer to?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker, I refer also to the Bill to authorise the Government to borrow from the Government of Canada for purposes set out in the Schedule a sum of money not exceeding \$250,000 (Canadian).

Mr. SPEAKER: Have hon. members received copies of this Bill yet?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes; I believe so.

Mr. St. JOHN: We have not yet been circulated with it.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Resolution relating to the provision of laundry equipment for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, I wish to inform the House that it is proposed to deal with this Resolution in all its stages today. It is very important. It deals with the equipment for this laundry, and the equipment has actually arrived.

NOTICE OF REPLIES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I should also have said that the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 65 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Peter is now ready.

QUESTIONS

Mr. CRAIG: To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

When does Government contemplate the construction of the National Stadium?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. member did his parliamentary duties properly, he would have known that we have a Resolution in here for the construction of the National Stadium.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order has arisen. No discussion will take place.

Mr. CRAIG: To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. Is Government aware of the great inconvenience suffered by the residents of St. Simons and King's Village Districts, in the parish of Saint Andrew, due to the long periods of time that water is unavailable?

2. If the answer to the above is in the affirmative will Government take immediate steps to remedy the said inconvenience suffered by the said residents?

Mr. CRAIG: To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. Is Government aware of the great inconvenience suffered by the residents of Hoyte's Village, Holders Hill and Thorpe's Housing Area all in the

parish of Saint James due to the low water pressure in the said areas?

2. If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, will Government take the necessary steps to remedy the said inconvenience suffered by the said residents?

Mr. CRAIG: To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. Is Government aware that the Tunnel in Doughlin's Road in the parish of Saint James is generally blocked whenever there is a heavy rainfall, thereby causing great inconvenience to the residents of the said District?

2. If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, will Government take appropriate action to remedy this state of affairs?

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, the Bill to authorise the Government to borrow from the Government of Canada for purposes set out in the Schedule a sum of money not exceeding \$250,000 (Canadian), was read a first time.

DISCHARGE OF SELECT COMMITTEE

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to discharge the Committee which was appointed to consider and report on a Bill to provide for the acquisition, deprivation and renunciation of citizenship of Barbados and for purposes incidental to or connected therewith.

The hon. members have completed their labour and the matter has passed this House since. I thank hon. members for the expeditious and efficient manner in which they performed their duties.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House: To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Island. 12.25 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: 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 of the House while in Committee to deal with the Resolution to approve an amendment to Item 129 of Head 46 of the Estimates 1967-68 relating to the provision of laundry equipment for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, of which notice was given by the Hon. Minister of Health; and also with the Resolution to place the sum of \$47,268 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1967-68 Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1967-68, No. 16 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, we have just this minute received a copy of the Resolution for the sum of \$47,268.

Mr. SPEAKER: Actually, the motion has not been seconded. Is the hon. member seconding the motion?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I must correct myself in respect of the Resolution to approve the amendment of a note of which notice was given by the hon. junior member for Christ Church. We do not have to go into Committee on that. With respect to the other Resolution of which the hon. member was raising a point, that Resolution has just been circulated.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second the motion.

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

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1967-68 No.13

HEAD 16 - PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE

Head 16 - Prime Minister's Office - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, Head 16, Item 4A (New), provides for a special allowance to the Head of the Civil Service. I think that the note is quite explanatory. In this case, the Financial Secretary as such is not necessarily the Head of the Civil Service, because there are other Departments which are just as important, and we feel that whoever the Cabinet appoints as Head of the Civil Service should be that Head, and not necessarily the Financial Secretary ex officio. By virtue of that distinction, the Head of the Civil Service is being granted an allowance in the sum of \$960 per annum. I need not say anything more about that. I beg to move that Head 16 stand part of the Schedule.

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: The Minister has said the person whom the Cabinet appoints. How did the Cabinet appoint him? What is the practice?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: It is what the Cabinet does.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Does the Cabinet act on anybody's advice? The hon. member has used the word "appoint".

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is.....

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I have asked a simple question. If the Hon. Ministers think that we are going to sit down forever and be treated as little children, they are quite wrong.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I do not care to be very abrupt at this day's sitting. Let us go back to fundamentals. The sum of \$640 is required to pay a special allowance during the current financial year to the officer who has been designated as the Head of the Civil Service with effect from 1st August 1967, at the rate of \$960 per annum. This payment is being

made in accordance with a decision by the Cabinet that whichever officer is designated as the Head of the Civil Service, he should receive remuneration, including his substantive salary, at a rate no less than the highest paid administrative or technical officer, that is, at a rate of \$12,000 per annum.

After all, the Cabinet has the last word. The Cabinet will seek all the necessary advice and they will have expert advice at their disposal. Whichever officer is designated as Head of the Civil Service should receive remuneration, including his substantive salary, at a rate no less than the highest paid administrative or technical officer. He should receive \$12,000 per annum. As to the question which was posed by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, that is nothing short of challenging the special rights of the Cabinet. The Cabinet has the advice not only of Government officials and any of the experts or so-called experts, but also that of the private sector; and in so far as the Civil Service is concerned, the Prime Minister has the advice of the Public Service Commission, the Personnel Department, the Establishment Officer and so on. The Prime Minister is the Head of the country and he has access to everything. If he has access to everything and is in a position to advise the Government, how can we fail to make a decision? If he feels that the Financial Secretary as such should be the Head of the Civil Service, it is the Financial Secretary; if we choose to decide on the Chief Establishment Officer or some other officer, that is the Government's prerogative. I did not think that that would call for any comment.
12.35 p.m.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I asked the Hon. Minister a simple question. This is the sort of thing that did not happen in my time. There was no Head of the Civil Service. Why cannot the question be answered?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: With all due respect to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, I thought that he would recall what happened in his days - fifteen or eighteen years ago. During that time the Financial Secretary was the chief of the Civil Service, and another time the Colonial Secretary was the chief of the Civil Service. That was before there was Ministerial Status; but since then, the Financial Secretary was chief of the Civil Service.

The question that Head 16 stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 45 - LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Head 45 - Local Government - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, this Head is asking for \$300,000 for a grant to be paid to the Interim Commissioner, and I hardly believe any hon. member would raise objection against it. I regard that as irrelevant. This is for backpay to local Government officers and officials, and I dare anyone to raise objection against this.

Mr. Chairman, the note is very explanatory. Employees of Local Government Councils which have

been recently disbanded were given the assurance that their salaries would have been increased by the Central Government. Now, many Resolutions were passed and we feel in duty bound to increase the salaries and wages of these Local Government officers. We feel that they are entitled to backpay as from the 1st April, 1966. Therefore, we are trying to regularise and equalise the position. We know fully well that we have done our best.

In the case of salaries and wages not exceeding \$1,200 per annum, the increase which we are giving is 25%. In the case of salaries and wages exceeding \$1,200 per annum, but not exceeding \$2,400 per annum, we are giving an increase of 20%. In the case of salaries and wages exceeding \$2,400 per annum but not exceeding \$3,600, the increase is 15%. In the case of salaries and wages exceeding \$3,600, the increase is 10%.

The estimated total cost of revision for the three areas is \$300,000 for the year 1966-67 and \$290,400 for the year 1967-68. Provision has been included in the 1967-68 approved Estimates for the Interim Commissioner for the estimated expenditure resulting from the revision for the year 1967-68.

We could not meet any retroactive taxes with the Resolution, and the Government had to come down with a grant in order to implement this programme. I am very happy to see that in spite of the delay that we have been able to bring down this Resolution. I am very grateful to the Hon. Prime Minister in consenting to this Resolution, and I want those who have worked for years to know that their case has not been ignored.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, any Resolution dealing with Local Government in Barbados must provoke some discussion. Whatever one may say of the merits or demerits of the Resolution, one cannot feel happy of the situation which exists today in Local Government. We have now an Interim Commissioner who is advising Cabinet. He is not elected by the people; yet he has power to levy rates.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but the hon. member is reflecting on a vote which was passed by this House in March this year. He is entirely out of order.

Mr. St. JOHN: I entirely disagree with the Hon. Minister. That is not a point of order.

The question is.....

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I take it that you would like us to have some respect for you. I made a statement on a point of order. This Hon. House is not a Sunday School. The Hon. Minister has made ob-

jection to what I was saying. This is a serious matter. He said that I was reflecting on a vote of this House.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Rule 26 (4) deals with reflection on a vote of the House. It says:-

"It shall be out of order to reflect on any vote of the House or attempt to reconsider any specific question upon which the House has come to a conclusion during the current session except upon a substantive motion for rescission."
12.45 p.m.

Your Honour was asked to rule, and instead of ruling, Your Honour began to put the question. You must hope to gain the respect of this House and you should not ignore the question that you should rule on the point raised by the Hon. Minister in charge of this Resolution.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I heard the Hon. Minister make an objection and it was up to the Chair to rule. In my opinion, I have not stopped the hon. senior member for Christ Church.

Mr. St. JOHN: I thank you, Sir.

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

Mr. St. JOHN: What point of order?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Minister has risen on a point of order. Let me hear the point of order.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, generally speaking, a very popular practice with hon. members of the Opposition, despite the fact that a Commissioner has been appointed, is to raise certain things. We are now getting money to give backpay to these employees.

Mr. St. JOHN: The Hon. Minister has interrupted me and is proceeding to make a speech. I ask Your Honour to rule that that is out of order.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The hon. member is attempting to debate what has happened in March this year.

Mr. St. JOHN: I am not allowing the hon. member to interrupt me. The hon. member expects that we, over here, must sit down and let the Government bring down a Resolution dealing with Local Government, and not use the opportunity to point out to the electorate that the Interim Commissioner has increased the rates throughout the whole of Barbados. That is the point we are afraid of. The public must be made aware of the fact that the rates have been increased.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order. And the public must also know that thousands of dollars have been misspent.

Mr. St. JOHN: The hon. member must act in accordance with the Standing Orders.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member take his seat?

Mr. St. JOHN: I will take my seat when the hon. member sits.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Since the abolition of the Local Government Councils, thousands of dollars have been saved.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Is the hon. member in order to be standing when another hon. member is standing?

Mr. St. JOHN: The hon. member is preventing me from making my speech.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Two hon. members are on their feet and I wish both of them to sit.

Mr. St. JOHN: Let the hon. member take his seat and his licks.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will both hon. members sit?

Mr. St. JOHN and Hon. C. E. TALMA took their seats.

Mr. St. JOHN: As I was saying, Sir,.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I was speaking and I want the hon. senior member for Christ Church to sit down.

The hon. member took his seat.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What I would counsel hon. members is this: We are dealing with a Resolution for the sum of \$300,000 and I would like hon. members to stick to the Resolution and to make sure that this Resolution is passed for the benefit of the people of this country. Let the hon. senior member for Christ Church proceed.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, this is a financial Resolution, and in spite of the attempts of the Hon. Minister to heckle me and prevent me from speaking, I intend to deal with all aspects of Local Government today. The Interim Commissioner.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am afraid that the abolition of the Local Government Councils came into being, and the hon. member had the right of explaining it to the country at that time. We are now dealing with a Resolution for the sum of \$300,000.
12.55 p.m.

Mr. St. JOHN: I want to advise Your Honour not to enter the debate because as soon as you enter, you make things worse for yourself. If you intend to go by the Rules, you cannot prevent any hon. member from dealing with Local Government. Nobody is going to stultify me.

The position is that subsequent to the abolition of Local Government, no election has taken place in this country for Local Government Councils, and the people that are laying rates have no responsibility to the people. The Cabinet is called upon to pay \$300,000

now when the Hon. Minister cannot deny the fact that there are arrears of over \$ 1 1/2 million in taxes which they cannot get collected.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The arrears did not take place when the Central Government took over; they were owed from long before. It is for that reason the Central Government took over.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Two hon. members are on their feet and I am asking the hon. senior member for Christ Church to please sit down.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: It is for that specific reason - the errors and the maladministration - that the Central Government had to step in. There was a lot of wastage of the taxpayers' money.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: What is the use of having a Chairman if a member is allowed to continue to break the Rules?

Mr. ST. JOHN: His attempt to stultify procedure is not going to prevent me from making my points. The Minister said that it was due to maladministration. It was due to his colleague from St. George, the Parliamentary Secretary, that nothing has been done in the last six months.

What has the Minister done to correct the errors? Nothing. But we are called upon to vote \$300,000. Let the Hon. Minister deny the fact that he has not done anything to correct the errors.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: You are running around these workers and calling on your nitties up there to call a strike.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I was making a point and you allowed the Minister to get up and make a point.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let me ask the hon. member a question.

Mr. St. JOHN: The Chair cannot ask an hon. member a question.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let the hon. member deal with the Resolution for \$300,000.

Mr. ST. JOHN: I ask Your Honour to act in accordance with the Standing Orders of this House.

Mr. ST. JOHN: The position is that the rates have gone up in this country, and the roads in the constituency of the Hon. Minister are in the worst state possible. The scavenging is the worst. Let the Hon. Minister deny that fact. It is in a terrible condition and nothing has been done about it.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The strike which he was organizing has not come off.

Mr. St. JOHN: What strike is the Hon. Minister talking about? The Hon. Minister admits that there was no Board set up to take the place of these Councils. These people were allowed to go without a salary increase because it was election year, and they were afraid to raise the rates. Let the Hon. Minister deny that fact, and let the Parliamentary Secretaries for St. Philip and St. George deny that.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I am being challenged, and I must rise to defend myself. The hon. senior member for Christ Church has challenged me. They have organizations and all sort of things.

Mr. St. JOHN: Is that a point of order?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, how long is this going on? This is against proper parliamentary system. Cannot you see that the Hon. Minister is out of order?

Mr. ST. JOHN: The Hon. Minister said that I was organizing a strike in Christ Church. That is a grave reflection on the Hon. Minister himself, but the Hon. Minister would know that negotiations were going on between the Barbados Workers' Union and the Council. Never has there been the contemplation of a strike.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The Barbados Workers Union never had the Southern District Council workers organized to that extent. That is true, and the hon. member knows it.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. Can I draw to your attention Standing Order No. 36 (2) which states:-

"The Speaker or the Chairman shall order Members whose conduct is grossly disorderly to withdraw immediately from the House during the remainder of that day's sitting, and the Marshal shall act on such orders as he may receive from the Chair in pursuance of this Order."

Mr. ST. JOHN: It is most unrealistic that the public is being asked to subsidize Local Government employees' salaries. The Barbados Labour Party refused to give a subsidy, but now because the Government has to cover up, they bring this Resolution inside here. This agreement was not negotiated for. It was dictated by the Hon. Minister's Ministry. It was not sought to deal with the matter in a way in which any Salary Commissioner appointed to deal with a salary revision would deal with it. It was an exercise which was done in salaries because of the fact that the Central Government has all of the power, and they feel that everybody can be dictated to.

But they have to face the facts. They have no responsibility to the electorate of Barbados. The Government has instituted a system that one man can say what are the rates of taxes for people all over this country. They will have sooner or later to face the facts.

What is the reason for coming here for \$300,000 for the increase of salaries for people who were employed in Local Government when you have arrears of taxes of over \$1 1/2 million? They refused to have a central scavenging system. The Minister is going to jump up and say that they are investigating it. They have been investigating it for two years. As far as scavenging is concerned, the Public Health system has gone worse in this island.

They say that they are going to create Boards. The Government is not going to create any Boards because the Government is having great difficulty in finding competent men to put on Boards. The Hon. Minister has had a particularly unfortunate experience.

1.05 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order. I would like the hon. member to be more explicit. These remarks may mean something to those of us who are not aware of his technique.

Mr. ST. JOHN: What I would like to know from the Minister is what steps the Government is taking to recover the 1 1/2 million in arrears. The position is that now that they have increased the rates, do they not realise that since the people will feel that they have no method of changing the rate fixing body, they will not pay any taxes in the future? Do you not realise that? As soon as you appoint Civil Servants to the Councils with no responsibility to the electorate, do you not realise that when you raise the rates you will create an atmosphere against the paying of the taxes? Are you using Central Government funds to subsidise the inefficient system of Local Government which we have now? And when you want to raise these matters, the Hon. Minister wants to stifle the debate! He wants to do so because they have no plans about Local Government. The idea that they were creating a Board is over now. Since the defalcations and the irregularities of other Boards, the Government is running shy of Boards. From 31st March until August where we are now, from then until now, nothing has been announced except an increase in the taxes!

What I want to know is this: and this is what the Minister should be able to answer on the floor of this House. What has happened with the negotiations which were going on with the former Councils with respect to the rate increases? My information is that these were not the ones which were agreed to by the Councils. Let the Minister say in here whether these rate increases were the same ones which were agreed to between the Councils and the employees. I believe that a number of anomalies are going to arise out of these proposals. Every subdivision and revaluation take all the jobs that are in Local Government, and adjustments are made in the salary structure to cater to the new and expanding Departments. None of that is being done in this case. Are we going to have an anomalies Committee? Those are the points which should have been talked about during the course of the introduction of the Resolution; but instead of that, we had a defiance of talk about it. The Minister in his usual style to attract the votes of intelligent people,

attempted to say that we are voting against salary increases in here. We would not do that except when we know that these increases were not arrived at after mutual consultation with the bodies which represent these workers. The Civil Service Association is now representative of the Clerical employees. Let the Minister say that the Civil Service Association has not written to the Interim Commissioner and instructed him that it now represents Clerical employees. We feel that a salary revision which has not been arrived at after proper negotiations and taking into account all the matters, does not solve all the problems. Let them talk about increases for the scavengers and all of these things that the electorate used to take into account in the past when there were representatives of the three Local Government Councils. Let them talk about the Cabinet and of how they have deprived the electorate of the responsibility of conducting their own affairs.

Mr. HOPPIN and Mr. WEEKES rose to speak.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. junior member for St. George caught my eye first.
1.15 p.m.

Mr. HOPPIN: Mr. Chairman, the officers and employees of the Local Government were promised by Resolution their salary revision; but most of us should realise the difficulties that Local Government had in order to meet this salary revision. Here it is, we have before us a Resolution from the Central Government which surely would be agreed to for \$300,000 to pay increases to these officers and employees. I feel the officers and employees would welcome it because they had been asking for it long ago, and we who belonged to Local Government had promised them; but the position was that the Councils could not bear it, therefore this has to be met from the Central Government.

A salaries revision has been gone into by the Local Government Councils for these officers and employees, and it was agreed that they would be put on the same scale as that given to the Civil Servants of the Central Government; but I see here that this salary revision is different. However, I dare say that the officers and employees would welcome it. As the Hon. Minister said, this was the only possible way to construct it, and I am glad to see that this Resolution has come down. I do hope that hon. members of the Opposition who, I know, have been agitating at every opportunity, bringing this to the notice of the Government, would welcome this Resolution.

This is the end of the pleas and the promises which these councils had made to the Central Government to have these salaries revised for these people, and I am glad that the Central Government has seen fit to agree to this sum of \$300,000 to be given to the Interim Commissioner as backpay for these officers and employees of the Local Government as from the 1st April, 1966.

Sir, we do realise that the rates of taxes have been increased. I read it some where in the news-

papers last Saturday that the rates have gone up. Every effort was made by the Aldermen and Councillors to keep these rates down, but I do not think that the last hon. member who spoke realises that this raise may be for the purpose of what is known as the paying of National Insurance. It may be that these rates have been increased because of that. No one has told me, but as soon as I heard that the rates had gone up, I thought that the Cabinet had to increase the rates because of that. As I have said, I think that the money for National Insurance would have to be met from the rates.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to say at this stage that I think that the rates should be laid earlier, as well as that tax bills should be sent out early so that the money could be collected earlier than now. During the last years of the Councils, we had meetings of all the various Committees in order that we could get these tax bills out as early as possible. Today, we are in the month of August, and no tax bills have been sent out yet.

The people would be glad to get their tax bills earlier when money was in circulation; but here it is, a lot of poor people who have to pay taxes are now only getting three days work a week. Another thing is that there will be a long time before any funds will be paid in. Those are some of the things which the Interim Commissioner should look into.

There have been talking about Boards. I do agree that the Cabinet is responsible, because they have come to the assistance of the Local Councils; and if they have not appointed these Boards yet, they probably know the reason.

I do not know if the Hon. Minister has decided to answer any questions, but I would ask, why are the Boards not yet appointed. This is a question which most people are worrying about. I feel that when these Boards take charge of this matter, there is the possibility that the people would have a chance of knowing what is taking place more so than through the Interim Commissioner. We have complaints from people who pay taxes and all that sort of thing to Local Government that they do not know to whom they must go if something must be done in the rural areas. I do believe that when these Boards have been put into action and their names are made public, the people would know whom they can contact.

As regards to the outstanding amount which taxpayers owe to Local Government, I do agree that it should be collected. On some previous occasion, the Hon. Minister of Finance said that people should pay their taxes. Every possible means should be put into effect in order to get in this outstanding amount. I would like to say that although the arrears seem to be a large amount, some of it has come from the days of the Vestry. The amount which has come down to the Government is something like \$1 1/2 million and the Government should find ways and means to collect it. During the time of Local Government, we appointed bailiffs and that helped a great deal. We even asked our staff to help in whatever way they could, and ad-

vertisements were put in the newspapers as well as announcements were made over the radio, in order to remind people of the arrears of taxes. In that way we have brought in some of this arrears: but, as I have said already, this amount has increased year after year, and I do feel that it is time that the Hon. Minister of Finance should make a decision in having these arrears collected. I say that because there is something being done for the people.

The people who are in arrears would see that the Government is doing something for their good and in their interest; therefore, Mr. Chairman, I welcome the Resolution brought here by the Central Government to pay these officers and employees in the service of the Interim Commissioner. This was for backpay which was promised to them by the Aldermen and Councillors of the various Councils when they were in office, and I am glad to say that our promise to them although it is not in accordance with what we know it was, has not been forgotten by the Central Government.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I know that the employees and officers of Local Government, particularly the employees of the Northern District Council, will be pleased as I am at knowing that subsequent to my bringing to the notice of this Honourable House the inadequate wages being paid to some of these employees, this Government has seen fit to bring about an increase in the wages and salaries of these employees. But, Mr. Chairman, the increase proposed here today does not begin to touch even the hem of the agreement where some of these people are concerned.

I am to say, Sir, that no hon. member who has feeling for these people should have to come to this Hon. House to ask that \$300,000 should be paid to these workers. This is an attempt to make the public believe that the Government is doing something for these people. This is not to say that the Hon. Minister does not have the interest of these people at heart all the time.

1.25 p.m.

Remember, Sir, that in the parish of St. Peter you will find that at the Infirmary there are Assistant Nurses who are receiving \$30.00 a month. I am sure that every Minister on the other side of the House employs a domestic servant. If they do not pay them directly they will see that they have the services of these servants, and they ought to know that \$30.00 a month today can't pay a domestic servant. How then can an Hon. Minister come before this House with what he will have us to believe is a grandiose salary increase or a grandiose wage increase? Increasing a salary of \$30.00 a month by 25% is an additional \$7.50 a month. Remember this, these people must be tidy on and off their jobs for \$37.50 a month. How does the Minister feel.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has raised this matter before by way of a substantive question. These anomalies will be taken care of. The hon. member has

been told that before, but, of course, he has tried to make an able point as a politician does.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. A point of order is something by which an hon. member interrupts another hon. member and asks for a decision by the Chair. I should like to draw your attention to Standing Order 28 which deals with interruptions. That Standing Order says this:-

"No member shall interrupt another member except by rising to a point of order, when the member speaking shall resume his seat and the member interrupting shall simply direct attention to the point which he desires to bring to notice and submit it to the Speaker or Chairman for decision."

In short, the hon. member must point out that the hon. member who is speaking is guilty of a breach of the Standing Order and ask Your Honour to rule. The hon. member may just as well tear up the Standing Orders if they are not going to be observed.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has made his point of order. Let the hon. junior member for St. Peter proceed.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I know that you are well aware that some hon. members drink of the cup that inebriates, and some may partake of the cup that intoxicates. Under the circumstances, I will be interrupted from time to time. What we have been hearing from the Minister is that these salary increases must be accepted, according to the Minister's words, as a temporary measure, because the employees of these former three Councils, the City the North and the South, are now employees of the Interim Commissioner. They had an agreement between them; a method of approach to the Central Government was agreed upon, and their recommendations to the Central Government were based on the Gardner-Brown Report; but what we are asked to consider and debate here today is something which has been dictated to these people by the Cabinet, otherwise, the Minister would not have to tell us about anomalies and adjustments to be made. You are increasing people's salary and what are you increasing? Nothingness? Before you set about to give salary increases, you make the necessary adjustments; that is to say, you bring people up to living standards first and then talk about increasing salaries and wages, as the case may be. The Hon. Minister can rest assured that as in the case of the scavengers, they will enjoy the benefit of the little increase which is given to them, and that will help them to pay off their old shop bills and house rents; but let the Minister understand that on the day after these people receive these little increases that are being talked about here now, they will be on the war path again.

1.35 p.m.

They are only waiting. What the Central Government has done is this. The Government has seen fit to feed these people with the longest possible spoon.

They have kept them at death's door for a long time before giving them a little water. The people have been suffering for a long time and they are now glad to see that some respite is given them. That is all this little increase would do for them. They would be able to pay off their old shop bill, but it is not going to give them anything in their hands to make a purchase of anything new. Therefore, let the Hon. Minister beware. The Hon. Minister must bear in mind that in some of these Councils there are some employees entitled to a double increment, but the Central Government has seen fit to ignore that completely and come down in their dictatorial manner with this Resolution.

It looks like money when you pay 25% on salaries and wages exceeding \$1,200. On salaries and wages exceeding \$1,200 per annum but not exceeding \$2,400, you say that they will be getting 20%; and on salaries and wages exceeding \$2,400 but not exceeding \$3,600, you are giving to these employees an increase of 15% and on salaries and wages exceeding \$3,600 you are giving an increase of 10%.

What do you find? You find that you are increasing a man who is only getting \$30 a month an increase of \$7.50. That is all that 25% is, but at the same time, it is costing the worker - the employee - almost the \$7.50 increase to pay for bus fare, travelling backward and forward, and in other cases some of them have to try to live near the institution which they work. Some has to pay out of the \$37.50 which they get, more than what they are getting.

Sir, there are certain matters which we must of necessity seek to draw to the attention of the Central Government, particularly to the attention of the Hon. Minister in charge of this Resolution. I would like you to understand, Mr. Chairman, that we cannot, like the Hon. Minister, look at the scavengers and call them nitties.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I did not call the scavengers nitties. I said that the hon. senior member for Christ Church in his anxiety to get certain things done invited certain Councillors - his colleagues.

Mr. HINDS: We on this side cannot run into error to attempt to look down on scavengers and call them nitties.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I rise again on a point of order. The hon. member is misquoting me. If this is his way of saying it, that is a matter for him.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, what I am saying is this. We on this side of the House cannot look at scavengers other than human beings and we cannot call them nitties. We cannot associate ourselves with anybody calling them nitties.

Mr. WEEKES I would like to substantiate the remarks made by the Hon. Minister and to refute the statement by the hon. senior member for St. James when he said that the Hon. Minister of Health called them nitties.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Is that a point of order?

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, on a point of explanation, Mr. Chairman. I have not addressed this Honourable Chamber for the day and the hon. senior member for St. Philip said that the hon. senior member for St. James made some reference to something. I do not know if he has a flask in his pocket.

Mr. WEEKES: If I said the hon. senior member for St. James, I apologise to him. I meant the hon. junior member for St. Peter.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, a gill in the head is worth more than a flask in the pocket. What we on this side have got to be careful about is this. We have got to look at the health of the nation. We have got to look at tourism and the money which comes from that industry.

The Hon. Minister of Health seems to be very touchy when he hears the scavengers' name called. The Hon. Minister knows that there was a time when I would bet my last dollar that he would do anything for scavengers and chauffeurs to help them stop a crease. Therefore, Sir, you will understand why the Hon. Minister gets so tired whenever he hears the name of scavengers called.

Mr. Chairman, let us get down to this matter. The Addendum states:

"It is proposed to revise the salaries and wages of the Officers and employees in the service of the Interim Commissioner for Local Government for the City of Bridgetown, the Southern District, and the Northern District, with effect from 1st April, 1966. The revision will be computed according to the following general formula."

If you are going to carry out a salaries revision, can anyone carry out a fair, just and equitable revision of salaries without first seeing that you have a basic minimum standard? Having set yourself that standard, you then go on to revising. But this is not the case in this matter. It shows quite clearly that the Hon. Minister has a total disregard for some of the employees of the Interim Commissioner.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I am sorry that I have to interrupt the hon. member. The Local Government was only abolished at the end of March. Who then had a total disregard for some of the employees? Therefore, when the hon. member speaks out of his mouth that the Minister has a total disregard, who drafted the rates? I have not even had five months dealing with them.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. What part of his speech is a question of a point of order?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is for the Chair to decide and I am asking the hon. member to sit.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Can I sit down when I am on a point of order? Mr. Chairman, freedom of speech was not made. Your Honour cannot dictate to an hon. member of the House. I am at liberty to speak at any time.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I said that the Chair has to decide when there is a point of order and I rule it was a point of order. Let the hon. junior member for St. Peter proceed.
1.45 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: The Hon. Minister (Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Nobody is afraid of you) (Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Is he in order?)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like hon. members to observe Standing Order 29 which deals with the behaviour of members not speaking. Let the hon. junior member for St. Peter proceed.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister has been at pains since the introduction of this debate to keep our minds' eye on the fact that Local Government was abolished in March. Nobody is denying that. We must say that all that has happened is this: Local Government was abolished in March and this Resolution for \$300,000 is before this House on this 22nd day of August, 1967. That is all we are concerned with. We feel that if the Central Government ever had in mind any intention of doing justice to the employees of these Councils, they would first have set out to find out under what grievances and under what handicaps these people have been working; but you will find that the Hon. Minister, in seeking to effect these wage increases, applied an entirely different yardstick from that which was applied when the salaries of Hon. Ministers on that side of the House were to be increased. You will find that when we come to paragraph 2 (b) of the Addendum it says this: "Salaries and wages exceeding \$1,200 p.a., but not exceeding \$2,400 p.a. - 20% increase." In truth and in fact, Sir, in asking these people to accept these proposals today - the Minister is asking these people to say: "Oh, the Government is giving these people \$300,000;" but when you look at it you will see that some of the employees are only being provoked in being given this money by the method employed in effecting these increases. In other words, as I have said earlier, the employees of these Councils submitted to the Central Government what were comparatively different increases to which they were entitled, but what do you find? The Central Government with all the indecency at its command, comes down with this amount when they very well know that these employees are in such straightened circumstances that they cannot afford, at this stage, to refuse the salary increases. That is all. The Minister must know that these employees are in such straightened circumstances that they cannot afford to reject this offer, and tell the Central Government: "Give us what we are really entitled to". Let the Minister go on: we have seen what a mockery is being made of the employees of these former Councils. This is a mockery of these people. This is all rolled up in a tidy sum of \$300,000; so it is expected that the Government will be using that figure and they

will be masquerading that the Government is doing something for these people. I have warned the Minister already and I will warn him again. These scavengers who have been called "nitties"

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order. The hon. member persists in misquoting me. If that is the practice in the "Truth" Newspaper, it should not be the practice in here. I did not refer to the scavengers as "nitties": I said that the hon. member should ask the advice of his colleagues who are "nitties".

Mr. HINDS: The Hon. Minister is now asking me to ignore the Chair and turn to my colleagues to determine what he did say. In this House the scavengers have been referred to as "nitties". I shall, by God's help, preach that throughout the length and breadth of this island. Wherever a scavenger is, I will be telling him; "You are now a 'nittie'", according to some hon. member on the Government's side. That is how the Government looks at you all, and that is why they offer you allowances and increases which are only suitable for "nitties". I will not go one step further. What we have got to determine is this: the Addendum to this Resolution tells us that the estimated total cost of the revision for three areas is \$300,000. It is \$300,000 for three areas.

1.55 p.m.

I have two different printed copies of this Resolution. One says 1966-67 and the other says 1967-68. I would really like to ask Your Honour's ruling on which I should go by. Anyhow, let us dismiss the page of the last one which says 1967-67.

It says here that provision has been included in the 1967-68 approved estimates for the Interim Commissioner for the estimated expenditure resulting from the revision for the year 1967-68. Now, this \$300,000 is the outright grant. Now, Sir, let us ask ourselves this simple question. When the Central Government decide to make an increase of \$300,000 to the Interim Commissioner for Local Government to effect salaries and wages increase, can we be expected to believe -

Mr. CHAIRMAN left the Chair and Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting now stands suspended until 2.30 o'clock p.m.
2.00 p.m.

On re-assembling,

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time, and I am advised that the reply to Question No. 65 has been laid. This Question stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter.

Mr. HINDS: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

1. Since when were Permanent Secretaries entitled to the compliment of the "salute" from members of the Royal Barbados Police Force?

2. Is the Minister aware that a Police Officer acting on the complaint of a Permanent Secretary, re No. 1 took it upon himself to order the transfer from the Bridge Police Station, of the full land police detachment stationed there?

3. Has the Commissioner of Police disciplined the officer concerned?

4. If not, why not?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the replies are as follows:-

Permanent Secretaries have never been entitled to the compliment of a Salute from members of the Royal Barbados Police Force.

2. No Sir. No transfer of any police constable was ordered.

3. & 4. The question of disciplining a police officer does not arise.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Hon. Minister can tell us whether or not notice of the facts of the transfer was posted on the Notice Board there?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I am afraid that I cannot assist the hon. member.

Mr. HINDS: Would the Hon. Minister expect that I saw the Notice and would the Hon. Minister investigate?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If the hon. member would represent what he asked in another question to be given notice of.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, is that not the specific question which I asked? Is the Hon. Minister aware that that is in the very question which I asked? I wonder if the Hon. Minister investigated that?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Would the Hon. Minister accept with respect to the detachment of the Royal Police Force at the Bridge Post that there was a transfer and if he says that there was a transfer, would he say that is not a matter which required investigation?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: It may require investigation, but this has come out of the hon. member's head himself. I said that if he required the information, a substantive question in respect of it would have to be put down.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: If the Hon. Leader of the House has the information, does he think it needs a further substantive question to be put for him to answer?

Mr. HINDS: Is the Hon. Minister telling us that a Police Officer did not receive a complaint from a Parliamentary Secretary?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Question No. 2 is:-

"Whether the Minister is aware that a Police Officer, acting on the complaint of a Parliamentary Secretary, took it upon himself to order the transfer from the Bridge Police Station of the full land police detachment stationed there?" And the answer to that is, "No Sir. No transfer of any police constable was ordered."

2.35 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, the other part of the question is: "Is the Minister aware that a police officer, acting on the complaint - in other words, is the Minister saying that there was no complaint from the Permanent Secretary to the Police Officer?"

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am not saying this; I am merely saying that no transfer was ordered.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Does not the hon. Leader of the House consider that a part of the petty-fogging things that the solicitors in the Victorian age used to do? Taking one part of a question and answering it without answering what is really cited or implied by the question? Does the hon. member see that?

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not regard this "petty-fogging like the solicitors in the Victorian age" to arise with respect to this.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, since the Minister does not deny the existence of a complaint, would the Minister tell this Hon. House what was the subject of that complaint?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: It is certainly true that I do not deny it. It is equally true that I never confirmed it.

Mr. SPEAKER: There being no further questions to which oral replies have been made, the House can now proceed with Private Members' Business, and under that Head the first thing stands in the name of the hon. senior member for Bridgetown, and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to repeal the West Indies Hospital Fund Act, 1964.

SECOND READING WEST INDIES HOSPITAL FUND (REPEAL) BILL

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, notice to repeal this Bill was given in my name during the last session of this House, when the House came to practically an untimely end. I feel so strongly in this matter that I have again brought it up. We spoke - those of us who feel very strongly in this matter - in the fair name of Barbados, we spoke on the repeal of this Bill at length. It is only for me to say today for those who have not been following this Bill that, while this Bill was unanimously passed by this House, I must make my position abundantly clear, that at the time I succeeded in sending it to a Select Committee, and at

that time I enquired as to the paid-up capital of this company, and I enquired as to the capital and as to the bankers.

When we met in Committee, the Government brought in the solicitors for this Company who told us then they were unable to give us the facts which I wanted to give to this House. However, taking the Government's word for it, and like all of us who wanted to see money in the Treasury, we accepted the fact that we were getting something like \$200,000 odd and that this money would be paid into the Treasury and to the Income Tax Commissioner, and that in short we would be able to do quite a lot for education and like, because in good faith we voted for this Bill.

This is not a censure of the Government; but this is what is worrying me: why should - after this Bill, and after what we have found out about this Company, why did the Government themselves not bring down a Bill to repeal this? We have had letters in the Press from the other islands condemning the idea of calling it The West Indies Hospital Sweep; we had letters from Canada; the Press published letters received from the United States of America, Canada, United Kingdom and other parts of the world, still today the sign stands as a monument at Seawell Airport selling this. I really do not think any honest man could sit here today and allow the fair name of Barbados to go down, to be dragged about in the gutter with the dishonest action of this Company. We know that some of the directors of this Company have been sent to goal; we all voted for it in good faith; we all voted for the Bill in good faith; but when we found out what was happening, I suggested to members of the Government then - maybe they will take their numerical strength today and possibly tomorrow or at any time to throw this amendment to repeal this Act out, but history will tell.

We of the Opposition - and at the time they were not the members on this side when I spoke - but we are thinking of Barbados and not merely of a few shysters. We know that Jamaica had turned this down; we know that on the last occasion we asked how much money out of the \$250,000 the Treasury or the Income Tax Commissioner had received, and up to then and up to now, less than \$20,000 have been paid in. These being the facts, it merely remains for me to move that this entire Bill, lock, stock and barrel be repealed. To err is human. I will admit that, in the interest of Barbados, when we realised and thought that assurance of the Government that we would have had a very substantial revenue annually from this Company, we voted for it. My colleague, I recall, still had reservations, like myself; but we do not like to think that we would be the ones blocking any legislation that meant bringing in such a handsome revenue to this country.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill, as I said, was before this House for some time, and on each occasion it was called I happened to have been out of the House. Now that I am here the Government has hinted to me that they were not ready on several occasions.

It then appeared to people that I seem to have been making sport with the Bill and never wanted it done. There were other members of the Opposition who wanted to do the Bill in my name, but I prefer to carry it on myself.

2.45 p.m.

There is no point in painting the lily. Every hon. member of this House and every member of the public know the danger that this Bill has done to Barbados. Experienced as I am, I shall await the reasons which will be given by the Government for not having this Bill removed from the Laws of Barbados. I therefore beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time. In the course of my reply, I shall produce all the documentary evidence to this House.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I beg to second that.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, the history of this legislation and the Company concerned is well known throughout this island of Barbados. For some reason or other, they have found themselves before the Courts of this country under the default provisions of the Act under which they were authorised to operate. Looking at this year's Estimates, 1967-68, I see at Page 10 under the Head "Revenue" that the Government itself has decided in its mind that this Company is bankrupt and that they do not expect in the current year to receive one cent from them. Under Head 2 "Taxation" Item 4, "Sweepstakes", I see that the sum of \$100,000 is budgeted for under the Act of 1941 - 4, but under the Act of 1964 - 20, - I speak subject to correction, but in the course of my speech I will definitely get it verified - as usual the Laws of Barbados for 1964 are not here. However, Sir, in respect of revenue under the Act of 1964 - 20 I see that there is a dash. What is most remarkable to me is that in the corresponding note under Head 2, Item 4, I see absolutely no explanation in these Estimates as to why the Government expects nothing in 1967-68, although it is the law of the land, they do not expect to receive one cent. Nobody is bringing any tales out of school when he says that it is a matter of public knowledge now that a Magistrate of District "A" in the exercise of his jurisdiction, gave this Company which has been awarded these concessions, a particular period of time within which to pay to the Commissioner of Inland Revenue, the arrears which were due under the Act of 1964-20. Up to yesterday that money has not been paid, so that it appears quite clearly to anyone who is looking at this matter objectively, that the Government itself feels in its mind that it is hopeless to try to collect any money from this Company; and further than that, it indicates that the reputation of this Company both in Barbados and abroad has reached such a level that nobody has any confidence any longer in this Company.

If there is any confidence still reposed in the Company, it is remarkable that one cannot hear of any public drawings on any of the races within the last five or six months. We can still see booths in operation at Seawell Airport which is the very gateway to Barbados, both from the point of view of incoming passengers and passengers who are leaving Barba-

dos. As far as I know, and I have been going there, I have not been seeing any tickets being sold. I think it is the responsibility of this House as a whole, having regard to the fact - and I think it is an undeniable fact - that the name of Barbados has got mixed up with the organisation in America known as the Maffia Group, and there can be no doubt about it that within the Company itself, the original people who negotiated with the Government of Barbados have been displaced. They have been displaced by another group of people, and nobody knows what is the real position except this, that it is known that people have been winning prizes and they have not been paid. That is a matter of common knowledge. People have written to the newspapers in connection with this matter, and there has been no liability from the Company. The Commissioner of Police is supposed to supervise the drawing, but when last was there a drawing held under the auspices of this Company? The Government does not know because it says that it is not getting any revenue from them this year. That is the seriousness of it. How can we pass laws which impose an annual charge on an Organization for a special concession and at the same time when you present your Estimates for the coming year and under your Constitution you are supposed to include their own - I have no doubt they have included their own - expectations of their revenue for the coming year - you have included nothing for the Company? The truth is that they do not expect to receive any revenue from this Company. What is the point of keeping this Law on the Statute Book? What is the point of doing that? The Government has decided that it will not get any revenue from this Company. This Company cannot even pay the fine which was imposed on it by the Magistrate of District "A". Why does the Commissioner of Inland Revenue not file a bankruptcy notice against this Company? In the exercise of his powers and functions it would be expected that any specific direction could be given by any Minister, be he the Minister of Finance or any other Minister, to a person who is holding a statutory office under a statutory authority. There can be no doubt about it that he has the power to file a bankruptcy notice and liquidation proceedings against this Company.

2.55 p.m.

Up to now, they have not signed them and this is the bad aspect of it. If you do now exercise your statutory powers in relation to companies like this, who are specifically required to do certain things in this country, then the whole of your conduct falls into disrepute, and individuals and other companies would feel that favours and licence are being granted to this Company.

I am going to read a sub-title and it is: "An Act to provide for a company to be known as the West Indies Hospital Funds Limited". That is on page 10 and in the Act 1964-20. Therefore, there can be no doubt at all that it is this Company, and this Company alone, with which we are dealing. An explanation must be due to this House, and not only to this House, but the public, as to why there should be no revenue collected from this Company. This Company was asked

to pay the sum of \$125,000 by sub-section 4, section 2 within one month of the appointed day. Then a further sum of \$125,000 was to be paid within five months of the appointed day. Then a further sum of \$125,000 immediately on the expiration of twelve months after the appointed day.

None of these amounts have been paid. That was money which they were prosecuted for in the Magistrate's Court of District "A".

I see here that the sum which the Government of Barbados collected was \$10,000. In the Revised Estimates it was \$11,000. That is the position. But there is more to this, because the directors of the company are subject to certain liabilities. Not a local person is a director of this Company. The only directors are from abroad. These are facts, and I challenge the Government to deny these facts.

This is a Company which is operating under a special Act. This means that they are operating under Government auspices. Yet, there is no means to find out if the Company with the terms of the Agreement which it has is operating in accordance with the terms. Those are facts which in my opinion today should drive hon. members of this House, if they have the interest of Barbados at heart, to vote for the repeal of the West Indies Hospital Fund Limited Act so that this Company can go out of existence and we would be able to redeem the fair name of Barbados which has been sullied by the operation of this Company.

Mr. SPRINGER: Mr. Speaker, much has been said and printed about the West Indies Hospital Funds Limited. Plenty of it might be true, but most very untrue.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am drawing it to your attention that the hon. member who has got up to speak has an interest in the Company, and he cannot speak unless he declares his interest in the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Would the hon. senior member for Bridgetown draw to my notice the Standing Order to which he refers?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am referring you to nothing. It is for you to know it.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. What I would draw to Your Honour's attention is that this is the standard practice of the British House of Commons.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. senior member for St. Michael proceed, if the hon. member so desires.

Mr. MOTTLEY: We cannot hear you.

Mr. SPRINGER: As the hon. senior member for the City has said, I have an interest in this Company. My interest is Assistant Manager of the West Indies Hospital Funds Limited. That is not a privilege.

Speaking on the Company's interest and before I make any comment, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I would accept Your Honour's ruling.

First of all, I would assure this Hon. Chamber that the initial shareholders of this Company who instructed their directors to consult the Barbados Government in forming this Company are the same shareholders. There is one other thing which I would like to repeat. I do not care what is in the Estimates or what is outside of it. It has been said that none of the \$125,000 has been paid to the Barbados Government.

3.05 p.m.

The Company was charged by the Inland Revenue Department for not paying the final instalment of \$125,000 and was convicted in the District "A" Police Magistrate's Court and fined \$151,000, \$10,000 of which was for refusing to submit to the Department of Inland Revenue, within 30 days of a particular draw accounts as stipulated in the Act. I do not know whether the information reaching some members of this House is correct or whether it is purely intended to get me to say what is correct. Of this \$151,000 this company has paid \$80,000 and within the last year - 1966-67 - the year 1966, the company has paid over \$60,000 in taxes from the sale of tickets.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, all of the arrears of the taxes for 1966 have been taken care of in 1967. Part of the taxes for 1965 have been paid and are being paid, and no current taxation is left unpaid. Now there are other means by which the Government benefits substantially, and for reasons better known to myself, I will not fully disclose them; but postage as well as cashing postal orders is a big part of this Company's operation, because money is not remitted by cheque or by cash; it has to be remitted by postal order; and this is one of the ways by which the Government benefits. I am not prepared to say to what tune at this stage, but much has been said by a particular newspaper about illegal posting of tickets in the United States of America and Canada. It is illegal, but the ignorance in his argument falls apart when you remember that every lottery is only legal at its base of operation, and in America - the senior member for the City knows this - there is the New Hampshire Lottery which is only legal in the State of New Hampshire. There is a federal law against the mailing of tickets in the state and you have a state contravening and Federal Law. What is even worse, just two months ago, there is in New York State a lottery which is guilty of doing the same thing that West Indies Hospital Funds seems to be guilty of. All of them contravene this law, because lotteries are only legal at their base of operation. All lotteries are illegal every other place, so as to this nonsense of contravention, it is a contravention that all lotteries are part of.

Besides, when members voted for this Bill they would have to be hoodminded into believing that there would be no sale in North America. It is established by all lotteries that the best market for lottery tickets is the place where they are most illegal, and that is

in North America. As a matter of fact, just one year ago the Irish lost over \$30 million worth of tickets in Ottawa alone. This does not include New York or any of the other capital towns or industrial cities in North America; so the operation of a lottery by postage or contravening a law is just nonsense.

As regards the non-payment of prizes, let me say this. In 1965 before this Company was three months old it got into difficulty because all of the tickets were confiscated in North America. Every one was lost in North America. The cost of transportation, the cost of printing - all of that was automatically lost too, so that with the few people who bought, there was not enough capital to pay the Government, pay the prizes and operating for business too; so what was the alternative?

\$65,000 say, you had as capital. Do you go out and owe everybody or do you remain in business and pay as you go along? This is the alternative. Do you remain extinct by taking your money and paying everybody or do you pay the Government some of the tax, continue in business and pay as you go along? And I will say this. I am sorry I cannot call his name, but a Barbadian shareholder, a former member of the Conservative Party a man who owns at least 5 1/2% of West Indies Hospital Funds, advised; "So what any Barbadian Businessman would do; pay what is necessary, continue in business and pay as you go on;" and this advice was taken. What is the result? The result is that 50% of the outstanding prize money from 1965 - in other words, the Company had seven draws and the result is that 50% of that money has been paid, and the other 50% is being paid as you go along.

The other thing is this. Here it is: the Company is fined \$151,000 with not even \$100,000 in cash or collateral on the island from which the Inland Revenue Department could collect. Most people said this was the end of the Company. Everybody said they could not pay it, and if the shareholders had belonged to the Mafia - and people who know about the Mafia know they do not get in anything as disorganized as West Indies Hospital Fund, they get into organised institutions where the money is already made and they take it. They do not go in and make money for anybody, they go in when it is made, and if the West Indies Hospital funds were associated with the Mafia, they would never have been in this position. Anybody who went to America would know how they operate; so if they were of that type the first thing they would do was to pull out and do not pay the money, but they set about even to pay the \$151,000; all of it has not been paid.

The Inland Revenue Department, as the hon. senior member for Christ Church said, did not collect all. They have already collected \$80,000. Common sense will tell you the Department was better off if they remained in business.

3.15 p.m.

That is commonsense to me. Besides that, as to the *Advocate* who used to do the printing, the Company paid them over \$100,000 to do this printing of which \$70,000 was for printing tickets alone. It was 20¢ a ticket, \$100,000 per race, three races a year, \$60,000 plus the rate - and the *Advocate* just gave away that job by refusing to submit a proof to me in time; and the Company, which does not intend to pay, has just set about to put down its own printing machinery for the printing of the tickets. That is a Company which does not intend to pay! This Company is going to print its own tickets. Further we are paying better wages than any other printing plant in the island for doing the same printing. We have carried away sixteen men from the *Advocate*; in fact, we have only got nine up to now. I will give them 50% more in wages than the Union asked the Company for. (ASIDES) (A MEMBER: That is if they do not repeal the Act). That is the attitude. The inability to pay is not dishonesty, and the hon. senior member for St. James will know this. If inability to pay were dishonesty, then the whole structure of commerce would fall; that would happen if all the people to whom money was owed called for their money. It is a bad thing to have a contract and not pay, but is that worse than not paying now, and paying later or running away with the money? The Company decided that we will pay this \$151,000 and that is the end of it.

The hon. senior member for Christ Church made a wonderful speech if he were defending somebody who had really committed a crime. He wants to know when the last drawing was held. The last drawing was held on the 4th August for races being run on the 5th August, and at no time has any employer, shareholder or director done a drawing. The drawing is done by the nurses; we usually have three and sometimes six nurses from the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

As regards this talk about \$10,000 in the Estimates and \$11,000 for that year and none for this year, I do not know who drew up the Estimates, but as recently as the 7th July, I think it was, the Company paid \$16,000 into the Inland Revenue Department as the tax on prizes. Undoubtedly when this Company was formed, the shareholders and the Government felt that it was an easy business and quick money to be made. This would have been possible if Mafia had got in, because two people who came down here to negotiate on the shareholders' behalf had given the Government an undertaking that no organised criminal element would be allowed even to control or to have an interest in the Hospital Funds. Several people whose character was in doubt were refused shares with this result that in this Fund today there are some 150,000 shares still in the Company's ownership, which they have refused to sell on more than one occasion because they are not satisfied that the people who want to buy them are free from organised crime.

What then is the result? Within the last three years the Government has received close on \$400,000 it may be \$380,000. Besides that, the Company has paid approximately \$200,000 for printing. Outside of

printing, I would say on a very conservative estimate, that at least \$70,000 a year is spent in postage and \$48,000 in wages. I do not know that the West Indies Hospital Funds Limited has earned a name in America like that of the Irish because Irish people got locked up. You talk about Jamaica, but the Jamaica organisation operated for two full years without paying any prizes at all, and they were acting legally because it was stipulated in the Act that you could take out expenses for the operation of the Sweepstake first and whatever is left, you then pay prizes. For two years they were operating in that way, so that for two years they were not paying prizes and they were still acting legally. It was their responsibility when negotiating on behalf of the Government, and they pulled a fast one because in relation to 20% of the gross stake, they would have to pay dearly for printing and postage and operation at gross level. It is alright to nod, but when we have to take 20% for the conduct of any operation, that has to be very costly. Therefore, whoever negotiated for the Government really went high.

3.25 p.m.

Sir, there is hardly anything else I can say other than it is a fact that the Company had a fairly bad spell when it first began operations. That was trumped up by a few politicians and the newspapers with a few exceptions for some reason. But I would say this for the newspapers. If the newspapers had acted as the Chamber of Commerce had and the Police a lot of what happened would not have happened. When something happened, the Chamber of Commerce got in touch with us and the Police. I gave them a letter and a cheque and asked them to see that that was paid for it.

But as regards the politicians, oh no, that was not the case. However, we do not have anything against the politicians personally. I have been very fortunate that I have as a jury the 38,000 voters in St. Michael who have illustrated and prepared to fear, witness for me and see to it that the alleged dishonesty would not put me in gaol. The electorate in St. Michael said "not guilty", and that, if nothing else, is satisfaction to me. The Barbados public themselves said that "you, Barry Springer are an hon. gentleman."

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member speaking of somebody in the House?

Mr. SPRINGER: I am speaking of myself. Besides that, it was claimed that I owed the Development Board \$7,200 and that I was to be locked up for it. I am glad to say that I have paid off that loan. This loan was approved by the Development Board and I have not been locked up for it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that the Development Board does not come in this.

Mr. SPRINGER: All of that was talked about the Manager of the West Indies Hospital Funds Limited and I happen to be the Manager. I say on the floor of

this House that this Company has lived through a harsh 1965 paid the current debts for 1966 and the first part of that for 1967. It has also reduced its liabilities to prize-winners by 50 percent. It has also reduced its debt to the Government substantially. It is paying its prize-winners and is keeping quite a few people in work.

What it is paying in postage rates is almost ten percent of the Government's revenue from the Post Office. We paid a direct payment into the Treasury of \$250,000. At this stage when the Company has not started to operate, it can do all that. What the West Indies Hospital Funds Ltd., is putting into the Barbados Treasury in hard cash is money whether it is from postage stamps postal orders, taxes or national wages.

I also wish to say that the wage scale of the employees of this Company is so high that everybody pays income tax. The minimum wage at the office of this Company is paid to a maid who works four hours per week and she draws \$12.00. She works three evenings per week. What another does is just sticking stamps on to envelopes and she gets \$32.50 a week. Some of the businessmen objected because they say that it is interfering with the wage structure of their business. There are other employees who work from 8.30 o'clock in the morning to 4 o'clock in the evening Monday to Friday. They do not work on Saturdays.
3.35 p.m.

Anyhow, Mr. Speaker, I very much regret that I was not in a position to answer any questions that the senior member for the City might like answered, but I can assure him that any information that he cares to seek whether it is through me, or through the newspapers, or through any other liaison which he can set up, I will be prepared to answer him. But for my part, as the person who knows about the West Indies Hospital Fund Ltd., I think that despite the publicity the shareholders and directors have proved that they did not intend to defraud any person of their money, because they remained in business and kept paying as they went along, and as I formerly said, the senior member for St. James knows quite well that inability to pay is not dishonesty.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the motion of the hon. senior member for Bridgetown that the West Indies Hospital Act, 1964 be repealed. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon. senior member for St. Michael, perhaps in view of the fact that week by week he attends the House of Assembly and can find nothing to say, has made a speech today which has in everything which he wants to say on any subject whatsoever from Mr. John Thorne and his four daughters of Land's End down to the fact that he represents the parish of St. Michael, and incidentally, in the course of his speech revealed that whatever won him the seat for St. Michael, it was not the capacity for Arithmetic, but we will return to that later.

I was not aware, of course, Mr. Speaker, that the election in St. Michael was held on the basis of the

performance of the West Indies Hospital Trust; I thought that part of the elections - as the hon. senior member says there were 38,000 voters, 27,800 of which voted and he got 12,000 votes, not even half, not even half of them supported him.....

(Hon. N. W. BOXILL: *Aside*): Enough to win a seat.

It was a mistake by the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, but the.....

Mr. SPEAKER: That hon. junior member has not yet spoken in this debate.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am obliged to Your Honour, but he and I know that my predecessor was better supported when he lost his seat than the hon. senior member for St. Michael; so do not let him think that 12,000 out of 27,000 amount to an endorsement of the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake Trust.

Mr. J. B. SPRINGER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I did not say it was an endorsement of the West Indies Hospital Trust, I said it was an endorsement of my character - as a matter of fact, I could have got less votes.

Mr. SPEAKER: I deem that not to be a point of order, but a point of explanation under Standing order 26 (16).

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, we hear his voice so seldom that when a subject is found on which he can talk we are glad to permit him to do just that: there are not many subjects on which he is capable of saying anything. Let me assure him that nobody in my hearing has ever attacked his honesty, his integrity in respect of the West Indies Hospital Trust; it has always been the honesty and integrity of the racketeers who shelter outside Barbados because they cannot set foot here for danger of prosecution. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have more often heard the hon. senior member for St. Michael referred to as an innocent agent, as a babe in the wood, as a child in the dark of the storm. I have heard him referred to as nothing else. People are sorry for him, not offended by him, and when he appeals to hon. members not to support this Bill now before this House he is talking because he is the manager of a Company; he is doing his best, and what would he do if he did not have that? That is the basis of his appeal.

It is an appeal of pure sentiment to the members of his own political Party, because the hon. senior member for St. Michael would have to go back to whatever occupation - I do not even know what it is - which he was enjoying before politics put him where he is today, in a position of authority at the West Indies Hospital Trust. Let us get it straight in our minds, and all the snide remarks about the senior member for St. James which can equally be applied to the hon. senior member sitting next to him - all the snide remarks cannot affect the Bill now before the House.

The hon. senior member for St. Michael has trespassed on a lot of ground where he is not competent to pronounce. To deal first with the New Hampshire and the National Lottery, the difference will be that we understand the details. If he is talking about these lotteries, what is offensive in the West Indies Hospital Trust Ltd. is that they broke the laws of the United States which do not permit gambling by sending tickets and attempting to sell tickets contrary to the laws of the home State. It is absolutely untrue to say that a State in the United States is contravening the Federal Law. There is no Federal law in the United States on a lottery.

Mr. SPRINGER: Mr. Speaker, I never said.....

Mr. SPEAKER: On what has the hon. member risen?

Mr. SPRINGER: I did not say that there was a Federal law against lotteries, I said there was a Federal law against the mailing of tickets from one State to another. While it is quite legal for the New Hampshire State and New York State to have lotteries, it was quite illegal for them to cross the State line, which is the same as Barbados crossing a State line. That is what I said.

Mr. SPEAKER: That again is a point of explanation.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: And an admirable point, Mr. Speaker, which in fact represents the true situation. Why does he make a statement like that? A State of the United States contravening the Federal Law! 3.45 p.m.

I challenge the hon. member to call for the Short-hand Report of his speech if he says that my quotation is incorrect. If he understands that, why did he make that statement? There is no evidence that these lotteries are sent through the mail outside these States. They are not run by a bunch of racketeers; they are not owned by a bunch of racketeers. I correct myself because the hon. member is not in any way connected with being a racketeer. You have in New York examples of what West Indies Hospital Fund should look up to.

Mr. Speaker, far from respecting the absolute regulations made by the United Kingdom Federal Government, the hon. senior member for St. Michael has made it clear, when talks about the greatest racket for lotteries being in America, that he personally intends to go on breaking the Law of the United States. He is nodding his head at this moment in agreement. In a speech in which he sets himself forward as a lawbreaker, he says that he has never been arrested for anything, not even for riding without a bicycle light. He is as liable to the United States Law as anybody else if he wishes to go there at any time. They are all patting their own backs and polishing their own images. "I have never consciously broken the Law of the United States and boasted about it anywhere." That is the tone of the hon. member's speech. He has taken upon his own back all the blows

that must, of necessity, be dealt to the West Indies Hospital Fund. He has taken the flogging on his own back; he cannot help it. The only director who was resident in Barbados had the misfortune to be convicted in respect of his offence, and he left the Company when it was revealed what it was. There are those who have been evading the police of 36 American States, and they are still saying that they are not organised criminals. Where are they? What kind of country are we when two Statutory promoters - persons whose names appear in our legislation as reputable persons supporting a supposedly reputable organisation.... (ASIDES)

Mr. SPRINGER: On a point of explanation. To say that these people cannot set foot in Barbados is not true. They were here in February spending fourteen days at the Paradise Beach Club. (Mr. MOTTLEY: The Police did not know).

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, we have just had a most enlightening and elucidating piece of information from the hon. member. The Commissioner of Inland Revenue has been issuing summonses in the same way in which Mr. Turney was convicted. The arch criminals can come here for fourteen days and not a finger is lifted against them!

Mr. SPRINGER: On a point of order. The hon. member is saying that they could not be found; but they were still convicted and fined \$151,000.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Let the hon. member take a little advice from the hon. junior member for Christ Church and the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, and only get up and make points of information. When he says that these people were fined, he is wrong. I do not think that the hon. member understands the difference between a company and its directors. The Company was fined \$151,000 - not Mr. Nicol or Mr. Anstey; they could only find Mr. Turney.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think there is some confusion between the words "find" and "fined".

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member talked about the benefit to Barbados by the printing of the tickets. It is one thing to talk about placing a contract for \$100,000 for printing, and it is another thing to talk about paying the money. The reason why the *Advocate* Company was not printing the tickets is that the West Indies Hospital Funds Limited had not paid for tickets which had already been printed and had to be sued for in the Courts.

Mr. SPRINGER: On a point of order. That is not true. The Company was never sued and the *Advocate* Company still does some of the printing.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Nobody can rise on a point of order when a point of order is being made, and I see two hon. members on their feet.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: This is worse and worse. The hon. senior member for St. Michael may have to say that some people are born with silver

spoons in their mouths, but some are born with silver forks in their mouths. How can he say that the West Indies Hospital Funds Limited, the Company, was not sued? I remember when the money was paid, and I know how much the lawyer was paid by the *Advocate*. I was there in the Supreme Court. If the hon. member does not know, that is his misfortune. As to the question of the *Advocate* not submitting a proof in time, I hope that the hon. senior member for St. Michael will not mind if I say that the *Advocate's* explanation for not printing the tickets was just possibly that they had to be paid in advance. They did not trust the Company in this matter of printing the tickets, and the reason why they cannot get the tickets printed here is that nobody will give them any credit. The Bank of Nova Scotia managed it in that they offered to give a guarantee; but, apparently, that guarantee was never taken. I do not believe that the West Indies Hospital Fund Company is given any credit at the present time.

3.55 p.m.

I just do not believe that the hon. senior member for St. Michael can seriously maintain that this Company is not regarded by all as an indifferent racket. The people who run the Jamaica Sweepstake tickets have to pay, and they pay large prizes. Is the hon. senior member for St. Michael saying that the people who run these sweepstakes are idiots?

We are told that this Company has established its own printery to print its own sweepstake tickets, when they are in such a bad financial position as not to be able to pay their own way.

loosing
As to their loosing their jobs -

Mr. SPRINGER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The people who were employed by the *Advocate*, we now employ to print sweepstake tickets. These people did not lose their jobs; they were laid off.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Let the hon. member go home and think about this. The reason why he paid the printers more is not because the *Advocate* laid off printers, but because nobody would print their tickets for them without the Company paying out a great deal more money for the work.

Now, Mr. Speaker, all we are hearing about is this fine of \$15,000. The hon. senior member for St. Michael thinks this is some substitute for an instalment of \$125,000. The order is the maximum for the payment of a fine.

We are a little surprised that the fine is not yet paid. Again, I cannot blame the hon. senior member for St. Michael for telling this Honourable House that \$80,000 of it has been paid. I want the hon. member to be absolutely clear in his mind that I am not accusing him of deceit. Before there can be deceit, there must be understanding. I do not think he has the understanding of the payment of the order on the West Indies Hospital Funds Limited by the Court.

The hon. senior member for St. Michael also included a monetary twenty percent levy that has to be made on all prize money before it can be paid to all prize winners. They are payments being made by every prize winner. By Section 5, they are required to pay twenty percent of its value to the Commissioner of Inland Revenue. I challenge the hon. member that these payments are also included in the payments.

The hon. senior member for St. Michael says that he does not know who prepared those figures. The Hon. Prime Minister presented that Bill in here and I for one do not believe the Prime Minister would be a party to falsification of the figures of the West Indies Hospital Funds Limited. The hon. senior member for St. Michael is actually accusing him of falsification.

Mr. Speaker, we have had some interesting deductions. The hon. member said that the Company has paid all of its debts and has reduced its debts to the prize winners by fifty percent.

4.05 p.m.

Mr. SPRINGER: I never said the Company had paid all its debts.

Mr. SPEAKER: What point is the hon. member saying he is making?

Mr. SPRINGER: Explanation. I never said it paid all its debts.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this is a direct challenge: "he did not say the Company had paid all its debts." This was at the end of his speech "and reduced its liabilities to prize winners by 50%". Mr. Speaker, we have some interest - there is nobody up here who is not paying income tax. Before I go on, if the hon. member has any point of explanation to make, let him make it now, because I heard him say that there is no employee up there who is not paying tax, and then he said that the least paid employee is a cleaner who works for 12 hours a week; she works three evenings a week.

Mr. Speaker, let us analyse this. I do not want to pour any more ridicule on the hon. member: he must expect, when you are in a vulnerable position as that that a few of the blows are going right home. Nobody who works 12 hours a week pays income tax.

Mr. SPRINGER: Anybody would know that any person who works three days a week at four hours each would not pay income tax; this is common sense. At least I credited the hon. member with that.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: There is no regulation that I know of which says that if you work for \$1 a day part time you do not have to pay tax. If the hon. senior member for St. Michael wants to make a statement, he must edit it carefully; otherwise he is opening himself to ridicule. If he goes on saying that everybody there pays income tax, and that the least paid worker gets \$12 a week, we can all draw our deductions as to his logic, his arithmetic and his sense of speech making.

Mr. Speaker, if this Company were controlled - I say controlled - by honest people, and were making an honest attempt within the laws of Barbados and within the laws of friendly countries with which Barbados enjoys a full state of international competence, we could respect the pleas made by the hon. senior member for St. Michael to give them a chance; but there is a difference between giving the hon. senior member a chance and giving the West Indies Hospital Fund Ltd. a chance. We are all very sorry for the hon. senior member for St. Michael that he will have to go back to abusing Mr. John Thorne and his four daughters on a political platform. Whatever the usual tenor of his speeches are, that is too bad; we are dealing with an Act of Parliament. Mr. Speaker, Sir, and I want the hon. senior member for St. Michael to hear this - many of us were remarkably surprised by what took place in St. Michael on this occasion, because what we knew of the hon. senior member for St. Michael, the man I heard with my own ears on a political platform talking about four masked men who went into the house of the former senior member for St. Philip, and all sorts of things coming from the lips of the hon. senior member for St. Michael, I thought he had grown up. Do not let him disappoint us now again: Mr. Speaker, do not let him get back even in the desperate situation in which he finds himself at present; let us all join together and view the affairs of Barbados in a broad light.

Now as regards the question of the West Indies Hospital Trust Ltd. There are members of the Cabinet who feel, as the senior member for Bridgetown does, that this Act should be repealed, and this view has been expressed in Cabinet, in other Councils, in private conversations - and indeed in even relevant public conversations there are numerous members of the Democratic Labour Party who regret that the hon. senior member for St. Lucy

Mr. SPEAKER: Do I hear the hon. member for St. Thomas right?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Your Honour did hear me say the hon. member for St. Lucy; but I meant the hon. member for St. Michael. He is the only thing standing between the Act and repeal. There is nothing else. But "poor Patsy". The hon. senior member for St. Michael, Mr. Speaker, if he is not careful, he will have to go back cutting hair.

I do not think the hon. senior member for St. Michael knows these things; but when you see a prize-winning draw; and out of 25, 17 or 18 have got a prize, and then in another 1,000 tickets sold there is no prize, you have your doubts about these things. When you see the second prize winner exists at a fictitious address that the New York Police have been asked to investigate the names of the prize winners, and when they go there all they find in a vacant lot - the hon. member for St. Michael could tell us the first prize winner is so-and-so, and we have a picture of him, that would be most admirable.

Mr. Speaker, ever so often there comes in to my Chambers, as into the Chambers, I believe, of the

hon. senior member for Christ Church, and perhaps other hon. members of this House, many people with notices sent out to prize winners congratulating them on the winning of a prize.

4.15 p.m.

Whenever I have had to speak to the hon. senior member for St. Michael about these letters, he has sent the money down by messenger. So far as I can remember, it has never been more than one guinea. I cannot recall anybody who won a bigger prize than a guinea. If that is incorrect, I am sure that the hon. member will correct me. I used to have to tell the people who wrote to me: "Don't worry with them. Don't mind that they tell you they will give you \$5.00". It was not worth my while to collect any prizes from the West Indies Hospital Fund. We have heard that at the Exposition this year, one of the things which plagued the Barbados-Guyana Pavilion - apart from the Macaw which swore - was prize coming to ask: "Why can't we get our money?" It is all very well to ask about the Chamber of Commerce getting their money, but they get one guinea. Sir, this Company should be called, not the West Indies Hospital Limited, or the "Fund of the Yard Fowls Limited", but "The Guinea Birds Limited Fund". That is the only prize since the inefficient window-dressing prizes for publicity - that is the only prize which I have ever heard being paid out.

The hon. senior member for St. Michael resembled Lord George in at least one respect. He bounds from corner to corner from ceiling to floor and back across again. In the course of his speech defending The West Indies Hospital Fund, he has contradicted the estimates, the Records of the Supreme Court, he has given a different account of the *Advocate's* record and he has given a different account from the account of the Barbados *Daily News* in relation to advertising. I cannot say definitely because I was not there. I cannot say that the *Daily News* refused to accept advertisements because they were not being paid for, and therefore we have to accept what the hon. senior member for St. Michael has said as to why the advertisements had been withdrawn. Since the hon. senior member for St. Michael has seen fit to talk of defending before a jury in respect of the speech of the hon. senior member for Christ Church, if I were a member of a jury and heard the defence speech made by the hon. senior member for St. Michael, I would not need to hear the speech of the prosecution in reply. I would have to see in what further tangles he would get himself. I would have to say that it is a performance, because you can see a most scandalous case and work it into a picture of rosy health by the use of a few skilful and well-chosen words; but we are all politicians in here. It is a jury of politicians to whom the hon. member was addressing the remarks. We are all persons with the disposition to see everything at its best. I believe that all of us can say that time has taught some of us more realism than others. Let us hope that the hon. senior member for St. Michael, as a result of this debate, will learn a little more realism. You cannot possibly on any account say that the West Indies Hospital Funds Limited needs to be guided now. There is

nobody whose eyes are not beclouded by self-interest, because the hon. senior member for St. Michael has declared his interest and we can see that his speech is a self-interested speech - there is nobody who is not self-interested who can conceivably say that the West Indies Hospital Funds Limited does not deserve probing in the dust. I beg to support the motion which has been made.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the hon. senior member for St. Michael on his very able defence of himself this afternoon and the corruption of a Company in which he works. I must confess, Sir, and it has always been an old adage, that birds of a feather flock together. It is not conceivable how the hon. senior member for St. Michael defended the West Indies Hospital Funds Limited so ably this afternoon. He gave us a breakdown of not being guilty to the electorate of St. Michael and he also, in his "mouse in the lard oil bottle" approach, made some very sleek remarks when he said that the hon. senior member for St. James know very well that the inability to pay is not necessarily dishonesty. Let us all agree that any other person on that side would be able to advise, and I am confident that the hon. senior member for St. Michael would have been given his knowledge by the Hon. Leader of the House and the hon. senior member for St. Andrew. I am sure that they are competent to impart such knowledge by which the hon. senior member for St. Michael can come in here and made these silly remarks.

4.25 p.m.

Many of us might be able like the West Indies Hospital Funds Limited to pay our debts immediately; but there are some of us, because of the credit squeeze and our approach to things who are unable to pay promptly. I never had a barber shop where stolen goods ever came into it. When you get things through the chute, you can buy them and then sell them for a lot of profit. I imagine that is why the West Indies Hospital Funds Limited has found itself in the embarrassing position which the hon. senior member for St. Michael spoke of. The hon. member brought to my house one hundred sweepstake books and asked me to take them to Dominica. That is a breach of the revenue laws of this country. I am hearing grunts just as coming from an animal. Surely, these grunts do not come from this side of the House. It seems to me like the voice of some animal from the other side of the House.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now 4.30 o'clock p.m. This House will now revert to the position in which it was before suspension of the Sitting.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. CHAIRMAN took the Chair.

RESUMPTION IN COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the suspension, the House was in Committee of Supply and the hon. junior member for St. Peter was speaking. If he so desires, he may continue.

Mr. HINDS: The Addendum says, Mr. Chairman -

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I can hardly hear the hon. member. I am asking hon. members to observe Rule 29 (6).

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, the Addendum states that "it is proposed to revise the salaries and wages of the officers and employees in the service of the Interim Commissioner for Local Government for the City of Bridgetown, the Southern District, and the Northern District, with effect from 1st April, 1966. The revision will be computed according to the following general formula."

Now, Mr. Chairman, what follows immediately after this paragraph cannot by any stretch of the imagination - or any stretch at all by either competent Minister - be taken as a general formula for the fixing of wages or salaries. What before us is not a general formula; it is specific. That is what it is because the method employed here is not to be found anywhere else.

One would see where an officer receiving \$3,600 per annum and over is now to receive a ten percent increase. When one looks at it, despite the fact that it is not all of the officers who are entitled to it, ten percent of \$3,600 is \$30 more per month; but when one looks back to see that an employee receiving \$1,200 per annum is going to get 25% that means that a worker who is getting \$30 per month is getting \$7.50 increase, and when you offer that, you can very well see what that means.

Mr. Chairman, there can be seen the hands of the economist at work on this; and whatever is done in matters of this sort, we must accept the fact that there must be taken into consideration the salaries and wages presently paid to the persons who are expected to benefit from any revision of salaries. Failing to do that, all that you are doing is only offering a palliative. I will therefore ask the Hon. Minister of Health whether or not this is merely a temporary measure being employed in this salary revision.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of explanation. The provision for revision of salaries was agreed to by the Barbados Workers Union and the Civil Service Association. What you hear going on today is just filibustering; but the accredited representatives of the workers have consented to these proposals.

4.35 p.m.

Mr. W. C. B. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, the Local Government employees are represented, some of them by BALGO, some by the Barbados Workers' Union, and some by the Civil Service Association. I would not like, Sir, to accuse the Civil Service Association of being hypocritical in dealing with Local Government employees, nor am I willing to accuse the Barbados Workers Union of anything short of being decent; and when the hon. Minister tells us that these proposals have been submitted to the Barbados Workers' Union and the Civil Service Association repre-

senting these various categories of workers, I am to wonder if the hon. Minister is giving this hon. House information which is honourable or worthy of being considered as honourable.

Mr. Chairman, if the Barbados Workers' Union, representing any of these workers, has agreed to anything like this, the representation has been dishonest and not worthy of representing the workers any further. Let us bear in mind the people who are affected by these wages, increases in the truest sense. They are the scavengers, the truck drivers, the people who are employed to clean beaches to remove dead animals from the beaches from time to time - these are the people here that we have got present wage? And you are to tell me, Sir, that the Barbados Workers' Union, representing that category of workers, could really and truly - the Barbados Workers' Union evidently has a Minister behind them: they go ahead, because the officers who negotiate from the Union certainly could not stand up and face these workers telling them that this is what they have done for them; they just could not. I want to tell the hon. Minister, I do not accept it at all that either the Barbados Workers' Union or the Civil Service Association agreed to anything that is in this Addendum here today. Not one word do I believe.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, Sir, dealing with this Resolution, I would like to mention this. Firstly, the salary revision is an interim measure to relieve the hardship caused by the low salaries paid by the Councils generally, and especially the Northern District Council. Uniformity of salaries cannot be achieved until the services are all centralised either by the transfer to Government or to the proposed three Boards. It means that this is a temporary measure; and as soon as the services are centralised and the Boards are appointed, the Government is prepared to go into the matter fully, and secondly, it does not mean that this is the end of the matter. I want to clear up that point before I deal with the issue.

The low wages which the Councils have been paying, Central Government has decided to do something at the present moment to relieve the employees; but again I repeat, it is not the end of the matter.

Now, Sir, in reply to certain members, I must state this. Local Government was introduced in this Island by the Barbados Labour Party and especially in the Southern District Council, the bulk of the unpaid taxes was handed down to members of the Democratic Labour Party. I have facts and figures. I would like this hon. House to know that the Barbados Labour Party never put one person in Court for the taxes; yet 50% or more was left by their Councils. Sir, this Resolution deals with retroactive pay for employees of the districts. As you will remember, the Central Government took over the major services; employees who were left to carry on the residual services, we are here to deal with them, and secondly, it is our duty to do something to relieve them for the time being.

4.45 p.m.

It is of paramount importance to deal with the employees who were left to carry on the services of the Councils. Disgruntled and frustrated servants can never render efficient service. They expect us to do something to help them, and we have to do our utmost.

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. senior member for St. Philip to the Standing Order which stipulates that no hon. member should read his speech. It would appear to me as if the hon. member is reading his speech.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have been watching and I have observed that the hon. member might have been looking at his notes.

Mr. WEEKES: Yes, Mr. Chairman. *(Laughter)* When this Resolution is passed, it will relieve the anxiety and tension of these employees. They deserve consideration because they have rendered faithful service to the various Councils. Sir, if the hon. senior member for St. James does not know that it is my privilege to make notes when member on that side were speaking, it is entirely a matter for him. I am going to look carefully at my notes and reply to all the points which have been made.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I have no desire of interrupting the hon. member, but on a point of explanation, it appeared to me that the hon. senior member for St. Philip was reading his speech, but he has made it very clear - and Your Honour has said - that he was looking at his notes.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let the hon. senior member for St. Philip proceed.

Mr. WEEKES: When this Resolution is passed, it is going to bring joy, happiness and felicity to the employees of the former Councils. They realise that this Government is doing its utmost for them, regardless of our detractors. Now let us deal with the percentage of increases; as to salaries and wages under \$100.00 a month, there is an increase of 25%; over \$100.00 a month, 20%; over \$200.00 a month, 15% and over \$300.00 a month, 10%. Now, you will see, that if a person is working for \$100.00 a month, he is going to get an increase of \$25.00 per month and the amount of retroactive pay which he will receive will be \$25.00 a month for seventeen months. I want that point to be cleared up because some members of the Opposition have been trying to give the public wrong impressions. It is true, Sir, that the people in the lower bracket will be receiving the greatest percentage and those in the higher bracket have been dealt with as has been set out. The position is this; the Councils could not afford to pay retrospectively, and they recommended that these increases be given to these employees.

I repeat that, as a temporary measure, the Barbados Worker's Union and the Civil Service Association have accepted these increases because they

realised that as soon as the services are centralised, new methods would have to be adopted to deal with this important matter. Therefore, we are only wasting our time, filibustering everything when we are told that this is a temporary measure. In this case, I am speaking as Parliamentary Secretary in the Ministry of Health, and when I make that statement, I am sure that it is authentic. Justice must not only appear to be done, but it must be done, and we are prepared to do all that lies in our power for the people. It is left to them to play their part as faithful and conscientious servants. In doing so, I am sure that the taxpayers of this country will be grateful to them. I am sure that when these employees receive the amount which will be given to them, they will thank the Government for the important part which it has played in relieving them of their problem. I will repeat that this is a temporary measure.

Now, let us get down to the facts. The three Councils could not afford to pay the retroactive pay. In order for the Councils to do that, it would mean an increase in the rates. (Mr. ST. JOHN: No.) I repeat that if the Councils had paid this retrospective pay, it would have meant a further increase in the rates. (ASIDES)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like hon. members to observe Standing Order 29 which deals with the behaviour of members who are not speaking. Let the hon. senior member for St. Philip proceed.
4.55 p.m.

Mr. WEEKES: We would have to think about the taxpayers. The taxation rate in the City of Bridgetown last year - 1966-67 - was \$15.0, this year - 1967-68 - it is 17.6 an increase of 2.6.

In the Southern District, in 1966-67 the rate was 26.8, now in 1967-68 it is 30.5, an increase of 3.7.

In the Northern District in 1966-67 the rate was 29.4 now in 1967-68 it is 32.0, an increase of 2.6.

Now, the proposals for the revision, which have been confirmed by the Government, were submitted to the Barbados Workers Union and the Civil Service Association for their comments before reference was made to the Cabinet. I want hon. members of this House to realise that we did take into consideration the taxpayers. Perhaps, it is possible that some of them might not be able to pay a big increase. However, we did take into consideration firstly the taxpayers, and that is the reason why we are here asking the Government to give this amount.

This is only a part, a subsidy, so to speak. We are really subsidising the Councils for this year. If the Councils in future cannot meet demands, then the Government would have to assist them occasionally. As I aforementioned to you, Mr. Chairman, this is a temporary measure, and salaries and wages would be revised when things are analysed.

Sir, this Resolution has my wholehearted and unstinted support and I do here hope that the Opposition will not filibuster, but try to accept matters so that we would get through with our business in this Honourable Chamber.

Mr. MOTTLEY: This word "filibuster" has come from certain hon. members of the Government. (ASIDES) I am one member whom you cannot interrupt when I am speaking. Mr. Chairman, in God's good time I am back here to deal with something in connection with Local Government.

I want to make it abundantly clear that the Government was the best friend I have in their abolishing Local Government. To use the Prime Minister's words; "If you cannot get rid of Mottley, get rid of Local Government." However, I am still here. (NOISES) Mr. Chairman, if you sit there and hear people "chupsing" and do not say something, I am going to show you what is going to happen.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like hon. members to observe Rule 29 (6):-

"While a Member is speaking, all other Members shall be silent or shall confer only in undertones, and shall not make unseemly interruptions."

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am sorry that the hon. member who has just spoken has left the House, I would like to draw to the attention of hon. members that one of the reasons given for the rise in the rates of taxes is that the Councils never sued anyone. I am speaking for the City Council, but I believe I can speak for the Chairmen of the other areas.

As the law stands, you have to sue people. At present, some 15,000 people or more owe an amount of taxes, and I had to wait on the Chief Justice in order to get him to appoint people in the Law Courts to process summons. Over 7,000, as far as I can remember, had been heard for the years 1964-65 and 1965-66.

I had to wait on them and get our legal adviser to see if he could get two girls to assist in processing the work. Therefore, it is not true to say that the Councils did not sue anybody. There is the feeling that because two millions dollars were owing, you were not collecting the unpaid taxes.

As the law stands -or stood, before you had the Interim Commissioner- it was the duty of the Central Government to confirm the Estimates of the Councils before they were acted upon. Estimates were submitted to the Government for the year 1965-66 in the month of March, and confirmed something like three months later.

They were confirmed something like three months later. In 1966-67 a similar thing was done; so when they are three months late, they must come back on the Council late, you have no machinery to address envelopes and figure out the tax upon which

people must pay, and not only that, when you send the bills out you cannot call upon anyone - except a Councillor or an Alderman - to pay one cent of tax until after 40 days.

Would you believe that in the new form of Local Government which took the place of the Vestry, the trade tax - several thousand persons who should pay trade tax in the island - should be sent to the City Treasurer by the Income Tax Commissioner? Would it surprise you to know that I am prepared to put all I have at stake tonight, that you will find now that for 1964-65 and 1955-66 taxes on persons who owe taxes have not been sent down or sent to the several Treasurers yet? This is no fault of the Commissioner; the system is so complicated, and as soon as there is an objection, as soon as a man is not satisfied with the amount he has to pay, there are further complications and further delay.

I do not think that the member who spoke understands much about it. When these taxes are sent back then they must be sent out and collected, and the same thing applies today. I will give you one instance. Take for instance, a company trading at the Deep Water Harbour. Do you know what it means to be waiting for \$40,000, \$50,000 or even \$60,000 in taxes, and three or four years passes by? The hon. member for Christ Church who has been a legal adviser to the Local Government in the South can bear this out. For several years they have not come down; but to say that no one was actually sued for taxes is absolutely incorrect, and I hope it is not a wilful attempt to mislead the House. It just is not true. I can tell anybody what I have refused to do, or what I refused to advise the City Council to do, and let the Government do it, if they want to do it. I made this pledge as a young man not to waste time; you see the people go to Court for one 25¢. If the Prime Minister wants to do that, let him do it; I told them I would not do it.

It has been revealed here this evening that people in the Hospital Sweepstake Fund - not are unable, but wilfully refused to pay taxes. Do you know why I refused to do this? If an old woman in Spruce Street or somewhere is unable to pay, you can go and do this, but if the *Advocate* refused to pay you cannot carry away one piece of machinery, and as I saw this I impressed upon the Council not to do it, but everybody had to be used; so this is not true, let them do it.

In support of the Resolution for \$300,000 I must make the position of the Bridgetown City Council clear. After 26 years' service and after the first five years we brought about an incremental system; in other words, instead of having somebody apply this year asking for a raise and then we would decide to raise the salary, we appointed a committee to go into this matter, which was under the Chairmanship of Dr. Cummins, and he brought about an incremental system as near as possible to the system the Government used.

Twelve years ago, when the Government made its first revision of salaries, we revised ours and put all our employees on the basis of Government employees. This was to stop this feeling that one set of employees are inferior to the other and I am going to prove that this talk about "temporary" is a joke.

Mr. Chairman, during last year the Barbados Workers' Union satisfied us that they represent the majority of workers - scavengers, cooks, etc. - and so we were at pains to get the Gardner-Brown Report. The Minister is there, let him deny this, we went right through it. Are you telling me that a Washer at the Infirmary, where you have 700-odd people, is entitled to less, because the Cabinet say they are entitled to less than the Washer at the Hospital? When I came back here convalescing then, the Committee brought it to me; we went into it and we sent to Government a recommendation upon the Gardner-Brown Report for salaries and wages for employees, but at that time the Government was disappointed in the fact that I had survived the foul-mouthed attacks from some of them. I am here for a long time, I can tell you. Do not make this mistake; I much prefer to wear out than to rust out. You are going anyhow; so wear out instead of rusting out.

The Barbados Workers' Union, sometime in October, with Mr. Greene, put up to the Bridgetown City Council a salary scale, nothing like this. In that salary scale we went into it and we recommended to the Council as to the incremental system. We found at the time of the last revision in 1961 the Government started Long Grade Clerks at \$95 a month and we started them there too. Why are you saying they are inferior?
5.15 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have never said any such thing.

Mr. MOTTLEY: In that Report which we made, we recommended that washers who were getting \$60.00 a month, and, of course, you will realize that between 1961 and 1966 that would seem to be very low - the recommendation would have been \$80.00 a month. I heard the hon. member who spoke just now talk about men at top getting this and that; he did not realise that the man at the top is getting \$30 a month more as against the man at the bottom whom he recommended for an increase of salary. Some of these Councils made a very bad salary scale. We know that the Council of the North had a very bad salary scale, and because you wanted to remove the North and the South which you could not get the control of, you are saying that they do not collect taxes. The Government has come down with this sum of \$300,000 to pay this retrospective pay. In 1961 and in 1965-66 we paid retrospective pay, so that what they are doing now is nothing new. As to the idea of saying that the rates would go up if you had to pay retrospectively, that is nothing new, because you always decided to pay retrospective pay and borrow the money. I am not

opposing this Resolution. I am very glad to see that this \$300,000 retrospective pay will include payment for the scavengers. I want to say that if it had not been for the scavengers, not one soul in these Local Government Councils would have got any retrospective pay. In 1965 the scavengers went from \$3.50 to \$4.50 a day and that was a result of the Barbados Workers' Union negotiating for the labourers. In this scale, although they would have been entitled to retrospective pay for 1966-67, if they had not made threats and any amount of threats, possibly they would never get this retrospective pay. The City Council sent out their Estimates and the Government took from May to August to consider them, and it was only last Thursday that the Estimates were sent down and the rates were increased. Mr. Chairman, we must have increased rates if you are going to have increased salaries. When the hon. member spoke of not collecting taxes, I want this to be borne in mind. I try to explain this to hon. members on the other side, who have not had any experience in Local Government. There are people who are doing business today who, normally, would not pay any sort of taxes. I think hon. members should know more about trade tax. When the Brydens and Scotts and Goddards pay trade tax, it comes out of the business. If you pay 19¢ in the dollar that is \$19.00 out of \$100.00 for trade tax. You take that off the business which you make and you pay the balance in income tax. If it were not for the trade tax - it may be an antiquated system - but if it were not for the interim traders and other people who do business - and because the Commissioner of Inland Revenue can see that they are doing business, he is able to collect income tax.

There are several dozens of people in this country who could earn salaries and pay tax; they pay between \$75.00 and \$100.00 and it is realised that you must collect some income tax from them. When it comes to the payment of this retroactive pay, I am happy to think that the Government has been able to settle, after five months of waiting, the idea of paying this retroactive pay, although, I repeat, it is nothing new. It was since 1961 and we did it. It may be that the other Councils did not do it, but we did it on the Report of Gardner-Brown and other Reports which the Government had. It would not be a question of upsetting the economic equilibrium of the country by saying that we have people employed and we will give them so much more than what the Government has given. Nobody could accuse me of that. That is why we have always been guided by the Reports which the Government has had; I am therefore at a loss to understand how the Government could come to the conclusion that the workers, who had a similar job, should be entitled at this present stage to less money. Whatever you are going to do, you should just view it in this way. If a scavenger is getting \$5.00 a day, you adopt that because of the force of circumstances. That is what Gardner-Brown recommended for a cook, a scrubber or washer. Because that is what Gardner-Brown said, you say: "We are not going to do that."

5.25 p.m.

While their brothers and sisters who are employed at the Mental Hospital are paid \$80, they are

paid \$20. How can I reconcile that? That is simply not fair. This is one thing that people cannot understand. That is being done to hoodwink people and this has been done to keep taxes down.

Are you telling them that this \$300,000 which you bring down to pay increased wages and salaries is only part and later you will bring down a Resolution for more? Or is it that this is the end of it? They are going to pay for it. I do object to your taking this out and saying that they are not entitled to Gardner-Brown's proposals.

Mr. Brown sat down with all sections and with all members of the City Council and we agreed that the recommendations for these people should be on the Gardner-Brown proposals. But the Government has come in here and said that this is only a temporary thing. I saw Mr. Moseley a few days ago and he said to me: "You know, it is peculiar that they would not accept what we recommended".

This was a last minute rush by the Government because I got back to Barbados alive.

When the Estimates were prepared on the last occasion, they said that they would make increases according to the Gardner-Brown Proposals. However only one set of workers they picked out and gave an increase to on the Gardner-Brown proposals. They are the scavengers. We know, and they know, why they picked out these workers. If they did not do that, there would have been some difficulty.

Therefore, Sir, while I support the Resolution and am glad to see that they are going to get this backpay, there is the question of increased wages and salaries. A little after the Central Government received the Estimates of the City Council, they signed a law to say that we could only give the employees their regular increments. That is all the increase which they are going to get. But, Mr. Chairman, I would like the hon. member to see reason.

Now, Sir, I would like to hear from the Hon. Minister in charge, what portion of this \$300,000 would be allocated to the City Council, what part to the North and what part to the South. I ask that for this reason. The Hon. Parliamentary Secretary stated that there would be no increase as far as salaries are concerned; there would be no increments.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, may I be allowed to clear up that point. I never said so. The employees would be given their increments and also the increase.

Mr. MOTTLEY: In other words, where there are increments given, they would be given their regular increments. In the North and South where there are no increments, there would be no increments.

Mr. WEEKES: The position is that in the South, the employees are not given any increments because they have reached their maximum.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What I want to know is what portion of the \$300,000 is allocated to the North and

what portion to the South. I suppose the hon. senior member for St. Andrew would be able to tell me if there are any increments given in the North. If you say that it is 25 percent increase on salaries and wages not exceeding \$1,200 per annum and 10 percent on those exceeding \$3,600, am I correct in saying that this same type of letter was written to all?

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, may I be allowed to say this? It is my opinion that the increments were paid from the 1st April -

Mr. MOTTLEY: You just cannot do anything until the Estimates are confirmed.

Mr. WEEKES: The annual Estimates has nothing to do with the increase of salaries.

Mr. MOTTLEY: When Estimates are sent up and you put \$10 on employees' wages or salaries, you cannot pay out that increment until those Estimates come down. All that has been amended. I am trying to say that when you sent it up in the Estimates you cannot pay out anything until the Estimates are confirmed. Only the Cabinet can decide that it can be done. Therefore, I want the Hon. Minister to tell us, if he can, what scale the increases on the salaries and wages in Bridgetown are and whether the increments would be paid and then the 25 percent increase.

Mr. WEEKES: That is so.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member admits that that is so. What is therefore now being done in the North?

Mr. WEEKES: Similar instructions have been given to all of the Councils.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member said that there was no incremental system in the South.
5.35 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Sir. If the hon. member would give way

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Minister is on a point of order.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The question of North, South or City does not arise; everything is centralised, and whatever instructions are given to the City holds good for the North and the South. The salaries are retrospective and retroactive from 1st April, 1966.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If a man is getting \$110 a month in the City, where there was an incremental system at the 1st April he is entitled to \$120 a month. When the Cabinet confirms the Estimates, then he gets 25% on his last year's salary, not on his increment. Is that right? And where there is no increment, what does he get 25% on? This is what I want to know. Will persons who were in the service between April 1966 and March 1967, and who are now within the service, will they be entitled to the increased pay?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of explanation. These salaries will be increased and become effective as from the 1st April, 1966. Anyone who is getting \$100 a month would, of necessity, get \$125 as from the 1st April, 1966, and whatever back pay there is, he gets from the 1st April, 1966.

As far as people who have gone out are concerned they are entitled as of right to whatever back pay is due to them, as long as they were in the service at the time.

Mr. MOTTLEY: This is a matter which employees wanted clear. If people were in the service between March 1966 and April, 1967, if they died, if they resigned, if they had to leave, this is a matter which caused a lot of trouble. If the hon. Minister will remember, on occasions before - and I want this cleared up now, because there is the feeling that if people went out they are not entitled. However, I support the Resolution, but I do feel myself that the Government should not let the fact to influence them that they view with some inferiority the employees of Local Government when they do a similar job as those in the Central Government.

Mr. ST. JOHN: I just wanted to - I heard a statement made here in this House, and I could not allow it to go unchallenged. The Hon. Parliamentary Secretary, the senior member for St. Philip, said that the Democratic Labour Party inherited from the Barbados Labour Party 50% of the present deficiency in rates, and he said he has figures from 1962 when they took over. I am charging the hon. member with telling this hon. House a statement which has no accuracy in fact.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution before us for the sum of \$300,000 to be paid in respect of salaries and wages which are to be increased for employees serving now under the Interim Commissioner for Local Government, is one that has been long awaited., for the employees of the now defunct City, Southern and Northern Districts have been negotiating for these increases for more than two years; possibly for more than three years.

Today we speak of the fact that backpay is given from the 1st April 1966. When it comes to the amount of increase, my colleague pointed out to the Committee that in the case of the Local Government worker whose weekly wage is \$30 he will be getting 25% added to that, but certainly when he looked down the line, 25% is a quarter. Does the Parliamentary Under-Secretary understand that 25% is one quarter?

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, Sir. I would like the hon. member to know this, that he quoted 25% of \$30 which is definitely wrong. He has to quote 20% of \$30.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I am on my feet. Mr. Chairman, I will read (ASIDES)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Rule 29 (6) asks hon. members to speak only in undertone while a member is speaking. Let the hon. senior member for St. Peter continue.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, paragraph 2 subparagraph (a) reads: "Salaries and wages not exceeding \$1,200 per annum, 25% increase" and the highest category is (b) salaries and wages exceeding \$3,600 per annum, 20% increase. Obviously the Parliamentary Secretary read something else.

Mr. WEEKES: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The point at issue is that there is no employee in the Council, as far as I know, who receives \$30 per month. 5.45 p.m.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has only stated his ignorance of what he does not know. When he says that he is not ignorant of something, that is elementary. To pass on from those who do not want themselves to know, I will say that I have listened to the hon. member who is in charge of this Resolution who rose on a point of explanation and made a very trite statement. I believe that the Minister will do better when he gets up to give the Committee his reply. If I have heard the Minister rightly, he said that the Government, the Barbados Workers' Union and the Barbados Civil Service Association agreed to these proposals. I will repeat that. I understood the Minister to have said that the Barbados Government agree to these proposals for increased salaries and wages submitted by the Barbados Workers' Union and the Barbados Civil Service Association. Only after the employees made.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, on a point of explanation. The proposals for the revision of salaries and wages which have been formulated by the Government, were submitted to the Barbados Workers' Union and the Barbados Civil Service Association for their comments and observations, and they agreed with them.

Mr. HUSBANDS: That is what I said. I do not have the Minister's file from which to read verbatim, and that was my only difference. I do not know what persons are members of the Barbados Workers' Union or of the Barbados Civil Service Association, but I know what proportion of them are not members of any bartering body. The Minister should know what I do not know. If the Barbados Workers' Union and the Barbados Civil Service Association have agreed to these proposals, that strikes me as being strange. Those workers who are getting \$100.00 a month will get an increase of 25%, that is to say, those workers who get \$15.00, \$20.00, \$30.00, \$40.00, \$50.00, \$60.00 per month, and so on, going up to \$100.00 per month, are going to get 1/4 of their salaries as an increase under this proposed scheme. Nowadays we hear that if anybody is working for \$20.00 a month, the Barbados Workers' Union wants a minimum of \$25.00 a month for him, and if that is so with that class of worker - like my colleague I am not hesitant in accepting what I have been told, that is, that a bartering body with the experience of the Barbados Workers'

Union and one as well equipped as the Barbados Civil Service Association, would accept a 25% increase in salaries which are under \$100.00 per month. In the ordinary course of negotiations it must have happened that these employees with these former District Councils must have put up proposals to the Councils, and the Councils must have made some agreement and forwarded in their Estimates for more than a year now, proposals to the Government. That should be the ordinary way of going about the matter in order to effect an increase for these workers. For the Minister to say that the Barbados Workers' Union and the Barbados Civil Service Association agreed to the proposals which were sent down to these people - that is a new way of doing things. The Government should be rejecting or agreeing to something; the Government should not be sending down anything. I say that this is something which is new and modern. Instead of these bodies asking the Government for something and negotiations going on between the two associations, you are telling me that the proposals of the Government were agreed to by the bartering bodies on behalf of these employees. Something must have happened. I do not know if the Minister will make a further explanation.

I am glad to see that the hon. senior member for St. Philip is in his proper place. He has told us that this is a temporary measure. The hon. member is parliamentary secretary in the Ministry of Health and Community Development. It is true that he is not a member of the Cabinet, but he certainly has the ear of his Minister. At least, he should have the ear of his Minister. But he tells us that this is a temporary measure. I remember that when my colleague was on his feet he made this statement; he asked if this is a temporary measure, how long will this measure be imposed? The hon. member says that we have to wait until centralisation comes into force and when all of these proposed Boards are established. I could tell these employees: "We have agreed to an increase of wages for you;" but from the mouth of the Parliamentary Secretary, we are told that this is a temporary measure and that on the establishment of these Boards, more money will be coming. You will be getting another increase.

5.55 p.m.

Is it true? Mr. Chairman, can I risk it? When people are in a responsible position, when they make statements, they must be very, very careful. It was only after my colleague was on his feet that the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary made the statement. He said that this is only a temporary measure, and on the establishment of Local Government Boards who will take the place of the former Councils, there will be another increase. These workers would be reading this or they would be hearing about it because they have been waiting for a very long time for this increase.

There are workers now working with the particular Interim Commissioner who are in receipt of wages less than \$25 a week. That is true for the North I do not know what is the position of the South nor of the City. The hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown spoke at length on this matter.

The hon. Parliamentary Secretary when he comes into this place should do one of two things, either keep his mouth shut or prepare his homework. This is not a place that tolerates half-baked statements - statements which cannot be supported by facts. He has to try some place else.

Therefore, on behalf of these workers, I would say that this is a measure of relief. I am not going to blame the Barbados Workers' Union or the Civil Service Association for any of this, because the right approach to pry into it has not been taken. They have sent down something just asking them if they have agreed with it. There is nothing to be gained by it. I said, if it is a temporary measure, I accept it as such and that is my point. The Parliamentary Secretary said so, but the Hon. Minister has not said so.

Mr. Chairman, I will sit if the hon. Parliamentary Secretary wishes to repeat what he said. However, you cannot read that into this. The Parliamentary Secretary said that it is a temporary measure. It is playing "Puss, Puss". This is no place for bluffing. We do not want any sop and when I go outside I will tell the people that it is a temporary measure. I will tell them that a responsible member of the Government Party said so. I think I have the right to tell them so. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof.

I hope the Hon. Minister will give me some enlightenment as to whether it is a temporary measure. If he does not, it means that the Parliamentary Secretary has told us something which we cannot repeat. The hon. Parliamentary Secretary said so in reply to something by my colleague. He stood on his feet and said "I want the House to understand that this is a temporary measure." I accept that.
6.05 p.m.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I see the time is getting short; what I know is that the grass is growing and the horse is starving. This Resolution must pass in order that people who are waiting on this money will have it for their use. Mr. Chairman, from the time the Local Government came into existence we had, from that year 1958, a burden carried until this very year, and I can give you the reasons for that burden.

When the Vestries went out of existence, it was preached throughout the island of Barbados that the taxes will be less because we would be amalgamating together, but instead of that, the taxes have been raised to once and a half what the Vestries were receiving, and I can assure you, Sir, from that year, 1958, some of the people have not paid the taxes up to now. They refused to pay those taxes and some are now being put in Court for that very money. Fancy Sir, when they have about \$300,000 the Councils had to borrow money at 8% to run the administration of the Councils as a whole. That was dead weight we were carrying, and we could never prosper all we tried.

We could find no way to get out of it because - if you have \$300,000 and lend it out at 8% to run a busi-

ness, could your business ever prosper? That was the way the Councils used to run because people of the Northern District and of the whole of Barbados wanted the facilities, but they did not want to pay the taxes, and the only means for future existence is taxation. The politicians were thinking of votes, but not Homie; tax them; if not, we tax the people and get the money. The same people are taking the tax money and appropriating to their own use, and the administration of the Council is going down. That is not good enough, so when we asked the Central Government to take over the burden of the Northern.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Did I hear right? Did I hear that the Councillors took money and appropriated it to their own use? Did the hon. member say that the Councillors took the money and appropriated it to their own use?

Mr. CORBIN: I said these words, Mr. Chairman, that the people took their own tax money, the money they were to pay into the Councils and appropriated it to their own use. Do not misconstrue me. We had to ask the Central Government to take over the administration because we were unable to carry that burden. We could never give higher wages. I am glad that this Resolution has come here because it is going to help many poor people. A man that is getting \$100 a month, in 17 months he will be drawing \$1,700 and more because he will be getting 25% increase. He will be getting 25¢ every month, therefore that is spending money going to his house. Mr. Chairman, that money will be a great help to those who are in need.

I am sure that the time that we have taken on this Resolution - I am not criticising anybody, but the time that was wasted here is valuable time, and when we stand on this precious daylight saving time in here talking members' personal character, that can be done outside. Let us get on with the business of this hon. House.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am saying this, that Government has seen it fit to bring this Resolution down and any member here is agreed - some say it is not sufficient, some say that they have not given this nor given that, but I say this; I am glad that it has come, and I will be glad if the money could be ready for the people tomorrow morning, because I know they are waiting for it. This Government today has done their best, they have a duty to perform, a job to do.

I am speaking, and when I speak you could listen or do not listen, but whatever John Wesley Corbin says in this House is going to come to pass. This Government has a job to do and they have to do it to the finish. The Conservatives had their job, they did it to the finish; the Barbados Labour Party had their job, they did it to their end; I am telling you we have to sit here and reason together to voice forth our opinion, and what we should do is to choose out the very best material and put it to good use. That is what we are coming here for, not to infringe on each other's character. A reasonable answer should be given, and we should try to uphold the dignity of this Hon. House.

Mr. Chairman, to hear hon. members and how they use abusive words towards each other, it is not right. If I cannot speak good of a man I will speak no evil of him, and I do not like to hear one hon. member insult another hon. member.

Mr. Chairman, let us get on with the business of the House, and I hope that this Resolution would not take up much more time, and I trust that the Minister will give his reply and all the people's business will be done. I am in favour of this Resolution and I support it.

6.15 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, we have been told that this Resolution is a temporary measure. I do not know how they spell the word "temporary" but, Sir, when one starts off wrongly he will always be wrong; he will never be right. The last speaker has said that there are people who would not pay their taxes. Now, Sir, in the North they have a tax collector, and if the people would not pay their taxes, if the hon. member is right, why did they appoint a tax collector? They have a tax collector, and yet the hon. member says that the people would not pay their taxes. Any taxpayer must pay his taxes in one way or the other, because there is an easy way to get them. You do not pay taxes on nothing. The ordinary man in the street who does not have anything, does not have to pay any taxes, but as soon as you are a taxpayer you have something to be levied on; yet the hon. member said that the people would not pay their taxes. That is somebody's fault.

Mr. CORBIN: On a point of order. If the hon. member would listen, he would have heard what I said. I said that when the Vestry system was changed to Local Government, the people refused to pay the taxes, but now we have a tax collector; and we have been carrying that burden for many years. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph was on the same Board as I, and he knows that we were in arrears and we could not get the money collected until we got a debt collector.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, you would know it. You have members of the Council in the North who were so much afraid of themselves and wanted to pat themselves on the back and, at the same time, wanted to hold a particular office, that they prevented action from being taken in respect of certain people. Let the hon. member deny that. You had some Chairmen who only wanted to sit in at one end. You had some men who were fighting like two mad cats, when it came to the end of the year, to be chairman. Everybody wanted to be Chairman. When you become a politician and you want to represent people, you must throw all the fear behind your back. An honest servant does not have to be afraid of his master: There are those who forget the people's business and think about themselves; they were much in ignorance of what was going on down there, but yet they knew everything. What was responsible for the Prime Minister snatching the services out of their hands so suddenly? He was fed up with the whole thing. It was the influence he had at the helm which caused him to

drift so far. If you do not have a good captain, the ship will drift and it will sink too. Imagine you had this system of paying taxes from the creation until you changed it from the Vestry system to the Local Government: But what has happened? This is the month of August and no tax bills have been sent out to the people yet. When the people in the country receive their pay cheques from the various factories, they cash those pay cheques; they pay their manure bills, take out the taxes and if there is anything to be left in the bank, will leave it and on the next office day they will go and pay their taxes. When December comes, that is a month when money flies; and do you want to tell me, when you have a few dollar bills and the children want shoes and you want a bigger ham, that you will keep that money for paying taxes and not spend it? That is happening all the time. This is the month of August. Last Friday morning I awoke and I was presented with the newspaper telling me for the first time of the taxes which I have to pay. Mr. Chairman, who is responsible for going into the figures and seeing what money you have to spend and how you are going about it? I do not know, but I have to pay taxes; they have no use for Lloyd Smith at all, but they know where Lloyd Smith lives to send him a tax bill for whatever taxes they care to ask for. I am saying, Sir, that that is not fair either to Lloyd Smith or to anybody else.

6.25 p.m.

You took it out of my hands, did whatever you liked with it, but yet still you have my name to do whatever you like. The taxpayers have no chance whatsoever but to pay their taxes. It is not fair. Even in the Government taxation proposals, they have the boxes - red or black - to come down at a certain time of the year to tell you what they propose to do. Who is responsible for it? This is not good enough and I would continue to say that if the Central Government did not bring down this, Local Government would have had to bring down one. You cannot do things like that. You do not know who are the people that compiled it or anything of the sort.

Sir, you elected people to represent your interest. What did this Government do? They stopped Local Government Elections; they stopped it until whenever they agreed, and then they abolished it altogether. Little Anguilla wants Local Government and big Barbados threw away theirs. Something is wrong somewhere. Why, because of a few Ministers? Of course, I do not blame all the Ministers because I know that not all of them are in favour of it. What I would say is that one man can mash up a whole spree. If the electorate had the opportunity to elect fair and proper persons at the end of each year or every three years, Local Government would be able to run itself because the electors would have been able to change and change their representatives until they got the right ones. But, no, you took the task out of their hands completely. You took the power out of their hands. The Government must be blamed. They had no right to go so far as to abolish Local Government; they had no right to make friends with certain people.

The Government has run in here with a Resolution now to pay the employees of Local Government which are under an Interim Commissioner. Imagine that you wanted money to run the Government and you say that \$120 is too small a sum to pay for travelling allowance. Are you telling me that on the little pittance which some of these people are drawing, you are only giving them an increase of 25 percent and you say that that is all? You do not increase salaries like that. In the same way that you did not go by a percentage basis when you were increasing your driving licences - you did not say 25 percent on \$1.20 - why did you not say what the particular salary should be? You knew that 25 percent on \$1.20 would not be sufficient for you to reach that mark you wanted, so you said to make it \$5.00. Why did you not say \$30 is too small for these people, make it \$60? No, but you have your good time to do things as you like.

Sir, I say that the Government has to get up and get, as far as the people are concerned. As far as I notice from this Resolution before me, you have given a little increase to these people. In doing it, you have thrown a little more work on the Interim Commissioner. He has to do the same job which he had before, and now you have thrown three more sets of Councils on his shoulders to administer. I wonder if the Government saw fit to give an increase to him. If this is not done, I do not know the type of person he is when it comes to money, but I know he deserves a big, handsome increase because I believe as far as the rates are concerned, he had a big part to play in arriving at the figures. It is not fair to him and he can be careless too if he wishes, and the Government would not be any wiser, either.

I warned the Government at that time that they had no right to abolish Local Government. I am sure that if the Councils were still trying their best this amount of money would have to come from the Councils. It is coming now from the Government. Well, then, the Government should as well put their house in order. It is only because the Government has the power that they have brought down this Resolution here and, as the Hon. Minister said, he challenged anybody to interfere with it, and if we do not vote for it, he will bring down the wrath of these people on our shoulders. I am not saying that you should not bring it down today, but they will still have to pay because the way how it is going to be done, they will be no wiser.

Sir, I will not be surprised if they come back here for more money soon for these people. It is not always that you can pick up a big stick; it is not always that you can do that. You can clearly see that this Government is telling you that it has to compromise. But their deeds are coming fast to an end, even faster than any of us expect.

6.35 p.m.

You cannot always take up a big stick. Just because you go home tonight, and you have a child, you cannot beat it and do not even tell it what you are beating it for. It is not always that you can do it. But

you can clearly see that this Government is telling us: "We have the numbers." Nothing to do with the Opposition; the Opposition can bark but they cannot bite; but biting days are coming faster than all of us expect. It is not because you are there as chairman, and you have the authority to do these things by the Standing Orders, but sometimes you have to sit back and, as the hon. member from St. Andrew regularly says, give a little latitude. But if you are going to play that you are a Sergeant Bailey and always be on the dot, the day you want help you would not get it, and that is what is going to happen to the members over there.

You cannot see everything at the same time. As I have said, the taxpayers of this country know nothing of what is going on. The taxpayers of this country remind me of the hon. senior member for St. Philip, in some of his speeches; he does not know what is going on. It is alright to get up and defend your Government; yes, I say, defend it. I cannot defend you if you are wrong, I would not try to defend you at all if you are wrong, and in this case, as far as Local Government is concerned, this Government is wrong, but what must we do? Somebody has to run the country and they have to run it until the times comes, whether it be right or whether it be wrong. But I will still maintain that you should respect the taxpayers of this country, because the majority of the taxpayers are in the country and although they may not be all big shots, you still must consider them.

The Hon. Prime Minister would not declare his hands as far as Local Government is concerned. Are you going to tell me that since March a Board cannot be set up to run the affairs of it? The Government cannot do it; do not expect the Commissioner to do it all by himself either. I believe that the Commissioner would be glad to be relieved of the responsibility tomorrow because the strain is too great.

They had no right to abolish it until they had the Board set up. They abolished it, and for weeks and months everyone of us - we are still out to sea. Even the Government is out to sea; they do not even know what to do themselves, because I have understood - I did not dream it, and seldom I dream wrong; the only way I dream wrong is if I forget to say my prayers - I have understood they cannot get the material to set up this Board. Everyone who has been approached is not too keen in taking it, and do you know why? I will say why. You have a Board of 10, you try to find 2 and the others are pimps, fly catchers; those two decent, intelligent and upright people are not going to associate themselves with such people. That is the mistake. They are not going to do it, because the other 8 do not care.

There are some people who do not even know respect; they only say "I support" and they want to do as they like. They cannot do it with the people's business. Outside of politics, when you are going to appoint members to Boards, look for people who can do the job; look away from people too near to you; they are the ones that bring you in trouble. Some people keep their families out of their business; if

does not work too well. If you have a stranger and you catch him or her doing something wrong, you say: "Go"; but when you have your own doing something wrong it gives you headaches; so that is my suggestion to the present Government, and at the same time the people are being fleeced.

We are not accustomed to dictatorial methods. You had 10 Vestrymen to some of the parishes, 16 to some, and they did everything for the country, they ran the parishes as near and as reasonable as they possibly could, and they did everything to keep the taxes down in the parishes. Since that, now that you only want supporters and you want to put anything at the head, there are certain men that really do not know what is going on; some of them - I do not know if they can spell Local Government, but they still go along and make a number. But it is the people who have got to pay for it.

The Government had no right to abolish Local Government. This is a whole island, and now what has happened? We have to look up to a Civil Servant as if a Civil Servant is not the same man, the same human being. But it is a big difference. A Civil Servant cannot do certain things, especially when whom he has to please is very difficult to please, and there are some people that you do not know when you are pleasing them from when you are displeasing them; so you have to keep neutral.
6.45 p.m.

A Civil Servant has to think of his job and of promotion; but if you have representatives, that is something quite different because they have to give an account of their stewardship to the electorate when the time comes, and they will do all that lies in their power to make the path as smooth as possible. Today we do not know whether the path is being made smooth or rough. We only have to look forward to receiving a tax bill and paying the taxes. Every hon. member on the other side of the House is a taxpayer, and those hon. members will be satisfied now because they have to be satisfied; but if they were on this side of the Table, you would hear some of them parading. I cannot see that that is fair. I think the time has come when we should cry halt to these unfair actions. What are you going to tell the people when you go back to them? You do not have to answer anything about Local Government; that is a thing of the past. That is out of the question, but your humble servant will have to raise the question when the time comes. I am a taxpayer, and I am treated in the same way as others, and if you try to treat me better than the others, you would not be any wiser. We have to try and get money in order to run the country and this money must be paid.

It is not fair to allow the arrears to remain as they are. The country has to be run by having money, but because of a vote you say: "Don't worry with this person." That is not good enough. The Prime Minister has now found himself in hot water. At a meeting in Independence Square the Hon. Prime Minister said: "I cannot get Mottley out of the City," and now he has got to pay for it. He was only thinking in terms of one

man, and the only thing which could affect that type of person is death. You cannot affect a man who has money; the only thing which can affect him is death. When Moses calls his name, he has to go and leave every penny behind; but when you try to fight at one man you are throwing down thousands. So you know how many persons are suffering today and the same man is going strong? You are not to play politics with certain things. It is a fact that a lot of people are suffering. I have some old people who come to me and I have to send them away because I do not know where to send them. Is that fair to me or to the people who are accustomed to their representatives to whom they can go? Do you know that there are some people who look up to their representatives just as they would look up to their father or mother? Do you think I could feel happy about this thing? They will have to get to the root of the question to find out who is responsible for this. You cannot hear anything unless you read your newspaper and see what is taking place. This does not look businesslike in any way. It looks to me as if on one of these mornings the people will come to me at my door and tell me that "the Prime Minister says that you cannot come out." (*Laughter*). We cannot stand for that. The Opposition will have to take action; they will have to go to the people and talk straight and plain; they will have to march to Government Headquarters or wherever the Prime Minister is, I do not say with a gun, but with a big stick.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: But not to pay out this \$300,000.

Mr. SMITH: I did not hear what you said, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I said that there cannot be any fear in voting this \$300,000.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, it does not appear as if you know what is going on. It appears to me that every D.L.P. member does not know what is going on. I am saying that we will have to drive some fear into somebody. You have to be wondering how the people will take these things. You have members on one side and members on the other side, and the members on the other side do not care anything about us over here. That should not be so. As I have already said, all of us have been elected by the people, but certain members do not want you to say anything at all. A certain member was referring to a pig grunting, but I do not know who he means. You do not do things like that. One hon. member says that you are wasting time in Parliament; but they were in the Opposition some time ago and they did not take things sitting down. Mr. Chairman, how would they have got the Government if they had taken things sitting down? They were as hot as anybody else and they should not try to muzzle us now. We have to try and talk and meet the people now. The Prime Minister in the course of his Budget Speech said: "Go tell it to the mountain, we have overcome."
6.55 p.m.

Do you not want to overcome too? If they overcome, we want to overcome too. The people want to overcome too. I hear now that they are going to beef up the National Anthem.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: But this has nothing to do with this Resolution.

Mr. SMITH: You cannot tell me what to do and what to say. When I am wrong, I will bow to your ruling.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I want the hon. member to observe Rule 26 (2)

"A Member shall confine his observations to the subject under discussion, and shall not introduce matter irrelevant thereto."

Mr. SMITH: Yes, But you cannot tell me what to do.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking on a point of explanation. I observe that you read rule 26 (2). In the second line it is "may" not "shall".

Mr. SMITH: I did not tell Your Honour that you are wrong; my colleague told you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: All I want the hon. member to do is to stick to the Resolution.

Mr. SMITH: Now, Sir, we are not arguing now. This Resolution is for money to pay increases and you ask me to pay them retroactively.

Mr. CHAIRMAN left the Chair and Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 7 p.m. of the clock, this Sitting now stands suspended until 7.45 p.m. 7.00 p.m.

On re-assembling,

Mr. SPEAKER: When the Sitting was suspended, the House was in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the suspension, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph was addressing the Chair.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, it was my intention to carry on until morning as a mark of protest, because I am not in favour of the way how the Government abolished the Councils and it is only because of the Rules of this House that prevents me from doing so tonight.

We on this side of the House are not against the Resolution and we are going to vote for it. We only wish to stress that the increase is small. I am not going to say anything more on this now because I have another chance when I am speaking on the Budgetary proposals. All I want to say now is that I want the

public to know how I feel about the present Government abolishing the Councils.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this Resolution but at the same time to throw out a warning as to certain changes the Government incurred in the administration of Public Assistance to those who need it more. I am referring specifically to the children in both Councils.

A specific case which met with the approbation of the Councils was to assist some of these children with clothing rather than lunch itself, and already many people are crying out for the change. Apparently, we do not want to improve their position because we are hearing of children who until recently were obtaining their lunches, who now are not entitled to these benefits.

As to scavenging, we can cast out eyes around and see what the position is. It is worsening. We were told that the lighting was much improved and that we would be soon driving with parked lights only, but we are yet to see any more lights in the Municipality as in other countries.

It would seem as if it is brought home to the people in the various areas that when people were elected who had a sense of responsibility to the electorate, their matters were handled differently. But the appeal I am now making to those who administer the affairs of Local Government is to see to it as far as they possibly can, that they make provision for children who need school books and for lunches. The parents still come to see us who are now powerless to do anything for them. Surely, it must appear to the people on the other side in the other areas that we did not carry out what we promised the electorate. Certain promises were made to them and those promises are not being kept.

7.50 p.m.

I want to make a specific appeal to those who have those matters to administer that they go about the administration with a feeling of greater generosity to those who need the benefits which were formerly extended to them. The clothing meant a great deal, Mr. Chairman, to a lot of people, the assistance with books and with lunch meant a great deal to many hundreds of poor children. Indeed those in a position to know must be aware that at many secondary schools, even some so-called first-class schools, there have to be funds for the provision of necessary articles of clothing to some of the pupils, because education now is extending into areas where it did not before reach, and many of the recipients cannot be maintained at school by their parents' efforts alone.

We are hoping, therefore, that although we are told that this is a temporary measure - we are sure of its temporariness - I am referring now to the long run - but we are hoping that until these Boards are established - I do not know what the personnel of these Boards will be, but we can all hazard a guess as to the type of individual who will be asked to serve on these Boards - that the people whose job it is present-

ly to investigate the cases will do so with greater zeal than they have been doing in the recent past.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, the last speaker mentioned something about the Municipality, but I would like to say that apparently he has not travelled on the Hincks Street area recently, and we were hoping that we would have had some sort of favourable comment along that area, since we have introduced a new form of lighting, but apparently some people are only trying to see what is not done and not what is done. I would like to

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, on a point of explanation. I would point out that the Hincks Street area is not one of my Party's Parks.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I thank the hon. member for that, but I know that I park there. As the Minister responsible for the lighting of the area, I would like to say that we just do not run and put a light because somebody wants a light here and a light there. This is a new form of light that we have just erected and I think it is a great improvement; but I was hoping that somebody would have the guts to at least commend the Government on that experiment. (ASIDES).

The point is, Mr. Chairman, somebody is asking where it is, but if they live in the country you cannot blame me. I am now making it plain and clear that we are doing something about street lighting in the City and its environs.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that the hon. junior member for St. Thomas has risen to say something about Street lighting, because it is being assumed - it had to be assumed by some hon. members on this side - that with the change-over, the shifting to the Central Government many of the street lighting problems in the island not only in the City but the country districts were being ignored. It seems that we are wrong in thinking that street lighting problems are being ignored; it is only street lighting problems in country districts that are being ignored.

Just in passing, Mr. Chairman, I would say that I often pass Hincks Street and I have noticed no difference in light. Since the Minister is so anxious to talk about street lighting, and since street lighting has been one of those problems that have been giving a great deal of trouble, how is it - he is the Minister responsible - that the parish which he and I together represent can be so ignored by him, that since 18th April a question has been on the Order Paper addressed to the Minister of Communications and Works saying that a petition signed by more than 100 residents of St. Thomas - a petition for street lighting in Porey Spring, Spring Farm, Dr. Moore's Woods, Arthur's Corner, etc. - and four months have passed and the Minister cannot even answer the question. 100 of his constituents and mine have petitioned his Ministry and he cannot even give a reply to their petition after four months, but he is anxious to ask the House to commend him for putting up a few lights on Hincks

Street. Hincks Street had lights before, but lights would help the residents of Porey Spring even more. It is not for me to tell the Minister that the people in Porey Spring need lights up there; if he is so anxious on a Resolution dealing with an increase of Local Government salaries to get up and talk about the good works of the Central Government, well, I will help him or rather help to remind him of his constituents and their needs.

He is talking a lot about street lighting at Hincks Street and he cannot put a light at Spring Farm Corner or Barket's corner where there is a bus stop and people sometimes alight from the bus and cannot even see where they are stepping. If he cannot remedy this, he should not be talking about street lights at all.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, just to put the record straight, because the hon. member seems to think he is talking to a village idiot. The point is this; what I said to the hon. junior member for the City was that the lights along Hincks Street is an experiment, but when the senior member for St. Thomas is talking about my representing St. Thomas, I am not a Minister for St. Thomas; I am a Minister for the island, not a particular constituency. Because he comes in here asking some out-of-the-way question about street lights for the people in the area, he seems to think that this is a feather in his cap, but I intend to pluck every feather out of his cap.

I told the hon. junior member for the City that we were putting these lights along Hincks Street as an experiment because this is an area where lots of people pass; I do not know if the senior member for St. Thomas would like me to put them in St. Thomas as a trial, to prove what? If that is the way he intends to run this country, that is the reason why he has to be kept out of the House of Assembly. Because somebody voted for us, that does not mean that they are getting a better deal than somebody who did not vote for us.

8.00 p.m.

The point is this: the hon. senior member for St. Thomas was born and bred in the nefarious actions of the Barbados Labour Party. He cannot get out of it. When they were in power they never got anything done in the City because they wanted to offend the hon. senior member for the City. It is only after this Government came into power that we repaired the roads in Westbury and New Orleans. They never did anything for St. James because Mr. Walcott was not with them. They have been so much accustomed to seeing who is in this area that they did not support him. I, as Minister of Communications and Works, will not support anybody who is running a Government in this way. Anybody can tell you that when a plane comes to Barbados it will not land in St. Thomas. Would you expect me to carry people in St. Thomas in order to show them that we have lights in the City? It is in the City where we put these lamps. I am warning the hon. senior member for St. Thomas that he should not come in here with these questions or resolutions, because when the time comes to represent St. Thomas we will see who is the better man.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I had no desire of entering this debate, but I must confess that I am very happy to hear the Hon. Minister, in his village pride, say that he is not a Minister for St. Thomas, but he is a Minister for the whole island. I am sure that because of those remarks he is going to give me a hearing without letting go any of his wild asides. I know he wants to get from Chapman's Village to St. Thomas. Since the month of June, I had a question on the Order Paper asking the Minister to put some lights on Highway No. 1. It is true that he will pay some attention to the City first, so that when people come into Barbados, they will know where to invest their money; but let me make the Minister understand this. On the West Coast you have millions of the Development Board's money tied up by way of hotels. I am only asking the hon. member that when he is trying out the lights in the City that he should also try them out in St. James on Highway No. 1. There are 26 lights from Eagle Hall to Porters in St. James and I feel that if you are dealing with street lighting well, I will not touch the affair of Local Government because I do not know enough about Local Government, and I do not get into things about which I know nothing; but inasmuch as the Minister has touched upon the street lighting system and this talk about trying to get Mottley out of the City and Walcott out of St. James... (ASIDES) Mr. Chairman, I am being interrupted by something which sounds like an animal. I do not know if one is in here.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, on a point of elucidation.

Mr. CRAIG: I am not giving way to that. If the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works.....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister is on a point of order.

Mr. CRAIG: That is a different matter, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order. The last hon. member who was speaking said something about his hearing something which sounds like an animal.

Mr. CRAIG: I was addressing the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will have to ask the Hon. Minister what is his point of order.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: The hon. member referred to me. As far as I know, we have three kingdoms - the animal kingdom, the vegetable kingdom and the mineral kingdom. I am an animal. He certainly is not mineral and he is not oil.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What is the hon. member's point of order?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I am coming to the point of order. The hon. member is animal but more like a barkless worm-eaten tree.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order. 8.10 p.m.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I now am going to make a point of order. I just would like to remind the person that my point was this. I just want to tell the member that there is a certain rule which says that a member should not use insulting or offensive remarks to an hon. member. That is my point of order.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, before I die, or before I leave this House of Assembly, I hope, whether it be the Prime Minister or any of us, we would do something with the Standing Orders so that instead of just having three points - a point of order, a point of privilege and a point of elucidation - that we also have a point of interruption. I am sure the Hon. Minister of Communications will have a Ph. D. in that.

Sir, when the Minister speaks about the lying on this side and about not having more investors coming into Barbados and living here - first of all, when he made mention of the former Government trying to keep members out of Parliament, I think he might have said that in Christ Church, not one of the members who had the honour to represent that parish then were members of the then Government - yet I am quite sure that no one can deny that Christ Church was almost a fully developed parish.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I rise on a point of order, Sir.

Mr. CRAIG: Knowing that the hon. junior member for Christ Church jumps from one Party to the other, I should have said only one of them.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I just want to remind the hon. member that almost all of the members of the House then, at one time or the other, belonged to the Barbados Labour Party.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I have.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would prefer if the hon. member gets a little closer to the Resolution.

Mr. CRAIG: I am wondering whether those words are coming from the Chairman of Committees of this House, one who went on a Parliamentary Course or one who is about to go, from what I have heard.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I want to draw to the hon. member's attention Rule 26 (2):-

"A Member shall confine his observations to the subject under discussion, and may not introduce matter irrelevant thereto."

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I have very little to say. It is over thirty-five years ago that I have had no dealings with parochial politics, and that is so long ago that it does not justify my intervening into Local Government Affairs.

I am led into this debate by an expression by the hon. member who said that the Barbados Labour Party when it was in power used to practise discrimination. I am giving him the lie direct. He said that I gave all our supporters jobs in the Government.

Far from that when I was Chairman of the Housing Board, as it then was, people complained to me that others were getting houses from the Government, and although they voted for us, they could not get one. I challenge the hon. member to point to a single instance when the Barbados Labour Party was in power that we practised discrimination.

The hon. junior member for St. Thomas got up and said that people could get jobs and so on. That is what the Government's people are doing now. People are complaining, day after day, and week after week, that they cannot get a job because the people in the Government know they were labourites.

Who would say that except the hon. junior member for St. Thomas? Can anyone say that such and such a man got such and such a job because he was a supporter of the Barbados Labour Party? The hon. member said that members of the Government do not practise any discrimination. A certain man was working at a Department of Government. Can you imagine that because he was a Labourite, they sacked him! If the hon. member continue with this thing, I would note every case and bring it to the attention of the House. The real trouble with the hon. member is that he never expected that he would have got so much power, and on account of that he has got rude and uncouth.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I object to the word "uncouth" used with reference to me and I ask that the word be withdrawn.
8.20 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: An objection has been made to the word "uncouth" and I am asking the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to withdraw the word "uncouth".

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am glad for your ruling. The time will come when we shall see a difference, if calling the hon. member who is obviously uncouth and should be stopped more often.....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I have asked you to rule.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have asked the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to withdraw the word "uncouth".

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I withdraw the word "uncouth" because the Chair calls on me to withdraw it, but I will repeat it outside with stronger emphasis.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, after listening to the speech of the very couth hon. junior member for St. Thomas, I wonder if he was talking in

the tongues of strange prophets. I tried to extract some sense from his remarks, but I cannot seem to understand what he was trying to say.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: May I intervene at this time? Rule 29 (6) says "when an hon. member is speaking members should speak only in undertones." Sometimes we will have members challenging the accuracy of the Reporters of this House, and if we continue in this way we will not be able to blame the Reporters even if they were inaccurate. Let the hon. member continue.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I hope that Your Honour is taking note that the person who is interrupting my speech is the hon. junior member for St. Thomas. Mr. Chairman, I would not really worry with my junior colleague; he bounces like a rubber ball and you cannot always see whether he is standing or sitting. He is five down, five across and five up. I do not know if it is parliamentary to suggest that you are going to keep a hon. member out of the House, but I understand his meaning, when I listened to his threats I have to wonder who is the senior member and the junior member.

What we are dealing with is Local Government funds. One of the functions of Local Government was the provision of street lighting, and a point which may escape the hon. junior member for St. Thomas. The point I am making is that St. Thomas had lights before Hincks Street. The point that I am making is - and in the same way the Minister can get up here and talk about lights in Hincks Street he can answer the four-month old question as to whether he has received a petition from the residents in St. Thomas. He may be Minister for Barbados, but he is also Minister for St. Thomas. I just want to add something about this question of discrimination both in Local Government and in other departments. St. Thomas.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The time being 8.30 p.m., I shall now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and Mr. CHAIRMAN reported accordingly.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman has reported progress and asked for leave to sit again. The moment of interruption having arrived, he so acted according to the appropriate Standing Order. Any unopposed business may now be disposed of. If there is any matter on the Order Paper which may be unopposed it may be disposed of or may be dealt with during the period of half hour which now remains for this sitting. May I point out that in Standing Order 5(4) reference is made to "any other business". That is business other than that which I presume has been passed by the length of time I was out of the Chair, unless of course members were expressing their full and whole-hearted concurrence during that time.
8.30 p.m.

The House may resume Committee of Supply or it may deal with any other business which is unopposed.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: All the business before the House is not unopposed. It would be absurd to say that the question with which we were dealing before the break came was unopposed.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the double negative still means that the matter is opposed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, the other side is not opposing any matters which remain on the Order Paper, including the one which we are currently discussing. Is there any means by which we can continue only with the one which we were discussing? (ASIDES) I am sorry that they are opposing all of them.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member says that it is not unopposed.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: In that case, I beg to move the suspension of this sitting until tomorrow morning at 10.30 o'clock.

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, you cannot suspend the sitting overnight. There is a passage in "May" which says that it should be for only an hour. You suspend a sitting until a time, but you adjourn the House from day to day. I repeat: Why do we make ourselves ridiculous? The Standing Orders which we have are copied from "May". You adjourn the House and suspend the sitting. You suspend a debate, until tempers cool down, for a time; for ten minutes, half an hour or whatever time. When the business of the House is adjourned, you adjourn the House. Do hon. members think that I have time to get up and make silly objections? Being in the House for over 40 years - does it mean nothing? For more than 40 years I began to study Constitutional Law, when some hon. members on the other side were not yet born. I have been in this House since 1934 with a break of eight years, and do hon. members think that I did nothing when I had time to refresh my memory on parliamentary business? Why does this House persist in what is wrong? It is because they have not got the grace to admit that they have made a mistake. I repeat; you adjourn the House for a day or suspend the sitting for a time. If we are going to meet tomorrow, the House will be adjourned until tomorrow and the House starts with the same Order Paper. The hon. member can say that the first Order of the Day is to resume consideration of this Resolution for \$300,000. Do not let us go absolutely against what is right.

As an amendment, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon. The hon. member must remember that members on both sides of the House have business to do. Government Business is Government Business and nothing interferes with that; but other hon. members have other business to do. When we came in here to day, we had no idea that we would be coming back here tomorrow. I am asking the Government to accept my amendment. If the Government presses for meeting

at 10.30 o'clock a.m. rather than 12 o'clock noon, hon. members on this side of the House will make it convenient to come here at that hour; but I do ask that the amendment be accepted for the purpose of getting the record straight and that we should not be constantly making mistakes.

Mr. St. JOHN: I beg to second that motion. 8.40 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is a motion for the suspension of the sitting until 10.30 a.m. tomorrow morning and there is an amendment of the motion for the adjournment of the House until 10.30 a.m. tomorrow morning.

The amendment for the adjournment of the House until 10.30 a.m. tomorrow morning will now be put.

The question was put and resolved in the negative the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. HINDS, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Mr. SMITH, Mr. St. JOHN, Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS - 7.

NOES: Mr. YEARWOOD, Hon. J. C. TUDOR, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Hon. N. W. BOXILL, Mr. LOWE, Mr. SPRINGER, Mr. CORBIN, Mr. WEEKES, Mr. HOPPIN - 11.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Are we voting now for the Clerks to stay here and watch the Mace for the night?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Clerks are fully apprised of their duties and they would be carried out with the maximum of efficiency.

The question is that this Sitting be now suspended until 10.30 a.m. tomorrow morning.

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

AYES: Mr. YEARWOOD, Hon. J. C. TUDOR, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Hon. N. W. BOXILL, Mr. LOWE, Mr. SPRINGER, Mr. CORBIN, Mr. WEEKES, Mr. HOPPIN - 11.

NOES: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. HINDS, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Mr. SMITH, Mr. St. JOHN, Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS - 7.

Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.

8.48 p.m.

On re-assembling,

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders 5, 14, 16, 18, 19, 40 and 45 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting.

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, if we are still in the middle of a sitting in which the Standing Orders were not suspended, how can the hon. member move that the Standing Orders be now suspended? The sitting was suspended, it has not been resumed, and notice would have had to be given if any question is put which implies any suspension of the Standing Orders. I have already drawn Your Honour's attention to that rule.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have noted the point made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, but I am afraid that I do not agree with the point of view which he has expressed.

The question that Standing Orders 5, 14, 16, 18, 19, 40 and 45 be now suspended for the remainder of today's sitting, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I am asking Your Honour to note that that is the Ruling of Your Honour in spite of the fact that I drew Your Honour's attention to the Standing Orders. That is a Ruling which, presumably, will be a precedent. There must be general assent for the hon. member to have made that motion. I ask Your Honour to note that it is your Ruling.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I could not note that it is the Ruling of anyone else.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: If we are to have breaches of the Standing Orders, it should be noted.

Mr. SPEAKER: On what is the hon. member speaking?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am speaking on a point of order.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: When the sitting was suspended, the House was in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

GRANT TO INTERIM COMMISSIONER

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the suspension of the sitting, the hon. senior member for St. Thomas was addressing the Chair.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, on the suspension of the sitting I was commenting on the newly found property of the Minister of Communications in connection with this matter of Local Government, when he said that he was not a Minister for St. Thomas, but a Minister for the whole island. I wondered how far the Minister was living up to that when he sent the Barber-Green machine to do the roads in Spring Farm, St. Thomas, and promised the people in

Shop Hill that the machine would start on the road adjoining Spring Farm on the next day. Of course, that was during election time. If the Minister can come into this House and talk about discretion, he can answer the questions which were asked about four months ago. He must not use his machinery for not seeing to the responsibility of the parish of St. Thomas only; if he is a Minister for the whole island he must not pay attention to St. Thomas alone; but he must pay St. Thomas some attention. It was four months ago since a petition has been on his file and he cannot even acknowledge it. The answer to the petition is not that he is a Minister for a part of St. Thomas, but a Minister for the whole of St. Thomas. He has said that I do not know when last I went to St. Thomas, but he would not know because there are parts of St. Thomas in which he cannot go; he has to hide from them. I had the pleasure of visiting parts of St. Thomas quite recently. I want to say that if it were the conduct of the Minister of Communications and Works on which I have to vote when voting for this Resolution, I would not vote for it. Unfortunately, although the Minister says that he has the most important Ministry and he has the greatest amount of money to spend, he is, of course, wrong, since the Ministry of Education disposes of the greatest share. Despite all that, the Minister is not in charge of the Government. His behaviour makes me wonder if he is in charge of himself. It is the right of every hon. member not to approach any consideration of this Resolution by the conduct of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas; do not let him put you off. He cannot help it and I urge hon. members to look at his conduct in the same light and forgive him as perforce all of us have to do at some time or other.

The question that Head 45 stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that a Resolution for the sum of \$300,000 do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1967-68 No. 14

HEAD 46 - QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

A Resolution for the sum of \$68,817 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, the next Resolution is a Resolution for the sum of \$68,817 in relation to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. This is really in the nature of a revote. The Addendum to the Resolution sets out the purpose for which this money is required. It is a revote in the total sum of \$68,817 to supplement the Estimates of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital under the following non-recurrent items:- 10.40 a.m.

Item 127 is for Furniture and Equipment and the sum of \$18,091 is required.

Item 128 is for Medical and Surgical Equipment and the sum of \$27,048 is required. That is an addi-

tional sum for some more equipment, thus making the total to be spent under this Item \$38,260.

Item 129 is for Laundry Equipment and the sum of \$2,700 is required. Some of this equipment did not arrive until after the end of the last financial year.

Item 129A is a new Item. It is for Mortuary and Laboratory Equipment. The sum required is \$20,978. This makes the total sum required \$68,817.

I beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of \$68,817 do now pass.

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

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

RE-COMMITTAL OF PREVIOUS RESOLUTION NOT AGREED TO

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, before you proceed with any further discussion, I am asking leave to re-commit the Resolution which we have just dealt with.

I am drawing the attention of the House to the fact that if what the Hon. Minister said is correct, then it is unconstitutional.

In paragraph 94, of the Public Service Commission, Part 2 - Appointment, Removal and Discipline of Public Officers - the Constitution says:-

(1) Subject to the provisions of this Constitution power to make appointments to public offices and to remove and to exercise disciplinary control over persons holding or acting in such offices is hereby vested in the Governor-General, acting in accordance with the advice of the Public Service Commission.

(2) Before the Public Service Commission advises the appointment to any public office of any person holding or acting in any office power to make appointments to which is vested by the Constitution in the Governor-General, acting in accordance with the advice of the Judicial and Legal Service Commission or the Police Service Commission, it shall consult the Judicial and Legal Service Commission or the Police Service Commission, as the case may be."

It then goes on to say:-

"(3) The provision of this section shall not apply in relation to -

- (a) the office of any member of the Governor-General's personal staff;
- (b) any office to which section 93 applies;
- (c) any office in the Police Force;
- (d) any office to which section 100 applies;
- (e) the office of the Director of Public Prosecution; and
- (e) the office of the Auditor-General."

We are making ourselves look just silly if we allow it to go forward like that. The position before Independence was different and you could do it so; but now that we are guided by a Constitution, you have to look at it in that light.

Mr. Chairman, in all humility, I am not speaking as a member of the Opposition or the Leader of the Opposition; but I am speaking as a member of the House of Assembly. I am asking you to allow this Resolution to be re-committed so that the Minister who dealt with it may have second thoughts before he asks that it be passed.

I beg to move that the Resolution for 300,640 be re-committed.

Mr. SMITH: I beg to second that.

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

AYES: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SMITH, Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS - 3.

NOES: Hon. J. C. TUDOR, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Hon. A. D&C. EDWARDS, Hon. N. W. BOXILL, Mr. LOWE, Mr. CORBIN, Mr. SPRINGER, Mr. SARGEANT, Mr. WEEKES, Mr. HOPPIN - 11.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1967-68 No. 16

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The next Resolution is for the sum of \$47,268 to supplement Head 25 - Police - under the Current Estimates, and the Item is Item 92 - (New) Expo' 67.

This amount is required to finance the cost of the visit to Expo' 67 by a Contingent consisting of a section of the Royal Barbados Police Band, and some members of the Mounted Troop, to enable them to participate in Equestrian Spectacular.

An amount of approximately \$21,478 is refundable by the Expo' Authorities.

I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

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

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

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of four Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

THE INTERPRETATION (AMENDMENT)
BILL, 1967

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is order No. 2 standing in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House: Second reading of a Bill to amend the Interpretation Act, 1966.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, this Bill should give the House no trouble. It is an amendment to the Interpretation Act of 1966 which is necessary to bring the Act into line with the present Constitution.

Hon. members I think will see very well the amendments which the Bill makes to the Principal Act.

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

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I thought that the Hon. Minister in charge of this Bill would have given the House some information on these amendments. I thought that he would have been able to tell us the points as to why the Act needed alteration so that hon. members beside those who are lawyers would be more conversant with the changes.

I see that they are using the word "Parliament" for "the Legislature". I do not propose to waste the time of the House whatsoever in asking the Hon. Minister to tell us anything about what the law is. I am taking the trouble to read.

Just now, I read part of the Constitution. You would have imagined that they would have paid special attention to it and would have agreed to the Resolution being re-committed. I therefore do not propose to waste any time. I only say that perhaps the Hon. Minister would have taken the opportunity to let us and the general public know in more detail how the Bill affects the present Act.

I repeat; the Opposition will take any steps to show the public that the Government would not listen to remarks made by us.
10.50 a.m.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that you do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 17 inclusive were called and passed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of this Bill in Committee.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN reported and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA; the Bill was read a third time and passed.

11.00 a.m.

RESOLUTION re LOAN FOR NATIONAL STADIUM

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is Order No. 3 which stands in the name of the hon. junior member for Christ Church and Minister of Health: A Resolution to approve the guarantee by the Government of a loan not exceeding \$1,000,000 and the interest thereon, by the Barbados National Stadium Corporation from Barclays Bank, D.C.O.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, as the Addendum states:-

"The estimated cost of constructing the proposed National Stadium has been put at \$1.7 million. Of this sum the Barbados Junior Chamber of Commerce has donated \$450,000.00. The Barbados National Stadium Corporation's revenue is expected to be just sufficient to meet its recurrent costs, and the estimated balance of \$1.25 million will be met over the period of 1967-72 by direct Government grants totalling \$750,000 and allocations from the Labour Welfare Fund totalling \$500,000.

In the meantime, the Corporation proposed with the approval of the Cabinet, to secure from Barclays Bank D.C.O. a loan of \$1,000,000 with interest thereon at 7 1/2% per annum fixed for the duration of the loan, principal and interest repayable over a period of five years. The amount will be drawn by the Corporation in such instalments as it may from time to time require.

I think, Sir, this is more or less explanatory. It is actually to approve a guarantee by the Government of a loan from Barclay's Bank, D.C.O. in order to make sure that enough money is there to carry on throughout with the first phase of the building of the Stadium. We have come here to ask Parliament to guarantee this loan.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this loan is, of course, for more reasons than one. One of the

reasons, as the Hon. Mover of the Resolution said, is for the approval of a guarantee by the Government of a loan from Barclay's Bank to the Barbados National Stadium of a sum not exceeding \$1 million and the interest thereon. But what I wish to ask the Hon. Minister to tell us is something further than the acquiring of a loan.

I would like to ask whether that loan includes money for building the walls around the Stadium or the erection of a pavilion and so on. Can the Hon. Minister give some indication of the plans proposed?

When replying, I would also be glad if the Hon. Minister would tell us how much he expects to get from the erection of the Stadium in the first year or in the first three years. I would also like to ask the Hon. Minister what is the estimated revenue and what is the sum which the Addendum says will just cover the cost from year to year.

Naturally, I would like to know these things.
11.10 a.m.

I presume that the Government contemplates its well-known principle that future generations will pay for the benefits they will be having; so I wonder what estimate the Government has of what the future generations will pay as distinct from what the people are paying now.

Mr. HOPPIN: Mr. Speaker, there is a question asked by the Leader of the Opposition about if the stadium would be fenced around. At least that was the first question I heard him ask; but, as I see here, the Addendum says "the estimated cost of constructing the proposed National Stadium;" so I gathered that the Government has decided we are having a complete stadium and they have estimated, as has been set out here, \$1.7 million would do the job; that is: fencing and everything pertaining to it. But since then I realise the Leader of the Opposition has been putting more questions about the cost of running the stadium, but I do not see - we have here the estimated cost of constructing the stadium if \$1.7 million, and I feel that that would be a proper stadium well surrounded with guard walls and all that. I do not think he expects \$1.7 million is to build a guard wall alone.

A stadium for a new nation like Barbados is something that we all wish to have and I do hope that this will be started pretty soon. I see no difficulty of withholding this Resolution; so I hope that the loan that has been asked for, the \$1 million, will be passed.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution which is before us this morning is for \$1 million in which this House is being asked to approve the guarantee by the Government of the payment of the principal sum not exceeding \$1 million and interest thereon. I wish, Sir, to salute those public-spirited young men who, by way of their efforts, by way of their vision, have brought the Government's attention to the dire need for a National Stadium, and I do not think there is praise too much to offer to those public-spirited

young men. It was unfortunate, however, some time ago, when these young men were subjected to some very harsh remarks by a former Minister of Social Services, and defenceless as they are, they have now proven beyond any shadow of doubt that whatever they did during their years they have done in good faith.

As the Addendum states, the estimated cost of the construction of the proposed National Stadium has been set at \$1.7 million. That is also, Mr. Speaker quite a sum of money, and I sincerely hope that Government will not find themselves in the very unfortunate position they found themselves in with the construction of the Hilton Hotel which cost this country many more million dollars than was estimated.

The construction of a stadium is going to be a very big project, and one of which the youth of Barbados will have very pleasant memories as the years go on. I also hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister, when he is making his reply, would be able to tell us of any tenders for the construction of this stadium and to let this House know what contract is issued. We are hoping, Sir, that we would not have to wait for many a year before the contract of this stadium is laid upon the table of this House.

I am one who will give this Resolution my blessing. I am happy to see that the Government has acted so swiftly in setting about to construct this stadium. I know, Sir, that such a construction is going to call for very skilful people, and I sincerely hope that Government will take some of these hints which I am trying to put before the Minister this morning that will serve him in good stead. The stadium in Jamaica, the Jamaica National Stadium, where the British Empire Games were held, has done a great deal for Jamaica over the years. Having something like 1,000 athletes at a Games Village is something which Government must give a lot of attention to, such as parking facilities; whenever there is a stadium, you must also have a village to house the athletes, and I am hoping, as I said earlier, Sir, that Government will let us see what the contract is like so that we on this side of the House will have a clear-cut idea of how many people the Government proposes this stadium will house.

11.20 a.m.

What is of paramount importance now is this: I hope that the Government will not abandon the idea of providing playing-fields also for the youth of this country, due to the fact of our having a National Stadium, and of making sure that they find a Director of Physical Education to be the Chief Officer in charge of this stadium, and not one of the Government's supporters for the sake of providing a job for him, and leaving highly-qualified people in physical education out. I know right now that there is a qualified Barbadian living abroad who is particularly interested in this job, but I have been hearing one or two names like the Sydney Walcotts and that type of thing. I hope that the Minister, with all of his experience, will make sure that these people, when they are appointed to take up these jobs, will not find themselves in the awkward position of having to be administrative. You

will find a classic example of the Barbados Marketing Corporation because of the Government pushing people on these Boards, people with absolutely no knowledge of marketing. I am only hoping that the Government will take a hint on this occasion and they will not find themselves in this position because of finding jobs for their supporters - I hope they will make sure that they do not have a person in a job like a square peg in a round hole.

There is this loan of \$1 million at 7 1/2% interest, which the Government is asking this House to guarantee. As to the awkward position in which we found ourselves when the Hon. Minister of Agriculture said on the floor of this House that a cheque was signed by the Chairman of the Marketing Corporation without the authority of the Board, and then it was repaid - I am hoping that such an incident will not occur again. I am wondering - in fact, I am hoping that the interest on this cheque for \$10,000 will be repaid. The Hon. Minister never told us how long this \$10,000 cheque...

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that that does not arise here. That is something other than this loan in relation to this Stadium.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order. I have never spoken of any \$10,000 cheque either in this Place or anywhere else, nor did I say that a cheque was signed by the Chairman of the Barbados Marketing Corporation without the approval of the Board.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us revert to the Resolution in respect of the Barbados National Stadium Corporation.

Mr. CRAIG: I have the reply. This Government is seeking the approval of the guarantee by the Government of Barbados of a loan of \$1. million and because of that, I have pointed out that I only hope that the Government will not find themselves in the unfortunate position in having a cheque issued to S. H. Cheeseman & Company without the authority of the Board, because the Government will have to pay 7 1/2% interest.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that the hon. member has made his point about S. H. Cheeseman & Company.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, if you are anxious to get out of the Chair, I would be very pleased to make my point.

Mr. SPEAKER: That remark will not be regarded in good faith, nor would such a remark be made by an experienced parliamentarian.

Mr. CRAIG: When Christ was in the Temple, he was only twelve years old. I am drawing to the attention of the House that the taxpayers will have to pay 7 1/2% interest, and if a cheque is issued by the Chairman of the Barbados National Stadium Corporation, I hope that it will not happen as in the case of the Chairman of the Barbados Marketing Corporation. I am dealing primarily with the 7 1/2% interest which the taxpayers of this country will be called upon to

pay. I wish to draw the attention of the Minister also to the question of the parking facilities in respect of which we will find ourselves in a very unfortunate position if proper parking facilities and roads by which we will get to the Stadium are not provided. I hope the Minister will take a hint from that. I have been to the Jamaica National Stadium and I have seen some very difficult parking problems. This money will have to provide all of these things, and I hope that the Government will be carrying out the wishes of the Jaycees which will be of benefit to them. I feel that no greater tribute could be paid to a man whose services to Barbados, the West Indies and the British Commonwealth is now history. I make mention of the late Sir Frank Worrell. I hope I will live to see the day when the Government will acquire a Stadium, and it will not be named anything like the DaCosta Edwards' Nursing Home or the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I hope that tribute will be paid to a man who has contributed so much to this country with so little. I do not think that any greater tribute could be paid to that great West Indian, the late Sir Frank Worrell than by naming the Stadium "The Sir Frank Worrell Memorial Stadium".

Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks, I take the opportunity of asking the Minister, knowing that he is very co-operative, unlike many others, to carry out the wishes of the Junior Chamber of Commerce with the wonderful effort which they have made in subscribing \$450,000 to the Government of Barbados for the purpose of constructing the Barbados National Stadium.

11.30 a.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I am taking a different line from that which previous speakers took. I hope the Hon. Minister in charge or the Hon. Leader of the House will please answer these questions.

Last week, when the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister was in the House and when we were dealing with a Resolution to guarantee a loan of \$500,000 from Barclays Bank for the Barbados Development Board, he said that it was necessary because of the different way in which the banks were prepared to lend money. I think the rate of interest then was one and one-half of one percent below the prime commercial rate.

Now, the Hon. Minister of Health in his introductory remarks said that the National Stadium Corporation proposed with the approval of the Cabinet to borrow one million dollars from Barclays Bank.

Now, this question must be answered to this House and to the public. When the Usury Act was amended, the rate was fixed at eight percent. The rate then at which the Banks - Barclays Bank D.C.O., Bank of Nova Scotia and the Royal Bank of Canada - was prepared to lend at was six and a half percent. I now see that the rate of interest to be paid by the National Stadium Corporation is fixed at seven and a half percent.

It is my feeling that you are dealing with the wrong Bank. I would like to know what claim Barclays

Bank has on this country that we cannot go to other banks to borrow money. I have had the experience where I had to go into all the banks here to call on the Managers and threaten that I would report them to Head Office. I am going to say that this is a racket. I am going to put it this way. This is the Government borrowing money. When the Government is borrowing money, it has all the taxpayers as its sponsors. The Government is not like a two-by-three merchant who wants to borrow money. Borrowing money from a bank is something which depends on your name. If I were going to borrow money from a bank, I probably would have to borrow at seven and a half percent.

Now, when the Government is borrowing money it gives a security which is a security of all of us. I am asking this. When you can go to a bank to borrow one million dollars and can give a security of all of us - especially my colleague who would like to see the Stadium started tomorrow because it is healthy sport and something nearest to his heart - I do not see why you should borrow at a high rate of interest when you can get it at a low interest rate.

It is my belief that if an attempt was made to get this money at six and a half percent, it would be had at that rate. If you go to the four banks which do business here and ask for a lower bank rate than what you have in this Resolution, I believe you will get this money at six and a half percent. When small people borrow, they pay a higher rate of interest. Business places in Barbados can borrow at seven percent. Do you think that Messrs. Bryden and Sons Ltd. are going to pay seven and a half per cent interest? Do you think that big companies are going to pay seven and a half per cent interest? That means that you have to pay \$7,500 a year. Why pay \$7,500 when you can pay \$6,500 a year?

Even if you argue that every bank is not in a position to lend one million dollars, it is not fair to the people of this country to come and say seven and a half per cent per annum is fixed for the borrowing of the loan, and the borrowing of the loan is fixed for the duration of five years. That means nearly one-half million dollars to borrow it. I am no economist but I can reckon. Two and two make four.

I would like the Hon. Minister to tell me if it can be acquired from time to time as is required. I know the answer will be this one million dollars will not be drawn all at one time. However, I would like the Hon. Minister to tell me if the Government attempted to get this money from other banks. I hold no brief for any bank in this country; I have a brief for the inhabitants of Barbados.

You have three Canadian Banks doing business in Barbados, and I am certain every hon. member in this House has business in one of these banks. I am quite serious and I know that when I am finished talking on this matter, Mr. Money, Manager of Barclay's Bank is going to say that I am an upstart.

One of these banks may not be able to lend you one million dollars, but you can ask them to join

together and lend you that amount. Do you think that Barclays Bank would refuse to lend you \$500,000 if two of the other banks join together and lend you the other \$500,000?

Everybody knows my colleague - Mr. Stadium. I expect that he will tell us something as regards why you are borrowing this at seven and a half per cent when I know that six and a half per cent is being paid by the North, the South and by the City.
11.40 a.m.

I remember when I became Mayor of Bridgetown for the first time, the Manager of Barclays Bank came in to me and told me the Government of Barbados was doing their business with him, and I had the right to do business with him as well. I was not very polite and I made it abundantly clear where I stood, that I considered the banks were all doing business and it was my view that we should do business with all of them. I had to be frightfully rude and he went out, but nevertheless we did business with all the banks and we got a reduced interest.

Now, today, 7 1/2% on a million dollars, five years to pay. Do not treat us like little children; do not treat us like asses; tell us that you have made an attempt to get it more cheaply. Of course, the hon. Minister in charge of this is noted for doing his work thoroughly, but I must warn him in a matter of this sort when it comes to finance - I am not one of the Economists, but please tell us that you have approached these other banks, seeing that you are not going to borrow all one time, it seems to me that you could take a proportion from each bank.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to record my great pleasure of this motion being brought before us which will give Barbados a National Stadium. We are indeed fortunate Sir, in that there are other wealthier communities in the Caribbean - notably Trinidad and Tobago - which are yet to have a stadium. There is a stadium in Jamaica, and it has been the focus of great national pride. We think that the same thing will occur in Barbados. I cannot agree with the previous speaker who would like the stadium to be named after the late Sir Frank Worrell whom we admired greatly, but no cricket will be played in this stadium; so I cannot see why it should be named after the great cricketer. We do not play cricket in a stadium; we have no famous athletes in Barbados to look back on; but the time may indeed come, Mr. Speaker, when we shall have one worthy enough after whom our National Stadium can be named.

We would like to invite the Minister in charge to give us some more information. We who happen to belong to various organisations who will be playing games in this stadium, would like to have more information as to the type of arrangements being made for the various games. It is singular that in Barbados alone the constituent organisations have not yet been consulted. When the Jamaica stadium was being planned, The President and Secretary of various organisations were called upon to give their ideas - not necessarily that they would be taken, but it was

the custom of courtesy and good will for people who were responsible for the games taking place in the stadium to be consulted. We do not yet know, Mr. Speaker, what will be the size of the boarding establishment which most stadia carry for the invitation and housing of teams from abroad; matters like that would be of great interest to various sporting organisations in the island. We are not yet aware of the type of banking which would be used for the part of the stadium for cycling; we do not yet know what type of track will be imported. These are matters which will be of the highest interest to the various sporting organisations which will be using the stadium.

I should like to point out, Mr. Speaker, also to the Minister that I am in agreement with my colleague as to the source of this loan. It is my experience, Mr. Speaker, when money is needed to send teams abroad until very recently, it is the President and the Secretary of the organisation who have to borrow the money. We are yet to borrow successfully one dollar from Barclays Bank, while we have floated many loans - some still unpaid - from the Canadian Banks, the commercial banks of Broad Street. It has been my task, Mr. Speaker, to have to go forward to borrow money for various sporting organisations of which I happen to be the President. From the Barbados Olympic Association and others, we have had to borrow money to send teams abroad, and in each case we have been assisted by one of the Canadian banks.

I assure you that we have so far been unable to repay some of these loans; so it comes with ill grace that we are now asked to support the sponsoring of a loan from Barclays Bank which is yet to extend a helping hand to any of the sporting organisations on the island. When a large sum of money is needed like \$1 million, we are asked to see that it be borrowed from Barclays Bank; we do hope that the Minister will be able to give us some information on the various points that have been raised, and if it is not too late, the suggestion that the loan be divided among the various commercial banks in Bridgetown be given some serious thought.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution, as far as I can see, so long as it is a corporation, Sir, it is moving off on the right leg - financially and otherwise - but after hearing the speech from the hon. senior member for Bridgetown, you can clearly see that the Corporation or the Government is rushing along, regardless of whatever happens with the taxpayers. Now the hon. senior member for Bridgetown raised the point that any businessman would have done. If we are going into big business, borrowing big money. Now I would have to believe that the Government did not take it upon themselves to go to any other bank but Barclays, because, if it did, I believe the Hon. Minister in charge would have got up and set the record right by saying that he has done so. Now whenever I hear the word 'Corporation' Sir, I begin to feel a little funny. I would be more than glad if the Government could see fit to change that name, because the Corporation now or the Corporations are changing themselves into Co-operations.

11.50 a.m.

I believe that they are more 'co-operations' than being 'corporations', because what is happening at the Barbados Marketing Corporation I would have to term co-operation, because they are co-operating down there and everybody is right.

Relative to the National Stadium, I am in favour of it. Although I do not go in for sport, I still like sport because there are various kinds of sport. Sport is sport, but too far East can be West. The Government members are doing a very good thing, and running off by doing things which they feel, in their opinion, are the best; but there are other things which they should be called upon to do and they are not doing them. When one goes home from sport and goes into a leaking house, one in which he cannot lie down when the rain falls, he forgets what sport he went to during the afternoon. He finds that his bed is getting wet wherever he turns. I think that the Government should think more of the houses in which people are living. Sometimes people have to go under the cellars rather than remain in the houses, and you have this Government introducing these schemes and asking for all of this money, and yet they are not paying the attention which they should pay to the houses. I will always have to speak to the Government about these things. I like sport, but I feel that people should be comfortable at their homes. Home worries are the worst worries that you can encounter; when you have these worries, you do not want to go home. A person may be sheltering in a dry house, but then he has to go to his own home.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the Government is starting off on the wrong foot. They have refused to do anything for the people of St. Joseph. They would not re-site the people in St. Joseph; they are asking us to O.K. loans for this and for that, and they would not do anything for the people of St. Joseph. An hon. member was wondering why it is Barclays Bank alone that the Government is dealing with. Barclays Bank is my Bank; it is the best Bank in Bridgetown and I would like all the business for it; but I do not think that the Government attended the function which Barclays Bank held down by the East Coast Road; because if that hon. member had gone down there, he would have asked them not to go to any other Bank. Barclays Bank has bought something for this money and I was looking to see if it was really worth \$10,000. Do you not want Barclays Bank to get back their money, regardless of how much it costs the tax payers? This is one time that I have seen this Government beginning to consider one who has done them a good turn.

I want to know - and I hope that the Government will see to it - that the right person will be selected to run this Stadium. Do not let them look for a supporter of the Government Party. Let them look for a person who knows about sport; you want a person who knows about administration; you want a man with the "know-how"; otherwise we will not be getting too far. From the way in which this Resolution reads - I hope that the Minister will direct me if I am wrong - but it appears to me that this \$1 million is for the working capital of the Stadium. You cannot blame me for thinking so. This is what it says:

"RESOLVED that the House of Assembly approve the guarantee by the Government of the payment of a principal sum not exceeding \$1,000,000 and the interest thereon, the said principal sum to be borrowed by the Barbados National Stadium Corporation from Barclays Bank D.C.O. for the purpose of meeting the obligations of the said Corporation and discharging its functions under the Barbados National Stadium Corporation Act, 1966....."

I believe that this money is not going into the building project at all. That is how I take it, and I hope the Minister will explain it to me and put my mind at rest. The Resolution goes on as follows:-

"the rate of interest to be paid by the Barbados National Stadium Corporation to be seven and one half per cent per annum fixed, for the duration of the loan and principal and interest to be repaid over a period of five years;"
12.00 (noon).

Now, Sir, the rate of interest to be paid by the Barbados National Stadium Corporation is seven and a half per cent fixed, for the duration of the principal and interest to be repaid over a period of five years. I am asking the Hon. Minister in charge to see to it when the time comes that the right type of people are appointed to form this Board. I know it would be a secret now.

I am sure that we are going to get back this money in one hour, and that is the reason why I am going to support this Resolution. As the old lady stated, I support it wholeheartedly; but if the money comes in through the front door and passes out through the back door, we would be no wiser. Therefore, I am sincerely hoping that all of this money will find its way in the right place. I hope that every crease would be stopped and every screw tightened. Let us hope that what happened at the B.M.C. would be an example for us.

I know a man who is quite willing to give up his job to be a member of one of the Corporations. I am putting it to this Hon. Chamber that I heard him say: "I will give up my job, if I get a pick as one of the members of these Corporations." I am therefore warning the Government to let us get the right type of people on this Board. Let us get hard-headed businessmen on this Board.

One of my colleagues would like this Stadium to be named the Sir Frank Worrell Stadium. I cannot agree to call it the Sir Frank Worrell Stadium. I wonder why he said so. He must have thought that they were going to play nothing else but ball games there. You could afford to name any cricket pasture, even the one in St. Joseph - although there is not one up there - the Sir Frank Worrell Cricket Pasture, but not this stadium.

I know that he is a good sportsman and he would like to suggest a name; but I believe that even if he were pulling a fast one on the Government, and the Government had intended to call it the Sir Frank Wor-

rell Stadium, they would not want it called so now because the suggestion came from over this side. One hon. member said that they should call it the Boxill Stadium. My colleague should have suggested that it be named the Louis Lynch Stadium because we all know how interested this gentleman is in a stadium for Barbados.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not referring to any member in here, I hope.

Mr. SMITH: I am not referring to an hon. member, but I know a gentleman by the name of Louis Lynch who would die for sport; therefore, it could be so named. Anyhow, do not name it the Sir Frank Worrell Stadium.

Mr. Chairman, I am not appealing to the members of the Cabinet, only the Minister in charge of this Resolution, because I understand that all the members of the Cabinet do not have any say. I am appealing to the big shots to really look out and put the right people on the Stadium Board to see how the money is being spent. I really would not like to see what happened at the B.M.C. to happen there. I do not like to see money being spent so wildly.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is for the approval of a guarantee by the Government of a loan of one million dollars from Barclays Bank to the Barbados National Stadium Corporation. I am careful to look up the Addendum and go through it step by step before making any comments.

This one million dollars is for a specific purpose. The Addendum says that the estimated cost of constructing the proposed National Stadium has been set at \$1.7 million. Of this sum the Barbados Junior Chamber of Commerce has donated \$450,000. The Barbados National Stadium Corporation's revenue is expected to be just sufficient to meet its recurrent costs, and the estimated balance of \$1.25 million will be met over the period 1967-72 by direct Government grants totalling \$750,000, and allocations from the Labour Welfare Fund totalling \$500,000.

Of course, that too is optimistic and we can so far see that.

Mr. Speaker, it is proposed that during the first five-year period, Government is going to have to give grants to a total of \$750,000. The information is very straightforward, and I am going to stick to it.
12.10 p.m.

The Addendum has been informative. Government is going to be asked to make regular contributions from three to five years of \$7,500 and this, to me, is very interesting. Sport, as a former member said, is not just sport; some sport involves business. This sport involves business; this is a stadium, and the member who was speaking about this stadium when it was being proposed, when the Government was telling us something about its administration, said that this sport is local sport. All sorts of sport will take place at this stadium - track and field events, water polo,

ice hockey. I do not know about local sport, anyhow. There may be cock fighting; there may be bull fighting. I do not know how Latin American we are or may soon become. O.A.S. might introduce cock fighting out here; I do not know; but let us get on.

The Labour Welfare Fund is serious money - sugar workers' money; and let me tell you something now, Mr. Speaker; playing fields in the rural districts come from Labour Welfare money, and now you are going to build a stadium from this money. I remember Mr. Freddie Miller, a former member of this House and of the Labour Party, plumped very hard for this stadium, and now it has become a reality; but when you talk about the Labour Welfare Fund contributing half million dollars in connection with this stadium, you are coming home to me. The Labour Welfare Fund has been put there for a specific purpose, and I do not know, when the United Kingdom goes into the Common Market, what is going to happen; but for now you have in Barbados, in St. Peter, St. Lucy - St. Lucy to some extent, I think, has more playing fields than St. Peter.

The Labour Welfare Fund is a source to provide playing amenities for the Workers' children, and I hope the Government will see to it at one and the same time when they are providing Barbados with a Stadium - a National Stadium and not a Bridgetown stadium, not a St. Michael stadium, not a St. George Stadium, but a National Stadium. Barbados is now a nation and it occupies a certain amount of physical space on the surface of this earth that is divided into 12 parishes, one metropolitan and all the rest rural - even Christ Church now, Sir; so when we are going to take the tourists around the island to see the playing fields and other amenities, we have to remember that all this is from the Labour Welfare Fund.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the Minister in charge that he has to come down and give me a playing field soon - and, very very soon - in St. Peter. Mr. Speaker, the rural amenities in Barbados seem to be grossly neglected, and in no less a direction than provision of playing fields. In St. Joseph, in St. Peter, and in many other rural parishes, when we are going to show off, I hope we remember what the source of these monies are. The member for the City talked about the method of getting this run. Well, he is a real estate man; he has to deal with loans and things like that. That is not entirely up my street.
12.20 p.m.

He is a real estate man and he has got to deal with loans, and when he says that some other source should have been found to get a lower rate of interests, I must agree with him. Do not let us deceive ourselves that this proposed stadium is going to pay for itself within a night or within a week, because that cannot be true. If Barbados as it is suggested, can accommodate the Olympic Games, if Barbados ever considered itself to be able to accommodate the site, and what not of the Olympic Games, then Barbados will have to have an Olympia Village. I have seen one of them in Australia, and I have known that there has been such a village there for 5, 7 or 8 years. It has

been there in bright surroundings and good terrain. For Barbados to be able to build an Olympic Village, they probably will have to go out of this island. Let us be realistic and let us think clearly on these matters. This is an expensive business which we are dealing with, and we are very fortunate to have nearly \$1/2 million as a gift from the Barbados Junior Chamber of Commerce. The Government cannot pat itself on the back about that.

I am glad to see that Barbados can have a stadium to which people will come from all the corners of the island. We have an Olympic Association in Barbados, and I will always say that this Association has got to be fed from the Athletic clubs. Since we are considering sport on a national basis, we have to spread far and wide, and therefore the Hon. Minister of Health and Community Development will have to look for playing fields in sufficient supply throughout this island. Let him not look at the superstructure first; let him attend to the foundation on which we will be able to build the top. Sometimes we put on the top before laying the foundation; we like to show off; I like a little showing off sometimes; but when you are reminded of the basic needs, the things that lie under the very substance in which you are spending, it is necessary to deal with them.

This Resolution has my general approval. I have to stick to the details which have been provided for me in a fairly informative Addendum, which I have not seen for a long time, and be able to make a speech. We had to dig at the Minister so as to get this Addendum. I quite appreciate the Minister having got behind his permanent Secretary or whoever it is who had to produce this informative Addendum. Do not let us forget our responsibilities here; The sum of \$1/2 million will be coming from the Labour Welfare Fund, from the rural amenities of Barbados, and they will have to be attended to. You take your tourist around the country, and you cannot show them one playing field. You can take them to the North Point Surf Resort and you can show them a swimming Pool to a certain standard. Throughout the length and breadth of Australia you can see swimming pools which are up to Olympic standards. I am suggesting that if our sport is to be on a national basis, then let the children play wherever the facilities are to be found. Give the Children facilities for playing and thereby develop their athletic prowess.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great attention to the various speeches which have been made, some of which were good in part. It is now my duty to reply on behalf of the Government to the points which I consider to be salient and which merit a reply. In the first place, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition enquired as to the plan of the Stadium. The plan has only recently been submitted by the architects, and it is being studied by a sub-committee of the Stadium Corporation. It will be coming up before them again on Friday, so that the plan is not yet available to me, in that it is not incorporated, in the first instance. The sub-Committee is still studying this plan. I am giving the House this assurance, that as soon as the plan comes to hand, it will be passed

around so that hon. members will have an idea of what it is like, and they will have an inside knowledge as to what our National Stadium will look like. I think it has been the practice in past years to pass around the plan and let hon. members have an opportunity to see it. I promise hon. members that as soon as this plan is available to me, I will pass it around. I hope that the plan will not automatically become the property of the House.

12.30 p.m.

As far as to whether or not a contract has been awarded, the position is that the Corporation only now has the plan and they are to await detail plans before starting, so no contract has yet been awarded. We could not go and invite tenders without certain plans being drawn up. If you do that, we would be starting on the wrong leg. We want to start on the right leg.

So far as a question raised by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is concerned, the money which we are seeking is for capital construction. Now, the hon. senior member for Bridgetown who is a financial wizard raised a very interesting point as to the rate of interest. This question was very fresh in his mind, as in the minds of all of us, when we were dealing with the Development Board as to the rate of interest. It seems as if some people believe that the Prime interest rate is the local interest rate. The Prime interest rate is normally around seven per cent and it generally fluctuates. At that time it was six per cent. I thought that I should first of all have made that clear.

It is wrong to suggest that the Government has one interest, and that it believes in one person more than another in dealing with business. To say that the Government has some liking for one person is not correct. If you look through the rates, you will see that the Bank of Nova Scotia is making loans to the Government. It is making loans for the working class people's houses and for the Barbados Marketing Corporation, as well as the Agricultural Development Corporation. The Royal Bank of Canada does business for the Government. As a matter of fact, it has been doing business for the Government for a long number of years - from the time of the Barbados Labour Party - and we are continuing with them in that respect. They finance business for the Transport Board also. The Imperial Bank of Commerce has some business with the Government. Barclays Bank has the money to finance the business of the Public Officers Housing Loan Board.

I am grateful to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph for reminding me that Barclays Bank has donated money to Barbados to provide an Independence gift in order to acquire land on the East Coast Road for the purpose of a National Park. I understand that this Park is within the area of St. Joseph; so both hon. members who represent that parish should be very happy to know that this Park will be sited in St. Joseph, and it will be not only for the people of Barbados and visitors, but for all people from now on. Therefore, I do not know where the hon. senior mem-

ber for the City has got this idea of our sticking to Barclays Bank alone.

I should also say that all of these financial negotiations are made by the Financial Secretary. He is the person who looks after this business. This Development has been going on since 1956 and the rates were agreed upon to some extent at that time.

Again, the Financial Secretary referred in a letter of 1957 to the fact that Barclays Bank would be willing to lend at a rate of interest of seven and a half per cent. Since then this interest rate has been reduced and the bank in a reply said that they would be grateful to know we would be willing to pay. However, the Financial Secretary entered into correspondence with Barclays Bank over this loan and the Bank replied on the 29th May, this year.

Certain arrangements were made with the Financial Secretary on the granting of a long term loan which is normally about one-half per cent below the bank rate.

Barclays Bank has done a lot of business with the Government of Barbados, and is the known bank for giving long term loans.

If the Barbados National Stadium Corporation only wants \$3,000, they can get it, and they will only pay interest for that amount for the time that the loan is advanced. Therefore, the money will be taken up from time to time as needed, and the contract will be given out to the best tender and the Stadium will be constructed in due course.

In so far as the appointment of members of the Corporation are concerned, that has already been done. Some hon. members seem not to remember that the Board was set up and is actually functioning.

So far as the hon. senior member for St. Peter is concerned, I will give him the assurance that I have the interest of the people of St. Peter at heart.

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

12.40 p.m.

RESOLUTION TO AMEND NOTE TO HEAD 46 - ITEM 49

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands also in the name of the Hon. Minister for Health and Community Development, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve an amendment to the note to Item 49 of Head 46 of the Estimates 1967-68 relative to the allowances payable to pupil midwives and ward assistants at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this Resolution states that the note to Item 49 of Head 46, Queen Elizabeth Hospital, in Part I Current of the approved Estimates for 1967-68 be amended or rather replaced

by the following: "Allowances for pupil midwives and ward assistants while in training. 20 pupil midwives each at \$50 per month and 20 students payable at the rate of \$40 per month per student."

The position is, as the Addendum sets out, that the training course is for trainees who have had no previous training. The staff nurses continue to receive their regular salaries while allowances for the pupil midwives were at the rate of \$14 per month. It is now proposed to increase the allowances payable to pupil midwives to \$50 per month and to amend the note to Item 49 accordingly.

At one time while they were in training at the Centre in Bank Hall, they had to travel and they were given transportation allowance. There is no travelling for them to do now, and it is felt that the pupil midwives who are not really trained nurses cannot really live on \$14 per month. The cost of living has gone up, everything has gone up and for that reason we are amending and increasing the allowance, and we want to try and improve the standard of midwifery and encourage as many young women as possible to go into this Nursing School.

I beg to move, Sir, that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure that if I had got in my question in time, certain members of Government would have come to the conclusion that I had a tip-off. It was only when I received this Resolution, Mr. Speaker, that I withdrew my Question from the Table of the House. I welcome such a Resolution, and more so the midwifery training course at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the trainees getting more than \$14 a month. I thought that was finished with long ago, especially after hearing the senior member for St. Michael say that some people only work for 3 hours a week at \$12 a week; but to get a midwife working for \$14 a month was certainly something that would have scared away any of the young girls who might have been interested in taking up nursing as their profession.

I welcome this move on the part of the Government, and as the Minister quite rightly and in a very pleasant manner introduced this Resolution. I hope he will also bear in mind that there is a dire need for medical journals at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital for the medical staff. I know that there are quite a few doctors whom I have quite a bit of contact with in my capacity as an insurance underwriter, and I have discussed many of these problems with them just by the way, and they have given me an idea which led me to believe that there is a lack of medical journals at the Hospital, and I must say to have a midwifery training course going and then not having the necessary literature at their disposal to keep them up-to-date, we will surely be serving no useful purpose. I feel that training our nurses in Barbados, and in view of what has just happened by the way at Government level, by allowing the nurses to take their certificates here

which would be recognised as much as an S.R.N. certificate from London. I am quite sure that even \$50 a month - there is not too much money that one can pay a nurse; the doctor is helpless without his nurse, and the nurse is helpless without the doctor; and if proper provisions are made for the medical staff, they should also be made for the nurse.

I would also draw to the Minister's attention that in spite of a salary increase, it is one which I am quite sure the midwives will be very grateful for. With these few observations - particularly where we have reached the stage in Barbados where we train our nurses and then they are going abroad, we can only hold them by way of paying them good salaries. We are suffering for trained people, and whenever we are in a position to train some of them, they are lured away to other parts of the world because of higher salaries, and in raising their salaries from \$14 to \$50 I am quite sure that the Minister is on good grounds as he has always been over the years.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, when one listens to the hon. senior member for St. James, he says.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Andrew seconded the motion and at the time gave no indication that he proposed to speak on the Resolution. 12.50 p.m.

Whilst it is a fact that Standing Order 27 provides that a Minister may conclude a debate on any motion which is critical of the Government, or reflects adversely on or is calculated to bring discredit upon the Government, and the mover of a motion may reply after all the other members present have had an opportunity of addressing the House, in this case, the Hon. Minister seconded the motion and did not indicate that it was his intention to speak at a later time. That would have been in accordance with Standing Order 26 (15). I am afraid that the hon. member can only speak now if the House exercises that indulgence.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. James has already spoken.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, it has now been established that there has been a shortage of trained midwives at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, hence the necessity for this training course. I only say that on this programme of the training of midwives. It seems to me that the Hon. Minister is being taken for a ride in having to deal with a Resolution of this sort. Less than nine months ago two United Kingdom trained midwives, one a Barbadian and the other a Vincentian who had spent most of their early years here, went to the United Kingdom to undergo training. After they received their training in the United Kingdom, they did service there as midwives, and they also worked in the United States of America. They returned here together and they both applied for jobs at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I am sure that I am correct in

saying that they had interviews with the Matron, I think it was the Chief Personnel Officer, and I am sure that they were both given a turning around. They were made to believe that there was no necessity for people as trained as they were on the staff of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. As a result of that, the Barbadian midwife decided that she did not have any more time to waste; so she booked her passage to return to England. However, Sir, a few days before she left Barbados to return to England, she went to see her doctor, and when her doctor heard that she was returning to England, the doctor got in touch with the Matron at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and this young woman who had become frustrated because she could not get a job at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, was then offered a job or was told by the Matron that she did not understand that there was an opportunity for her to get a job at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital; but the young woman had already made up her mind to return to England and thanked the Matron for her last-minute offer, and she went to England and she is there now.

The young Vincentian went home and was married just over two weeks ago.

Now, Sir, I have put the cases of these two young women before this House in order to point out in some measure that all would not have been well. The Minister apparently has not been given or has not been told all that he should have been told in a matter of this sort. We do not, for a single moment, seek or try in any way to deprive young women, or for that matter, even other staff Nurses, the opportunity to avail themselves of this training in midwifery; but how can it be that it does now seem to be so necessary to institute this training scheme with trained personnel and United Kingdom registration certainly respected throughout the Commonwealth?

As regards the \$50.00 allowance per month for the pupil midwives while they are in training, this is a small amount, and we are willing to admit that it is better than the \$14.00 per month; but this question must arise afterwards.
1.00 p.m.

After these people have been trained and are qualified, are we to understand that they will be given employment at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital or at the Cottage Hospitals or any of the institutions which their services are required? It is alright to say that they are doing this for X number of people. After they are trained, what next?

As regards the selectees for the training course in midwifery, we understand from the Addendum that in respect of the staff nurses they will be training a number of men who have had no previous training.

We are wondering what is the set educational standard required for selection to this training course. We know that there are nurses - State Registered Nurses - who could not, or did not, secure a pass when they sought to be trained as nurses at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, or rather at the old Gen-

eral Hospital. But we have learned subsequently that it was not always a case where applicants did not possess a particular appeal to a particular tutor. Some of these people who were rejected here in Barbados went abroad - some went to the United Kingdom and strangely enough, they have shown and proven themselves to be a credit to Barbados. We know that there are girls who left Barbados and went to England and have qualified as State Registered Nurses and they bear a good name wherever they work.

I say these things, because I sincerely hope that such will not be the case when it comes to selecting trainees for this midwifery course.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 3 o'clock p.m.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.

1.10 p.m.
On resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Item on the Order Paper stands in the name of the hon. junior member for Christ Church, the Minister of Health, and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to revise the statute laws of the island. I am advised by the Clerks of the Table that this Order has not yet been circulated by the Government Printery.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I think that a cyclostyled copy of this Bill was given to those members who were here at the time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member mean on Tuesday of last week?

Mr. St. JOHN: I remember yesterday the Leader of the House was enquiring about this Bill, and my understanding of the position was that he did not intend to proceed with it in view of the fact that all the members who were not here did not get a copy of it. It certainly formed no part of the Order Paper nor was it among the documents delivered to me or anybody in this House.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, as far as I know, the cyclostyled copies were issued. Anyhow, copies have been given out; but if the hon. member would like more time to consider this Bill, I have no objection. We can proceed with other matters.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member asking leave to proceed with whatever matter he seeks next to deal with? Let the hon. Acting Leader of the House intimate.....

Titel.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill in connection with the Government of Canada's response to the application made by this Government for assistance in the dairy industry - the sum of \$250,000 (Can.) - be the next item. It is not on the Order Paper, but notice was given of it yesterday and it has been circulated, and I am asking leave for the hon. Minister of Agriculture to deal with this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. member is seeking to deal now with this Bill of which he has given notice. The hon. member proposes that that be the next Order of the Day.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to move that this be 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 hon. Acting Leader of the House has asked that the hon. Minister of Agriculture deal with this matter. If there is no objection, leave will be granted.

(AFTER A PAUSE) There is no objection and leave is granted. Let the hon. senior member for St. Andrew proceed.

BILL re LOAN BY GOVERNMENT OF CANADA TO AID DAIRY INDUSTRY

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: In pursuance of the Government's policy of diversification, where emphasis has been placed on the promotion of the dairy industry, it is in this respect that on the 20th October last year the Government made representation to the Canadian Government for assistance in promoting the dairy industry. This assistance has been agreed to by the Canadian Government by way of a loan of \$250,000 (Can.) which is to be made available to Barbados over a three year period. The Government of Barbados will be obligated to using Canadian animals and equipment and even technical assistance for the promotion of the dairy industry.

It is agreed between the Barbados Government and the Canadian Government that a number of 80 heads of cattle will be bought from Canada every year for the next three years. Expenses from this amount in respect of an Animal Nutrition Adviser will also be paid for over a three year period. It is estimated at \$17,000 (Can.) for the establishment of a Unit, the provision of an Animal Nutrition Adviser for three years, equipment, etc. The estimated amount to be spent in this respect will be \$70,000, and the estimated amount payable for the cattle will be in the region of \$150,000 (Can.) It is intended that future consideration be given to a further Adviser on dairy farming in this country. This is over and above the provision of the Animal Nutritionist at the initial stages.

Now I should like to state here that we have in Barbados established over the past three years an Animal Nutrition Unit, but presently there is a problem in this Unit. We have an Agricultural Adviser responsible for it - it is to be noted that in recent years there has been a dearth - as a matter of fact, in this area - of qualified people to fill the post, and those whom we had, for some reason or other, we have lost. Hon. members will be pleased to know that we expect to have most of the posts filled in the Ministry - I mean the research posts - and the other posts filled early next month. Appointments have been made, some have already been accepted, and the officers are expected to take up their duties in the near future - in another few weeks' time, so this expert on Animal Nutrition will add considerably to the efforts which we are making at the Pine currently.

In order to effect this loan, it is necessary that we have this Bill because there is no present authority whereby the Government can accept a loan from Canada without legislative sanction. Hon. members will note from the Bill that this loan which is for \$250,000 (Can.) is repayable over a period of 50 years. It is an interest free loan and the Government will be obligated to pay none of it in the first ten years. It is a soft loan, and the amount payable for the remaining 40 years would be in the region of \$3,000 - let me give you the exact figure: I think it is in the region of \$3,125 - half yearly. We expect to pay 80 semi-annual instalments; \$3,125 payable on the last day of March and the last day of September in each year, commencing the 30th September, 1977 and ending on the 31st March, 2017.
3.10 p.m.

I do not know how many hon. members will be around then. The reason for this is that future generations will benefit from the establishment of the dairy industry in this country. Despite what is being said of the dairy industry, the future generations will shoulder their responsibility and pay their way with this scheme. There are certain conditions and those conditions are to be employed as follows:-

The loan shall be used for the payment of the cost of up to 80 heads of Canadian Dairy Cattle selected by the Barbadian procurement agents in each of the years 1967, 1968 and 1969; the cost of transporting the cattle by Canadian carriers to North American ports as may be agreed by Barbados and Canada. We will have to take care of bringing the animals from Toronto to Barbados by chartered flight, but if the animals are acquired in Ottawa, the transportation will be taken care of from this end. Hon. members will remember that in last year's Estimates an amount of \$70,000 was provided for this purpose in the Ministry of Agriculture for the Development of the Dairy Industry. Other conditions are as follows:- The cost associated with the procurement and shipment of the cattle, including travelling and the living expenses of Barbadian procurement agents, insurance, veterinary fees and other similar expenses - these will be paid from this loan; the cost of the Animal Nutrition Officer,

including his salary and transportation to Barbados, but not including local accommodation or other local costs normally borne by Barbados.

As I pointed out earlier, all the equipment must come from Canada. There is the cost of such additional live-stock services, materials and equipment as may be agreed upon between Barbados and Canada. Under the Agreement this list may be revised by mutual consent, but the total value of live-stock services, materials and equipment supplied under this Agreement may not exceed \$250,000 Canadian. There is the cost of laboratory equipment for the adviser, including procurement in Canada and shipments in Barbados.

On the question of procurement procedures, unless otherwise agreed, Barbados shall appoint a purchasing mission to select pure-bred cattle. The cattle shall be selected and purchased by Barbados on the advice when requested of the Canadian Department of Agriculture, and Department of Trade and Commerce and the Canadian Cattle Breeders' Association. Barbados shall place the purchase orders with Canadian suppliers subject to the concurrence of Canada; Barbados shall provide Canada with notice of all purchase orders immediately after their issuance.

As to the payment procedures, payment of the delivery costs of the cattle to the agreed North American Port shall be made directly to Canadian suppliers by Canada upon receipt of the purchase order, invoices for travelling and inspection service where applicable unless otherwise agreed upon by Barbados and Canada; statements of disbursement charged to the loan shall be prepared by Canada and forwarded to Barbados at six-months' intervals, normally, the 1st March and the 1st September in each calendar year until the project has been completed, unless otherwise agreed by Barbados and Canada.

The responsibilities of Barbados are as follows:- Barbados shall be responsible for the shipment and transportation by the Canadian carrier to the agreed North American Port; the arrangement and payment of the outward shipment of the cattle from the agreed North American Port to Barbados; the cost of insurance from the agreed North American Port to Barbados; the preparation and submission of claims covering trade shipments or losses or damage to livestock, material and equipment which occur while in transit from Canada to Barbados. That is also the responsibility of Barbados in respect of this loan.

I know that hon. members will be worried about the situation in the milk industry and they may ask why should we bring in more cattle when the farmers, cannot, at this stage, sell all the milk they produce. I am not presently aware of any recent complaints, since about a week or so, about farmers not being able to get off the milk they are producing. I think that the milk plant has been making an effort to find a market for the milk they are handling. As to com-

plaints of tins of milk not being good milk, that, too, has been corrected and attention is being paid to the machinery. The Minister of Trade has given permission for the importation of tins of evaporated milk for a period of two months, and that is the time when the milk plant has advised the Minister that it will be able to put its house in order in respect of the manufacture of evaporated milk again. It is expected that the plant will have two experts to look after this aspect of the operations by the end of this month. A new Manager is currently in the Island, and I think that the milk plant is doing its best to put its house in order. I do not think that it would be fair to the industry for us to cry down the milk plant any longer. On the contrary, I think we should all try to remember that this is an industry which we are hoping to push in order to boost the economy of the country, and that is the responsibility of every parliamentarian. Rather than going on a political platform, and otherwise pulling down the industry, I think it is our responsibility to encourage the industry. The people of this country are accustomed to the products manufactured by the milk plant. We are giving the assurance that it is unlikely that they will have this problem of producing bad milk any longer. We have accepted that they produced bad milk, but they are not manufacturing this milk again. Let us keep this industry going - so as to keep this money in the country, and not have to export all the funds from the country.

There is a sizeable amount of money being exported from this country in the purchase of milk. We feel that this money should remain in the country, and that will provide work for our people and raise the economy of the country. Do not let us criticise the milk plant any longer, but let us rather give encouragement to all and sundry to give as much support and encouragement to the plant as possible. As a matter of fact, I have instructed the Senior Agricultural Officer only yesterday to advise a meeting of the directors that I expect them to be taking all the milk produced by the farmers of this country by October. That is going to be absolutely imperative where they are concerned, because we are hoping to get the Bill dealing with the dairy industry in the Legislature in the near future. As a matter of fact, the Bill has already been drafted and it should be brought before the Legislature at any time now.
3.20 p.m.

This would make it imperative on the Milk Plant to take all the milk produced. It is true that this Bill would have to be brought in force by proclamation.

We are not satisfied that the Milk Plant promoters are doing as much promotion as they should be doing, and if they spend a little more in advertising - and when I say advertising, I really mean advertising; I mean that they must get down to a promotion programme - we feel that the industry will flourish.

After all, the milk produced in this country is between thirteen to fifteen thousand pounds of milk per day. This is not more than we can drink. It is true that the Barbados public has got accustomed

to powdered milk. We are now using this milk in the schools and we hope to get more and more children to use it. We are asking the Opposition to assist the Government in encouraging the people of the country to do their part in supporting this industry.

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

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

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, we have been asked on this side to do our part to encourage the development of the milk industry of this country, and to try to see to it that the industry is established on a stable basis in this country. I was one whom the Minister was referring to and I make no apology for it.

There is no Party in Barbados which is more interested in agriculture than the Barbados Labour Party. The Milk Plant has found itself in this position primarily through its own fault. It is nobody's fault because the Milk Plant has been given an abundance of protection by everybody. But they have found themselves in this position through a lot of mistakes.

Now, there are some things which should be said of the Milk Plant. It is my opinion that the first thing that is wrong with the milk industry is that the price of milk is too high. The price of milk is preposterously too high. We in Barbados, before the Milk Plant came into operation, were accustomed buying milk at seventeen cents per pint, and it is now sold at twenty-two and a half cents a pint. The position is that you cannot expect the wage-earners in this country to buy milk at twenty-two and a half cents per pint.

There is one point which the Hon. Minister made in which I am in total agreement; but you cannot accept, unless something is totally wrong, that you are producing 13,000 pounds of milk with 240,000 people and you cannot sell that 13,000 pounds. There must be something wrong. Leave promotion by the management out of the discussion. When we discover that we produce 13,000 pounds of milk and we cannot sell that in a population of 240,000 people, the real root of the problem is in our selling of milk, and something must be wrong to prevent the people of this country buying only 13,000 pounds of milk.

My opinion is that the price is not right, and that is the heart of the problem. I can say this for myself. In my household, we use the pasteurized milk. The only thing I see wrong in it is the price. As far as the pasteurized milk is concerned, my understanding is that it is fresh milk. Some people feel that the pasteurized milk is the one not bottled, the one that the school children were getting accustomed to until the unfortunate situation occurred. I do not want to go into the past, but the position was that the pasteurized milk was beginning to take on in Barbados.

What I would really like to know is what is the cost of production of the pasteurized milk which we produce. It seems to me that they are buying powdered milk at fourteen cents and they are selling

pasteurized milk at twenty-two and a half cents. That seems to be a 50 percent profit.
3.30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I just would tell the hon. member that the Milk Plant is paying 15¢ for a pint of milk rather than 14¢. I know a producer last week who got paid at 10¢.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, this is because the producer has produced substandard milk.

Mr. St. JOHN: The standard that is determined is not in accordance with any recognised international standard. If we can have our own standards - the basic point is - I do not mind if they pay 15¢ a pint - the point is they are still selling milk at 22 1/2 ¢ and the super pasteurized milk is 30 ¢. 15 added to 15. I make that 100% on the cost; that seems to me to be a large margin. Is there something wrong with the distribution? Half pint of milk for 15¢ and you tell me that they are paying 15¢ a pint for it. Half is sold at 15¢ and you are making 100% at cost.

That is taking the milk up. You have to absorb the cost of distribution, the cost of bottles. It seems to me that if you find yourself with the difficulty - and this is a point I want the Minister's representative on the Milk Plant Board to understand and to put forward to the Board, that you are only producing 13,000 pints and there must be something wrong. I do not see anything wrong with the quality of the milk; you get right back down to the question of price.

We have now come to another sore point. The Hon. Minister said that they have stopped manufacturing evaporated milk. That is obvious. He said that on the last occasion, but this is what I want to know. Is it not a fact that the Milk Plant has been granted a monopoly upon the importation of the 14 oz. tin as well as small tins of evaporated milk in Barbados? That is so; but what has happened? Even with that the price of evaporated milk has gone up too. It is so; they are saying it is not so. You used to be able to get Carnation milk, the 14 oz. tin, for 25 1/2¢ this is now 29¢ a tin. Do not tell me that the Ministry of Trade has put on a price control of 29¢ because I think that 29¢ a tin is too high.

You used to be able to distribute it, through the distribution system. Whereas before the channels of distribution used to allow them two months credit for the milk, now you have to go to the Milk Plant, pay your price, go to the harbour, charge it and you still got \$12.36 or \$12.99. The whole thing seems to me to be a fault in the distribution system and of the marketing ideas of the Milk Plant. You have the monopoly; monopoly means that for every pint of milk drunk in Barbados, that is the powdered milk - I still see powdered milk in there; there is a connection between the New Zealand Board and the Milk Plant which is something that one will have to have a special time to investigate, but as far as evaporated milk is concerned, it has risen to 29¢,

and the Minister should know that there used to be other brands of evaporated milk in the island which were cheaper than the Carnation, but you cannot get them now; you can only get the Red Seal. We are talking about the 14 oz. tin; so again the price is wrong.

This is what I criticised on the political platform, and I shall forever criticise it, because I cannot see how any Government or any industry could expect to have a monopoly and expect at the same time that the consumers must not have any kind of protection against them. I will encourage them to buy the local milk, but I will tell them too, as I feel honestly in my mind, that the price is too high. Having given them the monopoly, the price control should not be fixed at 29¢, it can be fixed cheaper than 29¢, and I would like to hear the hon. Minister on this. Is it because the Milk Plant has some source, some international connection or some agreement or some milk agreement with somebody abroad who feel that there is nobody in Barbados who will understand and know that there must be something wrong?

If we do not have criticism in this House and on the political platforms, those people up there will think they can carry the whole of Barbados for a ride; because the Government wants to develop the industry, that they can take advantage. We on this side of the House are definitely in favour of the development of the milk industry. There is nothing wrong with the quality of the milk; the price is wrong. The price of evaporated milk is still wrong; super pasteurized milk is still wrong. We hope the new Bill that is coming soon will empower people to fix or rather a competent authority to fix the price, and we hope that we will have an expert to advise on the marketing and distribution of the milk, and then they will see that 13,000 pints of milk will be nothing to get rid of in Barbados.
3.40 p.m.

An amount of 13,000 pounds of milk will be nothing to get rid of in Barbados, because Barbadians in the past used to drink fresh milk. They stopped drinking fresh milk because it went out of existence. I would like to know what plans the Government has for bringing within the distribution section and the producing section, all the small men in the country area. I want to know if the Government will seek out some centre in Trinidad, like the water-fall area where they have been encouraging the development of the industry. The Government has been setting up plants so that the bacteriological content of the milk of the small producer cannot be advanced any longer. It is useless to think that you can set up a proper industry in Barbados when you have 50 or 60 producers. I want to say that the whole system, the whole individual supply, has got to be brought to the industry; the small man with two cows should be able to get his milk sold without all this elaboration. That is what I want an assurance from the Minister on.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I have learnt from the Minister that of this \$250,000 Canadian, the sum of

\$150,000 will be spent on heads of cattle. I am wondering if the Minister cares anything about the officers in his Ministry who have been studying and doing some research in animal husbandry. The point is this: during the past year or so, the Ministry has been importing heads of cattle from Canada, and if I understand correctly an officer from the Department was sent overseas to carry out certain investigations. That officer was despatched from Barbados only after it was discovered that the Canadian cows were not living up to expectations. Some consideration has been given to the climate. As far as I know, the fodder which was fed to animals was also included in the same investigation, and one other matter that causes some concern was the price at which these animals from Canada were landed here in Barbados. I think, Sir, that the Hon. Minister would know that recommendations were made to the Ministry that they should try and get animals other than from Canada, wherever possible, and it is in the face of that kind of advice that we now find ourselves wholly and solely in the hands of the Canadian Government, the Agricultural Ministry thereof, because of an offer of a loan of \$250,000.

Of course, any loan must be appreciated, but it is to be hoped, Sir, that this is not just a case of trying to make people believe that we are trying to establish our daily industry in such a way or to such standards as are worthwhile. The fact is this: Something must have happened behind the scenes which prompted the Barbados Government to seek this loan from Canada.
3.50 p.m.

Something must have happened. In the dairy industry here, there is New Zealand interest, and we are wondering if this \$250,000 loan is not being advanced with a view to putting one business section in the dairy industry out ahead of the others.

It is alright and good for us to have a \$250,000 loan, especially when we understand it will be free from interest and other service charges, and will be made payable in eighteen annual instalments. That in itself is an incentive to go for this loan; but after we have got this loan, are we going to be any better off? In other words, what guarantee have we that if we put, not \$250,000, but \$250 million into the present Milk Plant, there would be a satisfactory improvement to the extent that the health of the milk drinking population would stand to benefit?

We have been made to understand that the Hon. Minister, not so long ago, called it a nine-fault industry; but instead of trying to correct the one which they say remains uncorrectible, we find that they have now to go further afield to Canada seeking a loan to improve the industry, but not to correct one fault of the nine that remain. That one, Sir, to my mind can bring death to the whole industry, not to say the milk drinking population.

Hon. Minister told us, Sir, that we will be having two experts. Remember, Sir, the Minister cannot be a nickle to have his Government to be shareholders in an industry such as the Pine Hill Dairy and do not

carry out a thorough investigation in order to determine whether or not the people who came down here to produce this milk and to do all sort of things what they should do. In other words, we find that even the Minister did not know that he was setting up an industry to be run by nickies; in other words, by people who do not know what to do.

I find that the Manager and other staff ought to be bowing their heads in shame for what they have done since the dairy was established; and if we are now going to get experts from Canada to help us to establish this dairy industry further, we do not want to see any clash of expertise or expert knowledge. If any such thing should occur, no one knows what is likely to happen to the milk-drinking population in Barbados.

What the Minister should have done was to ask the Canadian experts to inspect the nine faults, and let the population begin to have something which is decent. I mean decent stomach-wise, because I am sure, Sir, that the real loss and suffering which have been occasioned by the Dairy Industry are not being known as widely as they should be known.

Why is it, Sir, that the Public Health Authorities have not discharged their duties in this respect in the same way as is being done with some lowly one-cow owner from some outlying district?

4.00 p.m.

I remember two Public Health Officers waiting about gaps and street corners to take samples of milk, and if after the Government Analyst has reported that the standard is not what was expected by the authority, people have been prosecuted. Why is it that the Pine Hill Dairy has not been prosecuted? It is not fair, and we are saying that while it might be a good gesture on the Canadian Government to make available to us a sum to the tune of \$250,000, as the situation stands, if we are not prepared to set the Pine Hill Dairy house in order first, in other words, if we bring all the cattle from Canada down here and they give of their very best, beyond expectations, by way of milk production, and all the milk from Canada is channelled into the Pine Hill Dairy and that fault is not corrected first, we stand nowhere.

All we have got to do is this. Be sure, and not only sure, be doubly sure that we can justify the borrowing of this money from the Canadian Government. That is it. Stock will have to be taken at some time or other to see what progress we have made, if any, or if we have been retrogressing, whatever it is; and the Hon. Minister must not allow himself to be fooled any more. As the hon. senior member for Christ Church was stressing on the point just now, Sir, the Minister cannot deny that the Pine Hill Dairy has tried, and they have succeeded to some extent, in setting one standard for certain producers and another standard for others. The closer you are, Sir, not geographically speaking, but the closer you are to management, the better opportunities you can expect. In other words,.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order. I could not sit here and hear an hon.

member make a statement such as the one made by the hon. junior member for St. Peter without refuting categorically that there is discrimination where the price of milk at the plant is concerned. There is absolutely no discrimination where the price by the milk plant for milk is concerned. I will elaborate on that in my reply.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member state the point which he is directing my attention to and submit for my decision?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The point, Mr. Speaker, is the allegation made by the hon. junior member for St. Peter in respect of the milk plant paying one price to one producer and another price to another producer for the same quality of milk.

Mr. SPEAKER: And that is the point which is submitted to the Speaker for his decision?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Discrimination. And I made the point that there is absolutely no discrimination where the purchase of milk by the plant is concerned. As a matter of fact, this is untrue and unfounded.

Mr. SPEAKER: Anyhow, a point of categorical refutation has been duly made, but I am afraid I do not find it either in our Standing Orders or even in May's. The hon. member may bear in mind now that he has the right of reply.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, no one would expect that milk supplied to the Pine Hill Dairy by, let us say, the Hon. Minister - if he does supply any - would be discriminated against, but let the same Minister deny that dairy farmers in Barbados have been supplying milk to the Pine Hill Dairy, milk produced from the same cows each day, fed on the same thing each day, and they were given a price or prices which dairymen had to satisfy themselves with, that yesterday or the day before when the dairy did not get so many gallons of milk they got a good price, but that day when everybody's cows were overflowing, all sorts of faults were found and a lower price was offered than the day before. It might not be discrimination at all; it might be stark robbery; and that is what the Minister has got to try and cover up. And that too, Mr. Speaker, is exactly what caused this Hon. Minister here to be sitting in at conferences with our daily producers to try to have things regulated up there where prices are concerned.

We are satisfied, Sir, that this Canadian Government loan is not the answer to our present milk problem. It is not. A similar loan coming from Russia would not solve the problem; in other words, Sir, the trouble is at the Milk Plant; and until you have people at the Pine Hill Dairy who know that we in Barbados are entitled to decent standards, whether it be milk or milk prices, until we have people there who know that, we would not be any better off. What has happened Sir, is this, that all the wrongs that have been going on in the dairy industry during the past year have been hidden, so to speak, and the Minister

undoubtedly does not know what the general public knows about the Pine Hill Dairy.
4.10 p.m.

I feel somewhat sorry for the Minister in this matter. The Minister has the interest of the Barbadian shareholders to look after. He has got the interest of the dairy farmer - the large dairy farmer, and the small dairy farmer more so - to look after, because the large dairy farmer could very well speak with a voice backed up by gallons of milk, but the small dairy farmer is not that fortunate. I will tell you this: One of the best things which should be done with this \$250,000 is this: As to all these small dairy farmers who have been so badly treated in the past months by the Pine Hill Dairy that they have got frustrated and they have got rid of their cattle, the Government should take this money and buy good milch cows and give them to these small farmers, whether as an outright gift or on terms such as would not make it so difficult for them to live up to their agreement. We have had cows being brought here, and the Minister would know who was the first to get the best of these cows. It was not a case where the small man in St. Andrew, in fact, nobody in Belleplaine had any opportunity to go on the day of sale and stand up alongside of even the Minister and make his choice. It is nothing like that. It was after certain people got the best heads of cattle that the rest were offered to those who were not so highly placed whether in Government or elsewhere.

You will understand, Sir, that this whole business of the Pine Hill Dairy and the importation on cattle by the Barbados Government is not a business that this House could stand up with if we were asked to give a clean Bill of Sale. We know that the milk in itself is subject to bacteria. Even the cattle themselves are subject to contracting diseases, and all along the line we had it in the form of milk or in the cows themselves. Believe me, Sir, I am in a position to know that the milk has been souring even in the breasts of the cows. It has not been a clean piece of business at all, and I hope that no Minister has anything to worry about. The Minister got up to tell us about discrimination in prices. There are a number of registered dairy farmers in Barbados. It has happened Sir, that we have the Groves Agricultural Station, we have the Pine Agricultural Station and I make mention of this thing because they happen to be Government property; and I am not sure if there is a dairy farm at Culloden Farm that has been supplying milk to the Pine Hill Dairy. Is the Minister going to tell me that these dairy operators here are going to find themselves in the hands of a Minister having to come and pilot a Bill such as this through this Hon. House - are you telling me that they are not going to think twice - or even more - before they interfere with the price of certain people's milk in this Island?

The Minister can talk until he freezes, but we know what has been going on. And remember, Sir, that when the farmers, the big ones, have cause for complaint, they go to the Minister last. They come to the Opposition and tell us their story first. They often

tell us: "Do not do anything yet until I see the Minister and hear what he will do about it;" but in the event of the Minister not doing anything or what we should do in the interest of the farmers, we will bring it on the floor of this house. That is our position in this matter. What we should look at is this; that it is in the face of advice against buying cows from Canada that the Hon. Minister is here with this Bill. It would appear to us that for the next ten years at least we will be importing cows, whether they will be matured cows or calves, from Canada. You cannot expect to take the Canadian Government's money and then start importing cows from Puerto Rico, or else where. Even if we find that cows from Puerto Rico can stand up to our type of climate better than those from Canada, and that the milk production is far above that of cows from Canada, we will be importing these from Canada.

You will see, Sir, that this loan is to be interest free, but that is just what is written on the paper. Surely we must feel that the Barbados Government is going to give the Canadian Government some sort of guarantee for this loan, we might find ourselves being told that the importation of cows from sources other than Canada is prohibited for the next ten years because of this Canadian Government loan.
4.20. p.m.

In other words, we might find ourselves being told that the importation of cows other than from Canada is prohibited for the next ten years because of this. All of this we have to go into.

Now, Sir, of the \$150,000 to be spent on cattle, I am wondering how many heads of cattle can we expect for that \$150,000 (Canadian). What must cause us to enquire into this is that we should be told today by the Minister that there are so many heads of cattle in the industry at the present moment; and that, therefore, at the end of the next five years when this loan is used up when we expect to have all our herd from Canada, their will be so many and so many heads of cattle in the Island.

It might be that the Minister has his plans because it is not a case where you are going to receive this money from Canada and you do not have some plan to say how you are going to spend this money. Finally, Mr. Speaker, you should tell us that you expect to receive from Canada so many and so many two year olds or six-weeks olds, as the case may be, so that we would know at the beginning how many heads would be coming into the Island during the next two or three years and that of these so many are milch cows, so many six-weeks olds, so many would be calving and our milk would be so much and so much at a particular time.

We do not for one moment believe that the Minister went wildly in to the Canadian Government. He must have had some plans. I would also like to know if the experts who would be coming down here from Canada are to be salaried, housed and everything from this \$250,000, or if the experts would be in addition to the \$250,000.

One other thing must arise. We sincerely hope that the Minister would be able to make full usage of the expert knowledge of the personnel from Canada, and I think that it is an opportunity, since the Canadian Government is in a position to show us that they have some expert advise to give us - that our Minister should take the opportunity to have some of our local boys or girls who would be interested in animal husbandry trained abroad in Canada. We feel that the Canadian Government would lend itself to such a training scheme because we find that the Canadian Government is willing to give our dairy industry aid. It is for that reason we feel that they would offer to train some of our boys and girls as vets.

There is no doubt that the small dairy owners, the ones who own one, two or three cows, find it difficult at the moment, if one of his animals gets sick, to obtain the services of a vet. We feel that our Minister of Agriculture should set about this matter looking into every aspect of it, if they want our dairy industry to succeed and they do not want to take this \$250,000 (Canadian) and throw it down the drain. The Minister should see to it that we have in the next three or five years enough qualified vets and that they be placed in such an industry to bring the maximum benefits to the small dairy farmer.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I have been listening with great interest and restraint to the address by the hon. junior member for St. Peter. I was horrified by the amount of inaccurate information which the hon. junior member for St. Peter had in his possession. I have doubt that he was minding his business, but on this occasion his business embodied a large amount of inaccurate information.

That started with the allegation made against the Milk Plant of discrimination, his reference to a dairy at Culloden Farm and his reference to the selection of cows brought in from Canada.

4.30 p.m.

I should like, for the information of the hon. junior member for St. Peter, to let him know that the first two months that milk was sent from Culloden Farm to the Milk Plant, the price paid for it was 10¢ per pint because of low butterfat content. It was treated then as manufacturing milk. I should also like to let the hon. member know that I have received a price for milk lower than the premium price when my Holstein cows were fresh, and this is normal.

If you have the majority of your cattle pure bred Holsteins, the total amount of solids in fat would be 11.95 per cent - total solids and fat. What one has got to do is to increase the solids in milk through the Guernsey and the Jersey cows or if the Holsteins are crossed. If your herd is predominantly Holstein you cannot expect to qualify for premium price when your cows are fresh in milk because the more milk given by a cow, the lower the amount of solids and fat. Now, according to our standards in Barbados, the minimum amount of solids passable by the Milk Plant is 8.5 per cent; the minimum amount of fats is 3 per cent. The Milk Plant accepts a 12 per cent total solid, that is 8.5 plus 3.5.

Any farmer who produces milk with a total amount of solids and fat over and above 12 per cent he receives a premium price. If he produces milk over 11.5 per cent and below 12 per cent, he receives 14¢ per pound for that milk. I hope hon. members follow me. Over 12 per cent total solids and fat, he gets 15¢ per pound; over 11.5 per cent he gets 14¢ per pound. If he produces milk below 11.5 per cent, he gets paid for it at manufacturing price which is 10¢ per pound.

In the case of the reference I made to Culloden Farm, because of inexperience in dealing with these animals, and because of the fact that the milk was coming from Holstein animals, the amount of fat was less than 11.5 and the manufacturing price of 10¢ per pound was paid for it.

The Milk Plant has its advisers - dairy farming advisers who go around to the farmers when there is any deficiency in the milk: so in the case of Culloden Farm, advice was issued to the people who deal with the animals, and when they met the standard required, the price went up to 14¢ and then to 15¢. I remember the Zebu cows had to be brought in to improve the standard of the milk, but when it was purely Holstein it was 10¢. Now, I myself have had the displeasure to be paid at standard price in the month of February when my milk production was high from the Holstein, and I had no Guernseys giving milk. I have received standard price as against premium price for the milk; so where is the discrimination?

When an hon. member tries to insinuate that the closer you are, that the fact that you are a Minister or something of the sort, that is not so. I have received warnings from the Milk Plant as much as any other milk producer in the country. There is a system, and the hon. senior member for Christ Church is well aware of this because he himself is interested in the dairy industry - if not his own cattle, people closely connected to him; and he can tell you that if any morning or afternoon that milk has been sent to the Milk Plant that does not contain over 8.5 per cent solids in fat, if that milk is 8.4 per cent, you get a warning telling you that your solids have dropped and you have got to pull your socks up; that you have got to administer some more concentrated food or something of the sort. This is the normal routine of the Plant. If your butterfats drop below 3 per cent, you are given that warning, and if you persist in sending milk of low quality to the Plant, they will tell you they are not taking any more milk from you.

From the time you are given a warning, every gallon of milk which you send to the Plant is checked every day until you have reached the required standard. I go a little further, and I should like to point out that this does not happen to 'X' and not to 'Y'; it happens to every producer of milk in this country who sends milk to the Milk Plant. There are certain things that are responsible for poor quality of milk - hygiene for one, the way the animals are milked. Some people use vaseline on the udders of the cows which is not very wholesome, and this is not upheld by the Plant; they advise against this thing.

4.40 p.m.

That is not upheld by the Plant. Some people refuse to use a detergent; and if that is not used it means that it is possible that bacteria will remain in the milk. When they test your milk and put it down for two hours and it does not have that quality, you are warned about it. Anybody who is supplying the Milk Plant with milk is kept advised as to the quality of his milk, and he can go there on any morning or afternoon and check on his milk for the day before. If he wanted the Plant to have a run down on his milk he can have it done. There could be no discrimination where the question of the quality of milk is concerned, because every person can have his milk tested before it goes to the Plant. There is absolutely no discrimination where the question of the quality of milk is concerned.

Sir, I want to take up the hon. junior member for St. Peter on a few points which he has made. The hon. member said that he is aware that there is an officer - or there are officers - in the Ministry who are doing research in animal husbandry. This may be the hon. member's awareness, but it is not mine. We do not have any such person. The hon. member may be getting his information from his Agricultural Assistants. I think that there may be some Agricultural Assistants who, because of the fact that certain things did not happen in their favour, go around making certain statements which they know nothing about. There are certain people who are well placed in the Ministry of Agriculture who criticise the importation of the Canadian cows, people who know nothing about animal husbandry; but because certain things did not please them, some of them went as far as writing letters to the Press in other people's names. They are pulling down the industry. I know of this state of affairs. The hon. member has raised the question of discrimination where the purchase of animals imported from Canada is concerned. There is absolutely no truth in that. What has been the practice in dealing with these animals from Canada? If you wanted a cow, you put down your name at the Central Livestock Station. You may want two of the next batch which comes in and another person will also wish two. He will say "I want two." The hon. senior member for Christ Church can tell you that certain people who are closely connected with him have had the first choice of the cows, their names having been put down first, but there were other people who have had the first selection and who chose the best, in their opinion, the time before. Because they did not get first selection now, they decided that they did not want any now, because Mr. Williams or Mr. Bradshaw had the first selection since his name had been down first. You cannot eat your cake and have it too. If you went and put down your name first, then you got the first choice. I was not in the Ministry at that time, but the hon. junior member for St. Michael was in the Ministry then and he can tell you that this is the pattern - first come, first served. Those were his instructions when the question of selection was raised in the Ministry. We have to file these things. If Mr. "X" had his name down first, then he had the first choice. You must know that people who know about cows and who had a selection before you, will make the best

selection. All of these animals from Canada are pure-bred animals. We brought in pure-bred Guernseys and Holsteins. It was not a question of an animal being six-sevenths Holstein or seven-eighths Guernsey. All the animals were pure-bred animals and some of the best animals which people criticized and said that they did not want, turned out to be the best animals in production. A dairy farmer who had discussions with me, who said that the Canadian animals were not any good and who criticized the Officer who went up to Canada to make the selection, had the joy and pleasure of waking up the same Officer in charge of the Station and telling him that the heifers which he had gave 59 pints of milk at the first calf. That is the highest average which we have ever had in milk production. We have had other Canadian cows giving 50 pints. We have had a few which gave less than 40 pints at the first lactation period. We have had animals from Puerto Rico which calved and gave 18 pints of milk in one day and some of them had to be sent to the market. We have about two failures on the importation from Canada - one of them calved before the time and the other which had an unfortunate incident and did not live up to expectation; but most of them had given more than 40 pints a day and some more than 50 pints. We have been using all the skill we have in the importation of these animals. We know that they will take some time to acclimatize. We have been bringing animals heavy in calf; the calves are born in Barbados and they will be doing well when they come to the time for production.

The hon. member asked how many heads of cattle we will bring in from Canada with this \$250,000. If the hon. member was that interested in what I was saying, he would remember that I specifically said that we have to bring in 240 cows over a three year period - 80 in 1967, 80 in 1968 and 80 in 1969. 4. 50. p.m.

He speaks of a ten-year period and that we must bring cows in from any place but Canada. That is a joke. We can buy cows from any other place, but we cannot use the Canadian money for doing so. Canada is the best place now from which you can buy cows. Puerto Rico, Jamaica, the United States of America and other places are now buying cows from Canada.

Where else can we get cows now but from Canada? It is well known that the best breed of Holstein you can get is from Canada. We have brought in here animals from Puerto Rico. A few have done well, but the others have failed. The position is that when you bring them in from Puerto Rico you do not have any guarantee about their pedigree. You do not have any knowledge of what they are. When you bring them in from Canada, you know what they are.

To some, the sum of \$250,000 (Canadian) sounds like a lot of money; but when we buy from Canada, we are selecting the animals which would give you 120 pounds of milk. The position of the feed bill would be lower if you concentrate on quality rather than quantity.

The position is that cows in Barbados would give you 120 pounds of milk, but it takes you almost one hundred pounds of fodder to produce fifteen pounds of milk. You had better take the money and bring in quality. They have cows in Canada that produce 23,000 pounds of milk during a lactation period, but they are expensive.

The transportation cost of a Cow from Canada here is something like \$130, but you are bringing in quality. It is my opinion that you will be sure you will be getting cows giving you 120 pounds of milk. The breeders in Canada give you the blood strain and pedigree as well as a record of the production of the dame of those animals that we are bringing in. Therefore, \$130 may look high; but in the end, we would be able to get rid of some of the useless cows which we have and would be able to reduce the price of milk to the consumer.

The average we get from cows here is 30 pounds a day. If you bring down cows from Canada, the average of a cow there is 40 pounds a day. The average that you get from cows here is 30 pounds a day, but you also have some who give you an average of 20 pounds a day. If you can get an average of 40 pounds a day, then you will be in a position to reduce the cost of milk.

The hon. senior member for Christ Church has attacked the cost of milk to the consumer. We think if we bring down guaranteed stock to establish the dairy industry on a better footing and we brought in these pedigree animals, we are in a position to improve the dairy industry in this Island. Not only that, we would be able to pass on to the programme of improving the lot of peasants in St. Andrew, St. Joseph, St. Lucy and St. Peter. That is the sort of thing which we are doing.

I would assure hon. members that when this is done, hon. members on the other side will only have to wait until the cows come to Barbados.

Now, Sir, an hon. member talked of the future and the price of the cows. I would like to advise the hon. junior member for Christ Church that there has been actually no discrimination. We saw what the overall cost would be, and added the cost of transportation and the cost of guarantee, and I said that cows which were bigger were \$700 for A, and \$500 for B. We paid one price for transporting big Judas and small Judas.

Already we have bought animals from abroad, and we allow farmers to keep them for six months so that they can get a calf which we sell to them for \$120 or \$125. We hire them out to the farmer so that he can keep them for two or three weeks until they get a calf. You must remember that these animals to the peasant farmer are subsidised. If he had to pay for one from Canadian stock, he could not buy one for \$125.

5.00 p.m.

The hon. member spoke about recommendations made to get cows from other sources than Canada. This is not true. The position is that these people who come to you when they have advised the Government are not qualified - the people that the hon. member referred to are not qualified to tell the Government where to get animals from. They are no animal husbandry men as such: the fact that somebody else had an opportunity to go up to Canada and select the cows in preference to somebody else does not give that person the qualification to advise on cows; the fact that one officer was chosen to go to Canada and select animals, brought on him the wrath of another officer and the officer went to the extent of writing letters in the press criticising the purchase of Canadian animals.

Now the hon. member asked what guarantee we have that this purchase of cows - \$250,000 - would improve the position of the Milk Plant. I think that the hon. member was a bit off-beat there. I will tell you that the hon. member is getting mixed up between the fresh milk dairy industry and the other dairy industry, and he spoke of the nine faults and that sort of thing, and the hon. member said that \$250,000 in cows could not improve the nine faults of the Milk Plant, and that we did not tell him what is happening with the Plant and he did not see why we should be bringing in cows. This is what I understood him to have said. The position is this. The faults of the Milk Plant had absolutely nothing to do with the fresh milk. The faults which the Milk Plant had were in relation to evaporated milk, not even the sweetened condensed milk. The super-pasteurized milk is good. There have been all sorts of tests carried out at the Ministry of Agriculture, and the milk is of high quality; it is some of the best milk you can get and it is not fair to criticise it.

The Milk Plant had its faults; its faults have been in the manufacturing of evaporated milk. As I have pointed out to this Chamber, the Milk Plant has stopped the manufacture of evaporated milk and is now carrying out investigations in the source of bad milk. The experts are here. When this is done, we hope that the Milk Plant is in a position again to produce proper milk.

I hope that this satisfies the hon. member. There are a few points that I would like to answer. The hon. member for Christ Church spoke well. What he said made sense; he did not attempt to criticise when he did not know what he was talking about, but what he said gave a lot of food for thought. The hon. member spoke about the price of evaporated milk, 14 oz. tins at 29¢ a tin. I would like to remind the hon. member that before the price control was put on evaporated milk, milk was used in this country as a means to sell other commodities and because of this the price was dropped in the supermarkets. If a supermarket is using corned beef as a leader, the price of corned beef will drop in order to get people to go into the supermarket and buy corned beef, but there are other commodities

high in the air. Milk was used as a leader, just as the sugar which we subsidised - some of the merchants in Roebuck Street are using this as a leader to sell other things. Some of the smaller merchants will tell the people that when they buy brown crystal sugar, they have to buy rice or something else.

Some of the milk we have been getting in this country is milk which was a surplus on the world market, and it was more or less dumped in Barbados; as a matter of fact, a few years ago when hon. members remember that milk was brought into this country at something like \$9.00 per case, certain of the milk dealers left and went out. When they came back, the price of milk went up by \$2.00 a case: the invoice was changed. Although the world market price of milk did not go up, the price of milk in Barbados had gone up, after certain people from Barbados returned to this country.

(SIDE) You are getting into trouble.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I am not afraid of trouble. Now, the position is that I have had to make certain statements when I was Minister of Trade on this, and this invoked the wrath of certain merchants of this country. I repeat it here now. This is what happened. Around 1963 - look at the invoices - after the return of certain people to this country, the price of milk went up; the dairy plant set the price of condensed milk and evaporated milk at the price which the Commission Agents said they paid for it; but the position is that the Milk Plant at the time was manufacturing or was attempting to manufacture some of the best milk they could manufacture in this country. We have given a scheduled price for the best manufactured milk at 29¢ for a 14 oz. tin; this is the price at which the milk is being sold; this is the price at which the milk was sold prior to production by the Milk Plant in the shops, in country district - not necessarily by the supermarkets in Bridgetown because, as I said before, this milk was used as a leader. So I think that the hon. senior member for Christ Church can rest assured that it is not the intention of the Government to keep the price of milk high.

5.10 p.m.

I want the hon. member to appreciate this other point. The cost of production decreases when the quality of production increases. Therefore, when we take into consideration "Carnation" or any of the big firms of milk plant which produce a large amount of milk, we cannot compete with a production of a small amount of milk with the plant which is producing a large amount of milk. The greater the production, the lower is the cost of production. Because our Milk Plant has a lower production, we are expected to pay more for it; but we are saving money in the country and we are providing work for Barbadians, and if we have to pay a little more for that, what is wrong with that? We are not subsidising cheap labour in another country; we are subsidising labour in Barbados. Would you prefer to have a lot of starving people going around committing crime or to employ more people and keep down the incidence

of crime? We are providing work for Barbadians. Over 400 people are employed in the dairy industry when we take the animals plus the Milk Plant. What is wrong with a Barbadian paying one cent for his milk, provided that you are keeping the money in the country?

The hon. member spoke about the price of pasteurised milk and said that it is too high. I agree with the hon. member; but when we consider and compare the price of milk with the price of coke, the price of coke is higher than the price of milk. You pay 22¢ for a pint of milk and 12¢ for a coke. (Mr. HINDS: You do not vomit when you drink coke). I have not heard anybody vomiting when he drinks pasteurised milk. I appeal to hon. members not to pull down the Milk Plant; it has been producing an inferior quality of milk last month, but that is not so now. Let us help the Plant and not pull it down. For the good of the country, we ought to give the Plant a helping hand. I agree with the hon. senior member for Christ Church that something should be done about this matter. I am one of those who feel that every morning that a housewife uses pasteurised milk in bottles, she should not be throwing away money. In places that look much more insanitary than any part of Barbados, I have seen milk sold in bottles. I do not see any reason why milk cannot be sold in bottles, and if we bring the price of milk down to 20¢, we would pay more for pasteurised milk. I agree that that is one of the shortcomings of the Plant. The hon. member said that he would not associate himself with the distribution of milk in bottles; I am sure that we can take this Plant and run it to the satisfaction of the people of this country. It will make money, Barbadians will support it, and all the interests will not go outside. (Mr. HINDS: The Marketing Corporation.) Do not let the hon. member worry with that Marketing Corporation. You will have time enough to deal with that. The hon. member can rest assured that the Marketing Corporation will be as admirable in the near future as any other firm in Barbados. Mr. Speaker, I think I have answered most of the questions raised by hon. members, but there is one question to which I would like to reply finally, and it is the question which the hon. senior member for Christ Church raised about the assistance given to the small man in the production and marketing of his milk. A few weeks ago I mentioned that there is Doctor Hayde who is an expert in milk production, milk distribution etc., and we brought him down here to assist us in solving this problem. He is a man of the United Nations Foundations and we are now awaiting a report from him. The specific duty here was to advise the Government on how best a man with one or two cows could get his milk marketed, how a man in St. Joseph under Horse Hill and a man in Pie Corner, St. Lucy, could get his six or eight pints of milk per day marketed. This gentleman has been working on this question for the past six or eight months, and we hope that in another two or three weeks, we will be able to receive his report. I hope then to be in a position to tell the hon. senior member for Christ Church what is being done to assist this type of person in getting off the milk which he gets from one or two cows.

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

5.20. pm.

On motion of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

Clauses 1, 2, 3 and 4 were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

On motion of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

**RESOLUTION re CHANGE OF NOTE UNDER
ITEM 129 OF HEAD 46, QUEEN
ELIZABETH HOSPITAL**

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr Speaker, the next item is the Resolution to approve an amendment to the note to item No. 129, Laundry equipment in the Approved Estimates of 1967-68.

I beg to move that this Resolution be 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.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The Addendum sets out briefly what is the position.

Under Item 129 of Head 46, Queen Elizabeth Hospital of the 1967-68 Estimates there is a provision of \$13,100 of which \$3,000 has been allocated for the purchase of one large tumbler or dryer. It is proposed to purchase two smaller dryers of the combined capacity of the larger type at a total cost of \$3,920. Savings under the item can take care of the extra expenditure. It is therefore proposed to amend the note to the item by substituting the words "2 tumblers or dryers" for "1 large tumbler or dryer."

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.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker this concludes Government Business.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next 29th August, 1967, at 2.30 p.m.

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.
5.30 p.m.

