THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 23rd January, 1968

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.00 (noon) o'clock today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., F.Z.S., *(Speaker);* Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS; Mr. E. ST.A. HOLDER, J.P.; Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., *(Leader of the House);* Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, *(Minister of Trade, Tourism, Co-operatives and Fisheries);* Mr. ST.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. B. LOWE; Mr. L. A. LYNCH, J.P.; Hon. N. W. BOXILL, *(Minister of Communications and Works);* Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD, *(Chairman of Committees);* Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; His Honour G. E. SARGEANT, *(Deputy Speaker);* Mr. C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P.; and Mr. H. B. ST. JOHN, LL.B

Prayers were read.

Mr. L. S. CRAIG and Sir G. H. ADAMS entered the House and took their seats. (Cheers)

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that there are no Minutes yet ready for confirmation.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Minister of External Affairs, I am commanded to lay the following:

The Customs Duties (Joint Research Centre of the University of the West Indies and Sussex) Order 1968.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Minister of External Affairs, I beg to give notice of the following:

Resolution to place the sum of $22,659 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1967-68 Part I Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1967-68 No 43 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next Meeting to deal with this Resolution of which notice has just been given.

REPLY TO QUESTIONS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On behalf of the Hon. Minister of Health, Housing and Community Development, I beg to give notice that the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 78, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, is now ready.

I have also been informed that there are twelve questions standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. James whose replies were already laid and would be dealt with during Question Time.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Joseph. His Resolution re workers and National Insurance Scheme.

Mr. SMITH: WHEREAS workers of all categories over the age of 65 years are excluded from the benefits of the National Insurance Scheme;

AND WHEREAS these workers above referred to have helped to contribute towards the wealth of this country - sometimes for over fifty years - and still have to support their families;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House request the Government to enquire into the plight of these workers either (a) by introducing legislation to extend the limit for which contribution to the National Insurance Scheme can be collected from the age of 65 years to 70 years, thus bringing the said workers within the ambit of the said Scheme; or (b) providing such other ways and means as to the Government may seem fit to relieve their distress.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. James. His Resolution re prices of essential commodities.

Mr. CRAIG: BE IT RESOLVED that this House request the Government to enquire into the prices - both wholesale and retail - of essential commodities being offered to the general public, with special reference to the price controls recently imposed.

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member. His Resolution re purchase of incinerator.

Mr. CRAIG: WHEREAS the present system of garbage disposal in this Island leaves much to be desired;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House request Government to purchase an incinerator and place same at some central point so as to dispose of the refuse collected from the more densely populated areas of the Island.

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member. To give notice of a Resolution in connection with minimum wages.

Mr. CRAIG: BE IT RESOLVED that this House request the Government to set up an enquiry into the minimum wages of the Clerks and Clerkesses employed in stores and by industries in this Island, and in particular those employed in the garment industry.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. James. His question re the Hilton Hotel.

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

Will the Minister state the final cost of the construction of the Hilton Hotel?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member. His question re dissatisfaction among the dispensary staff at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

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

Is the Minister aware that there is growing dissatisfaction among the staff at the dispensary at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital as to (a) their conditions of employment; (b) their salaries; and (c) the shortage of dispensing staff?

2. Will the Minister investigate these circumstances and take such steps as are necessary to alleviate their grievances?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member. His query re compounding of prescriptions.

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

1. Is the Minister aware that members of the general public have to wait for long hours - sometimes more than a day - before prescriptions can be compounded for them at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital?

2. Will the Minister agree that the circumstance above referred to is due to the shortage of dispensing staff?

3. Will the Minister look into this matter and have this state of affairs remedied as soon as possible?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member. His query re the Holetown Bridge.

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

Is the Minister aware that there is widespread dissatisfaction among the people who reside near the Bridge at Holetown, St. James, because of the constant flooding of their homes after a heavy rainfall?

2. Will the Minister cause tunnels to be constructed so as to control the rain waters which proceed from the inland districts of St. James and other parishes by way of Trents, St. James, and so put an end to this great inconvenience and hazard to which these residents are now subjected?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member. His question re work permits.

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

Is the Minister aware that visitors to the Island are being employed at hotels at which there are guests without possessing the necessary work permits?

2. Will the Minister see that an end is put to this practice?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. George. His question re Nurses and patients at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

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

1. Is the Minister aware of the inconvenience and difficulty caused to recuperating patients and to Nurses at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital - especially when the said nurses are receiving telephone calls in connection with their duties - due to the noise of vehicular traffic on the highways adjacent to this institution?

2. Will the Minister take steps to have the portion of the highway known as Martindale's Road from the entrance of St. Michael's Girls School to the junction of River Road and Wellington Street declared a Silent Zone?

12.25 p.m.

RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY re DEATH OF OF THE HON. DAVID CLEMENT TAVARES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the passing of the following Resolution:-

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House place on record its profound sympathy at the death of the Hon. David Clement Tavares, member of the House of Representatives, Minister of Housing in the Government of Jamaica;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to the Government of Jamaica and to his family."

Mr. Speaker, since last we met a week ago, the news was received in this Island that the Hon. Mr. Tavares, Minister of the Government of Jamaica had died in the University Hospital after a long illness. Mr. Tavares was a relatively young man at the time of his death. He was, I believe, in his forty-fourth year, but he had been ill for several months, having suffered a quite severe heart attack in the early months of last year soon after the General Elections. This is the third tragedy which the Government and people of Jamaica have suffered in the past year. They had scarcely got over their bitter grief over the very tragic and sudden death of their Prime Miniser, Sir Donald Sangster, who was very well known and revered in these parts, when a few months after that the Hon. Mr. Wakeland, another Minister died, and all the while Mr. Tavares was grievously ill in hospital. It had seemed, so I understand, that he would have rallied, and every care that could be lavished upon him medically and otherwise was given; but he succombed to his illness last week, and so in his death provided the third such tragedy of the Government and people of Jamaica.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said before, on these melancholy occasions, the death of anyone is first and foremost a private sorrow, and despite the fact that a man or a person may have at the time of his death been in public life and thus enjoying the limelight, nevertheless it remains true that when he dies it is his immediate family circle who are the first and keenest losers, and therefore our sympathy must go out to his relatives, because it is their loss more than anyone else's and secondly to the Government and people of Jamaica of whom he was so outstanding an ornament.

He was born on 30th October, 1924, and was educated at Jamaica College. He was admitted to practise as a solicitor in 1950; he was a member of the Jamaica Labour Party almost from his teens, and at the time of his death, from 1953 onwards, he was of course the General Secretary of that Party, and a member of the House of Representatives for South-West St. Andrew from 1959.

In a life which was so short, he nevertheless won the acclaim and support of large numbers of the citizens of Jamaica, and played his part not only in Local Government, but in the Central Government. It is a great grief, Mr. Speaker, that public life sometimes takes so heavy a toll on those who are engaged in it, but I suppose in the last resort we have to regard this as one of the hazards of public life. But I am sure that the House, though many of its members may not have known the Hon. Mr. Tavares personally, would still like, nevertheless, to extend its sympathy to the bereaved family, and also to the Government and people of Jamaica.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

SIR GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I do not really remember ever having met Mr. Tavares, although I may have met him at a reception or something like that when we have had conferences in Jamaica; but I certainly have heard quite a lot from his political friends and political enemies of his ability, his character and the esteem in which he was held by all Parties in Jamaica.

If one were to carry hard things after death, he could easily have been attacked, just as any other member of Sir Alexander Bustamante's Party might be attacked, for not being over-keen about the Eastern Caribbean, but on the other hand nobody has ever suggested of Mr. Tavares that he was not entirely sincere in his views, and he was undoubtedly a very good man, a very clever man and a good Parliamentarian. He was not just a hanger-on; he was not just another man who reflected the eminence and the glory of Sir Alexander Bustamante. In his own right people felt that he was worthy even to have taken Sir Alexander's place as Prime Minister of Jamaica, and therefore I have great pleasure in having this opportunity of paying tribute, on behalf of the members of this side of the House, to a great figure who adorned the political life of Jamaica.

I beg to second the motion moved by the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: I beg to associate myself with the tributes paid to the deceased Jamaica Minister and to endorse the statements and tributes paid by them. I will invite hon. members, following long established precedent in this Chamber, to rise with me for two minutes to indicate our concurrence in the passage of this Resolution.

(Members stood in their places for two minutes.)

I declare this Resolution to be unanimously passed, and I direct the Clerk at the Table to ensure that a copy of it be immediately forwarded to the nearest relative of the former Minister, and to His Excellency the Governor-General of Jamaica.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House, and it is to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Island.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

12.35 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1967 -68 No. 36

Head 23 - Ministry of Home Affairs - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, this amount is required to supplement Head 23 of the Current Estimates, Item 33 - Printing of Laws. Hon. members will recall that in the Current Estimates the sum of $1.00 was approved by the House as a token vote because it was not then ascertained what the cost, or even the partial cost, of this exercise would be. They will also remember, of course, that this arises out of a decision taken since 1960 that the contract for the printing and binding of the Laws of Barbados should be awarded to Messrs. Eyre & Spottiswoode Limited of England. They will also recall, of course, that there has been an exercise in law revision going on for the past year, and that the Law Revisioners have now completed a considerable portion of their work and are ready for the Printers.

There are no funds available for this expenditure other than the token supply of $1.00. Therefore it is now required of the House to approve expenditure in the sum of $34,340 which represents one-third of the total cost of a complete set of six volumes I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I do not say, for obvious reasons, that it should not be passed, but I just want to make one comment. It was agreed in 1960, when the present Government was not yet in power, and, if for no other reason, I would be somewhat hesitant to criticise this decision. But the circumstances in 1960 are no long the same circumstances in Barbados today. I would like to suggest to the Government that everybody in this House, I believe, would agree to spend more money in making the Government Printery absolutely up to date. It is preposterous to think that we have to wait months to get a copy of the *Official Gazette*. As everybody knows, and everybody should know at any rate, you buy a copy of the Hansard in London the morning after the debate. Nobody should object to the public, and even more so members of the House themselves, having to pay something even substantial for a copy of the *Official Gazette* a few days after a debate has taken place.

Therefore I suggest that for the future as much as possible should be done to build the Government Printery up to the stage when it can be deemed to be as efficient as any Government Printery anywhere else. In the old days the *Advocate* printed the Laws of Barbados. I should not be surprised to find that the laws here on my right have been printed by the *Advocate* Company. If we felt that the *Advocate* was good enough to print the laws of Barbados, I think that today the Government Printery should do all official work instead of getting somebody from outside to do it. As I said, nobody would object to voting this sum of money, but I do hope that the Government will bear in mind that it is not likely to get any opposition from this side of the House if it spent more money on the Government Printery.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the expressions of the last speaker, but I am going to remind the Government in this case of its pledge to members of the Legislature - on that occasion the pledge was given by the Hon. Prime Minister who is not now in his place - that every individual member of the Legislature should receive a free copy of each volume of these laws. That is following a usual, established precedent, and I hope, on this occasion, it will be maintained.

Just briefly referring to the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition, if for no other reason that in Barbados we know that as far as unemployment is concerned we need to have our unemployment force constantly being reduced, I think the Printing Committee in consultation with the Government Printer can do a lot to increase the proficiency of the Government Printery. I know that, as far as printing of Hansard is concerned, suggestions have been made at one time to the former Printer for expediting the printing matter of this Chamber, but the then Government Printer did not comply with the suggestions being offered by the then Speaker and the Printing Committee.

I hope that that attitude on the part of the present Government Printer does not exist at the moment, because a lot more can be done here. Mechanical machines can be brought in this place and used for speeding-up the printing of debates, but this has been resisted in the past. I hope that that sort of attitude on the part of the former Government Printer is not adopted by the present Government Printer.

I heartily agree with the Leader of the Opposition that all members of this Opposition would go all out to assist Government in doing all that is possible to get the *Official Gazette* and, consequently, Hansard to the public and to Members of this House as early as possible. So far, we know of the long waits; we know how often the Debates Committee has been embarrassed, as well as Mr. Speaker, and I need not dwell on this matter very much longer.

Again, the Hon. Prime Minister is not in his place, but the Leader of the House is in his place and I want to remind him that members of the House will be anxiously waiting to receive their own individual copies of the laws of Barbados from the January to Easter publications.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I should just like to reply to two points: one raised by each hon.

member. Certainly the undertaking given by the Prime Minister that when the revised laws have been printed hon. members will each have own bound copy - that undertaking still stands. I would like to give the hon. member that assurance.

With respect to the other matter raised by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, there are two points I would like to make. The decision to award this contract to an English firm was, as I think he knows, made to honour the undertaking which the previous Government had started. Political parties may disagree with one another, but the Government of Barbados never dies. Normally, when a succeeding Government finds that a matter has been set in train of such importance by its predecessor, it normally, unless there are grave and sufficient reasons for doing otherwise, honours all undertakings given by the previous Government.

There were, of course, and still are in our opinion, some technical reasons why the Government Printery could not be asked to undertake this work. Certainly the Government needs no reminder that, when the Government Printery is technically and administratively capable of doing this or any other bit of Government printing we should have it done here, not only because it is a matter of pride to have the best work done in Barbados, but we wish to employ our own people.

12.45 p.m.

So, none of the points raised has been lost sight of by this side of the House; but for reasons which the hon. member appreciates, we have taken this step.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1967-68 No.38

A Resolution for the sum of $80,838 was called.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, the Resolution before the Committee is for the provision of supplementary funds under Head 102 - Communications and Works - of the Capital Estimates in respect of the following Items:- Item 3 - Equipment; Item 21A (New) - Repairs to Pierhead; Item 21B (New) Telecommunications Equipment; Item 21C (New) - Government Printing Office, and Town and Country Planning Department. This is in order to permit the Ministry to satisfy a number of claims which were outstanding at the end of the 1966-67 financial year. Hon. members on the other side might want to know why this has come in so late, but the reason is that sometimes when we order equipment it does not arrive in time, and the financial year lapses before we can get the money to pay the people. As a result of that, we have to come here and ask for permission to get this money. Under Item 3 - Equipment - in respect of Highways and Transport, the amount required is $80,016.82, and the total amount of $80,838 is made up as follows:-

Head 102 (2) Public Works, Item 21A, Repairs to Pierhead, $158. Head 102 (2) Public Works, Item 21B, Telecommunications Equipment, $98. Head 102 (2) Public Works, Item 21C, Government Printing Office and Town and Country Planning Department, $564.45. I am giving a dissertation of how the money is planned to be used, and I hope hon. members on the other side will pay attention to me when I am speaking. I have already said that the reasons for this is because some of the equipment came late in the financial year and it lapsed; therefore I am giving a full resume of what took place. An amount of $180,000 was provided in the 1966-67 Estimates under Head 102, Communications and Works (1) Highways and Transport and Item 3, Equipment, for the purchase of equipment for the Department of Highways and Transport. Payment was made for some of the items which were received by the Department, but a number of bills were submitted too late for payment during the financial year 1966-67. No provision was made in the 1967-68 Estimates for the settlement of these outstanding amounts which are as follows:- Asphalt Paving Machine, freight $1,055.10; Marine Insurance, $67.76; Commission to Crown Agents at 2 1/2% of $23,088 which worked out at $577.20, making a total of $2,200.06. One low loader $67,016.76; Filler feed for Asphalt Plant, $10,800, making a total of $80,016.82.

The expenditure under Head 102, Highways and Transport, Item 3, amounted to $111,267.96 at the end of the 1966-67 financial year, leaving an unspent balance of $68,732.04. Revote of the unexpended amount of $68,732.04 would, however, be inadequate to settle the outstanding commitments amounting to $80,016.82 and, consequently, a supplementary provision of $11,284.78 also is sought. The expenses incurred in the purchase of the low loader through the Crown Agents exceeded the amount of $55,000 which was included in the provision of $180,000 under Head 102 Item 3, by $12,016.76, arrived at as follows:-

Purchase price and inland freight, $60,022.20, the Crown Agents' procurement charge, $972.84, making a total of $67,016.76. Provision in the Estimates was $55,000. Over expenditure was $12,016.76. Similarly, the expenses incurred in the purchase of the Asphalt Paving Machine through the Crown Agents exceeded the amount of $25,000 which was included in the provision of $180,000 under Head 102, Item 3 as follows:- purchase price, $23,088; freight, $1,555.10; Marine Insurance, $670.76; Commission to Crown Agents, as I said before, at 2 1/2% was $557.20, making a total of $25,288.06. Provision in the Estimates was $25,000, over-expenditure $298.06. The difference in the over-commitment of $12,016.76 was $288.06 and the supplementary provision of $11,284.78 was offset by savings on Items for which payment has already been made. The unexpended balance of $68,732.04 in the 1966-67 Estimates under Head 102, Communications and Works, Item 3, Equipment - a part of this is really a revote. This is not really asking for this amount; this is only a supplementary. Under Head 102, Item 21C, Government Printing Office and Town and Country Planning Department, an amount of $3,789 was provided by supplementary Resolution No. 70-1966 under Head 102. I do not intend to bore hon. members on the other

side, but if they want me to continue, I will do so; otherwise, I will just ask that this Resolution be passed. However, it is my duty to let hon. members know how their money is spent, because they will want to ask some questions. When I say their money, it is ours too; so do not let them think that it is theirs alone. It is my duty to let them know how the taxpayers' money is being spent. If hon. members want me to continue, I will do so. *(After a pause)*. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, just this expression, Item 21C which is supposed to be a new item - Government Printing Office and Town and Country Planning Department. These are two separate Departments actually - the Government Printing Office and the Town and Country Planning Department - and they have been put together, under one amount.
12.55 p.m.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: The reason for this is twofold. Formerly the Town and Country Planning Office along with the Government Printery came under the Ministry of Communications and Works, but it was transferred about two years ago to the Ministry of Home Affairs. But the reason for this too is that no matter what Ministry you might have, my Ministry is responsible for the construction and works.

I did not go on to explain further because I did not really want to bore the House, but I can tell you that this was a Public Works item. We were renovating the place and tiling the floor as well as extending it. As you will remember, they pulled down the wall in front, and the Electric Company put up a transformer there, and so on. These renovations took place at the Town and Country Planning Office.

No matter that it was not my Ministry, it was still my Department which had to do the work.

That is the reason why we are asking for this money. When you go to vote money in the Estimates, you will notice that under this Item, Head 102, Item 21(C) you still have to come to my Department for construction. That comes under Public Works. Therefore, I am responsible for the money, though we might ask another Ministry to put up the money. You will notice here that the Ministry of Communications and Works have to look after that responsibility.

Mr. HUSBANDS: That may be for two different Departments. Admittedly, he has inferred that some renovations has been done for the Town and Country Planning Department. But what was done for the Government Printing Office?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: The reply to that is this. This Government Printing Office was extended extensively. If you will notice when you go to the back of the Government Printing Office where Dr. Bayley's Hospital is, that building comes right back out to the road. When the Printing Office first started, it was built farther in, but as soon as the volume of work grew, we had to extend the building; so it has been extended. The wall to the back of that place, going to Dr. Bayley's Hospital, has been extended. It cost some money, too.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister of Communications gave us a breakdown of this amount. He also told us that he did not want to bore us by going any further. As long as he is telling me something worthwhile and sensible, he would not be able to bore me; I would listen to him until the break of day. He would only succeed in boring me if what he is telling me is more confusing than anything else.

Believe me, Sir, this Addendum and his explanation are two different things. The Addendum reads:

"Supplementary provision of $80,838 is required to permit the settlement of a number of outstanding bills which were unpaid by the Works Department at the end of the financial year 1966-67. The bills were submitted too late for payment to be made during the financial year 1966-67."

This Addendum is telling us about the supplementary provisions. The Hon. Minister said that it is a revote; it is not a supplementary.

Well, I do not know which of these to believe because one is saying one thing, and the other is saying another thing. Which is right? Well, I leave it to myself to find out which is right. In my opinion, both are wrong. Imagine, a piece of equipment arrived late or the bill was delayed. It costs more than they anticipated. A particular item was said to cost something like $125,000. If I am wrong, I hope he will correct me. That is why I am saying that both are wrong. I cannot understand it. Who is the person that has made out this? Who gave the quotations and things of that sort? You have been told that one item has cost something in the vicinity of $125,000. If I were to tell this to my child at home, he is not going to believe me. Do not tell me this.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I do not know where the hon. member got that from. I never said that. It is not here and I can only say what I read. What I said is one item which was the Asphalt Paving Machine cost $25,000. I heard the hon. member talking about something costing $125,000. The Asphalt Machine was estimated to cost $25,000 and I pointed out that it cost $288.06 more. That is what I said.

I do not know how the hon. member on the other side got it that I said that something cost $125,000. He got mixed up somewhere along the road. I never said that. He would perhaps notice that the largest purchase here is for the Low Loader which was estimated to cost - you must remember that we are not buying these things here in Barbados - sometimes you go into Town and see the price of a thing at a certain price at a store, and when you go back the next day, you see that the price is raised. The estimated cost was $55,000, but I told you that the pur-

chase price and inland freight rate was $67,022.20, but I did not say anything about $125,000. I think the hon. member has made a mistake.

Mr. SMITH: I am sure the Minister mentioned something about $125,000 more and he mentioned the Crown Agents did something. I am not going to contradict him. I am not going to argue with him. But tell me any businessman that is going to place an order for machinery or equipment who is going to wait until it arrives in the Island to be told that it costs X dollars more before leaving the country of origin.

Now, Sir, when you are ordering goods, the first thing is this. If you have a representative - if the Crown Agents are your representatives and in my opinion either the Crown Agents are taking this Government for a ride - I believe so and you cannot take it out of me - or the Government is taking the Crown Agents for a ride. It is one of the two things. But if you are ordering goods through an agent, you are being given or you can call for your *pro forma* invoice.
1.05 p.m.

Are you going to tell me that you allow the Crown Agents to quote a price after the item has arrived in the country? That is why I say that this Resolution is confusing, and if I am confused, you have to bear with me. As I said in my opening remarks, the Minister said one thing and the Addendum says another. You must be businesslike. I would not like to blame the Minister for this, but if he is responsible, then he would have to take the blame. If you cannot entrust the Crown Agents here in Barbados to do your business and order your goods, call on them to supply you with a pro forma invoice. If you are going to order an Asphalt Paving Machine, you should ask the Crown Agents to send you a *pro forma* invoice as soon as possible. A *pro forma* invoice is given before an order is entered upon so that you know what the price is going to be, and you would be in a position to know if you have enough money to pay for the item or whether you have to borrow money from the Bank to pay for it. If you request a *pro forma*. invoice, the item is not going to be made until the invoice has been signed and sent back to them. If the Government does not do it this way, then the Crown Agents can take them for a ride, and we have to be more than particular with the taxpayers' money today, because I understand that very little is available, although the Government can find whatever they want whenever they want it by turning on the heat on the taxpayers. You should not send up wild orders, because, as far as I can see, all is not well with the prices. You should not order goods before you budget for them and wait until they come to ask us for money to pay for them.

Mr. Chairman, the Department of Highways and Transport knows ahead of time what they want, because equipment like this which cost so much money is not like a case of milk from the Pine Hill Dairy which is stink when it comes to you. This is big machinery, and you cannot order it and then come to us for the money. The breakdown which the Minister gave does not satisfy me. The Minister has given a breakdown from the figures he has in front of him. I am not going to accuse him of what I am going to say now because he is too decent a chap for that; but on the floor of this House years ago a particular member got up in here and read something, and nothing of what he was reading was on the paper. The Minister cannot blame me if I am doubtful even now. (A VOICE: Who was that member?) I will tell you privately. What the Minister has read should be before us. You are asking me to give you the green light to spend money because you have overspent, misreckoned or did not know how to budget, but I am still not convinced at the way this is being done. The Minister should make his Secretaries do their job and have these things in front of him, because I understand that there are certain documents which the Ministers only see on the same morning. You must question these things before they come here, because what I am demanding now you would have been able to give; I believe you have more brains than I do. This matter has not been approached in a businesslike manner. How many businessmen in Bridgetown would be able to exist if they had to order goods under these conditions? How would they be able to quote customers certain prices if after the goods arrive the Crown Agents tell them they expected an item would have cost $10.00 but now it costs $30? There is only one way to run a business, whether it be Government or private, and that is the right way. It is only because you have a majority and can come here for this money that you are not paying the interest you should pay to these matters; so I must say for the second time that I have my doubts about these Crown Agents.

Mr. Chairman, you cannot ignore your Crown Agents down here. There are honest Barbadians who have to pay taxes, and even if the local agents increase their rates, you can get some money back by way of taxation; but when the overseas Crown Agents increase their rates, you are not going to get anything back from them. We are independent of them and yet we have to hold on to their coat tails. If I were they, I would draw every tooth out of the Government financially, because you do not want them in one way, and yet cannot do without them in another way. If you are independent, you should be independent of the Crown Agents, and, if possible, buy locally.
1.15 p.m.

So far as placing an order is concerned, I do not even know the name of this machine. The foundries here have contacts with their manufacturers up there. You can place orders here with them, and they can get the goods down. You will know before the goods leave England, or the place of origin, what they are going to cost you and you can budget for them. You will know the insurance, the cost of freight and so on, before the manufacturers put the order into operation. Do not come back here asking us to give you the green light for Resolutions of this sort asking us to vote money. Ask the people who are responsible for doing this not to do it any more. Let them get a *pro forma* invoice on everything that is to be ordered from your Department. You must remember that

you have to stand up here and give us an explanation for these things. In other words, you have to take the blows. Whoever is responsible will not be able to shield the blows from you.

Let me remind you that you are the person responsible for the Department. You must get out of the wheel chair and look around and see that everything is going right, as far as your Department is concerned. It is a very important Department. Your Portfolio is a very important one. That is why I am a little "Shadow Minister" for it. When you allow me to be criticising you all the time, you know what the others will say. Get your *pro forma* invoices and let us know these things. These are thousands of dollars. I can understand even $5,000 over; but when you are going up to $120,000 more, that is a different matter. The only thousands I know of are the things you get in Mellowes River - a lot of small things in the water that you cannot count; but when you come here to me about money and mention all of these thousands, you are confusing me. Do not let it happen any more. Of course, the taxpayers will have to pay this money.

I am not ashamed; I have to eat certain things. I used to pay 50¢ for a loaf of bread, but, last Thursday morning when I went to get a loaf, I was told that I would have to pay 10¢ more for it - I had to pay 60¢ for it - 20% more on my bread. When you add up all of the percentages that are being put on things through the devaluation of the £, what is going to happen to those bread-winners who are working for $20.00 or $25.00 a week with four or five children to support? Those are the people with whom we are concerned. You must tax these things, but you must spend the money wisely. In this case you are not spending the money wisely.

This is not the way things should be explained to us in the Addendum. The Government should know the cost of these pieces of equipment before they are landed here. You are taking things too easy with the Crown Agents. Suppose, after the machinery is landed here, the Crown Agents write and tell you that it will cost you ten times more? The machinery will be here in the Island; it will be your property, and you will have to pay for it. I am not going to agree to anything like this again. Fix it right, and I will fix you right.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, there is a single point with which, I am sure, the Minister will be able to help me. He said that the Crown Agents' inspection fee is over $1,000. I take it that the equipment has been ordered through the Crown Agents. If it has been ordered through the Crown Agents, one would expect that they would be charging a commission on the overall business.

On the other hand, the Minister may be willing to explain if it is a case where an order had been placed with other exporters, and the Crown Agents had been asked to inspect the machine before it was shipped, or whatever happened in this particular case. What we are concerned with is that inasmuch as the Crown Agents had been entrusted with the business, then we cannot see how an inspection fee could be charged. In other words, one would never have expected the Crown Agents to dispatch to us any commodity without inspecting it and seeing that everything was in order. That is exactly what goes to make up their commission. I cannot understand this question of the Crown Agents' inspection fee. The figure quoted by the Minister is over $1,000. Perhaps the Minister may be willing to explain how this came about. Exactly what did they inspect?

As I said earlier, is it a case where they inspected a consignment of goods that they were sending to us, or is it a case that goods were ordered and the Crown Agents had been asked to inspect them? If it were a case where the goods were ordered elsewhere and the Crown Agents had been asked to inspect them, then, surely, that would have some reflection in the price submitted by the original or principal shipper. Why was an inspection fee of over $1,000 paid to the Crown Agents? It might be a case where the House is being told that there is a Crown Agents' fee when, in truth and in fact, if the Minister and the Officers of the Ministry had examined the claims from the Crown Agents, they might have found that the $1,000 could well have been saved. All of these things come up in the course of business. Even at this stage the Minister might be in a position to be able to draw the attention of the Crown Agents to the fact that we should not be called upon to pay this inspection fee. They should be asked to give an explanation, and the Minister is not obliged to accept or be satisfied with the explanation.

The Crown Agents are buyers, so to speak. In other words, they do not buy a pig in a bag. Although we know that many items are shipped out by the Crown Agents without any Crown Agent looking at them - we do not expect them to see all the items shipped out, but there must be some conceivable reason why we should be asked to pay a sum of over $1,000 as an inspection fee. The Crown Agents are responsible for shipping commodities to us, and they have been doing so for many years.
1.25 p.m.

As I say, Sir, these things may appear to be small when it comes to the question of a Resolution for the sum of $80,000, but if out of this $80,000 we find that it is possible to save $1,000, evidently we will have done something, because there are no two ways about it, a saving of $1,000, let us say, on each money Resolution which may come before this Hon. House is something. With the number of unemployed which we have here, these one thousand dollar savings can go a long way in relieving the situation as it is today, and I am sure that the Minister would be willing to explain to us this $1,000 fee for inspection by the Crown Agents.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, there are two questions which were posed. The hon. junior member for St. Peter asked about the Crown Agents' inspection fee. Yes, he was right. If we are buying buses, we ask the Crown Agents to get somebody to inspect the buses. We may discover that the springs were too close to the tyres.

I want to say that nobody is going to work for you for nothing, especially when you are a Government. Even if you are not a Government, nobody will do anything for you for nothing. The Crown Agents' are agents and they deal in everything. They buy and sell everything. If we want anything, we ask them to look after it for us. As to the money which the hon. member asked about, the $1,000 for the inspection fee for the Crown Agents, it may be that they had to journey quite far in order to inspect this equipment in order to make sure that it is in order before it comes here. If the equipment comes here and we use it and something goes wrong, then you get no end of trouble and you cannot prosecute people for it. We have to wait on them and make sure that the equipment stands up to the proper test before it is sent to us.

I do not remember if the hon. member raised any other point, but in reply to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, he should understand that the accusations he made against me and my Ministry were not correct. A Government cannot function like somebody who has a peddling shop; he runs out of cigarettes and sends next door to buy a few more. These things are placed in the Estimates, and we get the prices then; but the day after the Estimates were passed, there was a strike in England, wages went up, and things were held up. It means that the people will not get the equipment for the same price. It is the same thing with the devaluation of the pound sterling. These things happen. We put in the Estimates a figure commensurate with buying the article, but we have no control over people asking for higher wages, strikes taking place and so on. Sometimes the people from whom we buy the equipment are so filled up that they cannot get down to our orders until a year after. I do not think that the hon. member really meant to attack me but I can see his point, that he was somewhat doubtful in accepting what I said. I do not think that he is doubtful now. He will appreciate that when we deal with Capital Estimates, we always have to put in an amount so that the Legislature can approve that amount. After that has happened and we discover that because of certain things which are beyond our control, things have gone beyond the price, there is only one thing which we can do. We do not want to send back any items to England, and therefore we have to come back to this House and explain the position.

I have to bear the blows because I am the person who brought this down here; but there is nothing which anybody on the opposite side has raised that I cannot answer fully and give a good account of myself. I am not afraid of the blows. I have taken part in fighting and in boxing and so on, and therefore the blows do not frighten me. I think I have satisfied hon. members on the other side.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1967-68 No. 9

SEAWELL AIRPORT - TERMINAL BUILDING

A Resolution for the sum of $123,623 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, in the Capital Estimates at Head 106 - Prime Minister's Office - and under the Item Seawell Airport, provision was made for the sum of $107,500 for the purpose of effecting certain works to the Terminal Building at the Airport. There was to be a new wing erected to the Terminal Building, and that is nearing completion. However, the Government has been advised that just before this work is completed it would be sensible to carry out certain ancillary works before the new wing can be fully commissioned. These ancillary works include new essential works, additional car parking facilities, the conversion of the present Arrival Hall into the proposed new Intransit and Departure lounges and the retiling of the Main Concourse 1.35 p.m.

The Department concerned has examined these proposals quite thoroughly and I am convinced, as well as the Cabinet, that this would be the proper thing to do before the work is fully completed. Therefore, the supplementary provision to this amount is being required to complete the essential work as well as to meet the cost of increased wages.

I dare say hon. members might wish to ask questions on this matter, and the information is here. I cannot anticipate all the questions; so if hon. members ask questions, I would be pleased to answer.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the first thing that must strike one's eye with regard to this Resolution is that the supplementary provision is now for $123,623 - the original sum was $107,500.

Now, Sir, we have got to look at things in their right perspective. There can be no doubt, looking on the face of this Resolution, that there has been no planning, no proper estimating, or nothing. In other words, when this House was asked to vote $107,500 in the Estimates, the Government had nothing to substantiate nothing concrete before it on which to ask this Hon. House to vote that sum.

Now, Sir, as the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works made mention not too long ago, a Government is not run as somebody would run a peddling shop, sending next door and buying two packs of cigarettes. But fundamentally, this is what the Government is doing now. They are showing themselves to be in the position where they seem not to be able to run a peddling shop.

Originally, they set out to spend $107,500 and today they do not come and ask you for the same sum or something less than what they estimated for originally; they come now and ask you for more money. The sum of $107,500 is gone and they now want $123,623. All of that, Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Mover of the Resolution might well be in possession of the information which led to having to come before this House for this sum today.

But what we are saying, Sir, on this side of the House is this. If a thorough survey had been carried out before embarking on this project, the House would have been apprised from the very first instance of some aspects and other things involved, and we would not, perhaps, have found ourselves in the position to be voting, or being asked to vote, a supplementary sum greater than the original sum.

Mr. Chairman, what does the Addendum says? It tells us that work on the new wing of the Terminal Building at Seawell Airport is nearing completion. However, certain ancillary works remain to be carried out before the new wing can be fully commissioned. We are to wonder exactly when Government knew that this Terminal Building wing could not have been commissioned until these ancillary works were carried out. After all, this is Government. The Government has officers who are directly responsible to the Ministry.

But, what we have discovered is that they have to be much reshuffling at engineering level in the Ministry since this work was in progress. Things have reached such a stage where I think that I am right in saying that an Accountant in this Ministry was on the verge of a breakdown, and doctors worked very hard to save him from going to the Mental Hospital. The Accountant, further, has bluntly refused to be associated with anything in the Ministry of Communications and Works when it comes to figures and money That is a fact. I understand that, though not sick, he has been transferred to the Hospital.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is all well and good; what the Government might find itself owing to this side of the House is coming forward boldly and telling us whether or not the work which has been done justifies the expenditure of $170,500. That is where we on this side of the House have very grave doubts. Let me say at this stage; if the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works has found it necessary to carry out any sort of a reshuffling amongst his engineers and others, we want to give him credit for it.
1.45 p.m.

All that has happened is that he may have acted too late after the materials had gone, of which the engineers need not have known. Are we satisfied that the money originally voted for this very extension has been properly spent, and having been spent, can it be really and truly properly accounted for?

Mr. Chairman, the Government set out originally to spend $107,500. Now that you are nearing completion of the new wing to the Terminal Building and before it can be brought into service, you need another $123,623, more than what was originally voted. I believe the Hon. Minister is as anxious as any of us on this side of the House to have such matters aired. We feel that he is no more a party to any of the wrongdoing apart from the fact that he might not want to bring all the tales out of school; so he has tried in whatever way he could to sort things out, and now finds himself face to face with the Opposition in this House. We could not, Mr. Chairman, ask the Minister to justify his position here today by dismissing all those who were concerned with the presentation of the first estimate, because there could be no doubt that the condition of the buildings at Seawell Airport had not been taken into account, nor were the requirements to meet the travelling public and the various airlines. We understand that the airlines want more counter space, and that they would like to have at least two scales each. There are some Jumbo jets which will be coming into service as the years roll over, and they will touch down at Seawell International Airport as anywhere else, and while we are now spending $107,500 and an additional $123,623, I understand that this does not touch the hem of the garment. When this money is spent, Seawell Airport will still not be in any condition whatever to receive the big planes that are going to touch down at other Airports and would be glad to bring business to Barbados.

Mr. Chairman, before one penny further is spent, Government would be well advised to go back and carry out a thorough survey of the requirements of the airlines, look at tourism from its broadest sense, and see what we require for Seawell Airport, and then come to this House, and we assure the Hon. Minister of our wholehearted support. We understand that the airlines suffer because passengers are now given one hour to be at the airport before embarking on the plane, but with one pair of scales to each airline, it would mean that with a plane taking as many as 90 or 100 passengers from Barbados in one flight, passengers' baggage would have to be weighed at a rate faster than one a minute. I have with my own eyes seen long queues of passengers who intended to depart from Seawell Airport. We are willing to see this congestion relieved; so you should make it possible for the airlines to have at least two pairs of scales operating at the same time. What is the point of making provision today for the airlines to have possibly two pairs of scales each, and two days after tomorrow you find that you still have to make further provision to accommodate the travelling public and the airlines?

The time has come, Sir, when Seawell Airport must not be regarded merely as an International Airport. It has got to be brought up to the standard of an International Airport. Seawell has got to make provision for all this, and even in the question of the handling of baggage. Thus we have got to go into this in the not too distant future. At many of these International Airports, a considerable amount of baggage handling has got to be engaged in. I have travelled and I know what it entails, and we have got, Mr. Chairman, to see to it that a complete change is brought to the operations at Seawell Airport.

In connection with the retiling of the present Main Concourse, and the tiling of the new Intransit and Departure lounges, are we to understand that those concerned with presenting the Ministry with the requirements for such an extension at Seawell Airport sat down in their offices and merely drafted something, and put it before the Minister and asked him to run before the House and get it passed?
1.55 p.m.

At this stage, what do you find? Even for the re-tiling of the present Main Concourse we will have to vote money. It is not so long ago that this work on the new wing at Seawell Airport was going on. It could not be a case that the tiles, which were formerly laid, began to tilt, skin up and give trouble. No proper inspection or survey had been carried out originally, and that is why you find that we now have to vote this sum of money.

We will, however, lend our support to the Minister. We appreciate the predicament in which he has been placed. It may not be all of his own making. But in future, before matters of this sort are brought before this Hon. House, a thorough investigation should be made. One may say that a plan for the extension of Seawell Airport need not have been put before the members of this House. If a plan had been put before this Hon. House when this new wing to the Terminal Building at Seawell Airport had been proposed, we in the Opposition would have seen to it that a thorough survey should have been made. We would have requested that, and we feel that the Minister would have gone into the matter. Nevertheless, we will vote for the Resolution.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: In view of the fact that two o'clock is now the hour of the day, this sitting stands suspended until 2.30 p.m.

2.00 p.m.

On resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I ask that the bell be rung.

Mr. SPEAKER: Apparently, there is no quorum, and the Leader of the House has asked that the bell be rung. Let it be rung.

The bell was rung and several members entered the Chamber and took their seats.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move that Standing Orders 5, 10, 14, 16, 18, 19, 40 and 45 be suspended for the remainder of this day's sitting.

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

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

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time. I am advised that certain Answers are ready to Questions standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. James. No. 23, that is on page 4, at the bottom of the left hand column.

AMENITIES FOR SPRINGHEAD

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister:

Will Government consider:-

(a) increasing the number of stand pipes;
(b) installing street-lights;
(c) providing a proper road;

for the convenience of the approximately 500 residents of the district of Springhead, St. James?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the reply is as follows:-

There are already two stand-pipes serving this tenantry of 19 houses, and these are considered to be adequate.

(b) Consideration will be given to this matter when plans for the improvement of street-lighting in the area are being prepared.

(c) Roads in the Springhead area are privately owned and therefore do not qualify for repair by the Government.

Mr. CRAIG: As a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister be able to tell this House when he envisages installing street-lights there?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: When the plans for this area are completed.

Mr. CRAIG: Will the Hon. Minister be able to tell us when he envisages that the plans of this area will be completed?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: That, Mr. Speaker, I cannot say.

Mr. SPEAKER: Number.....

Mr. CRAIG rose.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member posing another supplementary question?

Mr. CRAIG: With regard to Question 23 (a), would the Minister be able to say, in view of the fact that there are 19 houses in this area - from what he has said, would he be able to tell this House if he has any idea as to the distance between these two stand pipes?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot tell the distance because I did not measure it, but I went there myself.

Mr. CRAIG: I beg to apologise for rising so often but I did not hear the Minister's reply because of the noise made by a motor cycle.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry; I did not hear the reply because of the noise made by a motor cycle.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I said I did not hear the Minister very well, and I would ask him to repeat what he said.

Mr. SPEAKER: Would the Hon. Minister be so good as to repeat what he said? I could not hear myself because of the noise of the motor cycle.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I said I did not measure the distance, but I went there to see for myself.
2.35 p.m.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, from the Minister's last reply, I wonder if he would be kind enough to say if, because of his looking at it, he feels that it is adequate. What has caused the Minister to feel that it is adequate? These two pipes could be two miles apart.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I am sorry that the hon. member has taken this attitude. I went there with the Permanent Secretary, the Chief Engineer of the Water Works Department and the junior representative for St. James. I did not go there by myself. I went to examine the possibility to see if it was really necessary.

Mr. SPEAKER: By the junior representative is meant the junior member for St. James.

EXTENSION TO BUS SERVICE TO HOYTE'S VILLAGE

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 24 standing in the name of the same hon. member.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister:

Is the Minister aware that residents of Hoyte's Village, St. James have to travel approximately two miles to reach the nearest bus terminal for transport to Bridgetown?

2. Will the Minister see to it that the bus service from Bridgetown to Holder's Green is extended so as to reach Hoyte's Village?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the Reply to the hon. member's question is as follows:-

1. No, Sir.

2. A bus service has now been introduced to serve the residents of Hoyte's Village during the peak period of travel.

Mr. CRAIG: I thank you very much.

IMPROVEMENT OF LIFEGUARD SERVICE THROUGHOUT THE ISLAND

Mr. SPEAKER: In the name of the same hon. member stands question No. 66.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Would the Government consider the advisability of taking over, improving and maintaining an efficient Life Guard Service throughout the Island?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the Reply to the hon. member's Question is as follows:-

The needs in the Life Guard Services at the various beaches in the island are being examined. Some extension of the present service is contemplated.

Mr. CRAIG: I thank you, Sir.

WORK ON THE HOLETOWN BRIDGE

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 67 also stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. James.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Can the Minister state the reasons why work on the Holetown Bridge in the parish of St. James, has not yet been started? *(Laughter)* .

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the Reply to the hon. member's Question is as follows:- I thought that the hon. member would have withdrawn the Question. *(Laughter)*

Mr. SPEAKER: Is that the answer to the Question?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: No, Sir. Work on the reconstruction of the Holetown Bridge was held up through the negotiations for the purchase of the areas of land for the project. Work on the bridge is now in progress.

BATH AND LATRINE FOR FISHING CENTRE IN St. JAMES

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 72 also stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. James.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I should like to remind Your Honour that there is one before that, Question No. 69.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am grateful to the hon. member. I like to take these Questions in chronological order. Unless I indicate otherwise, all other Questions are in the name of the hon. senior member for St. James. Question No. 69 standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. James.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Would the Minister favourably consider erecting a public bath and latrine at the fishing centre in Fitts Village, St. James?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the Reply to the hon. member's Question is as follows:-

The priorities of the current financial year have already been drawn up, but consideration will be given to the construction of a public bath and latrine at this site.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary question, are we to understand the Minister to say that the priorities were drawn up prior to the 20th June 1967, when this Question was tabled?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: That would naturally be the case since the priorities were drawn up in time to meet the Appropriation Bill which has to be passed every year. Naturally it would be drawn up before then.

QUALITY OF EVAPORATED MILK PRODUCED BY THE PINE HILL DAIRY

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Question is question No. 72 standing in the name of the same hon. member.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. Has the attention of Government been drawn to complaints by both consumers and dealers, as to the quality of the evaporated milk produced by the Pine Hill Dairy.

2. If Government is aware of such complaints, can the Minister say what improvements are envisaged in the future?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the Reply to the hon. member's Question is as follows:-

1. Yes, Sir.

2. Barbados Dairy Industries Limited has suspended production of evaporated milk and is seeking technical advice with a view to overcoming the technical difficulties which the Government has been informed have been responsible for the faulty evaporated milk which was being produced. The plant is expected to resume production of evaporated milk in the near future.

Mr. SMITH: Is the Minister aware that evaporated milk is still being supplied from the stores?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, evaporated milk was supplied from the stores to the consumer always.

2.45 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I cannot hear you.

(Mr. MOTTLEY thumped the microphone.)

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Do not break it up.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Oh, no! They seem to put the good ones before the Government Ministers.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: That is not true.

A VOICE: Go outside.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I have not even addressed the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there no more supplementary questions that hon. members care to put now?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am sorry, Sir. There is a supplementary question which I would like to ask the Hon. Minister. Is the Minister aware that evaporated milk which has been either manufactured or labelled - if you can call it so - by the Pine Hill Dairy is still being supplied and being complained of by customers? Is it still of no quality?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am not aware of any evaporated milk being offered to consumers in this country today manufactured by the Pine Hill Dairy being complained of as of no quality. As a matter of fact, the Pine Hill Dairy is not offering on the market any of this manufactured milk. The position is that the Pine Hill Dairy has spent about $38,000 in the last six months on research in the production of evaporated milk. There has been testings of this milk which has been manufactured, and they intend to do testings on it every week until they are satisfied that it is of the quality required by the consumer. They are not putting it on the market until they are satisfied.

Mr. HINDS: Sir, I would like to enquire from the Minister when did the Pine Hill Dairy suspend operations?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I do not have the date here with me on this file, but it is now over six months.

Mr. HINDS: Sir, when did the Minister get the information that the Dairy plans to resume operations in the near future?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it was estimated that it would have taken them two months to get their house in order; but after starting the research on this project it was discovered that they could not complete the operation in the two months time. What has been done? At the end of the two months they called in the experts and they produced the milk which is being tested on the elasticity quality of it. They are not putting any milk on the market produced by them until they are satisfied that it can last for over six months.

Mr. St. JOHN: Sir, is the Minister satisfied that the stocks of milk which were sent to the shopkeepers and other retailers of milk from the period that the milk was found not to be of the best quality have been withdrawn from the shops in Barbados?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the answer is that this is my impression.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, is the Minister aware that during the past week consumers had to take back this milk which has been produced by the Pine Hill Dairy and is still on the market to stores in this country?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am not aware of that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary, is the Minister aware that the Pine Hill Dairy is still supplying S. E. Cole in Roebuck Street with stinking milk? I am calling names now.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of that.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister aware that there is still bad milk coming from the Pine Hill Dairy to be found on the market?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am not aware of that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister aware that when consumers buy this milk which is alleged to have come from the Pine Hill Dairy and they carry it back by the tins - in dozens - that they are not getting back their money, that the same Pine Hill Dairy refuses to take it back?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would think that the points raised by hon. members are on subjects which should be brought in by substantive questions so that I can investigate. I cannot investigate them in the Legislature. I am being asked a question about consumers not being given back their money. If a formal question is being asked on matters like that, I would investigate and bring the appropriate reply to hon. members.

Mr. HINDS: In the light of the question asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, is the Minister still satisfied that the Pine Hill Dairy, as he stated, is not supplying milk that they manufacture to the local market?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, to the best of my knowledge that is not so.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that the Minister said that he is satisfied.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I want to know from the Minister if it is his intention to investigate this case and let us know at our next meeting how many thousands tins of bad, rotten, dirty milk have been returned to the Pine Hill Dairy during the last month, including those to S. E. Cole.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am only too willing to investigate and let hon. members know the results of my investigations. They know that they can expect co-operation from me in this respect.

Mr. HINDS: Can the Minister tell us, Mr. Speaker what date the Pine Hill Dairy proposes to bring its milk back on the market?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Again, I can investigate this.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Did the Minister ever had in his Ministry a woman coming in with bad milk and complaining?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The answer to that is "No". Mr. Speaker, I do not know if anybody went to one of my offices, but nobody came to me with any complaint on this question of milk.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Has the Minister any knowledge that anyone in his Ministry has been approached by a person from a Guest-house telling them that milk which is alleged to have come from the Pine Hill Dairy was bad and that the Pine Hill Dairy refused to take it back? They did not approach the Minister himself, but his Ministry?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Well, it was not drawn to my attention, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HINDS: Has the Minister ever seen a tin of bad milk that was produced by the Pine Hill Dairy?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have cows and do not drink any milk produced by the Pine Hill Dairy. I have my own cows and I do not have to buy milk.

Mr. HINDS: Sir, is it that the Minister does not have to care, once he has cows? He does not have to care if the public is being supplied with bad milk.

Mr. SPEAKER: That I am afraid is not a supplementary.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: My reply is that I do not buy condensed milk because I produce my own milk and I would not produce and buy too; so I do not know anything about the quality of the milk produced at the Pine Hill Dairy.

Mr. SMITH: Is the Minister aware that if he does not take prompt action that he will be losing five per cent of our population through bad milk?

Mr. SPEAKER: Did the hon. member say five per cent or about five per cent?

Mr. SMITH: About fifty per cent of our population.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this does not call for all of this. The point is that hon. members have raised questions which I think should be put in the form of substantive questions; but I have promised hon. members that I would investigate all of these questions raised and see, if something is wrong, that the situation is rectified.

2.55 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would remind hon. members of Standing Order No. 12(3): "A question shall not be made the pretext for a debate."

The next Question, not in chronological order, does not stand in the name of the hon. senior member for St. James. It is in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. It is No. 78.

QUESTION re NECESSITY OF TELEPHONES IN RURAL PARISHES

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows:-

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. Has the Government's attention been drawn to the great necessity of having telephones available in the outlying districts or parishes?

2. Is Government aware that a notice is posted on the Highways and Transport Office at Belleplaine, St. Andrew, forbidding the use of the telephone, while private persons are often making their telephones available to their neighbours and general public?

3. If the answer to question 2 is in the affirmative, will Government cause such notice to be taken down, and to permit persons to make necessary telephone calls?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the reply is as follows:

1. It is the policy of the Government as indicated in Chapter XV of the Development Plan 1965-68 to provide pay telephones in the rural districts.

2. The Government is aware that a notice was erected at the Highways and Transport Depot at Belleplaine on 18th March, 1966, forbidding the use of the telephone by the public. A business telephone cannot be made available for indiscriminate use by the public, but urgent telephone calls are in fact permitted."

3. No, Sir."

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary, if the public is allowed to use this telephone, why put up a notice?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Well, I could only answer the hon. member within the terms of the reply. It seems to me that the notice was put up because it is a business telephone, and not a public one. So it seems.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister really term a Government telephone, paid for by the taxpayers, a business telephone so as to prevent the travelling public from using it? Will the Minister tell me that the Government telephone is not to be used as a business telephone?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No, Mr. Speaker, I would not tell him that, because I did not say so. All that I said was that a business telephone cannot be made available for indiscriminate use by the public, but urgent telephone calls are in fact permitted.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, is the people's business the Government's business? That is what I want to know. Will the Minister define the people's business and the Government's business and show where the disqualification comes in from using it?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I do not think I can be called upon to define that, but I can see a distinction between legitimate use which is facilitated and indiscriminate use which is prohibited.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could tell us what makes a telephone call urgent. Is it the speed with which the intended caller arrives at the booth, or is it by the nature of the intended call?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, this question cannot be answered and I would not attempt to answer it; but I would think that a person who is in charge of a telephone in a particular area or district would have some good idea of when an urgent telephone call is required, because he or she, whoever is in charge, would know the people likely to use it, and he would, because of his experience, be able to separate those who would be using it indiscriminately from those whom he would wish to assist.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, since the Minister has tried to give us an idea of what he considers a matter of urgency and who should be disqualified from using the telephone because of the necessity of that particular telephone call, can the Minister tell us if the person in charge of the telephone is to be told by the individual what business he is going to discuss for him to determine what is urgent from what is not?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I am afraid the hon. member has put quite a lot on my plate and I have not been able to digest it all. I should just like to tell him that I have not presumed to set out any definition of what is urgent or what is not; but it would appear to me that this notice was erected at the Highways and Transport Depot, which of course is an office or sub-Department of a Ministry or a Government undertaking. I am also informed from the files that they have not prevented what they regard as the legitimate use of the telephone, but they have prevented the indiscriminate use. Unless hon. members opposite wish to believe - and if they wish to believe this I cannot stop them - that the people in charge of the depot are so hard-hearted or so harsh as not to want to facilitate people who have genuine telephone calls to make. I would think that reasonable people, even although they are operating what is a Government telephone, would still on any occasion facilitate a reasonable request. You have to believe this, because if you don't look at it this way, you are bound to come to the conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that the people in charge of the telephone ought not even to be in charge of the telephone. That is all I can say.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister tell us what gave rise to the setting up of this notice?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I can only answer the hon. member inferentially. It has been reported that the indiscriminate use of the telephone motivated the setting up of the notice. It is also reported - and I think hon. members should bear both things in mind - that urgent telephone calls are allowed.
3.05 p.m.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Hon. Minister what exactly does he mean by legitimate use of the telephone? Is plugging in and listening to other people's conversation a legitimate use? That happens to me.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I would not know this; I am no Polar Bear sitting in an Arctic waste of self-righteousness. I can only answer questions on the basis of the information I have before me. The information quite simply says that while the people at the depot try to facilitate reasonable requests for the use of the telephone - this is what they say - they do not allow indiscriminate use. That is all I can say.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister aware that, firstly, Belleplaine is very short of telephones; secondly, that the population of Belleplaine used to make telephone calls at the St. Andrew Almshouse; and, thirdly, that that telephone is no longer available and therefore they started to use this telephone, the subject of the question; and fourthly, now this notice has been put, it is very difficult for people to get a telephone message from Belleplaine because the Police Station does not allow the use of the telephone either?

Mr. SPEAKER: What is your last question?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The last question is that it is very difficult, if you live in Belleplaine, to obtain the use of a telephone. Will the Minister accept - since I hear asides about the Police Station - that it is difficult for lawyers to get through to Belleplaine Court because the policemen do not want the lawyers to use their telephone? I have had to call them up on the Police Wireless. *(ASIDES)*

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. If there is civil war in any constituency in Barbados, it cannot continue in this Chamber. Let both participants retire to their arena.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Is Your Honour asking the participants to go outside and get into a boxing ring?

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, we take it that the Minister meant to tell us that the Ministry received complaints from the depot in St. Andrew. If the Ministry received complaints, I am now asking if the Ministry received complaints against persons. *(ASIDES)*

Mr. SPEAKER: Let there be order on both sides of the House.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I have no available information as to the number of complaints or who made them. I am sorry that I cannot assist the hon. member for St. Peter who asked that question. However, with respect to the question posed by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, if Your Honour permits it and the House wishes it, the Hon. Minister of Agriculture may be able to throw some light on the question with respect to the Belleplaine Station.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am asking a further supplementary question. Now that the Hon. Minister has revealed to this House that representation has been made of the indiscriminate use, apparently, of the telephone of this department, in view of the circumstances, has the Minister made representation to the Telephone Company to install in St. Andrew, near the Almshouse or near the Highway Depot, a telephone for the use of the general public? This is a straightforward question. I accepted all that was said. Indiscriminate use is being made, a sign has been put up "DO NOT USE THIS PHONE." Therefore I ask: Has the Ministry made representation to the Telephone Company to have a telephone put there?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I am going to answer the hon. member's question by saying "No". The reason for saying "No" is that this has not been found to be necessary for reasons which the Hon. Minister may wish to tell the House.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, what is the standard beyond which a message becomes indiscriminate? What standards do you go by? What is reasonable and what is not reasonable? The Hon. Minister has said that, reading the files, this is the explanation, but what is unreasonable to one person is not necessarily unreasonable to other people. What is the standard by which they go?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that we should surmise that a person in charge of the Depot at Belleplaine would be less forbearing than any hon. member of this House, whether he gives or withholds permission to use a telephone which he controls. We have to assume that such a person would exercise the same willingness to help and, on occasions, the same firmness if he thought it necessary, as any of us would exercise in similar circumstances. We cannot assume that the man in charge of the Depot would act more harshly than anybody else would act in similar circumstances. He is in charge of the telephone; he knows the people in the area; several times during a day several persons come asking for permission to use the telephone. If somebody wants to call a doctor, or has a message affecting the safety and welfare of his business, or his domestic arrangements, we must assume that such a person would be allowed to send that message.

For instance, I would like to hear the score of the cricket match in Trinidad, but I could not expect to leave the House's business to go to find this out. Therefore, I would imagine that a request to use the telephone judged by the person in charge to be frivolous would be turned down just as a request judged

to be legitimate by the person who should know and who would be in charge of the telephone would be accommodated. If you look at it other than this, we are like Alice in Wonderland. I do not know of any other way to assist members in this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Chair to understand that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is unaware that the score is 357 for 9?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I am most grateful to Your Honour. I did not know that when I dropped that hint, you would have responded so readily.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, since the Minister has discovered this apparent indiscriminate use of the telephone, has he done anything about it? He said that he did not ask the Telephone Company to do anything about it. Now that the Opposition thinks that something should be done, will the Minister make representation to the Telephone Company to install a telephone at some place to be provided by the Government where people can pay to use the telephone? We think that it is necessary.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether or not my colleague under whose Ministry this portfolio comes, has already taken such steps. The most I can promise the hon. member is to draw it to the appropriate Minister's attention.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the Minister can tell us if this is not a case where the person in charge of the telephone at St.Andrew did not know how to differentiate between people, or whether it is a case where people were using the telephone indiscriminately, bearing in mind that a request had to be made for the use of the telephone before anybody could use it?
3.15 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I would like to be able to assist the hon. member, but the information is just not here. It would well be that this matter has a deeper significance than has been revealed by the facts which we have had at our disposal. However, I do not think so because it has been, as far as I can see, quite thoroughly investigated and no more has come up to us than the fact that certain telephone calls are permitted when they are deemed to be urgent, and other telephone calls are not permitted because they are deemed to be indiscriminate. All that I can ask the House to do is to have enough confidence in the person in charge of the depot to suppose that he would not act any lest responsibly than with any other hon. member sitting around this table. That is as much as I can do.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, since admittedly this telephone at the Depot in question may have been used indiscriminately, does the Minister not agree that there does arise in the parish of St. Andrew and in other parishes the lawful and legitimate use of a telephone by people who are not subscribers to, or patrons of, the Telephone Company in the normal and lawful course of their business on occasions of emergency?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: That is exactly what it is, because a part of the reply was that urgent telephone calls are permitted, so that I would imagine that in a case of emergency, the summoning of medical or other help would naturally be facilitated. I have no doubt about that. Urgent telephone calls are accommodated. From what I have gathered, I am satisfied that certainly urgent and emergency calls are accommodated. I do not know how the person in charge of the Depot judges what is or what is not indiscriminate, but I am satisfied that a resident in the district who has to summon medical or other assistance or has urgent business of his own to contract, may, with perfect certainty, use the telephone facility. That is how I understand it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, since this Depot has a telephone, which must be of necessity a temporary convenience, does the Minister not think that when this telephone, which is a temporary convenience, is no longer necessary at this site in St. Andrew the public of St. Andrew and other outlying parishes should be accommodated by a telephone which could serve them on occasions of emergency and urgency and even in the ordinary intercourse of their lawful business?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I cannot tell the hon. member whether this would be so or not. I agree that it should be so and I will urge it upon my colleague.

Mr. HINDS: Would the Minister tell us when are persons judged to be indiscriminate in the use of the telephone? Is it before they use the telephone or after?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, if I give a silly answer, nobody would remember that it was prompted by the question. I would prefer to say that I am powerless to answer.

Mr. CRAIG: If I recall very well, the Hon. Minister said that it will be up to the discretion of the caretaker of this particular place where you have a telephone for persons to use. Let us assume.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us assume that the hon. member was about to ask a supplementary question.

Mr. CRAIG: I was about to do that. Would the Minister state that if the characteristics of the caretaker were very much like those of the junior member for St. Thomas, would he then allow the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to make a telephone call?

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not deem that to arise out of the Reply.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker,.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. James caught my eye first.

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Speaker, I am asking this question and I hope that the Minister will be able to help me. I am dealing with the second part of the question which reads as follows:-

Is Government aware that a notice is posted on the Highways and Transport Office at Belleplaine, St. Andrew, forbidding the use of the telephone, while private persons are often making their telephones available to their neighbours and general public?

What I want to ask the hon. member is this: Did the caretaker or the man in charge of the Depot put up to the Government that he is having some trouble or anything like that, and he got instructions to post that notice? Or did he do it of his own will? I am asking if that directive came from the office and therefore I am hoping that the Government will see the necessity of installing a telephone in that area. 3.25 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Oh yes! I really cannot tell the hon. member whether the notice was put up by a directive to the person in charge from the person above him or whether he did it on his own. All I know is that this was done since the 13th March, 1966 and that since the notice was put up, persons have been allowed to use the telephone for their urgent business.

The hon. member has spoken about - I think he did - private householders facilitating the general public. The question itself asks this. This is something which is done: but there have been cases, Mr. Speaker, where a private householder has out of the kindness of his heart allowed a neighbour the use of his telephone to make messages; the sequence of which was that a person put through an overseas telephone call costing a substantial amount which was sent to the telephone owner, so to speak, to pay.

I do not think that this could happen in the case of the Government telephone, but even a private householder, Mr. Speaker, has to exercise some discrimination in granting this facility. No one can say, Mr. Speaker, that because you are a private householder, you will allow your telephone to be used at hours of the day which you yourself deem inconvenient, or with a frequency which you deem annoying. So since a private telephone can be used by persons who may run up a bill for overseas telephone calls without your knowing, if that were the case, you might find yourself with $80, as happened in a case of which I am aware, added on to your monthly bill; so that if the private telephone owner must of necessity exercise some sort of restraint and some sort of discrimination, how much more so a person in charge of a Government telephone which, because of certain circumstances, must be restricted.

But one hopes - I am speaking on personal information - that just as the Leader of the Opposition can be trusted to exercise sensible discretion or as the hon. member over there asked, my colleague would allow the Leader of the Opposition to use the telephone if he were placed in similar circumstances, I believe that this would depend on what the hon. member wished to use the telephone for, among other things.

Mr. SPEAKER: To which colleague does the hon. member refer?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I refer to the Minister of Communications. We should all - members on both sides of the House - exercise the same sensible discretion as, I am sure, the person in charge of the depot is exercising, where it is a case of necessity to allow the telephone to be used. Where you judge that it is not a case of necessity, you inhibit or oppose the facility. I do not know how we can satisfy hon. members. I am afraid that I must say that there is nothing more that I can add to anything that I have said.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, does he not see that it is not very right to ask a man "What are you telephoning for?" Or, "what are you telephoning about?" Has the hon. member ever refused anybody a telephone call?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that that is a personal question - "whether the hon. member refused anybody a telephone call."

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Well, I withdraw the second part.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am grateful to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: But, I ask him again. Is it right - he talks about discrimination, the type of message that you want - to ask a man "who are you telephoning to?" "What for?"

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, it may not be right, but it may be sensible.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that to send urgent and necessary calls by telephone is admissible, and in view of the fact that private people have to allow the public to use their telephone, and in view of the fact that if one passes and sees the notice, and having an urgent call to be put through by telephone, one may be forced to go on, will the Minister consider the advisability of instructing the authorities to take down this notice?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the most that I can do would be to say to my colleague, the Minister of Communications and Development, that this matter has been raised and allow him to use his judgment on it. I do not know the circumstances, therefore, I cannot give the undertaking to give instructions that the notice be withdrawn because this may harm the working of the Department of Highways and Transport. I am not familiar with the situation, but I can draw it to the attention of the Minister of Communications.

Mr. SMITH: I thank the hon. member, but he can still give me that undertaking, since the persons telephoning will not be allowed to use the telephone indiscriminately, to have the notice taken down.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Well, I cannot add to what I said except to say this. The Government and I - and I need to stress this - are anxious to see that public-paid telephones are established all over this island to facilitate the people. We have them in St. James, St. George and St. Joseph, I understand. What we are anxious about however, is this. There seems to be a sort of vandalism with respect to these telephones, and no sooner than they are established, they are destroyed - the wires, the receivers, the hook and everything pulled down.

If we can be assured - and I would like to invite the hon. members opposite to use their influence in their respective constituencies - that when we do these things, the telephones would remain there unmolested for the use of everybody, I am sure that this will be a boon to the community as a whole.

I am not saying however that the destruction of telephones inhibits the Government in providing the system. We feel that it is necessary anyhow, but we would make an appeal to the general public that the installation of the public-paid telephone system is meant to facilitate everybody, and that if they are not destroyed everybody benefits. We would like hon. members to use their influence in their own constituencies to make appeals to the effect that when telephones are established, they must be used fully by everybody and not destroyed.

The hon. junior member for St. James has a question on the Order Paper asking the Government to establish a telephone at Thorpes Day Nursery. The reason why he asked that question, Mr. Speaker, is because one was in the district and it was destroyed. It is because of the destruction of that telephone that the hon. member has asked for one in the Day Nursery This is the kind of problem that we are up against, and that is why I would hope that all hon. members on both sides of the House would say to the people of Barbados that when public telephones are installed, please do not destroy them because they are public property and they are there to help facilitate the whole community.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Does the hon. member not see that if anybody is going to do any destruction of any telephone that he will destroy the one that he is told that he cannot use? If he knows that he may go to a private individual and use his telephone, is he likely to interfere with that? On the other hand, he would cut down and tear down the notices and go and cut wires.

What is the good of throwing that at us? It is known that is not the policy of the hon. member on my left. I repeat that that would happen; but do not use that as an excuse, basing the hon. members' argument on the fact of destruction. Does he not see that he is inciting people to interfere with telephones which they know that they cannot use?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has got it all wrong. There was no prohibition to the use of the telephone at Thorpes, but it has been destroyed. I agree with him that if you do make prohibition, there may be a tendency to destroy them.

There was one at Ellerton; there was no prohibition against the use of that and that was destroyed, so I am informed by my colleague, the hon. junior member for St. George. We had three cases - one at Thorpes, St. James; and later on, one at St. Thomas and one at St. Joseph - where telephones were put for people to use without let or hindrance, and they were destroyed.

Mr. HOLDER: Sir, with regard to the telephone at Thorpes, the Minister has said that it was destroyed. I suppose that was so, but the plan which was to consider that telephone's replacement into the housing area at Thorpes was not carried out and, therefore, the telephone was left alone.

It is a supplementary question.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr. HOLDER: All the members over on that side know that. The Minister goes around; so I am just explaining the cause.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr. HOLDER: You just cannot carry a telephone booth and put it up to the wind. The Government was changed, and the plan that was to control the use of these telephones was never put into practice. It was left there. I would say that the telephone was not destroyed wilfully.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am really afraid that I cannot even see a question mark there. Could the hon. member just summarise the question?

Mr. HOLDER: I am finished.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is concluded. 3.35 p.m.

Mr. HOLDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 93 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. James.

QUESTION re INCONVENIENCE SUFFERED BY RESIDENTS OF RISK GAP AFTER HEAVY RAINFALL

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows:

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware that the residents in the district known as Risk Gap, St. James, are unable to enter and/or leave their respective homes during, an immediately after a heavy rainfall due to the preser unsatisfactory drainage System?

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

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

1. The Technical Officers of my Ministry have had consultations with residents of Risk Gap who have stated that they are satisfied with the work done by the Department early in the year to improve the drainage, and that they are able to enter and leave their homes without inconvenience.

2. Does not arise."

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, it was unfortunate for me and, I think, other hon. members on this side of the Table that we could not hear the Hon. Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: Would the Hon. Minister be good enough to repeat his answer? I myself did not hear.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I think I am aware of the Rules of this House, and I do not see any part in the Standing Orders where anybody is to speak in a microphone. I am speaking loudly enough that everybody can hear. What they probably want to say is that what I was saying was audible but not intelligible, but they do not know how to say that. It is strange he could not hear what I was saying.

Mr. SPEAKER: Anyhow, let the hon. member, for the benefit of myself, repeat the answer.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not agree with you saying 'for the benefit of yourself'.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I do not care if you agree or not.

Mr. SPEAKER: Anything for the benefit of myself is for the benefit of the entire House.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: "The Technical Officers of my Ministry have had consultations with residents of Risk Gap who have stated that they are satisfied with the work done by the Department early in the year to improve the drainage, and that they are able to enter and leave their homes without inconvenience.

2. Does not arise."

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister says that Technical Officers from his Ministry went to this gap and the residents claim they are satisfied. Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask the Hon. Minister if he can bring any person or any documentary evidence to prove that residents from that gap came to him, saw him and said that they were satisfied with the conditions of that gap, because I have had people come to me in connection with it.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, will the Hon. Minister state when the Technical Officers paid the visit and how many residents were interviewed?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, according to the file I have before me, the visit was paid on 12/9/67.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I also asked how many people were interviewed.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I do not know how many people were interviewed because I do not know how many people live in Risk Gap; but the reply says "the residents" of Risk Gap were satisfied.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister state when the work was carried out by the Technical Officers?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: In April, 1967.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, can the Hon. Minister state how many residents were interviewed by his Technical Officers?

Mr. St. JOHN: Will he say who are the Technical Officers?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I do not think that is his business.

(VOICES: Oh, no!)

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I said I do not think it is his business.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Everything is our business.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Well, make me answer. Who do you think you are?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Nobody can make you answer.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Well, sit down.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Nobody can tell me to sit down. You know the Rules but you do not know ordinary, simple, elementary manners.

Mr. SPEAKER: In spite of the grave disorder which has fortunately just subsided, I am not suspending this sitting. May I appeal to hon. members to continue as we have been going on?

Mr. St. JOHN: May I repeat my question? I am asking who are the Technical Officers who have visited the site. These people are paid by the taxpayers of Barbados, and it is certainly the business of the House of Assembly.

3.45 p.m.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: The Technical Officers are from the Ministry of Communications and Works.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I asked for the names of the Technical Officers of the Ministry of Communications and Works.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: You cannot ask me for the names.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Will the Hon. Minister say in what respect the officers were technical? The word "technical" when used in Barbados has a lot of meanings.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: They were technical in their profession as Engineers.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister tell us if, on the 12th of September when these Technical Officers visited the area, it was the day after a heavy rainfall?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister say if the Technical Officer who visited Risk Gap is the same Technical Officer who is supposed to have spoken with the hon. senior member for St. James in connection with an earlier question about a tunnel at Weston? Mr. Speaker, you will recall that the hon. senior member for St. James had to deny that any Technical Officer spoke to him.

Mr. SPEAKER: I recall what the hon. member has referred to, but I do not deem this to be supplementary. If he feels like supplying the information, he can say who the Technical Officer was on this occasion.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I asked the Minister if the Technical Officer visited the area the day after a heavy rainfall.

Mr. SPEAKER: You mean if the Hon. Minister is aware whether the Techincal Officer visited the area the day after a heavy rainfall.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary question. What did the residents of Risk Gap say they were satisfied with? The condition of the road? The drainage of the road?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, if members would listen instead of shouting across the Chamber, they would hear what I have to say. I said that the residents were satisfied with the work done.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, my question included the words: "..... to enter and/or leave their respective homes during, and immediately after a heavy rainfall due to the present unsatisfactory drainage system?" I would like to ask the Hon. Minister what work he was speaking about. Cleaning the garbage? Weeding the roads? Repairing the roads? With what were they satisfied?

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister state whether the work done earlier in the year had anything to do with drainage?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I now proceed to Question No.94 on the same page 12, at the bottom right hand column, in the name of the same hon. member.

REQUEST FOR COMMUNAL BATH AND LATRINE AT PILE BAY

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I am hearing tones. May I proceed?

Mr. SPEAKER: As the chief servant of the House, I am always ready.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Is Government aware of the great inconvenience suffered by Fishermen at Pile Bay, St. Michael due to the absence of a communal bath and latrine in the said district?

2. If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, will Government take the necessary steps to have a bath and latrine erected in the said district?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, the replies are as follows:

1. Yes, Sir.

2. The Government has been taking steps to acquire additional lands at Pile Bay since February, 1967, in order to provide an area for the hauling up of fishing boats. When negotiations for the acquisition have been completed consideration will be given also to the provision of the communal bath and latrine.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister tell us what date in 1967?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, does the Hon. Minister seriously tell this House that the Government cannot walk in and take possession while negotiations are going on? Can't they start to erect, whether or not the negotiations are completed?

Mr. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, there is a Land Acquisition Act, which the Hon. Leader of the Opposition knows very well can be used, but the fishermen at Pile Bay have been caused no inconvenience. Immediately as we heard that strangers were coming in to purchase the land and would stop fishermen from hauling up their boats, the necessary procedure was taken. Some of the owners are in the United States and some cannot be found.

We have started negotiations regarding the valuation and the price of the land; so nothing has occurred in the meantime to stop the fishermen from hauling up their boats. There was no need to take action under the Land Acquisition Act. If it were a case where the Government had to take compulsory acquisition forthwith, then the Land Acquisition Act would have been used. There was no need to use it.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the Government has seen to it that the fishermen are in no way embarrassed, cannot the Government see to it that the public of the immediate area suffer no longer embarrassment as a result of the non-erection of this convenience in Pile Bay?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. senior member for St. Peter phrase his question again? I have not heard him clearly.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Inasmuch as the Government's action has stopped or put to an end the embarrassment of the fishermen in the immediate area, cannot the same Government stop the present embarrassment being suffered by the public of the immediate area by erecting a public convenience at Pile Bay? 3.55 p.m.

Does the Minister not understand the question yet?

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member be so good as to put it again?

Mr. HUSBANDS: I will do that, Your Honour. I am just refreshing the Minister's mind before I put an immediate supplementary question. That is all I am doing. I think I am doing for the Minister what one hon. member should do for another. Inasmuch as the Government has seen to it that the fishermen at Pile Bay are not now suffering any embarrassment although the land is not fully acquired, cannot the same Government now see to it that the public of the immediate area of Pile Bay do not any longer suffer any embarrassment by the immediate erection of a public convenience in the same area?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, the Government at present has a small shed at Pile Bay for cutting fish, and in most of these fishing areas we have found it fairly convenient and necessary not only for the fishermen but as a convenience for people who come into the area for purchasing fish; and this would be considered at all the fishing beaches, fishing sheds and fishing areas in the island as soon as we get around to them, in turn to put a bath and convenience at all of these fishing beaches.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I should like to ask the Minister again, how does he square his answer to the first question, that the Government is aware that there is personal inconvenience to fishermen? How does he square that with the fact that he has allowed nine months or so to elapse without putting a bath and a latrine there?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, fishing is nothing which has sprung up in Barbados overnight; fishing is something which has been carried on in this island at the same fishing beaches for all the number of years. I would like to tell the hon. member this, that if during the last seventeen years just as much fishing was carried on and more requirements were necessary in the island and none was carried out - I am perfectly sure that more conveniences at fishing beaches and stand-posts for water and sheds for cutting fish have been carried out since 1961 than they did for the last seventeen years.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Now that the Minister has made his political speech, will he answer my question - a simple question? This is the question put to the Minister; Is the Government aware of the great inconvenience suffered by the fishermen and so on? He said: "yes, the Government is aware of it." My supplementary question was a very simple one; if the Government is aware of the great inconvenience suffered by the fishermen, why have they hesitated for all these months to give them a bath and latrine? And the hon. member makes a speech about the last Government and this Government and all of this nonsense? Why can't the Hon. Minister answer a simple question? If you are aware of it, why hesitate?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: No, I am not answering it.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: The ill manners shown on that side are such that you will soon see this House.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid.... *(Asides)*

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I will get behind if you start with it.

Mr. HUSBANDS rose.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Peter rose, I gather, to put a supplementary question.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Yes, Your Honour. Will the Hon. Minister see to it that negotiations with a view to acquiring land for the erection of a public convenience in the Pile Bay area be concluded as early as possible?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, because the Government is aware that there is a necessity for it, and this land will be acquired mainly for the hauling up of the fishing boats. From time immemorial, from the time I knew myself, fishermen in Pile Bay have been using this land for the hauling of the fishing boats. It is not Government land nor land belonging to the fishermen, but to private people and they were selling out the land for building purposes. In February, some of the land presently used for hauling up the boats was set up for sale and the fishermen came to me and asked that provision be made and the sale was stopped for that reason, so that they are still hauling up the boats in that area. As soon as the Government owns the land, provision will be made for the necessary facilities in the area.

Mr. HINDS: I wonder if the Minister can tell us if the area which the Government is now trying to own falls within the area which we understand was an original road from Lands End to Bats Rock.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: The area which the Government considers purchasing is an area bounded by the beach and the sea on one side, and then there is a public read leading into some new dwelling house. In other words, there is a road stretching north and south of the area which the Government is presently acquiring. There is a road leading on the eastward side of the area where the boats will be hauled up and there is a fishing shed on the southern side. I cannot find any direct access by any main road coming from Black Rock to the side of the shed, but there is a

shed on Government-owned property at present, a very small area on the southern boundary of what we are presently acquiring where the boats are hauled up.

Mr. HINDS: Can the Minister tell us where this public road to which he made reference begins?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I cannot find any entrance or outlet on either the northern or the southern side of the road. It is an area where a few fishermen and peasants dwell on the eastern side, and between the boundary of the trees and where the boats will be hauled up, there is supposed to be a Government road. The plan shows that, but I cannot see any projection proceeding either northwards or southwards of this particular area.

Mr. HINDS: Are there any buildings in the area? *(After a pause)* The Minister does not seem to understand me. The Minister says that he cannot find where this road begins, and it ends at a point where the Government now has a shed. What I am asking him is this: at this point where the Government has a shed- he told us that there is an area between the sea and this public road. Is there any building immediately north or south of that road?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I told the hon. junior member for St. Peter that I cannot find any entrance either from the northern or the southern end. In other words, it is an area lying within the middle. There is no right of way leading from the northern area or from the southern side. I have enquired and I cannot find any. What the Government has been doing is considering joining up or buying the land from the present Electric Company where their road goes to the very area. I cannot find anything either on the southern or on the northern side.
4.05 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am not interested in this matter. What interest there is, it may be a bit personal. The Hon. Minister could possibly come across the only plan of the existing road. That plan which his father held caused tremendous controversy in this country for many years. I am sure the Hon. Minister has not let that slip out of his very valuable possession. I have see it myself. You very well would remember, Mr. Speaker.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that you did not quite ask a question.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Yes, Sir, I will put this question now. Has the hon. member ever seen a plan which was held by his father showing the road from Lands End right through to Bats Rock leading out where you can see the club now?

That is the road that I am thinking about. I have seen it, and the hon. member has seen it. Has the hon. member ever seen that plan or heard of it? Or, is there one in the possession of the Department of Highways and Transport?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Sir, I have seen the plan. There was a road leading from the Lazaretto Burial Ground right through to Lands End. Claims have been made that that road has been eroded. During my father's enquiry into it, he said that he was quite sure there was a road, but it is not now there. I can tell you that I can see a part of the road on the plan. I have found that out, but I cannot see it on any plan by the Government, either on the northern entrance or on the southern entrance. It is just a separate piece left in space with absolutely no entry to it from the north or from the south.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Is the hon. member satisfied that on the northern or southern entries of this part of the road which I have seen and which he has admitted seeing on his father's plan, houses are not now built? Is the hon. member satisfied of that? I am not telling you that they are; I am only asking you if you are satisfied that they are not built on that?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I feel quite sure, Mr. Speaker, from what I see on visiting that site and from the surveyors producing a plan of this area that it was a public road because houses have been built, and I enquired into how permission could have been given for houses to be built in a certain area unless their owners had permission of the Town Planner. I discovered through that that there was a road there owned by the Government and that was how permission was granted for a house to be built there. But then there was no further plan of the northern side of it or of the southern side. Houses and buildings proceeded down to the Paradise Beach Club: so it was all built up on that area.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, in view of the Minister's awareness of this road which is in fact the most ancient of Barbados' roads - I believe it was the road previous to Highway I - is it the policy of the Government of restoring it, joining up Lands End to Brighton and again to the Lazaretto Cemetery as far as possible?

Mr. Speaker, I would agree also, as a further supplementary, that the only part of the road actually eroded, underwater, is at Lands End; it is either built over or grown over at the other points where there is a break.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I have asked a surveyor and the Crown Solicitors about it, but they cannot find any plan. The only claim I see that the Government would have is if they can produce plans of the area and I have asked about that. I have said that the only place that can be found is in the central area, and it has no entry or outlet on either side. There is nothing to the north or nothing to the south. The Government cannot find any plan at all of that area.

I cannot see the Government owning anything there, even a fishshed without an entrance or outlet to it. I asked for the plan and that cannot be found.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Will the hon. member enquire from the Crown Solicitors whether they have

approached other solicitors as regards this plan? As regards the point made by the hon. senior member for the City, some twenty years ago, there was a point discussed in the House that Mr. Ward was preventing people from going over the existing road. The Hon. Minister's father came to me and told me something. I went down there too. Mr. Ward shouted at me, and said I was trespassing.

Will the Hon. Minister promise us at least to get the Crown Solicitors to enquire from other solicitors whether they know, or knew, of the existence of actual plans of the site? As the hon. senior member for the City said, you can look at the plan and see the road as it existed in those days.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, would the Minister tell us from the plan he had seen, if erosion of the road has taken place at the Lands End portion or at the Paradise Beach end?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Erosion has taken place on both sides from my realisation, from the Lands End side and the Paradise Area side. Erosion has taken place on the whole west coast of that area. I cannot see how on the southern side and on the northern side erosion could have taken place to that extent and yet had left a central area so far away from the sea.

4.15 p.m.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Since the Hon. Minister has made that disclosure, does the Minister not think that what he had formerly described as being erosion which upon reflection seems to be something different, if that same land at the particular end in question had been built over or used by any person, corporation, individual or Minister for that matter, the Government cannot still appropriate or use such portions of this land to the benefit of the public of Barbados?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not in any position to answer that question. I do not think I know sufficient of the law to know Government rights and whether it will be Statute-barred or the length of the period during which people were using it, or whether they would have rights to claim for it. But I know that that part of the road on the northern side which is down by the Lazaretto Burial ground or the Bearded Fig Tree, down on the old Fort where Baily killed Millie, is still there, and that has not been eroded. The part by Pile Bay where the fishing boats come in is so far inwards from the sea that I cannot see how it would have been possible to erode around the Paradise area and further up without greater encroachment or closer encroachment of the now existing road where houses can be built behind them. It is not an area that has been built up like Rockley. Erosion has taken place gradually right around, and if the area in which the present middle spot is still that far away from the sea, I cannot possibly see how the erosion could have taken place to such an extent on the southern and northern boundaries of it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Parliamentary Question No. 98 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. James.

QUESTION re BLOCKED TUNNEL AT DOUGHLIN'S ROAD

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the question reads as follows:

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. Is Government aware that the Tunnel in Douglin'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?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the reply is as follows:

"The matter of the blocked tunnel at Doughlin's Road has been investigated and it appears that the blockage was caused by the dumping of garbage in drain. In an effort to avoid a recurrence of the matter complained of, additional receptacles for the collection of garbage have been placed in the area."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Parliamentary Question No. 102 stands in the name of the same hon. member.

QUESTION re YOUTH TOWN

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the question reads as follows:

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

Is it a fact that Youth Town has been closed through lack of financial support?

2. If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Minister use his good offices to have this Centre re-opened with the least possible delay?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the reply is as follows:

"1. Youth Town has never been closed.

2. Does not arise. However the Government is aware of the needs of Youth Town and is giving consideration to the means of its future development in the context of the Development Plan 1968-72."

QUESTION re PLAYING FIELD AND COMMUNITY CENTRE AT ORANGE HILL

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Parliamentary Question No. 103 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. James.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the question reads as follows:

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Is Government aware that there is need for a Playing Field and Community Centre at Orange Hill in the parish of Saint James?

2. If the answer to the above is "Yes", then will Government take steps as soon as possible to provide such a Playing Field and Community Centre.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the reply is as follows:

1. Yes, Sir. The need for such amenities is apparent in many districts, but priority has to be accorded to those of the highest population density. School premises will be used whenever this is feasible.

2. Current priorities are set forth in the Development Plan 1965-68, and these do not include Orange Hill."

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, has the Minister got any figures for the population of Orange Hill, Endeavour and the surrounding districts in St. James?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I am afraid not, Mr. Speaker, not in this file. If the hon. member wishes, I am certain that the appropriate Minister can have them for him, perhaps, at the next sitting, but they are not here.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, what is the basis then for saying that districts of greater population density have priority if you do not know what the population of Orange Hill is?

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, since the Minister seems not to be well aware of the population density, and if I am not mistaken I understood him to say that the Minister in charge is not in his place and he would rather the Minister gave a reply at the next sitting, am I to take this as an assurance that we will have further information to Question 103 at the next sitting?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I will tell the Minister this, because this is the Minister's reply which I am giving; but I will let him know that supplementaries were asked with respect to population density in the Orange Hill area, and suggest to him to bring in the information. That is all I can do.

QUESTION re GOVERNMENT'S POLICY ON WEYMOUTH

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Parliamentary Question No. 104 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. James.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the question reads as follows:

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

What is the Government's policy with respect to the lands known as Weymouth situate at Roebuck Street, Bridgetown?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the reply is as follows:

It is the Government's policy that the land at Weymouth which is vested in the National Stadium Corporation for the benefit of sport should remain so vested and be administered by the Corporation."

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as a supplementary, will the Government consider cleaning up and beautifying the outskirts of Weymouth especially in connection with an improved road building programme?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this has been the concern of the Government, and consideration is being given now to cleaning up the outskirts of Weymouth.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Will the Minister give an assurance that he will consult not only the National Stadium Corporation, but other interested persons, as well as the Ministry of Communications and Works, in connection with this matter?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Government Corporation consults all those bodies it should consult, for example, the National Trust and other bodies concerned, on any project which they have; so there is no question of consultation with appropriate bodies.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken.

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

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

HOUSE RESUMES COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When the sitting was suspended at 2 p.m., the House was in Committee of Supply..

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, do I understand that the Standing Orders were suspended? I am just asking because I do not know.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Before Your Honour leaves the Chair, do I understand that the Standing Orders were suspended? They were not suspended at the beginning of the sitting.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, Your Honour had just sent the House back into Committee of Supply and was about to leave the Chair, and it is discourteous to delay the Deputy Speaker when he has already sent the House back into Committee.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: If you are going by Standing Orders, you are going by Standing Orders. I am perfectly entitled to draw to Your Honour's attention that the time for suspension is at the beginning of the session and not when members happen to go out for lunch.
4.25 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have already said that the House is in Committee.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1957-68 No. 40

Head 3 - Parliament - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution supplements Head 3 - Parliament, Item 22 - Payment of Substitutes - $3,000, and Head 16 - Prime Minister's Office, Item 22B (New) - Entertainment Allowance - $9,600. I do not imagine that Head 3 will give hon. members any difficulty. *(ASIDES)* I will deal with Head 3 first. I beg to move that Head 3 stand part.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: The Addendum states:

"The sum of $75,000 provided under Head 16, Item 13 - Conferences and Delegations in the current Estimates has been found inadequate to cover expenses under this item for the financial year.

Supplementary provision of $15,000 is therefore required to meet anticipated expenditure under this item during the remainder of the year."

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: You are dealing with the wrong Resolution:

The question that Head 3 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, Head 16 is a new item and it arises from circumstances which hon. members, I think, will readily appreciate. It is felt that certain senior officers holding the status of Permanent Secretary and other posts should be granted a fixed entertainment allowance, so that they might more easily discharge the requirements of their offices by extending appropriate hospitality to official visitors whenever this is deemed to be necessary. Their duties bring them into contact with their opposite numbers representing other Governments, or with distinguished persons having business to do with the Government of Barbados through its own senior officers.

We have noticed that in the past year the occasions for the offering of this kind of hospitality have increased, and have imposed undue strain upon the resources of individual Officers. This is nothing at all to do with the normal calls which are made in the normal course of events upon the Government's Hospitality vote. Therefore it is proposed, through this provision, to grant a non-pensionable allowance at the rate of $50.00 a month to such designated officers and to the Financial Secretary, except that in the case of the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of External Affairs, who has a heavier load of duty in this respect, the allowance will be at the rate of $100.00 a month.

Hon. Members would like to know that the initiative for this rested with the officers themselves; it was discussed quite fully and exhaustively in the Civil Service Association, in the Whitney Council and among the individual officers concerned, and it is largely their own recommendations which have been brought here for implementation in this Resolution today. I beg to move that Head 16 stand part.

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

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

AYES: Hon'bles J. C. TUDOR, G. G. FERGUSSON, A. DaC. EDWARDS.....

(At this stage the Hon. N. W. BOXILL entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister cannot vote on this matter. *(ASIDES)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Am I to understand that the House is still in session? This type of behaviour must not be continued. Let the division be taken.

AYES *(cont'd)*: Messrs. LOWE, CORBIN, SARGEANT, WEEKES and HOPPIN - 8.

NOES: Messrs. LYNCH, MOTTLEY; HINDS, CRAIG, J. M. G. M. ADAMS, HOLDER, HUSBANDS, SMITH, St. JOHN and SIR GRANTLEY ADAMS - 10.

4.35 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am advised that eight hon. members voted 'Aye ' and ten hon. members voted "No." I declare that the "Noes" have it. *(Cheers from the Opposition.)* .

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, there is no question in mind, and hon. members need not panic over this. The Government is not going to resign because this is not a defeat on policy. That is out of the question. This is a matter of procedure. My colleague, the hon. junior member for St. Michael, informs me

that the hon. senior member for Christ Church was not in his place when the question was put.(MEMBERS: No, no). That is what I have been informed. *(Asides)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would again advise hon. members that the sitting has not been suspended and they should follow Standing Order 29 (6) which says this:-

"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: Mr. Chairman, there is no panic in a matter of this sort. If hon. members know that they can recommit it to have this thing done.... (Asides). Not today, next week or something, but you should not say that the hon. senior member for Christ Church was not in his seat. That is not so. He was there.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: The hon. junior member for St. Thomas and the hon. senior member for Church Church came in at the same time. (MEMBERS: No, no.)

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Before the question was put, I leaned over and spoke to the hon. senior member for Christ Church in his chair and told him to vote "No." This is the second time that the hon. junior member for St. Michael has misreported facts to this House. A lot has been already said. On an earlier occasion the Leader of the Opposition did not walk out of the House. *(Asides)*

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I even heard some of the words used by the Hon. Leader of the house. I came in during the course of the speech of the Hon. Leader of the House, and I heard him specifically say that this sum had nothing to do with the Government Hospitality vote. He specifically said that and I was right here. (Mr. MOTTLEY: What is before the Committee now?)

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order . It is as simple as this. If you take away one from there and one from here, the result would be the same. Even that, and that is not so. *(Asides)*

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 16 be recommitted.

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, you have appealed to the Committee to play the game. That is what you have just done. You have just reminded us that we must have order. Could anything be nastier than the present suggestion? Could anything be worse than the present suggestion? You get defeated and then because you have the numbers - could there be a worse instance of dictatorship than this? You call them in and say: "Let us play the game all over again. We have greater numbers now." I appeal to you, Sir, not to put any such thing to the Committee, that this Head be re-committed. You can do anything however nasty, if you want to do it, until you are stopped. As long as I am in this House, however, I am going to insist that we stick to the Standing Orders. We have departed from the Standing Orders too long. *(Asides)* I put it to you, Sir, that in the interest of playing the game- I use that remark deliberately; this is not playing the game, to lose and then send outside and start all over again. You come and sit down and vote against the decision of the Committee. This is a decision of the Committee. We have just registered a decision of the Committee and it should go down there and stay there. If the hon. member is going to take a matter like this to be Socialist, then I would call upon him to resign on the ground that on a financial matter of this sort, and obviously the policy of the Government, they have been defeated.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I hope , I need not answer the hon. member on this. You do not get a Government with this kind of Parliamentary tricks. You win an election, you convince the majority as a people, you get seats and you win the Government. The other side played what I thought was a quite reasonable Parliamentary trick for a given moment. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Not a trick). Well, a manoeuvre. For a given moment you had the temporary majority. You did not choose to take part in the debate because you did not want to give us time for our numbers to be made up. Alright. A division was called for and it registered against us. I would have said, on behalf of the Government, that we do not regard this as a matter of confidence, and therefore the question of the Government resigning does not arise.
4.45 p.m.

I now move that the Head be recommitted.

A VOICE: No, you cannot do that.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: If the hon. member does not take it as a Vote of Confidence, why then does he want a recommittal? When he talks about a parliamentary trick when in the absence of members on this side of the House he took out of position a matter, Head 24 of the Estimates, and treated it as No. 1 and No. 2, was that a trick?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Can I again remind hon. members, especially the hon. senior member for St. Thomas and the hon. senior member for St. James, that Standing Order 29 (6) is still in force?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: The hon. members were not disturbing me. Members sitting in every Parliament while somebody is on his feet will say something. It is only when they are disturbing somebody that they ought to stop. They do not disturb me. I did not even hear that they were speaking.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, Sir, there must be some grounds for recommittal. Obviously, Mr. Chairman, anyone presiding in Parliament even with the minimum of experience would normally know that you cannot recommit for recommittal's sake. There must be some plausible grounds for recommittal.

Now, why does the Leader of the House want to recommit this? Does he want to recommit because there was something in the Resolution restrictive, because there was some slip-up in the Resolution that the draftsmen made, and therefore he wants to make a correction or otherwise? Oh, no! The Leader of the House is recommitting because he lost the vote.

Now, we will go down in history all over the English-speaking people as the biggest fools in Christendom and out of Christendom if that motion was allowed. Believe you me, Sir, if you allow the recommittal, I say that the House of Assembly of Barbados would stink inside and outside of Barbados. Why does the hon. member want recommittal? For recommittal's sake? Mr. Chairman, if that is right, anything can be right.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Obviously, I know exactly what the Government can do in a case like this, and that is to have the matter debated. That is why I moved the recommittal, but the hon. member who has just sat down had a faulty memory.

I have been in this House long enough to remember that there was a time, when he was in the Chair, a similar incident arose and Mr. Keith Walcott, a former junior member for St. James, put up an argument which prevailed upon the then Speaker to rule that you could call in a member to vote. This is what a previous legislature has experienced, and this happened in this House when the hon. member was in the Chair. That is why I say "a temporary tactic which was used." Because we did not have all our members here at the time does not bind Government to regard that manoeuvre as more than a temporary manoeuvre which can happen in any Parliament. We do not regard it as a "Vote of No-Confidence", and the other side does not regard it as that; therefore, I am entitled, since you do not regard it as that, to move the recommittal of the Head and I have done so.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the hon. member has just said that he recalls that a similar incident arose in this House when a former member - he named him - Mr. Keith Walcott, was involved in a recommittal, and he said that it was under similar circumstances.

Now, Mr. Chairman, anyone can accuse.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I do not want the hon. member to misquote me. Mr. Keith Walcott put up an argument that the then Speaker, who is the hon. member who has just given way, could rule and call in a member to vote, and Mr. Speaker - as the hon. member was then - ruled that way.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Sir, "Mr. Speaker, as he was then". Who was that Speaker who ruled that a member could come in and be allowed to vote? Who was that Speaker? May I sit while the hon. member answer that?

I have not the faintest recollection of that and I know that the hon. member does not have it either. You see, it is alright to get up in here and say things hoping to get away with them. Now, I challenge the hon. member to produce any Hansard to justify his statement. How can a Speaker allow a former member to bias him and let a member come in here and vote? It sounds so trivial, so nonsensical, so rridiculous, that the hon. member should be ashamed that he should be associated with a matter like that. It is absolutely untrue, unfounded, unfair and prejudiced, and that is what I declare. I challenge him from now until Doomsday to search every Hansard, every debate in the history of this Parliament, to prove and justify his statement. Absolutely not true, unfair, unjustified, prejudiced and in my own personal opinion a barefaced, naked misrepresentation of facts.

Who could believe that? He himself does not believe it. There are two Clerks at the Table, one of whom must have been present at that time. The hon. member is a comparatively new member as compared with the term of office of the present Deputy Clerk. Absolutely unfounded, Mr. Chairman, I would not say you, because you were not in Parliament at the time. Believe you me, Sir, although he is your colleague, I doubt he can believe himself. He has this afternoon made me to regard him as the lowest order of humanity. Believe you me sincerely. I deprecate him now; I loathe him now; he never can rise in my estimation to the norm to sit in my presence and say that when I was Speaker, on a motion, or on a suggestion of a Speaker, of a former member of a Parliament, I allowed somebody to come in and vote after the motion was taken.

What Parliament would allow me to do that or allow any Speaker or Chairman to do that? Although we do not have intelligence tests in here, it is true - you can fail an entrance examination and become a member of this Parliament; you can fail to get in a secondary school and get into this Parliament because we get in here by votes and not by intelligence - anybody in here can be a fool. I did not say 'is a fool'. Anybody can be a liar, maybe - not 'is a liar.'

After the last demonstration I have had, believe you me, Sir, with a member like the Leader of the House, a member whom we have to call honourable, what does that mean in English? It can only mean something in here. The hon. member said that I allowed a recommittal on the flimsiest of grounds. Mr. Keith Walcott is still alive. Ask him if he still remembers it. Just like a child; "I played a bat-and-ball; the sticks belong to me. I get bowled for nought. Everything is finished. The sticks are mine; game done; no more sport; all is mine."

Well, that is the game which we are playing at today. You recommit because you lost the vote. I am not even suggesting that they have asked the Prime Minister to come in here just now. It can only be a just admission of the game. I am not suggesting that; I am not imputing anything to him. I am not going to do that; I believe all men are men until I find them to be some creature whom it is difficult to describe

in Parliament, because when you are in here, you have to use parliamentary language.
4.55 p.m.

I fail to see how and on what grounds you could allow a recommittal to reverse a decision of this Committee. What has been pointed out to us? What was wrong in the drafting of the Resolution? What was against the policy of the Government that they are now going to make right by an addition, deletion and substitution of words? Absolutely nothing. Because they have been defeated, they say "let us recommit." We have got the votes now. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: You did it then.) I never did that, thou hypocrite! I could never have done that. I have never been a member of a Parliament that would have allowed me to do that and get away with it, and you can see from these protestations, Mr. Chairman, that you as Chairman of this House would be called on to account for this. You can see that from these protestations of which I am playing no mean part.

Mr. Chairman, after all, we like to work for the benefit of the people of this country, but those of us who have witnessed what has happened here now with a vote having been taken, without a speech being made, will realise that we categorically say "No". A division was taken and what has happened? Now there is a motion for recommittal. Well, we vote "No" for the recommittal, and there will be a lot to be said about this in Parliament and outside of Parliament.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, there are ways and means of doing things in a Parliament, and even the Leader of the Government upon mature consideration might perhaps realise that if you do anything to encourage or even allow a system by which every decision in Committee can be immediately challenged, in the long run it is the Government which will suffer, and it will be open to the Opposition who are indeed guilty of the wish so often ascribed to this particular Opposition to filibuster. It will be open to such an Opposition to move the recommittal of every decision, and, in effect, double the time which a normal Committee session would take. I am sure that the Leader of the Government would not wish to be responsible for bringing this particular spectre into the House. I was not present when the Standing Orders were suspended. I do not know if Standing Order No. 46 which permits the recommittal of Bills reported from the Committee to the whole House was suspended. My impression in my parliamentary innocence was that unless there is some mistake, some error or misconsent, you had to wait until you went back to the House to recommit a Bill as is set out in Standing Order No. 46; but that was only an impression which I am sure you will be able to correct me on, or the Clerks will be able to advise on this particular point.

This particular decision which has been taken was not taken really, as the Leader of the House himself rightly conceded, in the interest of carrying out a parliamentary trick, because the Opposition is opposed to the idea of paying Permanent Secretaries this entertainment allowance where there is a Government Hospitality fund available. We believe there are alternative methods without the necessity for a separate vote; but that is by the way. The particular motion before the House is for the recommittal. Now, Mr. Chairman, it looks bad. "We got some blows, and so immediately we changed the Rules", more or less. Decisions are given by voting in here. The Government is not permanently prejudiced because Head 16 cannot stand part of this particular Resolution. They can recommit tonight when we report back to the House, or they can bring it down again next week. It is only a money Resolution, but that is not the way in our view to carry out parliamentary business.

You would be placed in a very embarrassing situation, Mr. Chairman, of having apparently to vote against your Party if we had taken the vote at the stage where the motion was first moved because you would of course, have had to record your vote with the "NOES", and that would have been a position into which the Leader of the House had placed you, a position gravely open to misunderstanding, although I am sure you would have acted with parliamentary propriety in the circumstances. I suggest that the best possible thing is for the Leader of the House to withdraw this motion for recommittal, let us get on with the rest, and let it stay there as a warning that he must manage his affairs and his majority better, because when a Government with a majority loses a vote, it is the Leader of the House and his Whips, if there are any, who should be called to order, and the Leader of the House should take his blows, Mr. Chairman, in this instance, and make those who do not come to the House come so that this will not happen again in future.

When we call for the attendance of the Prime Minister, we do not call for it so that he can come and vote against us. We call for it because we believe it is right he should be here. He has now had it fortified because not only is he now to know that his duty brings him to the House; he can now see that his interest should bring him to the House as well, because in his absence and the absence of the hon. senior member for St. Michael who no doubt has pressing duties and engagements elsewhere, Government has been defeated on a financial Resolution. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the hon. Leader of the House to take his defeat, bring the Resolution back next week and let us have our debate, but let us get on now. There are a lot of Resolutions to be done, and I should not have to be telling him his duty. If he wants it back, a recommittal in this manner is not the way to bring it back. Let him find another way. What does he want? Does he want a debate lasting until 9 o'clock on the recommittal? Does he want us to talk until dinner time on a recommittal and come back fortified from dinner and talk about it some more? That is what a move to recommit would lead any Opposition to do. If we do not have the numbers, at least we have our voices, and if we have to talk and talk until our point of view is made clear, then we will talk and talk until our point of view is made clear. This is our view, Mr. Chairman. It should be withdrawn and let us get on with Government Business. We are always hearing that we must get on with the business of the Government and

that the Government is here to govern. Well, let it govern. Do not let it behave like a little child - I have forgotten the name of the song - "I don't want to play in your yard if you won't be good to me" or whatever it is. Do not let us get on like that. We are men in here; let us take our defeat like men.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I came in more or less at the tail-end of this debate and I have listened very carefully to what the hon. senior member for St. Thomas who has just sat down has had to say. It is very unfortunate of course for this Island and for the Legislature that hon. members come in here with an idea of making snide remarks instead of getting the work of the people done.
5.05 p.m.

As far as we are concerned, we have a duty to discharge to the Public Service of this Island, and it is remarkable that the people who always want to champion the Officers of the Public Service, many of whom they feel were created by them and in their own image, are themselves using an opportunity to.... *(Interruption)*

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I want you to tell the House if, in your opinion, the Hon. Minister is speaking on the motion for recommittal. That is the motion now before us. We have not come here to be lectured to. This is no Sunday School; this is Parliament. You will speak on the matter, or you will not speak at all - Prime Minister or back bencher. This is Parliament and not Bay Street.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I take it that there is only one Chairman.

Mr. HUSBANDS: That is why I am addressing one Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. senior member for St. John proceed; I do not rule that a point of order.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I will rise again, if the Hon. Minister does not speak on the motion before this House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not rule that a point of order.

Mr. HUSBANDS: A motion is before this House and it is the property of this Committee, and I will get up and speak again, Mr. Chairman.

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I understand the hon. member's reference to Sunday School. I have never taught at Sunday School. I understand that he was taught in Sunday School by a dear, departed relative of mine.

Mr. HUSBANDS: That is absolutely untrue. He got away with that at mass meetings. He is an alien to the truth.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There are two members on their feet. Will they both sit. Will the hon. senior member for St. Peter take his seat.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I am very greatly relieved to hear the hon. member repudiate what he himself told me in St. Peter.

Mr. HUSBANDS: That is absolutely untrue; I never told him that in St. Peter or in any other parish.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would be greatly disappointed in that relative of mine if this was the kind of product that was produced. It is obvious that I was mistaken, and I apologise to the hon. member for having suggested that a relative of mine would have attempted to have taught him, because it is clear that he did not learn the lessons and the Collect, for that matter. I hope the hon. member will accept my apology.

As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that members take an opportunity like this to make mis-statements of fact. I was speaking on the Resolution - I am speaking on the motion for the recommittal of the Resolution.

Mr. HUSBANDS rose.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Man, go outside and take a shower!

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. There is no Resolution before this House. There is something called recommittal. The Minister cannot talk to me in that way; I am senior to him.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I heard the hon. member for St. Thomas make a statement that this will teach the Leader of the House a lesson and that hon. members would not attend. I am not going to make any apology, for when I elect to attend the House, the time I report - I do not have any demonstrations to make; I only have the business of the people to perform. *(Interruption)*

Now let us get this straight. The hon. members who are all here were all in the precincts of the Chamber. When the motion was made and seconded, my information is that no debate took place. In good faith the Leader of the House assumed that as this was a matter dealing with the Public Service of the Island - it was not controversial - he did what I, certainly, would not have done, knowing the members as I know them. I know their propensities.....

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. Did the Prime Minister say that all hon. members now here were in the precincts of the Chamber when the vote took place? If so, is he saying that he was in the precincts when the vote took place?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Why should I have to apologise for not being here? I was doing something much more important than listening to the hon. member talking nonsense. I just want to get the records straight. All the members on this side, with the ex-

ception of myself, who was obviously absent from my prefacing remarks, were in the precints of the Chamber, and this was well known to hon. members on the other side. They made no contribution to the debate; they said neither "yea" nor "nay"; they did not disapprove.

Never in the history of parliamentary democracy has it been known for an Opposition to take advantage of the shortage of numbers on the Government side, or the absence of members on the opposite side, without previous debate, to vote against a measure just because members are absent. In the British Parliament, the House of Commons, what is usually done is that members pair off even for meetings.

The Prime Minister of Canada could never conduct the business of the people of the Dominion of Canada, as he only "enjoys" a relative majority and not an absolute majority. He is dependent for his measures on the support of the Democratic Party of that country. He is dependent on getting his measures through, and at any time the N.D.P. can vote against the Liberal Government in Canada. But the Conservative Opposition on no occasion has taken advantage of the fact that the Government of Canada does not have a majority to force a measure through or to vote against a measure which has not been discussed or debated on the floor of the House.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. The Prime Minister made a statement, which I suggest, Mr. Chairman, is not true. Ask the Prime Minister if he has ever heard of the occasion when Lord Attlee mobilised a majority in Committee against the debate on the White Fish Bill and defeated it; so that for four years the Conservative Government could not get it back into the House, when the Conservatives had a majority. He does not know, so how can he get up and deceive the House?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I did not know that Lord Attlee was ever a member of the Canadian House of Commons. I thought that he was a part of the British House of Commons. My ignorance is profound, because I did not know he was a naturalised Canadian citizen or that he ever sat in the Canadian Parliament. It is as simple as that; I am sorry; I will have to go and read my books again and try and find out the years when Clement Atlee sat in the Canadian Parliament. This is what we call cheap politics. *(INTERRUPTION)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: While a member is speaking all other members must be silent, or shall be silent, or shall only discuss in undertones. I would like to remind the hon. senior member for Christ Church of this. Let the hon. senior member for St. John proceed.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, as far as I am concerned, I would like to say it is a matter of indifference whether they vote against or vote for a particular financial Resolution. This is no great public issue, as far as we are concerned; but having examined the proposals for the payment of these allowances to public officers performing certain functions in Government, this Government is more or less committed to it.
5.15 p.m.

They are not doing anything to me or to any of my Ministers if they vote against it purely for the sake of saying that they have voted against a Government proposal and outvoted the Government. If this is their idea of the discharge of their public functions in connection with persons in whom, as I said before, they pride themselves, whom they tell everybody that they created their own image - and now these officers will get dis-illusioned with them. That is the only effect of their voting here tonight. It will not do us one single thing. I will say this: as far as I am concerned, I do not think that the immediate necessity arises to recommit this particular matter. It will teach some other people a lesson as to whom they are dealing with.

The hon. member has said that they will do it next week. As far as I am concerned, it is back-dated and I do not think that any officer will have to go into the Bankruptcy Court if he does not get an allowance by next week. Therefore as far as I am concerned, I do not see why we should waste any more time discussing it. I am therefore asking that.....

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I have not said that we will do it next week. I said that if the Government want to bring it back next week, let them do that. I have not said that we will do it next week. It is not in our hands to do any Resolution. Any Resolution which has to do with any supplementary appropriation is not in our hands.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I really cannot understand the hon. member. I understood the hon. member to talk about snap votes, and I understood him to say that the Government could bring it back next week. *(Asides)* That is what I understood the hon. member to say; but they are getting on as if a Resolution for the expenditure of public funds is something like somebody with a tray of fowls on her head; she has got a Leghorn and a bare-necked chicken and something else, and you tell her that you do not want any today, bring it back next week, and it may be that it will look a little fatter or something like that. *(Laughter)* This is really trifling with the public business. If the hon. member never supported it, it is a matter of supreme indifference to me. It is not in our Manifesto and therefore, as far as I am concerned, the Hon. Leader of the House has said that he is withdrawing at this stage the motion for the recommittal, and I agree with him.

As far as I am concerned, the Government does not have to recommit something that has been voted on already, if it were a grave matter of principle involved or not. The Government does not have to do it just to get a favourable vote. If it were a matter of great pith and moment, if it were a matter of great principle, we would have the numbers present inside the Chamber and we would have voted on the measure, and even the gates of Hell and the rantings and ravings of hon. members on the other side would not prevail

against us. It is as simple as that. I want them to understand that all the so-called friends that they think they have in the Public Service will now be able to know what kind of people they really are. The Hon. Leader of the House has said that he would ask leave to withdraw the motion.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave formally to withdraw the motion which I made asking for the recommittal of this Head of the Resolution.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Hearing no objection, leave is granted the hon. member to withdraw the motion.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move the postponement of this Resolution.

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

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is finished and how could it be postponed? *(Asides)* I do not want to hear any advice on this. The Resolution has been considered.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: For the information of the hon. member, we were dealing with Head 16 of the Resolution, not the entire Resolution.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Head 16 is the only other part.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Head 16 has been voted against.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Therefore we have finished with that. How can we postpone it? Postpone what? There are two Heads; two questions were decided and then you postpone what? - The blank, the white paper underneath? Some hon. members on the other side, the Prime Minister especially, keep accusing the Opposition, or some members of the Opposition, of doing something that they are not doing, of doing something and calling it wrong. I am not using the words of the Prime Minister that he is warning you, Mr. Chairman; I ask him to see that the Resolution before the House has two parts and both parts have been put to the Committee, both parts have been voted on, and how can it be postponed? It is finished, completely finished. Postpone what? All that can be done now is that the Resolution can be reported to the House.

The question that this Resolution be postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:-

AYES: Mr. CORBIN, HON'BLES J. C. TUDOR, E. W. BARROW, G. G. FERGUSSON, A. DaC. EDWARDS, N. W. BOXILL, MESSRS; LOWE, SPRINGER, SARGEANT, WEEKES and HOPPIN - 11.

NOES: MESSRS; LYNCH, MOTTLEY, HINDS, CRAIG, J. M. G. M. ADAMS, HOLDER, HUSBANDS, SMITH, ST. JOHN and Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS - 10.

5.25 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1967-68 No.41

CONFERENCES AND DELEGATIONS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution seeks to supplement Head 16 - Prime Minister's Office - Item 13 Conferences and Delegations by $15,000. It is mentioned in the Addendum that the original provision has been inadequate to cover expenses for the financial year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will only just like to say this. It is a very common, but nevertheless persistent, misconception that the Conferences and Delegations vote of the Government is entirely at the disposal of members of the Cabinet. This persistency has continued over the years, and it has even been mentioned from time to time by those members on the other side of the House who themselves have had Ministerial and Cabinet experience.

The facts are at variance with that misconception, for in the year under review, that is to say, the period between the 1st April, 1967 and December 1967 we have conclusive proof that Ministerial activity in so far a Conferences are concerned, was only twenty-eight per cent of the total activity of the personnel of Government in conferences throughout the period. For instance, there have been between the period April to December participation by members of this Government, both official and political, in some 60 conferences, working parties, seminars, meetings of officials and what you will. In these sixty engagements, so to speak, 93 persons have participated.

Now, when you reflect, Mr. Chairman, there are only eight or seven Ministers of Government, but that 93 persons have participated in these engagements over the year, you can see that the overwhelming majority of persons using, as they are properly entitled to use, the Conferences and Delegations vote are officials of Governments - and in some cases - not even officials of Government because when occasionally, as we have to every year, representatives going up at the International Labour Organization Conference, or whatever it is called, in Geneva - and incidentally it is the most expensive item in the whole Conference vote - when that comes up, the Government has to honour the tripartite structure of that Conference and the Minister of Labour has to be attended and advised by representatives of the workers and of the employers whose expenses Government quite frequently is required to defray - must defray, as my colleague reminds me.

But I just want hon. members to know this. You can get as wide a variety of things to be participated in as for instance:-

The Fifth Congress of the Meteorological Organization;

The Conference of Commonwealth Meteorologists in England both of which took place early this year;

Such things as meetings of the Standing Advisory Committees for Medical Research in the Caribbean;

Such things as any yearly session of the United Nations; Economic Commissions for Latin America;

Such things as the Eastern Caribbean Trade Ministers Conference;

The meeting of Officials in Jamaica and elsewhere;

Meeting of the Appraisals and Finance Committees of the University of the West Indies.

The World Conference on World Peace attended by judges;

The International Survey Officers Conference;

A meeting of the Committee for Legal Education;

The Commonwealth Finance Officials Meeting;

The I.A.T.A. technical conferences at Switzerland;

Conference of Caribbean Credit Unionists in Trinidad and Curacao;

Data processing in Mexico;

Air navigation in Montreal;

Regional Shipping in Trinidad;

Health Seminar in Rio de Janiero; and matters like these - a whole wide range of activity, the overwhelming majority of which fall to technical officers and even to persons outside the Governments, and the minority of the activity confined to Ministers.

So I wish the House to know quite clearly that the Conferences and Delegations vote is a vote at the disposal of the whole Governmental machinery, and not only to members of the Cabinet.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I would like the House to know how I stand on this type of Resolution.

"The sum of $75,000 provided under Head 16, Item 13 - Conferences and Delegations in the current Estimates has been found inadequate to cover expenses under this item for the financial year.

Supplementary provision of $15,000 is therefore required to meet anticipated expenditure under this item during the remainder of the year."

Now, Sir, I was listening to the Minister just now, and he called those conferences and the various other things that this money was spent on. Those places which he called out are the ones that have been attended already. Now that you have to attend these conferences, well, I think this increase is justifiable. But those conferences which the Minister mentioned were the ones that have been attended to already; surely he could have let us know how many more conferences that he anticipates they would be attending during the next two months. You can just as well say that January is gone and you have only February and March.

As I have said already in this House, these thousands and thousands of dollars confuse me. How must I know that you are not asking for too much? I know, if you ask for too much, the balance will lapse. Anyhow, let us know something. I will be glad if the Minister would take a little time off and let us know how much the country benefitted from some or all of these conferences.

5.35 p.m.

One minute you hear there is a conference here, and before it is finished they are expecting to meet somewhere else, and three, four or six people are going along to these conferences. I do not know if they go to the conferences, because when they come back nobody knows what has happened. A man can get up at Seawell when the Reporter interviews him and say all sorts of nice things, but I cannot see or hear what is being done. I do not know if, when we spent $75,000, the country benefits $5,000 from it, or if when we spend $75,000, we lose $80,000. It is confusing to me and you cannot blame me. You come in here all the time and ask for these thousands of dollars for conferences, and a Minister carries three or four persons with him. He cannot go from here to Trinidad without having his Permanent Secretary and somebody else. When a Minister goes to a conference, he should be the type of man to get up and talk and do everything. I believe these conferences have Secretaries to record the proceedings, but I believe that these people are going on a spree. There are some Ministers who would not move from their Ministries to St. Andrew without the Permanent Secretary and three or four more Civil Servants with them. This was not happening before.

Mr. Chairman, we are spending too much money on these conferences, and I would like to see what we are getting from them. I would like to see the dividends that are being paid out. Formerly, if a Minister did go to a conference, he would have to go alone, but they have the new look now, and a Permanent Secretary and somebody else must go along too. This makes me believe that the Minister is incompetent to go anywhere alone. If I were a Minister I would not want a Permanent Secretary or a Private Secretary to go anywhere with me. I can remember the Prime Minister telling me some years ago that I undertake to do things that I cannot manage. If I were a Minister I would go to a conference and get through. This makes me think something else. I wonder if they all share the same room when they go away! You can get up now and lash me as much as you like, but that is my feeling about it. And you will notice, Mr. Chairman, that only certain people are going. You have to look at these things. I am not satisfied with it.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Arising out of what the hon. member who has just sat down has said is the fact that there should in all these money Resolutions be a breakdown. You come to the House and say you need this extra $15,000 for conferences. If it had been $16,000 or $17,000, how are we any wiser whether the money is needed? There should be a breakdown. Over and over again I noticed in the last session that these bald statements are made, and there is no real telling us how you arrive at that particular sum; and when you ask some Ministers, as has happened more than once, he picks up his file and reads from it and maybe reads sixteen things and you do not remember all; and when you ask him again, as has happened with the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, he mumbles something and generally makes a rude remark about not answering. That is not good enough.

Every single money Resolution should set out in the Addendum how the money is arrived at. You have asked for $15,000. The Hon. Leader of the House has made a generalised statement that we have to go to these places. We are entitled to know what are the rates, whether they are first class rates and whether you have luxury rooms in a hotel and so on. None of these things we know. We know that at some of these conferences you attend, only the Heads get the best rooms and that sort of thing and their rates are higher than the people lower down - the Permanent Secretaries, stenographers and so on. We do not know if the sum of $15,000 is computed and spent in a way that could make us pay more than we normally should pay, going by normal practice. The Prime Minister gets a special rate, special room and so on, but not the Permanent Secretary; and I am not just speaking of Barbados. Stenographers have to be content sometimes to share rooms, because you are trying, unless you are the fabulously wealthy United States of America, to do an efficient job with, so to speak, a minimum expenditure of public funds.

I therefore appeal to the Hon. Leader of the House to see that in future money Resolutions come down with a breakdown so that we know how the sum asked for has been arrived at. I sit down asking the same question with which I began. Why didn't you write down $6, $7 or $8? We would be none the wiser as to how you arrived at it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I have not changed my policy in respect of conferences and delegations from what it used to be some years ago. I have always held that representatives of Barbados going abroad should not have to duck into a train here and a train there, or live in such circumstances that they would not want to go back. But there is only one question I want to ask. I do not feel either that representatives of the people at conferences should have to travel going to London - or wherever it is - cloaked up as any tourist class. I held that view when the last Government was in power, and I said that on the floor of the House, and I say that again today.
5.45 p.m.

While it is true that expenses in respect of conferences and so on must be greater, I would like to know, and the Minister should be able to tell me, if any special arrangements have been made with what is considered as the National carrier, or B.O.A.C., for the purpose of getting a special price for Government Officers, or officials, or Ministers, going on conferences. This would be very interesting, because when you look at it quite a tidy sum is spent, and I believe that there should be some special arrangement. I understand that this is so in Trinidad, and I would like to know if we get any rebate or anything of the sort in this respect. Otherwise, I am going to support this. As I said when the Leader of the Opposition was then the Premier of this country, I did not like the idea of his having to go and duck about in a train. I did not support the idea of his getting a Rolls Royce or anything of the sort to drive around in, and I think he should be treated as a true representative of the people at a conference. I would like to know if we are getting a special rebate from the National carrier, B.O.A.C., or Pan American, when officials are leaving here for conferences, especially now that we are a nation and we are attending conferences abroad in Canada, America, England, Trinidad or wherever it is.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the procedure in the Government Service for anyone who was acquainted with the work of the Ministry has not changed. The coming of Independence has not brought about any revolution in the procedures which are normally adopted before money Resolutions are brought to this House. Of course, it is true that lots of people did not spend as much time in their offices when they were supposed to be doing this job as they should have.

What usually happens is that long before the matter gets to a Cabinet Minister, a circular goes around to the various Departments, and they are asked what commitments they have - what are their commitments in the sense of what bills they have in the offices which have to be paid, what conferences they envisage that the officers or the Minister in that Department will have to attend between the time when the circular is sent out and the end of the financial year - and it is on that basis that the calculation is made.

If we reproduce every single letter that came in from the Ministry of Trade and Fisheries, the Ministry of Agriculture and National Insurance, the Ministry of Home Affairs, that would not be the kind of information which we put in an Addendum. Any hon. member who, at any time, wishes to know what the Ministry of Agriculture has to spend between now and the end of the financial year can ask a substantive question. We can only base our calculations on the information which comes in.

For example, the meetings which the Ministry of Agriculture and National Insurance will have to attend are: A meeting of the British Caribbean Veterinary Association - no Minister is involved there - $405: The Caribbean Symposia on Nematodes of tropical areas - $700. This is a very important conference, because the agricultural experts in this Island, working for the Sugar Producers and carrying out private

investigations for industry and also for the Government, have discovered that Nematodes are really a scourge on the diversification programme, so much so that in one experiment it meant the difference between 80,000 lbs. and yield of 8,000 lbs. of a particular product which had not been pest-controlled. We had to spend $700 on that, but the possible benefit to market gardening in this country may be $700,000 over a space of two or three years. Then there is a Conference on Plants Quarantine for another $700. Neither of these Conferences has come off, so that the total involvement in the Ministry of Agriculture between the time that this Resolution is passed and the end of the financial year is $1,805.

Now there are other outstanding bills against the unexpended balance, of course, which have already been approved. You go from Ministry to Ministry like that, and it is a simple question of arithmetic. To suggest that we just think of a number and, say, put down $15,000 for the Minister of Finance is a joke. Anybody who has been a Minister of Finance would know it is a joke. Anybody who has not been a Minister of Finance, of course, would ask the kind of questions that I have heard here today. This is a question of arithmetic; it is not a question of thinking of a number, multiply it by seven, add six, minus two, double it, and put scratches and come to the House of Assembly. We do not work it like that nowadays. It is done on a scientific basis.

The hon. member for the City asked something about air fares, and I would like to disabuse the hon. member's mind. We do not have any National carrier. The United States of America does not have a National carrier. What the United States of America has done is to negotiate bilateral treaties with a multiplicity of Overseas Governments; and then the Civil Aeronautic Board, an Agency of the Government, has designated specific airlines to operate those routes to carry the American Flag. So you will find in the Caribbean alone, that the United States Government has five National carriers. I know they have Caribair, Pan American, Eastern Airlines operating out of Puerto Rico, and it has another operating out of Jamaica and so on. You have National Airlines and American Airlines. Some people may refer to them as all National carriers in the sense that they are designated, but in Barbados we do not need any National carriers. I hope that one of these days we will have 105 National carriers, all carrying the Barbados flag. We want as many planes as possible landing and taking off at Seawell. Only someone who is not in his right senses would think that there is some magic in having a National carrier.

We do not have a National carrier; we do not own any airline, and we do not intend to own any airline as a Government. We intend to designate proper air service routes to people who are capable of flying those routes. This makes commonsense from an economic point of view. Therefore we cannot demand from any airline coming here that we should get special rates or special treatment, because if those airlines are members of I.A.T.A., that would be an infringement of their particular business to give us special rates. What we are asking is that people in the Caribbean should not be discriminated against. This is a different thing altogether.

Furthermore, we are saying that when we issue licences to anyone to operate into and out of our territory, we expect him to abide by the terms of that licence and not to exploit the general public. There was a time when, in consideration of a certain amount of money granted by the Government under an agreement with West Indian Airways, the British West Indies Airways allowed Government officials travelling on business a deduction or rebate on the fee; but there had to be a specific subvention or donation given to the British West Indies Airways in consideration of this. As a matter of fact, there would be no infringement at that time because B.W.I.A. was not a member of the International Air Transport Association before January last year, for all the years it had been operating. All of a sudden it decided to jump into the pool, for some motive which, up to now, I have not been able to understand.

The position is that we have to pay the same fare to the airlines as any member of the public. 5.55 p.m.

As far as Cabinet Ministers are concerned, unless they are travelling with members of other Governments, they use the economy class fare in the Caribbean, and if they are travelling, certainly at least on three occasions this year, in order to keep down the cost of these Conferences and to keep down the pressure on the vote, we have invited Cabinet Ministers to travel tourist class all the way to Europe and the United States of America. I myself have volunteered to travel tourist class and was informed by my colleagues in the Cabinet that it does not look good for the Head of the Government of Barbados to be walking out at the back end of the aircraft; but I think I am resourceful enough that I can do like a certain legal friend of mine who always travels tourist class, but whenever he gets out of the plane, he goes through the first-class door, so that it will look good to his friends who are waiting to see him. *(Laughter)* I am resourceful enough that, even if I travel tourist class, it will not make any difference. The back end of the plane arrives at the Airport at exactly the same time as the front end of the plane. As far as I am concerned, I am willing to travel tourist class if the House of Assembly want me to travel tourist class; but let them just give me permission to walk through the front end of the plane so that when the photographers and so on are there, it would not look as if Barbados cannot afford to pay for the Head of the Government. My Ministers have been very considerate in this matter because they themselves travel whenever possible economy class, and the Government officials also travel economy class except in circumstances where a single Permanent Secretary will be travelling with a Minister who cannot get an economy class passage; then both of them will travel first class because we do not want to separate the Minister from his Permanent Secretary.

The hon. member for St. Joseph said that we take three or four people. I have seen a delegation

from Montserrat went - and the hon. member for the City can corroborate this - twice as large as the Barbados delegation to a conference, and their total budget at that time was $1 million and $839,000 of that came from the British Treasury. We arrived with three members and they arrived with seven. You must have a sense of proportion in these things. We do not take Government officials because we feel that Mr. So-and-So should have a trip or anything like that. It is not a question of that at all. There is a lot of Committee work to be done at these conferences. At the Independence Conference, the Opposition were making out a claim for greater numbers because of the Committee work and so on involved, and they said that they should be allowed whatever number, unlimited or limited as the case may be, so that they could be properly represented. The Minister of Communications and Works could not go to a conference in Trinidad on Regional Shipping without expert advisers. The Minister of Trade could not go to a Rice Conference without a member of the Chamber of Commerce who has to deal with these people and knows when they are trying to pull a fast one, because the Hon. Minister is not supposed to photograph in his mind every single thing in a file or to retain in his mind everything that he has been told in preliminary discussions with members of the trade or industry of this country; therefore, you must have a specialist who would take over the Committee work. One of the great difficulties which the Minister of Agriculture found when he went to the Food and Agriculture Organisation Conference in Rome recently was that there was so much Committee work to be done that he had to be dashing from one Committee to the other, even although he had the assistance of the Deputy High Commissioner in London; and that is another saving that we have effected because by having the High Commissioner over there we have been able to use him to go to Algiers to the United Nations Commission and Trade Development Conference they had in Algiers last year. That is preliminary to the Delhi meeting, which is supposed to be the big meeting, and we will have to call on that Deputy High Commissioner to go to New Delhi; thereby we save an air fare from Barbados to London because we would only have to pay a London delegate, and the same Deputy High Commissioner also represented the Barbados Government at the I.L.O. Conference, at the Sugar Conference and at the Conference of General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs. We would have had to come back for a lot more money because of these International Conferences which we cannot avoid going to or participating in. If we did not have a High Commission Office in London, as a matter of fact, I daresay, let us assume that the High Commission Office over there costs us $203,000 this year. It is somewhere in that region for all the migrant services and everything else. The amount that we have saved on travelling expenses to these International Conferences by being able to use the services and good offices of the High Commissioner in London is at least, in my opinion, 30% of the total cost of running that office.

Mr. Chairman, I think I have explained the procedure which we follow before we come in here and ask for a vote. This is not a Ministerial Conference vote; this is a vote for all the representation which has to be made by people who have to leave Barbados and there is also an element in it of the payment for secretarial services and so on, for people who are coming into Barbados to attend meetings and conferences with officials and delegations.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1967-68 No.42

QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

A Resolution for the sum of $375,876 - was called.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution seeks to provide a supplementary provision of $375,876 for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. 6.05 p.m.

Item 16 makes provision for Substitutes and Temporary Staff. The amount previously voted was $140,000 and the amount spent up to the 18th November, 1967, was $138,712 thus leaving a balance of $1,288. This makes provision for vacation and sick leave possible to the Unestablished Staff, for the salaries of temporary staff taken on with prior approval and for the employment of substitutes in posts on the Hospital establishment where the occasion arises, or for sickness or grant of vacation leave.

The nature of the items makes accurate budgeting impossible because it is not always that you can estimate or know how many people may become ill or when will persons become ill.

There has been a temporary staff of eighteen persons including two Assistant Anaesthetists and eleven subordinate posts. The leave for the Unestablished Staff amounted to $13,420 and the leave for the substitutes amounted to $78,580.

Now, this was the breakdown:-

One Orthopaedic Appliance Technician,
One Medical Librarian,
Two Laboratory Technicians,
One Senior Radiologist and
Five special Nurses.

This amounted to $82,000 and the leave for Unestablished Staff amounted to $16,000.

Instead of the amount of money spent on substitutes being $78,000, the amount required to pay substitutes for the entire year is estimated at $127,500. This makes a supplementary provision of $85,000 necessary under Item 16.

Item 26. There was an original vote of $51,000 for House Officers, and by the 18th November, 1967, the amount spent was $29,506.26. The balance of the vote is $21,493.74. Since then, since the beginning of the financial year, provision was made to increase

the number of the House Officers in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital from ten to fifteen and this makes a supplementary provision of $4,006.26 necessary - you had better say $4,007.

Item 33 deals with Dental Outpatients Service and the amount required here is $304. This is to take care of the advance in payment which was made to the substantive holder of the post whilst on leave, and when a substitute had to be taken on. There were two people paid that month.

Since then, it was refunded to General Revenue. Well, to get back out the $304, a Resolution would have to be voted for that sum. I want to make this very clear. But the substantive holder of the post and the substitute received the salary of $304 for that month, but it was repaid to the Treasury by the substantive holder of the post because he was on leave. That is just a part-time service and therefore it means now that the officer is back on the job, at the end of the financial year - the last month of the financial year - the vote would have been depleted if the $304 is not supplemented.

Item 34 makes provision for Specialist Officers' service rendered. Hon. members are aware that the services performed by the Surgeon Specialist or a Specialist practitioner at the Hospital - whether they are surgeons, or physicians, or radiologists - of the total amount of money which the patients are asked to pay for treatment, etc., in private wards, 75 per cent is paid to the officer. Now the amount of money, which has had to be paid to the officers during this year, was more than anticipated. As to this money which is paid to the officers, the equivalent to it is paid into the Treasury before it is paid to the officers. This provision is made in the Estimates to pay these officers, but the officers are paid only when the people hospitalised have paid in respect of the services rendered them at the Hospital.

The Surgeon - Specialist doing this operation receives 75 per cent of the amount, but he does not get it until that is paid into the Treasury; so it means that we have to make provision for it here in order for it to come out of the Treasury. But it is not really a charge on the Government. As a matter of fact, we get 25% of it. He gets it after it is paid into the Treasury. I think hon. members would appreciate that it is not a charge on the Treasury; it is only money which is being refunded. It is paid in by the patients, and after it is paid in, the officers are given 75 per cent. That is to say, if $10 is paid in, 75 per cent of that is given to the officer. Suppose an operation cost $500 and the patient paid in $50, the officer is paid 75 per cent of the $50 paid in.

Well, more money was paid in this year than was anticipated, and that is what occasioned the supplementary to this item.

Item 85 deals with the Resident Engineer. The amount of money provided for the salary of the Resident Engineer was $8,160 because at the time when this money was put in, the Estimates was being prepared, and no decision had as yet been made as regards revised rates that should be attached to the post. Now the revised rate attached to the post is now $9,600 per annum and therefore the vote has got to be supplemented by $1,440.

Item 92 deals with Supervisor of Gardens and there is a provision of $432 per annum made in the last Estimates. That is now increased to $648 per annum and a supplementary of $216 is asked to pay the Supervisor of Gardens of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

Now, these are about all the points involved. I hope I have given hon. members as satisfactory a breakdown as they would like, and I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of five Resolutions in Committee of Supply and the postponement of one.

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

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

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

6.15 p.m.

On the separate motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, this concludes Government Business for today's sitting.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 30th January, 1968, at 2.30 p.m.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I really cannot and it seems I will never be able to understand the attitude of the Government. They adjourn the House to suit them. Last Tuesday, they adjourned until 12 o'clock today because they had some work to do, and now they are adjourning until 2.30 p.m. next Tuesday. When on earth are they prepared to let us do Private Members' Business? When we meet at 2.30 p.m. next Tuesday, the Government will take up to about 3 o'clock introducing Bills and so on. If the Government adjourns until 2.30 p.m., we should commence with Private Members' Business, and then when the time for Government Business arrives, they should then start with the regular introduction of Bills in their own time. It is not fair to us, because Tuesday after

Tuesday items of Private Members' Business are taken off the Order Paper. What is the good of our promising the electorate everything by way of Resolutions when we can only give notice of them in here and that is all? It is a deliberate attempt to flout the wishes of the people.

With respect to the reply to the last Budgetary Proposals, we might just as well finish with that because the next Budgetary Proposals will come before we have finished the last one. The Government should be ashamed of that. Because they have the numbers, Tuesday after Tuesday, they adjourn to suit themselves. In the Standing Orders you will see that the House should adjourn until 12 o'clock noon. The Standing Orders do not say that we should start at 2.30 p.m.; so if we are going to adhere to the Standing Orders, let us do so or rip them up. Let us come in here with some big sticks and let the strongest tell. The people expect us to do something for them, but this action only gives me ammunition, because when I go back to the people I will tell them how you tried to push them around and pull some fast ones. I can tell them differently out there because the Standing Orders prevent me from talking to the Government and telling them how I feel. Why is it that you should adjourn every Tuesday until 2.30 p.m. and when it suits you, at 12 o'clock noon without asking us? If the Leader of the House had asked me how I felt about it or had called me over to him, I would have gone, because I can go anywhere in this country. I am not afraid or ashamed to go anywhere. If he is ashamed to come by me, that is his business. If the Prime Minister called me to Culloden Farm, although out there is dark with plenty of trees, I would still go; so I am not afraid. Why do this all the time without asking us over here? You just do not care anything about the Opposition; but we have to drive some fear into you if you are not afraid.

Something happened here this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, and I am getting to the point where I may decide not to come back, because I cannot tolerate what is going on in here. I will have to bring in a little chopper or something and chop off somebody's head when he is ruling wrong and trying to steal my rights and that of other people. I am losing my temper, because this is Parliament and we have Rules to govern us, and we must adhere to them; but it seems to me that the Government is tearing up the Standing Orders. What must we do now? I am going to appeal to you for protection, and you must rule that kind of adjournment out of order. Do something and let me see that you are on the side of the people - not me or the Opposition, because we are dealing with the people. There are some of us who only know the people at a certain time. We are not getting any work done and you give instructions - not even for the House to hear - when items are to be struck off the Order Paper. I am not a puppet representative; I am not one on the top of a house that moves when the wind blows. I am a representative of the people, and I would not stand for such pulling around. If it is in your power not to accept this kind of adjournment, do not accept it and let the Island and the world see that you are what everybody expects you to be - one of the best speakers that ever sat in a Chair.

6.25 p.m.

Do that, Sir; protect us; you have to protect us, because the people on the other side are not going to protect me. If it were different, I would protect myself from either one of them. Somebody would hit the ground first through the window. It is not fair, and I am appealing now to the Hon. Leader of the House not to let it appear that he is being one-sided.

We want the work to be done. Look at the Order Paper, Sir, and you will see how much Private Members' Business is on it. I brought in a very important Resolution here today for the benefit of old people, and that will soon be struck off.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I hope the hon. member will give way. Since it appears to be of such importance to the hon. member and, as he said, to the other side, I wish to make the Government's position perfectly clear. I do not fix the time of adjournment with any design to embarrass, or to intimidate, to fool or deceive the other side. I, in my capacity as Leader of the House, have to be guided by the exigencies of the Government's work, and according to the quantum of business I see under Government's Business.

If, however, the hon. member feels so strongly about this, I am perfectly prepared to amend my own motion to twelve o'clock noon instead of 2.30 p.m., and my colleagues agree that I should do it.

Mr. SMITH: I thank you, Sir.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am perfectly willing to do it. My motion is formally amended to read "twelve noon" instead of "2.30 p.m."

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. senior member for St. Joseph any amendment to make?

Mr. SMITH: I was not listening, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the hon. senior member for St. Joseph was, as he says, not listening, the motion became one for the adjournment of the House until twelve noon next Tuesday. I was inquiring if the hon. member had any amendment to that.

Mr. SMITH: I would make it 10.30 a.m., but I would not amend the motion.

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

The House was accordingly adjourned.

6.31 p.m.