

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 9th July, 1968

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

PRESENT

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

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret to have to inform hon. members that only the Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, 12th March this year are available for confirmation. I understand that they have been circulated, and unless any member objects, I will declare these Minutes duly to be confirmed.

There being no objection, the Minutes are declared confirmed.

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 beg to lay the following:-

Report of the Ministry of External Affairs for the year 1967.

The Pensions (Pensionable Offices) (Amendment) Order, 1968.

On behalf of the Minister of Agriculture and National Insurance, I beg to lay the Report of the Registrar of Trade Unions for the year 1967-68.

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:-

A Resolution to place the sum of \$21,447 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1968-69, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1968-69 No. 10 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to place the sum of \$8,000 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1968-69, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1968-69 No. 11 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to place the sum of \$20,540 at this disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1968-69, Part II - Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1968-69 No. 12 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to approve the Pensions (Pensionable Offices) (Amendment) Order, 1968.

A Bill to amend the Income Tax Act, 1921.

On my own behalf, Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 178 asked by the junior member for St. James is ready.

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Income Tax Act, 1921 be read a first time.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, as I intimated to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, I propose to move the suspension of Standing Orders 5, 14, 16, 18, 19, 38, 40 and 45 for the remainder of the day's sitting. I give the usual undertaking that Questions

Time and Private Members' Business will be taken at the appropriate time.

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

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

RESOLUTION OF THANKS FOR GIFT OF BOOKS TO LIBRARY

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, in consultation with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition I beg to move the passing of the following address:-

THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY

Most Gracious Sovereign:

The House of Assembly with loyalty and due submission beg to inform Your Majesty that they have thankfully received from the House of Commons in the United Kingdom a most valuable gift of books for their Library.

The House note with pleasure that this gift commemorates the Independence of Barbados, and that Your Majesty had been pleased to direct, in response to a prayer made by the House of Commons, that the appropriate supply be provided.

The House accordingly wish to thank Your Majesty for this gesture of goodwill, and respectfully request that an expression of their warm appreciation to the Honourable House be conveyed to Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, after some consultation between myself and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, it has been decided that our appreciation for the gift which has been sent to us by the Hon. House of Commons of the United Kingdom be expressed in this form.

The reason is this: the procedure taken was that an Address was passed by the House of Commons to the Queen asking Her Majesty to give directions for a Library to be presented from the House of Commons to the House of Assembly of Barbados, and also assuring Her Majesty that the House of Commons would be prepared to make good the supply necessary for the gift.

The Queen replied in a Message that she had given such directions, whereupon the customary Resolution was moved and passed in the House of Commons and it was in this wise that the matter was settled and we were able some four weeks ago to receive a delegation from the House of Commons with the gift.
12.25 p.m.

We had, of course, both myself and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, on the occasion of the presentation expressed the thanks of the House, but we gave the assurance that the House itself would in its

customary form express the thanks which was due both to the Queen and the House of Commons. It is, therefore, in this way that we decided to do it, and I am sure that I need not repeat all that the three of us said on that occasion when we expressed the gratitude of the House and of the individual members not only for the selection of the books, but for the thought and generosity which prompted the gift. I, therefore, beg to move that this Address do now pass.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I have very much pleasure indeed in seconding the passage of this Resolution. As the Hon. Leader of the House has said, it is unnecessary for us to repeat all that we said on that occasion, which includes Your Honour. But I think it is right that, coming from the House, we should say what a great gesture it is. I repeat that much of what I said on the occasion on the actual presentation, because I do not know who was responsible for the actual choice of the books; but the choice reflects consideration and, in fact, is even a compliment to the House of Assembly of Barbados and thereby to the people of Barbados and to the educational standard of Barbados and what we may call the comparatively wide reading of the Barbadian public.

As hon. members will have noted, on looking at the books, they could not help but reflect the cultural aspects, one may say, of the Barbadian public in that there were so many books on cricket included in the gift. One point to which I referred and to which I will refer again is the fact that they have included a number of dictionaries not only in the modern languages: French, German, Spanish and English which is a foreign language to some hon. members on the other side, but even Latin, the great standby to classical students - *Lewis & Short Latin Dictionary* and *Liddell & Scott Greek Lexicon*.

I have just spoken of the cultural aspects and the educational standards of Barbadians. I was rather surprised when I was looking at the books, in came the Clerk of the House and it was he who first pointed out to me these dictionaries and books on cricket. He said to my great surprise - great surprise because he mixes so much with Government members, and I would have thought that he would have come across the word before. He said he had come across the word for the first time in his life "hydrocephalus", and knowing that the Greek word for water was "hydro", he looked it up and found that it contained two Greek words "hydro" meaning water and "cephalus" meaning head. In other words, "water on the brain". I was, therefore, as I said, rather surprised that although he mixes so much with members of the Government, yet he did not perceive the meaning of the word "hydrocephalus" and its application.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that hon. members - and I mean this quite seriously - I say it without, I hope, any reasonable accusation of pretence to knowledge, but frankly we would all be better off from reading those books on Parliamentary Procedure more often. There would be fewer mistakes made; there would be fewer breaches of order, and

it is not confined to this House. I have heard some strong language used in the House of Commons by the Speaker, and even by the Prime Minister in referring to the frequent abuse - in fact, it was the Prime Minister from whom I got the word "fraudulent", and I referred to it last week - the frequent abuse of some hon. members rising on a point of order which is not a point of order, but in order to make a debating point, to make another speech.

I suggest to the 23 hon. members to read, learn and inwardly digest what they must learn if they read these books on Parliamentary Procedure. There are some books, which I take it, Your Honour, are not in the category of books of reference, in this part of the House which members could take home and read, and therefore they can still improve their knowledge of Parliamentary Procedure by reading these books which are available to them for reading at home.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition means to take home, read, and return.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Even though, like myself, they will not return them for weeks and in a few cases for months. It only shows that somebody else, who should have been reading the books, has not asked for them.

Mr. Speaker, I again say that I have very great pleasure indeed in seconding this Resolution. It is a great gesture, and we ought to be very thankful for this gift of books.

Mr. SPEAKER: It does not appear that any other hon. member seeks to contribute to this debate on this Resolution of Thanks. If I may be permitted to associate myself, I will do so on behalf of the House and, of course, myself in this magnanimous and gracious gift from what is still the Mother of Parliaments to one of the very oldest of her former children.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I should have interpolated earlier, when the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was speaking, that the choice of books was made by the Hon. Leader of the House with whom was associated the Hon. Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the learned senior member for Christ Church. Both parties took a hand and collaborated.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Government Business is now the instant Order of the Day. Order No. 1 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 grants of sums of money for the service of the Island.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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. C. E. TALMA: 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 ESTIMATES 1968-69 No.9

Head 35 - Waterworks - was called.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, as the Addendum sets out, the sum of \$13,000 which was provided in the 1967-68 Estimates for the purchase of a Mobile Compressor for the Waterworks Department lapsed because the purchase of this equipment was not effected by the end of the financial year. It is accordingly necessary to revote this amount to meet the cost of the equipment this financial year.

What really took place was that some time in the financial year 1967-68, tenders were invited to supply this piece of equipment, but due to circumstances beyond our control the equipment was not purchased then. As a result the money lapsed, and we are now asking the Committee to revote this amount so that we might be able to purchase this piece of equipment. This Compressor is for driving pneumatic drills and will be on wheels.

I beg to move that Head 25 - Waterworks - stand part.

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

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

Head 38 - Ministry of Education (1) General Administration - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, under item 44A - Centre for Multi-Racial Studies, the sum of \$3,600 is asked for in respect of this item, and it is because Government has decided to make a subvention to the Centre for Multi-Racial Studies in respect of the care of the Richard B. Moore Library. Hon. members will see from the Addendum what the Centre has to do in respect of this guardianship. If there are any questions arising, I will be pleased to answer, although for the benefit of the hon. junior member for St. Peter, I should like to say that all the Library has not been received. Mr. Moore has explained that his principal assistant who has been helping him in packing and so on has been on a visit to Africa and will not return for a month or so, and

that he himself had been changing residence, but he hopes within the next two or three months, and at any rate not later than the end of September to have the whole thing assembled, packaged and delivered to Barbados. If there are any more questions, I shall be pleased to answer them.

I beg to move that Head 38 stand part.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is necessary for me to say much at this stage, except that I am glad to see that the Library has found a resting place. I hope that will not be taken to mean a burying place. What strikes me about this Resolution is simply this: the Leader of the House has just informed us that the complete Library has not yet arrived. Evidently, he was trying to take the wind out of my sails, because he knows quite well that I would be well apprised of all that is happening. Nevertheless we are asked here to vote the sum of \$3,000 as Government's contribution to the Centre for guarding the Library and what not. I am well aware of the fact that Mr. Chandler, the Archivist, went over to New York and saw what he could of the Library, and I am in a position to say that even Mr. Chandler's visit and examination was not on a broad enough scale as to permit him to return to Barbados with a complete catalogue of these books.

We are not saying, Mr. Chairman, that our contribution to the Multi-Racial Centre must necessarily be based on the number of books, but nevertheless if the Centre for Multi-Racial Studies is to undertake any work in respect of these books, one would have expected that the books would have arrived and an inspection and examination carried out locally, and some means arrived at whereby we could assess in its entirety what charge or contribution might be laid on us. In other words, Mr. Chairman, I would hardly believe that if this Library consisted of, let us say, 100 books that our contribution would have been \$3,600. If it is a case where we would have been asked to pay \$3,600 whether the books were 100, 1,000 or one million, I would like to hear from the Leader of the House.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. member has raised two very interesting points. Let me deal with one of them immediately. We are not giving this subvention to the Centre for Multi-Racial Studies on the basis of the number of books. This does not arise at all. This is being given because in our view - and this is a view which I think is appreciated and shared by a lot of people - they are the proper establishment to look after a collection of this sort. 12.45 p.m.

The Richard B. Moore collection which has spread over some forty or fifty years of Mr. Moore's interest in collecting books, includes books on almost every aspect of Negro history and literature, books on the early colonization of Africa, books on the Arawak civilization of Latin America, books, for instance, on the role of the European colonising

powers in Africa and Asia, and many other categories of books are in this collection. By my own estimate, and I have seen a part of it, the collection must number easily about fifteen thousand or twenty thousand volumes; it may be a few less or it may be a few more. When Mr. Chandler first visited Mr. Moore, I believe, in 1965 or whenever it was, to see the collection, he did make a provisional catalogue - a sample catalogue - because he did not have the time to see the complete collection; but what he saw was enough to give the Government some idea of the intrinsic value of the collection. It was largely on the basis of his provisional report that we understood how valuable and how important a collection this was. The full cataloguing and arrangement can only be made when the Library is completely assembled. However, for as much of it as has already been received, and I think I can safely say that much more than one half of it is already in the Island, some preliminary cataloguing has been done.

I myself do not know the technical terms for this, but Mr. Chandler and his assistants with help from some of the people of the History section of the University of the West Indies, and some assistance also from Mr. St. Hill of the Public Library, have all had a very close and technical examination of the collection which has been so far received, and they have been able to make quite an interesting recommendation as to how the books are to be catalogued and how they are to be finally presented for use to the public. The connection between that and what is now proposed is simply this; since the entire collection would be a valuable adjunct for the general public and the researchers generally in their work of multi-racial societies, it has been thought that the Centre for the Study of Multi-Racial Societies should be the proper guardian of the collection. We have every reason to believe that they will look after it properly and will be able to make the collection or any part of it, from time to time as it is required, entirely available to scholars, students and the general public. And what is even more important is that they will also be able to look after its continual preservation, maintenance and upkeep.

This is a collection which will have to be added to from time to time. The Universities of Sussex and the U.W.I. will want to add to the collection from time to time as soon as appropriate material comes to light. Public benefactors, I believe, will also wish at some time to give new volumes of interesting works on the History of negritude, as it is called, to it, and the general public may wish from time to time to take advantage of this development. On the basis of these considerations and in full consultation with the authorities of the Centre, they have said that they think the physical facility already provided, the room or rooms in which the collection is to be housed - and these facilities will have accessibility as well as all the requirements for the preservation of precious books, will have availability and also they will always be under the kind of staff which can do the re-classifying and re-cataloguing whenever these should be necessary, and can site any additional gifts and bequests into the appropriate sections as and

when they are made. Therefore, by and large, I do not think that we need have any fear that the collection will not be properly looked after and properly cared for. The main point, of course, is that it must be always available to those who wish to study, whether they are academics or members of the general community. Equally important is the fact that the collection is being handed over to a responsible academic body, and they have undertaken, apart from the usual requirements of maintenance, preservation and availability, to do what is required with respect to commemorating both the Lions Club of Barbados for their generosity, and commemorating especially Mr. Moore for the scholarship and the persistence which he has shown over the years first in collecting such a worthy prize, and then in making it available in these circumstances.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Hon. Leader of the House was speaking off the cuff when he spoke of adding to the Library by future gifts. Surely the Richard B. Moore Library should be kept by itself, and you could have an annexe for future gifts. The Richard B. Moore Library in the year 2,000 will cease to be the Richard B. Moore Library and it will cease to be ascertainable as the Richard B. Moore Library if you mix up subsequent gifts. I hope that the Hon. Leader of the House was merely speaking off the cuff, because it seems to me that this is a unique collection which should be kept as the Richard B. Moore Library, just as in the case of the Law Library, although I believe, there is a little mixing over there. Books which belonged to the late Mr. Walter Reece, some 2,000 of them, are purchased and put in a separate part of what, I believe, should be called the Law Library.

I make the suggestion - and this is a matter for the Multi-racial people - that this Library should be kept by itself as being unique and other contributions could be an annexe. I would not guess off-hand - I saw those books about fifteen years or more ago when I was not at that time a *persona non grata*. If I were to attempt to cross Mr. Richard B. Moore's place now-a-days, I would be shot, I have no doubt; but I do say that in the days when he thought that I was contributing something to Barbados and the West Indies, he did show me these books. However, this is a unique collection, as the Hon. Leader of the House has said. It is a labour of love to have collected these books over all of these years, and there are some books in his Library which it would be extremely difficult indeed to find except in the largest libraries of the United States or Britain or France.

12.55 p.m.

I want to make this one little point, one contribution, in saying that this is intended in respect of the care of the Richard B. Moore Library. The chief point I want to make is the original point that this Library should be kept uniquely - by itself.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, before the Leader of the House rises to reply, I think that he made mention of the word "Negro" in reference to the Richard B. Moore Library. I thought I should remind the Min-

ister that Mr. Moore has since published a book entitled "The Word 'Negro' and its Evil Use." In that book Mr. Moore says that the word has a degrading connotation and is something repugnant to human decency. I am sure that Mr. Moore would not like his Library to be connected in any way with the word "Negro".

What I do know is that Mr. Moore much prefers to make such references as Afro-American or Afro-West Indian, as the case may be. There is one other point that I want to make. I hope that everything will be done by the Government and the Centre for Multi-racial Studies to make the Library available particularly to the boys and girls who want to study - those from the Primary and the Secondary Grammar Schools in the country districts.

I hope that everything will be done to publicise it that the Library is being used at the Centre for Multi-racial Studies and that it is available to these boys and girls, and that they can be made to feel as part and parcel of the whole undertaking that is being carried out at this Centre.

I sincerely hope, Mr. Chairman, that on the next occasion on which we make mention of the name of the Richard B. Moore Library that this Hon. House will be receiving a report that at long last the ship bringing the Richard B. Moore Library has sailed into the Bridgetown Port - at long last.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, there are three points on which I want to speak. I did not want to suggest in my remarks that nothing will be done to preserve the collection, and that it would be dissipated in such a way as to lose its identity as other bequests bearing on the same topics. No; every sensible and proper method will be taken and used to preserve this collection as a distinction collection. Just as you have in New York the famous Schomburg Collection preserved, so will this be preserved.

But, of course, books on cognate or equally important studies may well, of course, be acquired by the Centre. In any case, it is proposed that a large portion of the Richard B. Moore collection will be stamped in such a way that it will always be recognized as the Richard B. Moore Collection.

The second point deals with one raised by the hon. junior member for St. Peter. I did not really use the word "Negro". I said that a lot of the books covered what is known as negritude. That is a word recently coined by the Society of African Writers, among whom are such distinguished persons as Cesar Ayme of Martinique and President Leopold Sengar of Senegal, both of whom are close friends of Mr. Moore and with whom he corresponds.

The word "negritude" is used to describe a philosophy, an outlook. It has nothing offensive about it; but, as I have said, it is used by the Society of African Writers.

I know that Mr. Moore has strong feelings on the word 'negro' and what I was saying was that the collection covered a vast part of the field of negritude.

The second point made by the hon. member was that he hoped that full publicity would be given to the establishment of the Library and that it would be available particularly to the younger generation for study. This hope is fully shared by the Government, although I should point out that the books in the Richard B. Moore collection will not, except at a certain intellectual level, prove to be ordinary reading books.

They are books of reference, and naturally school children as well as older scholars will have the books available to them. Some of the books, as I think the hon. member knows, are pure history. Some of them are legend dealing with allegorical subjects; but in such a collection it is obvious that there will be a large part which will be suited to the more general reader. An impressive part of the collection would be suited to research scholars and students who want to fill up gaps in their history and which only that collection can fill.

There will be something for everyone, and there is no reason to believe that young people as well as the general public cannot make use of the collection and that the treasure in this collection will not be theirs to draw upon.

The question that Head 38 (1) stand part was put and agreed to.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move that the Chairman do now report the passing of one Resolution in Committee.

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

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

1.05 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution be now read a first time.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution be now read a second time.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution be now agreed to.

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

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

DAIRY INDUSTRY (REGULATION AND CONTROL) BILL, 1968

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House, and it is to resume debate on the consideration of the Amendments of the Senate to the Dairy Industry (Regulation and Control) Bill, 1968.

In respect of that we will be unable to proceed now inasmuch as the Committee has had one meeting only, which was extremely sparsely attended, and it was decided to postpone its next meeting to a date about a fortnight from then; therefore there has been no Report yet laid on the Table of this House in respect of these Amendments by the Other Place.

Order No. 3 is the next Order of the Day, and it stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to take charge of this matter in the absence of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister.

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (No.3) ORDER, 1968

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to take charge of Order No. 3 in the absence of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister. Unless there is any objection, leave will be granted to the Hon. Leader of the House to proceed to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 3) Order, 1968.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This House will see that this Civil Establishment Order really concerns three Departments of Government: the Ministry of Home Affairs, the Post Office and the Training Unit. I suppose the most significant part of the Order deals with the proposal to abolish the post of Confidential Records Officer. This arises from the fact that for some time now all of the Ministries of the Government have, of course, established their own registries in which their confidential documents and papers are being taken care of.

This devolution, so to speak, this decentralisation makes it unnecessary for this post and this office

to be retained, since each Ministry now has for some time assumed and will continue to assume responsibility for its own classified and confidential papers

The second part arises out of the decision already communicated to and approved by this House to set up a Philatelic Bureau, which is to fulfil a long-felt need in the Post Office administration. The proposal, therefore, is to give them an Assistant Supervisor and a Stenographer.

The third section deals with the establishment of a Training Unit in the manner set out in the Addendum.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

LEASE OF LAND TO THE BARBADOS LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY LIMITED

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the leasing of a parcel of land to the Barbados Light and Power Company Limited for the purpose of maintaining a sub-station already erected thereon.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution has reference to a piece of land in the City which is part of the lands of the Central Police Station - roughly 126 sq. ft. It is proposed that this lease be granted to the Barbados Light and Power Company Limited for a stated period of 10 years at a rental of \$21.50 per year. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that. 1.15 p.m.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, while I shall be told that the area is very small, how does anybody know the value of land in five or ten years' time? It is too long a period for so small a rental. Surely that must have occurred to members of the Government. You make a lease now; how are you going to change it unless you pass an Act to tear it up? How if land goes up tremendously in value till you get a reasonable sum of money for the rental in another seven years or whatever time it may be clear that rental values have gone up tremendously? Look at land values in this Island! I suggest to the Government that there is no earthly reason for renewing it at that rental simply because it is a small portion of land.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no other hon. members desirous of speaking, then the Hon. Introducer may exercise his right of final reply.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The hon. member has raised an important point, but I think I can assure him that

all aspects of this matter were very carefully gone into, and it was discovered that the interest of the public would not be badly served by this arrangement. Ten years is not thought to be such an exorbitantly, extravagantly, long time, and it is also felt that, as I said, the interest of the public and of the community is not badly served by this arrangement. (A VOICE: When does the lease expire?) I believe the hon. member's question *sotto voce* is when does the present lease expire. The lease expired on the 14th February, 1967 and it was in December of last year that the application for renewal was made.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I think this is perhaps a convenient time for us to suspend the Sitting.

I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended until 2.45 p.m.

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask whether lunch is being provided now. Is this to be taken as the luncheon interval?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I do not think so, Mr. Speaker.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Is there going to be lunch later on?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Oh yes.

The question that the sitting be now suspended until 2.45 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 5 is the next Order of the Day.

QUESTION TIME

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Question Time be now taken.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I am advised that only one Reply has today been laid, and that is to Question No. 178 in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter. I am also reminded that there was a question in respect of which supplementaries were being asked

when Question Time expired at the last meeting of this House, and that was in the name of the same hon. member.

Question No. 123 which stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter is the question on which supplementaries had apparently not been completed when time was called. Are there any other supplementaries in respect of Question No. 123? 2.50 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to enquire from the Minister. I remember on the last occasion my first supplementary Question to him was whether he knew of any arrangements by International Scientific Limited to provide Cod Liver Oil for any of the workers there.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I think I replied that I knew of no such arrangements.

Mr. HINDS: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister can tell us whether any tests have been carried out on the eyesight of any of the employees there since these Questions have been asked.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the Reply to that Question was given last week when it was pointed out that the Labour Department Act, 1943, prohibits information being given out by the Labour Department, which it gets from the employers. I made this quite clear. I invited the hon. member to have a look at the Labour Department Act, 1943.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, is it that the Minister is trying to protect the Labour Department in this instance or is he looking after the interest of the workers?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: It is the duty of the Minister to protect Officers who are working under him.

Mr. HINDS: I wonder if the Minister realises the responsibility of hon. members to look after the interest of the workers.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the question 'whether the hon. member wonders?'

Mr. HINDS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, 'whether the Minister wonders'.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The Minister does not wonder; he knows that it is the responsibility of people to protect the workers, and he is one of the greatest protectors of the workers in this country.

DELAY OF CANE-FIRE VIGILANCE POLICE SQUAD

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Question to which the Reply has been laid is Question No. 178, standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter. That is on page 13, left-hand column.

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

Is Government aware that the cane-fire vigilance squad of the Royal Barbados Police due to carry out special duties in the Northern Parishes of this Island on the night of Tuesday, April, 23rd, 1968, did not leave Central Police Station at the scheduled hour?

2. Is Government aware that the long delay was due to an outbreak of near-riot conditions, firstly in the barrack room, and secondly, in a police van and thirdly in the yard at Central Police Station in which the policemen involved were engaged in torch-light-smashing, baton-tossing and stone-throwing?

3. Does Government realise that men who were on duty and due for relief at the scheduled hour were thus delayed and caused to work extra hours whilst this exhibition of bad manners was taking place?

4. What steps have been taken, if any, to prevent a recurrence?

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

"1. Yes, Sir.

2. No, Sir. The delay was due to a misunderstanding of the details of duties for drivers which resulted in the absence of a driver at the scheduled time of departure of the police van from Central Police Station.

3. The men on duty for relief were delayed for approximately half an hour.

4. Stricter supervision over the despatch of police patrols in the country districts was carried out."

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to hear from the Minister if there was torch-light-smashing, baton-tossing and stone-throwing on the premises of the Central Police Station on the night in question?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I am afraid that I cannot assist the hon. member. The question seems, of course, to imply that, or rather not to imply it because it was stated in the original question; but I see no mention of it in the answer. Obviously, there was some disturbance.

Mr. HINDS: Do I understand the Minister to admit that there was some sort of disturbance at the Central Police Station on the night of April 23rd, 1968?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes, I would think so. If a particular patrol was delayed from taking up its duties, and if this delay was due to a misunderstanding of the details of duties for the drivers, I would call that a disturbance, certainly.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, is it that the Hon. Leader of the House has a different interpretation of the English Language than what hon. members on this side of the House would have? In other words, the Minister is saying that a misunderstanding arising from a van driver not knowing that he was detailed for duty for a specific hour, constituted a disturbance. I would like to know if the Minister means that a disturbance is an offence chargeable at law or a disturbance of the mind or whatever he is referring to.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I am afraid that I am not clever enough to mean any such thing. If a particular or a regular schedule of work has been interrupted, I would say that it has been disturbed.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, are we to understand that whenever there is such a misunderstanding as the Minister refers to, are we to believe that policemen are smashing torch-lights at each other and throwing stones about the compound of the Central Station at each other?
3.00 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The hon. member may understand that if he wishes. I don't.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Will the Hon. Leader of the House promise to answer me now, and not facetiously? He has said that the delay was not due to this outbreak in question. Is the hon. member admitting that there was an outbreak, but that it was not the cause of the delay? If there was an outbreak, has it been investigated?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: That has already been answered explicitly or impliedly. The question was: Is the Government aware that the cane-fire vigilance squad of the Royal Barbados Police due to carry out special duties in the Northern Parishes of this Island on the night of Tuesday, April 23rd, 1968, did not leave Central Police Station at the scheduled hour?

The answer to that was "yes". We were further asked if Government was aware that the long delay was due to an outbreak of near-riot conditions, firstly in the barrack room, and secondly in a police van and thirdly in the yard at Central Police Station in which the policemen involved were engaged in torch-light-smashing, baton-tossing and stone-throwing?

Does Government realise that men who were on duty and due for relief at the scheduled hour were thus delayed and caused to work extra hours whilst this exhibition of bad manners was taking place?

What steps have been taken if any, to prevent a recurrence?

The reply was that stricter supervision for the despatch of patrols to country districts is carried out. I have no personal knowledge of any riot or near-riot conditions. I just do not know. I am answering the question as I see information appearing on the file.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Will the Hon. Leader of the House answer this question? He said that the delay was not due to a disturbance in the proper sense of the word, and if there was a disturbance it had nothing to do with the delay. What I ask was if that disturbance has been investigated. The Police are to keep order - not to have disorder.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, for me to say that a particular disturbance was investigated would be for me to admit that I know of a particular disturbance. All I have is the information given to me here that the schedule was interrupted and that this interruption lasted approximately half an hour, and that stricter supervision over the despatch of Police patrols is being carried out.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: If there was no disturbance, is it not the duty of the Leader of the House to tell this House that not only was the delay not due to a disturbance, but that there was no disturbance at all? That would be a forthright and honest answer.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I leave it to the hon. member to decide what is forthright and what is honest. I cannot compete with him in that respect. I can only answer the question on the basis of the information which is before me.

Mr. HINDS: I wonder if the Minister can tell us if he carried out an investigation to find out if the van driver was involved in the stone-throwing, baton-tossing and torch-light-smashing?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No, Mr. Speaker. The information on the file does not show this.

Mr. HINDS: Now, Sir, has any disciplinary action been taken in respect of the van driver for his conduct on this night of July 23rd?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Assuming that the van driver transgressed some regulations - assuming this, I would imagine that the question of disciplining would come in with the stricter supervision which is now being put into effect.

Mr. HINDS: Does the Minister know whether or not policemen have been called upon to pay the cost of replacements for the torchlights that have been smashed?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Assuming that torchlights have been smashed, Mr. Speaker, I do not know this. That information does not appear.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, is the Leader of the House prepared to assume that the hon. junior member for St. Peter did the very thing which he ought not to do - make sure of his facts? I draw the hon. member's attention to Standing Order No. 12 which says that questions may be put to Minister relating to public affairs for which they are officially responsible, and that every question shall conform to the following rules -

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member purporting now to put a supplementary question?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am putting a supplementary. I am asking the member whether he is suggesting that the hon. junior member for St. Peter is not prepared to support or substantiate the statements that he has made? I ask the hon. member again; is he prepared to suggest that the hon. junior member for St. Peter is not prepared to substantiate his statement, thus going against Standing Order 12 which says that a question should not contain statements which the member who asks the question is not prepared to substantiate? (A MEMBER: Behave yourself, boy!)

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the Hon. Leader of the Opposition conclude his supplementary. (*Asides*)

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am sorry that the hon. members on my left are speaking. I think that I heard remarks in that direction.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I remind hon. members who are not speaking of the appropriate Standing Order - that hon. members who are not speaking - (*Asides*) - hon. members on both sides.....

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am finished, Mr. Speaker. I was only asking the Leader of the House whether he was saying that the hon. junior member for St. Peter was ignoring Standing Order 12 which says that a question shall not contain statements which a member asking the question is not prepared to substantiate?

Does the Leader of the House think that the hon. member has come here and asked that question - a question that passed Your Honour - and is not prepared to substantiate it? Does the Leader of the House not think that it is his duty to investigate a very serious breach of discipline on the part of members of the Police Force?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I have not said that the hon. member did not base his question on facts. All that I have said was with respect to the supplementaries asked, the relevant information does not appear in the files, and I am unable to assist the hon. member. That is all I have said.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to hold up this House, but am I to understand from the hon. member that to question No. 1 he said "yes", about a half an hour"? I am asking the Minister if during that half an hour, Mr. Speaker, there was any torchlight smashing, stone-throwing or baton-tossing

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: This I do not know.
3.10 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that the answer to No. 42 has been laid, but the hon. member is not in his place at the moment.

FLOODING OF HOMES AT HOLETOWN

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 135 standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. James on page 6, right hand column.

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

Is the Minister aware that there is wide-spread dissatisfaction among the people who reside near the Bridge at Hometown, 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?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: The replies are as follows:

Work on the construction of the culverts has already been started.

Mr. SPEAKER: I gather there are no more oral replies laid to questions which have been asked by hon. members who are in their places. I will say this in respect of the next meeting of the House: I hope that hon. members who cannot be here, answers to whose questions have been laid several meetings ago will authorise other hon. members to put those questions for them.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, you will recall that when I moved the suspension of Standing Orders, I said that Question Time and Private Members' Business would fall in their natural course. We have come to the end of Questions for today, and it is for the other side to indicate whether they wish to proceed with Private Members' Business and, if so, they can indicate it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Item under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Leader of the Opposition, and it is to resume the debate on the passing of a Resolution in connection with the Fiscal Year 1967-68.

When this debate was last adjourned the senior member for St. Joseph was addressing the Chair - that was on the 2nd July, 1968.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to know I am still on the Floor on the 1967 Budget. But before going any further, Sir, you will remember last Tuesday that myself and the Hon. Minister of Labour had agreed to finish what I would call a non-controversial item on the Agenda relative to the National Insurance. He assured me that he has all of his data ready. As it is non-controversial, I would ask leave of the House before I go on to my proposals, that Item 6 be the first Item or Order of the Day under Private Members' Business.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If the hon. member will give way, I will move that Private Members' Business be now taken.

Mr. SMITH: Yes.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Private Members' Business be now taken.

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

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 6 be the first Order on the Order Paper under Private Members' Business.

Mr. ST. JOHN: I beg to second that.

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

NATIONAL INSURANCE AND SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. SPEAKER: Accordingly, the first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution requesting the Government to review the Regulations relative to the National Insurance and Social Security Act for the purpose of protecting those workers who were qualified at the qualifying period by paying up the required amount.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the Resolution is as follows:

BE IT RESOLVED that this House requests the Government to review the Regulations relative to the National Insurance and Social Security Act, for the purposes of protecting those workers who were qualified at the qualifying period by paying up the required amount, and since then have been disqualified through no fault of their own;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this House is of the opinion that such people who have been disqualified through no fault of their own, should not lose those amounts of money already paid up; neither should they be called up to work in any form without enjoying some measure of Social Security.

Sir, this Resolution is asking Government to consider what I would call the snags that have been left in the Social Security Act. I am asking the Government to reconsider them, and I sincerely hope that the Government will see it fit to do so, because there are a lot of snags and, I would say, robbery.
3.20 p.m.

The Government is practically stealing the poor man's money. I am aware, Sir, that you have to pay up fifty instalments before you can be qualified for

pension. I have a few cases in point, but I will mention one at the moment. I know a chauffeur who because of his age was not qualified at all, but he is still working. The scheme came into operation since last year, and he was refused because he had reached the age limit. This man worked last year and is working this year, and if he were not doing that job, the plantation would have to contribute to a younger man doing the job, and the younger man would have to contribute also. This man is willing to contribute, but due to the age limit he is exempted from the scheme.

Now, Sir, the plantation is benefiting from this man, but he is losing. I think you would know better than I do, Sir, that as soon as a chauffeur reaches that age, he has to have a medical test and get a medical certificate; otherwise he is struck off. This man is qualified all around; he got his licence last year and again this year and is working, but he is not protected under this scheme. I feel that so long as an employee can work and satisfy his employer, he should not be prevented from being protected under the scheme. This man is working, and the plantation is making money off him because they do not have to contribute. The man cannot afford to go home because he still has his family to work for, and knowing that his other colleagues are protected doing the same work, he only remains because he has reached sixty-five years. So long as an employee can do his work as well and as efficiently as a fifty-year old or 35-year old, I do not see why he should be exempted. The Government has nothing to lose by it, because both the employer and the employee would be contributing. Why should they round it off at 65 years when, speaking under correction, Old Age Pension runs to 68 years? The Government has set the age at 68 years before you can get the paltry sum of \$3.00 a week, but you have to work and work until you reach 65 under this scheme. That alone shows that something is wrong. If they were not out to rob, they would carry it at least to 68, because if it is 68 for one, it should be 68 for all.

Everybody felt, Sir, that this scheme should have come about long ago, but we were all thinking in terms of the old people who could not help themselves, and not so much in terms of the young ones. The young sauce-pots would not know about those days when people worked for 8 cents and 10 cents a day and sometimes a shilling a day, and had to support a family. These are the old people of whom I am thinking. I do not think there is anyone on the other side, apart from one or two, who know about those days. The Prime Minister would not know about those at all, because I do not think he was born yet; so in bringing down this Bill he was not thinking in terms of those people.

Listening to the programme "Fifty years Ago" only last week, an advertisement appeared in the paper at that time for a butler, somebody to serve meals to the big shots, at 60 cents per week. In those days a pair of white pumps was cheap all right, but you could not raise the money to get them. A lot of us used to wear white pumps on the corners of our mouths, because we were so starved out that the cor-

ners of our mouths became white. In another instance in the same programme, I think there was a worker at Clifton Hall Plantation in St. John who got five shillings per week. He did something, and the plantation manager withheld three shillings out of the five as a disciplinary measure, leaving him with two shillings. The man left and went to another plantation, but he jumped out of the pan into the fire. The manager put him in Court because he did not return to work at his plantation, and the Magistrate put six shillings on him as a fine, and told him that it would pay him better to go back to the plantation and work. The poor chap had to do so; otherwise the manager would have brought him up again, and he might have to pay twelve shillings.

These are the conditions that these poor people had to work under. Working for five shillings a week and having to pay out nine shillings, he would have to work for two weeks to repay that; so how was he to feed his family?
3.30 p.m.

Those are the people that I am asking the Minister to consider. You still have some of these men working and I would not expect the Minister to get up in here and tell me that it is the Act, that it is the law, that it is happening in other countries and all of these things. He can say that; but if he says it, he is only going to irritate me and make me do things or say things which I would not like to say. I am dealing with Barbados and the people of Barbados, and I do not want to hear from him about the people from anywhere else. I am dealing with the people of Barbados, I repeat, and I want to help them as much as I possibly can, and the Minister or the Government does not have to put his hands in his pocket and pull out one cent. They will not have to be creating any charge on the Treasury. It is the worker who is contributing to himself, and the employer. In those days we had people working for five shillings a week, for six days at twenty cents a day, and these same people are still responsible for the wealth of this country, not the young people. I am not against the young people. Social Security is a right thing; it is the best thing to have, but you must not think of the young people and forget the old ones. The old people are weaker; they need more nourishment and more protection. The young people can wear tight pants, but the old people cannot do that, so that when the young people will take one-and-a-half yards of cloth to make a pair of pants, the old ones will take one-and-three-quarter yards or two yards. That only speaks for itself.

I know that the Minister is going to get up and tell me about the other countries and where it happened, that you have to tie off at somewhere, you have to stop somewhere, there must be a ceiling and all of that foolishness and all of that tripe. I am saying that so long as the employer is satisfied with his employee and the employee is subscribing to the scheme, the employer must employ him as long as he can and he must go on doing so. When you stop a man at the age of sixty-five years and he goes home, he cannot go home and sit down, because he will meet a family there or even himself. He cannot do that as long as

he is able to work, and here you have a Government or a Minister telling me that you must stop somewhere. Well, if you have to stop it somewhere, I say, stop it at ninety years. It is not fair that the Government is compelling one to go at sixty-eight years, and it is tying it off at sixty-five. Sir, do you know how many people can be roped in at sixty-eight years? In three more years a lot of people can be roped in, people who are working like Hades. Are you telling me that you are going to be satisfied that the plantation or factory or the employer is benefitting at the hands of these poor people? If they have to contribute a shilling per week at least to a worker, and the same worker on account of his age is stopped - fifty-two weeks mean fifty-two shillings; they are saving and the worker is losing fifty-two shillings and he is helping to keep the same plantation or factory working so as to pay out to the others. I say that it is not fair. Regardless of what the Minister may tell me, regardless of what the Act may tell me, there is nothing that we do in here which cannot be amended. If the Minister were looking through the same glasses as I am looking through, and he had passed the same way that I have passed - and I am sure he has passed that way; he knows more of that type of hardship than I know, and therefore he is trying to make this House believe that what I am suggesting cannot be done when you have a song on the radio saying: "It will soon be done" (Laughter) Why can it not be done? Why can it not be amended?

Mr. Speaker, I will quote another case. You have a man working at Warrens, a man who has been driving an engine there for forty years. He has been employed there for forty years, and up to this crop he was still working. When the steam engine came into operation, he was qualified; he had not reached his sixty-fifth birthday; he contributed and he is contributing now until he reaches his sixty-fifth birthday. Now he is called upon by the employers and told: "You are finished; we are not contributing to you and you are not protected anymore." Sir, to make matters worse, that man might have contributed thirty-six times, but we have this hard, unfair Act in the laws, we have this particular paragraph in the Act, this thieving paragraph, one which is prepared to steal the poor people's money and tells you that you must contribute fifty instalments. This man had only contributed thirty-six instalments. You will be surprised to know, Sir, that this man has been told that he will not be getting back the money which he has paid out. You have finished with that, you have knocked him off; sickness benefits, funeral benefits - none of these benefits is for him. Why are they keeping this man's money? If they do not want him any more, if he is disqualified - and this is a Government, it is not a person who is keeping a little meeting turn or "sou-sou"; this is a Government which should set an example and have sympathy for its people. This Government by the Act is telling this old man: "No, not one cent you can get back." If this man had been taken ill before his sixty-fifth birthday, he was qualified and he would have got his sick benefits. If he had died before, he would have got his funeral benefit, but age has caught up with him and everything has gone. Could anybody call that fair treatment to this

old man, a man who has been working for forty years on a particular job without moving from it? That shows you that the man was competent, efficient and everything of that sort; and now, at sixty-five years old, the people are still willing to keep him on the job, whereas this Government has a law on the Statute Book to penalise this old man when he has contributed his money.

We have to think of the terms and conditions under which these people forty and fifty years ago were working. These people could not even get a good breakfast. They did not know anything about a Pyrex dish out of which to eat. They go to the shop and pay down before the butter skillet comes out of the shop, and the crop will start next week or two weeks from that time. They will say: "Take this ten cents and the first butter skillet that is empty, I want it to put my food in for the children to bring to me." People used to eat out of a butter skillet in those days. Of course, the Minister is too young to know that, and very few of them over there would know it, but that is how these people had to live. Sometimes when they put the food in the butter skillet and it reaches its destination, it is more water than food because they covered it down tightly and it sweats more than the Prime Minister when he is ready to sweat in here.
3.40 p.m.

You are going to tell me now that these people must be chased out and you will not give them back their money? Now this man paid up 36 contributions. Suppose they had even called on the man and said you have to pay 14 contributions more and you will be qualified, it would still be showing some sympathy; but he pays 36 contributions. He comes out before his 65th birthday. Call on him to pay 14 contributions.

Call on him to make it right, to fix-it-right. That should be done. Do not lie back and allow these people to go ahead and pay up their money. I say it is not fair, and if this Government does not do something in the matter this is something that can cause them to come down because you are dealing with poor people - people who cannot help themselves.

These people work a whole day, and how they live I do not know. A man working for 60¢ a week cannot live, no matter how cheap things are. He could not find a suit of pajamas to sleep in. He had to sleep in the same clothes that he was working in. I can tell you that, Sir, because you would not know. You did not have to pass that road.

Why bring about a scheme which will operate to the disadvantage of these people? It should be more for them than for anyone else. I would admit that you cannot see everything in a Bill. In drafting a Bill you cannot see everything, but after you have seen it you can amend it. You cannot see everything. It is just like playing draughts. Myself and the other man sitting at the draught board cannot see the stroke like another person who is watching.

I hope that the Government will not try to shelter—behind any foolish excuses and tell me anything about

some other part of the world. You have to see that these people get protection. I know that you will not be opening yourself to anything because the Minister may raise the point that if you amend this Act you may get people coming in at 45 saying that they cannot work anymore so that you may get more 45s than 68s. That cannot happen because you will not accept that without a medical certificate showing that the man cannot work anymore.

I feel, Sir, that an amendment can be made to help these people. I say that because the Government will not be losing anything. It is the employer and the employee. Why should the Government go so far as to protect the employer and squeeze the employee? This Act only protects the employer.

I cannot see a sympathetic Government doing things in such a way to squeeze the worker. It is very wrong indeed.

There is another point which I want to draw to the Minister's attention. Now, take for instance, you have boys learning a trade. In fact, this happens at my garage. The boys are not working for any money; they are learning a trade; but in order for them to get to work, I give them a small piece to pay bus fare.

I am not paying them, because they have just come to work; but it is hard on the parents to find lunch money and bus fare to get them to work because the majority are from the country. Some, Sir, are from St. Lucy. You will pardon me for saying so, but some are from St. Lucy. My colleague says that the most are from St. Joseph. I wonder if he thinks that I will be so foolish as to let the least number come from St. Joseph. I have some from St. John and from St. Andrew.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not referring to a member of the House by name?

Mr. SMITH: The parish of St. John.

Mr. SPEAKER: You meant the parish?

Mr. SMITH: I give these boys a small piece so that they can come to work because some times when I ask them why they do not come, they say: "My father and mother did not have the bus fare, and they could not let me come." I gave them bus fare to help them come to work.

But what has happened now? You have to take out National Insurance from that small piece and so reduce it. I want the Minister to look into this because it may be happening all over the island. These boys are not working for any money. They are not workmen; they are apprentices. You give \$3.00 or \$4.00 to a boy to offset his bus fare, and the Paymaster cuts out so much for National Insurance. I admit that it will help them because they were paying early, but at the same time they are not working for enough to pay it.

It is only because I am a hard old Labourite that I do not tell them to remain home. I try to help them

and I have to contribute to National Insurance. I could tell them not to worry to come out, that I do not want any more boys. I would save the bus fare and the contribution to National Insurance.

Now, a hard person would do that. This Act is encouraging employers to be hard. Then who will be hard hit? Not the employer; it will be the boy and his parents who will be hurt because they will either have to find the money or keep him at home. When you keep them at home, they get lawless and bring themselves into trouble.

All these things must be brought to the Minister's attention. This Act would have to be amended to help these people: else everything that you do or put on the Statute Book, all the levying and budgeting will hit back at them. All that you are prepared to do will hit at the poorest hardest.

When the Minister gets up, I sincerely hope that he will not talk what I would call tripe saying that he cannot agree after I have pointed out all these things to the Government. Will he sit back and let people suffer? Will he let the poor old man at Warrens, will he let the poor old man at Mount Wilton work until he falls down without protection?
3.50 p.m.

The people are still working and doing a good job. Some of those old boys can still do good work. Some young people, as soon as they begin to sweat, will slow down the work. Some of the old people leave young children at home, who should be working, and go to work. Do not just tell the people that the Government is responsible; when people are sick they will get paid, and when they resign, they will get a pension. Stop fooling the people. The Government has not done anything yet; the Government has only passed the law for the people and their employers to protect them. The Government is not prepared to put its hand into its pocket; it is for the employer and employee to contribute and fix-it-right. The Government merely passed the law, and it should now be amended.

Sir, I am thinking in terms of the poor hard-working people - people who cannot help themselves. You will find people living in houses that you would not run the risk of putting a good expensive cow or a good expensive horse in them. I know that some people are living in houses in which the Hon. Minister would not put his race horse. (Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: You do not put a horse in a house.) Do you call it a stall then? Do you call it a stable? Are you so simple now that you do not know that all is housing? If you put it in a stable, it will be in a house. It will be out of the sun, the air, the light and so on. If it is in a house, it will be just the same. It is only a question of a name. That is the type of Minister with whom we have to deal! He cannot see right from wrong. Because it is a stable and I call it a house, he says that you do not put a horse in a house. I know that Jack Vaughan had a horse in a house. He knows that, too. One day a woman passed with some mangoes while the horse was looking through the window. The woman said: "My lady, do you want some mangoes?"

He knows that, because he lives in that area. I know that Jack Vaughan had a horse in a house with windows and so on. A man who has money can do as he likes. (Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Anything can happen in St. Joseph.)

As I was saying, Sir, these contributions the Minister will have to take into consideration. There should be no contributions at all. This is a good way to rob the people. This is just like some Insurance Companies. Some Insurance Companies, or most of them, are always ready to take money from you, but when you have to make a claim they give you all sorts of trouble before you are paid. The Government should not follow these private Insurance Companies. Some of these private Insurance Companies should be sent out of the country. It seems to me that the Government is putting on the same shoe. Why do people have to qualify themselves by the payment of 50 contributions when they are qualified? It does not look to me as though you want so many qualifications. It does not look to me as though you want so many qualifications to be a barrister or a doctor. You are now calling on an ordinary person to get a lot of qualifications. You have to get 50 contributions to be of some benefit, 100 for another benefit, and 150 for something else.

Sir, the Minister may tell me that we passed the law here and agreed to it. He may put it that way; but when we pass a law and the Regulations are not forthcoming, we can get into trouble. The Regulations are responsible for this confusion. The law may be all right, but the Regulations are causing the trouble. Sometime ago I called on the same Minister for the Regulations with a Bill, and he said it was necessary to pass the Bill before we received the Regulations. Now, you may pass a Bill, but when the Regulations are introduced you may not get a chance to peruse them. You may have read the Bill and given it the green light, but the Regulations can put you in trouble. I believe that these hard-and-fast qualifications are in the Regulations.

Since everything has been passed, and since I have drawn certain things to the Minister's attention, let us do something about the matter. There are several cases to which I can refer. I know of an old man at Warrens, and one at Mount Wilton, and one at Friendship, St. Andrew. It is not everybody who will come to me on this matter. Some people take things easy, although they are meeting it hard. It is not like the days of long ago when a man could leave one plantation and go to another. A man felt that it was the law of the land; he could not do anything about the matter, and he made up his mind to die.

Now, Sir, the people have representatives to represent them, and the first to be given priority, so far as protection is concerned, are those about whom I have been talking. Those old people cannot help themselves any more. They are just waiting to be called home, and they want a place to rest. While waiting on the call, they want something to eat and a place to rest. They should be eating as good as any-

body else. When they should have been eating, they were working. Most of these old people can only drink milk in their tea once a week. On Sunday mornings they would buy a gill of milk for everybody in the house and after that Sunday morning the milk would be from a "black cow" - no milk at all. That is how these people exist. Sir, do you know that some people used to rear fowls, sell the eggs, and buy feed for the same fowls as well as breadfruit and yams for themselves? They could not afford to eat the eggs. 4.00 p.m.

These are the people for whom I am making a plea to the Minister, because he is going to get up and make the Government's case very clear. He is going to make all the excuses he possibly can, but I am appealing to him so that when I go to St. Andrew I can tell the people how I pleaded with him. If he goes to St. James, I will tell them the same thing and if he goes in St. Michael, it is worse, because I have more friends in St. Michael and the City than in St. Joseph. Wherever he goes I will be behind him telling people how I tried to convince him about their hardships, and he has refused when I know it can be done. There is nothing in this particular Bill that he cannot do or agree to. I know well that there are some Ministers who have to fight like me to get things agreed to at Cabinet. I know a particular one, poor fellow, who gets up here and makes a lot of styles and delivers untruths, and they do not give him a hearing because he plays "Joe Blunt", and they keep him back longer than they would keep me back. I know how they operate up there, and if they do not open their eyes and represent the people, the people will represent them. There are some who get nothing. Sir, if I get a chance some time, I will come for you on a Sunday afternoon and take you to a particular parish and show you what is happening and the money that is being spent; and the poor Minister that is responsible cannot get anything done in his parish in spite of all that is done there. I am not calling names, but I know these things.

These Ministers, Mr. Speaker, are not getting the consideration they should. It is not that they do not want to co-operate; so whenever you get a Government operating like that, it cannot work. You know my old time subject: Lammings. I will soon come to that. I will await the replies of the Minister and I hope that he will not give me any ammunition to fight him with, because I do not know what was operating in his mind all the time I was talking. I would like him first and foremost to tell me if he knows about the conditions that the people to whom I referred used to endure and how they used to live. If he says he does not know, I will have to forgive him. There were no Day Nurseries in those days, and the mother and father had to go to work to make ends meet; so the mother had to put the child in a bundle of trash under the pea trees that grew around the hedgerows. Those are the conditions that the people of this country had to endure, and yet these are the people that are exempted. If the Government votes against the Resolution, that is their business; but I am not going to rest. I will bring it again and go all over the country and preach it. I am not asking the

Government to do anything that will throw them down. This is not creating a charge on the Treasury; this is simply amending an Act, and doing a great service to several people. Anyone who votes against this Resolution is one who does not know about sympathy or love, because I am not asking too much; it is only for them to exercise the power that the same people gave to them, thus showing the people your appreciation.

Mr. Speaker, I could have waited until there were a lot more cases like this one before I drew it to the Government's attention, and then go out and build up my popularity; but while I was waiting for the Government to fall, the people would be suffering. So the Government can make themselves more popular by agreeing to this Resolution, and finding out if there are any more snags than the one I have raised. If they vote against the Resolution, they will be confirming what they have in their Manifesto - just making promises and not doing them. I feel I have them on the spot, and it is their business to vote for it. If they vote against it, they would not be voting against Lloyd Smith; they would be voting against the people of this country, because they are not in St. Joseph, St. Andrew or St. Michael alone, but all over the country. I feel that there should be no limit, but the limit should be the strength and vitality of the worker. If they want to put a ceiling, they should carry it to 70 years or 75 years; but in my opinion, so long as a person can work, he should not be exempted. I know that the Managers of these plantations are not going to get rid of a good old-time worker, because he knows his job and can cut canes better than the young ones, because he has the experience, and an experienced man is more conscientious than an inexperienced one. If the Government can turn down a Resolution of this nature this afternoon, it is clear that they are far from thinking of the poor, down-trodden people. They would be telling me directly that it is not true that a man had to exist on five shillings a week or sixty cents a week. They are telling me that we have all millionaires, and that their parents were not poor. This is a Resolution to test the Government. I would like it to pass; so I will give the Minister an opportunity to speak because I have the right to reply. Last Tuesday I took out the pliers, but today I will take out the gun, not one to kill - I mean my mouth.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I have the assurance of the Hon. and Learned member for Christ Church that the book or document which he appears to be reading is directly connected with the business of this House?

Mr. St. JOHN: You are so assured.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, may I second the motion without prejudicing my right to speak later in the debate?
4.10 p.m.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, there seems to be some question of a point of order here, questioning the right of a member to reserve his right of seconding a motion for the purposes of debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no problem there at all. It is perfectly in order for a seconder to reserve his right to speak later.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution reads as follows:-

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House requests the Government to review the Regulations relative to the National Insurance and Social Security Act, for the purposes of protecting those workers who were qualified" - and I should like to underline the word "qualified" - "at the qualifying period", - and I should also like to underline the words "qualifying period", - "by paying up the required amount, and since then have been disqualified through no fault of their own."

I want to deal with that. The Resolution says that there are people who qualified at the qualifying period, and subsequently they were disqualified through no fault of theirs. I want to get the record straight. If they qualify, the hon. member, my friend, my good friend, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, should be more specific by saying what these workers qualified for. Workers qualify for seven benefits under the National Insurance and Social Security Scheme. There are Regulations governing the seven benefits under the Scheme. A worker qualifies for sickness benefits after having contributed over a thirteen-week period and having made a minimum of eight contributions. The hon. member does not ask why should there be a qualification for sickness benefits. He is talking about qualifications for other benefits, but he does not question the qualification for sickness benefit. He agrees with the qualification for sickness benefits because the hon. member himself knows that in any society - and the National Insurance Scheme is only a society - the hon. member was au fait with the running of a Friendly Society now for years, and he knows that contributions must be paid and that a certain number of contributions must be paid before you can qualify for benefits. If the hon. member is saying today that he does not agree with paying up a certain number of contributions for a person to qualify for a benefit under a particular scheme, and if the hon. member is saying that this is highway robbery, I am saying that when the hon. member was running the "Golden Egg" Friendly Society, he was indulging in highway robbery then if he told the people that they had to qualify. There must be a qualifying period and, as a matter of fact, the hon. member was robbing me then because I was a member of the "Golden Egg" Society. If there is a qualifying period, there must be a qualifying period. Are you going to tell a man not to pay the qualifying period and he makes one contribution today, he feels that he is going to get ill, he makes one contribution this week and next week he claims sickness benefits (Mr. St. JOHN: Deal with pensions.) I am coming to the point. I did not stop the hon. member from developing his point. He developed his point, he attacked me, he attacked the Government, and I am replying now. I am going to take my lashes and I hope that the hon. member will take his. There must be a qualifying period. As I said, Sir, the hon. member does not

question the qualifying period for sickness benefit. He comes in here with this Resolution which deals with the qualifying period. He does not say what you qualify for. (ASIDES)

Mr. Speaker, I would like you to speak to the hon. senior member for Christ Church to allow me to develop my point. I was dealing with the word, "qualifying", the term used by my friend, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. The position is this. My colleague does not like me to say: "My friend" in referring to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. He mentioned my running mate; he wants to amend the National Insurance and Social Security Act for the purpose of protecting those workers who are qualified at the qualifying period by paying up the required amount. What I want to make clear to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph - and he can consult his colleague, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph on this - is that when he mentioned the qualifying period, the impression given is that the same worker whom he has mentioned from Warrens, qualified for pension benefits; but he did not qualify for pension benefits. He qualified at a qualifying period for sickness benefit, invalidity benefit, but he did not qualify for old age benefit. There are a certain number of qualifying periods. When you use the word "qualifying", you must be specific in saying what you mean. I would like to state here and now that the Government cannot support this Resolution as it stands. The impression given in this Resolution, and that is why I cannot support it, is that people qualify at one time and at another time they do not qualify.

4.20 p.m.

What the hon. member fails to understand is that the person or persons whose case he may be fighting qualified under the scheme for sickness benefits. I have to let the hon. member know that Mr. Vaughan whose name is mentioned, the man from Warrens Plantation made 39 contributions to the scheme. He made 11 contributions under Group 6, five under Group 5, 21 under Group 4, one under Group 3 and one under Group 2, and the amount of money that this person put to the scheme was \$38.80.

If during the time he was contributing he had claimed sickness benefits, he would have been entitled to a benefit of \$361.04 after only having contributed \$38.00. Now, to tell me that because this man did not receive a sickness benefit because he did not claim one, or because he has reached the qualifying age of 65 before he had paid his total of contributions - to tell me that because that happened you should give him back his funds is like telling me that if you insure your car, because you do not have an accident you should tell the Insurance Company to give you back your money or that if you insure your house and it is not burnt down in a year, you should tell the Insurance Company to give you back the money you contributed.

Let us be realistic. You insure against a risk. The average worker in this country, when he contributes to National Insurance, is contributing towards a risk. He knows that if he gets ill he may not be able to feed himself, and therefore he contributes towards sickness benefits. He also contributes towards the risk of dying and leaving his wife and children,

so that after contributing for the qualifying period his wife and children will receive survivor benefits. A woman contributes to National Insurance for maternity benefits so that in the event she can receive maternity benefits.

There are several benefits under the Scheme to which you contribute. You cannot give an isolated case. I do not care how you shout over there or try to disturb, you cannot put me off the track. I am going to make my point and make it well too.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I think that it is a breach of the Rules to announce that a man of 65 can have a child, or a woman for that matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order and no breach of a Rule.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The only person who could make such a suggestion is the hon. member who made it. (A VOICE: A village idiot.) I am not saying that he is a village idiot. I am only asking to be allowed to continue without being disturbed.

The Regulations dealing with National Insurance were not hidden in the Ministry, but were laid on the Table of this House: and if he did not agree with all these things, he could have brought in a Resolution objecting to these proposals in the Regulations. He brings it up now. I am saying that he has no point, and I know that he is going to agree with me. What I am saying is that what Mr. Vaughan qualified for was sickness benefit.

Now, if during the course of making his contributions Mr. Vaughan had died, his people would have received a funeral grant. What I am trying to explain is that a funeral grant is tied to the benefits like sickness benefit, maternity benefit and invalidity benefit.

I am telling the hon. member that there is no part of the world where a person can qualify for old age benefit without having made the minimum number of contributions. The hon. member's colleague, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, has been representing Barbados at the I.L.O., or he has been making a contribution to the I.L.O., if he does not object to my putting it that way, and he knows. I understand - that was before my time - that he was one of the founders of the Barbados Workers' Union, and he knows that there are certain International Labour Conventions which you operate in accordance with.

He knows - and he can advise the hon. senior member for St. Joseph - that this National Insurance and Social Security Act was founded on an International Act and in accordance with the advice we got from an I.L.O. expert; and he knows also that that is the criterion on which benefits are paid out in Social Security schemes all over the world.

There is no place in the world where a Social Security Scheme is operated in a way in which the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is asking that this Act be operated. There is no part of the world where

a man can make 39 contributions to a Social Security scheme and then get an old age grant. You can go and scrutinise and examine all the annals of labour legislation and you will not find it in any part of the world.

Now we are being asked to bring in an innovation in Barbados. There are certain principles which we have got to go by. Every year there is a conference of the I.L.O., and there are certain conventions which you agree to. Quite honestly, I do not see the hardship.

What the hon. member is trying to force me to do is to explain to this Chamber that the hardship experienced by his friend Mr. Coward at Mount Wilton and his friend Mr. Vaughan at Warrens he is partially to be blamed for, because the National Insurance and the Social Security Scheme only started in Barbados last year and has wiped out the hope of Mr. Vaughan getting old age benefit from the Scheme. 4.30 p.m.

But had it started in 50's or early 60's, he would have qualified. That is what the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is telling me. I discussed the matter with the hon. member; I told him what my views are and what my advice was on the matter. I do not think he was fair in trying to attack me on it, because he knows that we must draw the line somewhere. He says that there should be no age limit. What this means is that at any time a worker can claim Old Age Pension. Now, where in the world does that happen? If there is to be no age limit, what is wrong with a man at the age of 45 saying: "I cannot get work; I am an old man at 45." Another thing that the hon. member says is that there should be no age limit as long as the employer is satisfied with the work of the employee. What is wrong with a man at 45 not satisfying his employer and the employer saying: "I am not satisfied with the work of this man; therefore, he must qualify for pension," if you were to follow the argument of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. The other thing that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph has lost sight of

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I only want to ask him a question. How many contributions should have been paid before he qualifies for a pension?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Fifty contributions must be paid before he qualifies for an old age grant; 150 before he qualifies for Old Age Pension. Let me explain the matter. In accepting the 50 contributions and in accepting the 150 contributions, this means that we are already crediting the worker with a certain number of contributions, because a pension scheme is normally a 10-year contribution.

In the Civil Service a man qualifies for pension after ten years, as you are aware, Sir. We have gone out of our way to assist the worker who comes in at the age of 62 or 63 by crediting him with a certain number of contributions. Normally, the worker would have had to make contributions for 10 years at 50 contributions or something of the sort; therefore, you

will expect 500 contributions. We are not doing this. Instead of asking a worker, who is 62, 63 or 64, to do something which would create a hardship for him by saying: "If you do not contribute 500 contributions you cannot qualify for a pension," we say: "If you are in your 60's and you make 150 contributions, we are crediting you with 350; therefore, you will then qualify for a pension."

Mr. St. JOHN: Please give way.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not understand what the hon. member rose on.

Mr. ST. JOHN: Just to ask the Minister a question, with your permission and his, of course.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister has already given way.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, if a person was 63 at the time when the scheme started, it would be impossible for him, even if he worked every day and every week in the year to get to a grant.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what we have stated. We have gone out of our way to assist such a person by crediting him with as much as 300 contributions. If the man is 62, all he has to do is to work for three years and he will get his full pension, because he would have made 150 contributions. If he does not make the 150 contributions and he makes 50 contributions, he will qualify for an old age grant.

Mr. St. JOHN: If he is 63, what is the position?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: He will make 50 contributions in two years, and he can still qualify for an old age grant.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: If the Hon. Minister will be so kind as to give way. I must thank him for acting like a proper Minister today. I do not mean that he does not always act like a proper Minister, but he was willing to give way today. The point that, I take it, my colleague had been making is: Do you ever take contributions from a man although he cannot possibly make enough to qualify? He will reach 65 before he can qualify, and therefore his money has been taken from him for nothing.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The position is this. Why do you take contributions from the man? You take contributions from him because he can qualify for sickness benefits. Even during the last year he is working, if he makes his contributions and he gets sick, do you not see that even after the man is 65 years of age he is still entitled to sickness benefits? He can get sickness benefits for 26 weeks, although he might have only made eight out of thirteen contributions.

Mr. St. JOHN: As I understand it, all that Mr. Smith's client has to do is to get a sickness certificate and draw out all the money that he paid in.

Mr. SPEAKER: Who is Mr. Smith's client?

Mr. St. JOHN: The hon. senior member for St. Joseph, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is really no grave disorder now. I am rising for a period not exceeding two minutes, and the House remains in session.
4.40 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I am inviting the attention of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph and his colleagues to Regulation 11 of the Contribution Regulations of the National Insurance Scheme, and it reads as follows:

"Where an employed person attains the age of sixty-five on a date not more than thirteen contribution weeks after he becomes an employed person, then for each contribution paid in respect of any contribution week falling within the said thirteen contribution weeks, he shall after attaining the age of sixty-five be entitled to a refund of the employed person's contributions. The application for a refund pursuant to paragraph 1 shall be in writing addressed to the office of the Board and shall be made within three months from the date the employed person attained the age of sixty-five."

If you were to study this Regulation carefully, you will notice that if a man made contributions to the National Insurance Scheme and he did not qualify for any of the benefits under the scheme, the money is refunded to him. So obviously within the first thirteen weeks of his making contributions, if he could not qualify, there is a benefit for which he can qualify. In these first thirteen weeks he can qualify for sickness benefit, and after having contributed only eight contributions the man could have received a little over \$361 in sickness benefit. But he did not claim sickness benefit. The whole intent of the Act is to refund where a person could not qualify for any benefits under the Scheme. During this time and this man had died, his estate would have qualified for a funeral grant; so it is not fair for the hon. senior member for St. Joseph to come here and say it is highway robbery. I would say that the man was enjoying good health, and therefore he did not claim sickness benefit. It would have been highway robbery if the man had qualified for sickness benefits and had claimed them during the time he was a contributor to the Scheme, and did not receive them. You have to be contributing eight weeks of the last thirteen weeks before you become ill according to the Regulations; so if he has retired now and has ceased making contributions for some time, he cannot claim now because he would not qualify for the eight weeks within the last thirteen weeks' period.

Let the hon. member ask himself what happens to a man who takes out an insurance policy for his house and he did not claim anything. What happens to all of us who buy motor cars and contribute to Third Party or Comprehensive insurance, do not get into an accident or have a fire with the motor car? We do not go back and tell the people to let us have

back the money. What happens to the person who buys an insurance policy from the hon. senior member for St. James, and after making contributions for two years and eleven months is no longer in a position to make any further contributions? It has not reached the qualifying period of three years, and therefore he cannot get anything out of it; but he has made contributions.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to let the hon. member for St. Joseph know that we have gone into this matter carefully, and I would like to give him some very pertinent information on this. Following is a break-down on it. On attaining the age of sixty-five this man ceased to be a contributor under the Scheme. You can get short-term benefits if you are a contributor under the Scheme. Old Age contributory benefits are only one of the benefits payable under the Scheme. There is a qualifying period for that. Sickness benefit is another, and there is a qualifying period for that. All contributions paid under the Scheme are held in a Fund from which benefits are to be paid to insured persons as they qualify for them. Mr. Vaughan, the person in question, could have qualified for sickness benefit as early as the 4th September, 1967. Up to that time, that was thirteen weeks after the scheme started, he had been a contributor. Had he been employed at the time and paid at least eight contributions to the period of 4th September, he could have received sickness benefits if he claimed them, and he could have got such benefits for as long as twenty-six weeks. There is another factor here; he would have qualified for sickness benefits over and above \$361 had he claimed sickness benefits at the time when he was making maximum contributions to the scheme; but he started with maximum contributions and then came down to Group 2. (Mr. St. JOHN: What can he get now?) He does not qualify for anything under the Scheme now, because death benefit is conditioned on sickness, invalidity and maternity benefits. It is the final end of sickness benefit, maternity benefit or invalidity benefit. The man qualifies for nothing now. The whole position is that his coverage was a short-term coverage. He enjoyed the benefits of the Scheme. He did not claim any benefits from the Scheme, but during the time that he was under sixty-five and had claimed any of these short-term benefits, he would have been entitled to them. (A VOICE: He could not receive maternity benefits.)

I am never ridiculous to people on the other side, and I do not appreciate their being ridiculous. When it comes to telling me about a man receiving maternity benefits, I think this is nasty. Had he claimed a benefit before he was sixty-five, he would have got something out of the Scheme, and he would have got about 12% or 15% more than what he put in the Scheme. His money is dead now; so nothing can happen. I would like the hon. member to know that this matter was carefully investigated. You cannot go and change legislation because of personalities. If you change the legislation and carry it to 68 years, somebody will come in here and say he has to work until he reaches 68 before he can receive a pension when he can receive a pension when somebody in the Gov-

ernment Service can receive it at 65. The average Civil Servant can qualify for a pension at 55 years and at 60 years compulsorily. Are you going to tell me to carry a man who is not in the Government Service to 68 years when there are more people who are less able to work before they attain the age of 65 than there are those who are able to work between 65 and 68 years? I am dealing with the majority of people; so do not tell me to carry it to 68 when you know it is going to create a hardship on more people. If this were done, there would be absolutely nothing wrong with an employer telling an employee when he reaches the age of 62 or 63 that he is not working well enough and to go home. That man would then have to sit down for six or eight years before he could get a pension or a grant if you extended it to 68 years. There is nobody in this country who tells you to carry Old Age Pension to 68. In one breath you tell me that a man should qualify for a pension at 60 years, and in another breath you are telling me it should be 68 years.

4.50 p.m.

It is at sixty-five years now. In one breath you will tell me that it should be sixty years and that a man should qualify for a pension at sixty years, and in another breath you will tell me that it should be sixty-eight years. I remember on the last occasion when I dealt in this Chamber with Old Age Pensions for the non-contributory Scheme, the hon. senior member for the City was very firm in his conviction that the qualifying age should be sixty-five years, (Mr. MOTTLEY: I was always firm on that.) and so were some other hon. members on the other side. I think that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph too, in the last session, got in this Chamber and said that the qualifying period for Old Age Pensions should come down from sixty-eight years to sixty-five years, and now he is telling me to carry it to sixty-eight years. The hon. member fought that issue in here, and now he is saying that the qualifying age for Old Age Pensions should be sixty-eight years. I would like to bring it down to sixty years. I would like to see the National Insurance Fund swell to such an extent that I could recommend to the Cabinet the reduction of the age. I would like to see the time arrive when we could afford from the National Insurance Fund to pay pensions at sixty years rather than at sixty-five. Are you going to tell me that I must bring it from sixty-five to sixty-eight? That is a big joke. I know that there are some hardships which workers, especially those in the sugar industry, will be experiencing.

The hon. senior member for St. Joseph is concerned with Mr. Simeon Coward and those people, and they will be taken care of later in the year. Provident Fund legislation will be introduced in another couple of months' time, and those people will be taken care of. The Bill has been actually drafted and it will be introduced in the Legislature in a few weeks' time, so that they do not have to worry. Sir, I think that I have said enough in this matter and I think that any reasonable and rational-thinking member of the Legislature will agree with me that, at this stage, you cannot amend this legislation because the more

you amend, the more problems you will see, and we cannot extent the age to sixty-eight years. If anything, the age should be brought down.

Mr. St. JOHN: Sir, it is impossible for any draughtsman before a scheme is implemented, to envisage all of the contingencies which can come into existence. (Hear, hear). The position is that when you have introduced a new scheme, there will be situations which come into existence, which you did not foresee, but the hardship and the injustice of the facts necessitate your looking at the provisions again. This is what has occurred in this case. A number of people who were between sixty-two and sixty-three years of age or between sixty-three and sixty-four, could never have, under the scheme.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member is speaking about new legislation by a draughtsman, but this is no new legislation. It may be new to Barbados, but this Bill was drafted on other Social Security legislation, and the Regulations were drafted on Regulations which were in existence in other countries, and we did this with the advice of the I.L.O. experts.

Mr. St. JOHN: That answer does not deal with my point because it is known that in other countries there are national societies and other welfare benefits guaranteed by the State which supplement the financial position of people, so that even if they are not eligible under the contributory scheme, there is a minimum guaranteed standard of living. The resources of Barbados do not go to that extent. The only thing which you can get other than National Insurance if you do not continue working, is the two pence or two shillings a week under the Ministry of Health and Community Development's Local Government Public Assistance. What I am talking about is this; it has now been proved that there were a number of people who, because of their age, when the Scheme started - it was impossible for them to get the benefit of a pension. That is so. They were eligible for sickness benefits and some other benefits under the Scheme. This is no new problem in Pension Scheme legislation. If the Minister were to check with the number of Schemes in the Department of Inland Revenue run by the firms, if he checks with any Insurance Company, he will find that when they introduce Schemes, there is always a Clause to the effect that if a contributor ceases for any reason to be a member of the Scheme at any time, he is entitled to get back at least the contributions which he has put forward, a certain percentage of interest less any drawings which he may have had under the Scheme. Look at the position. The hon. member says.....

(Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS rose.)

Let me finish this point.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: You interrupted me all during my points and I will interrupt you during yours. Mr. Speaker, on a point of elucidation. I thought that I had explained to the hon. member when this point was raised, that this is not only a Pension Scheme; it involves lots of other things. The Insurance Com-

panies run Pension Schemes. This involves other things, and the point is that it is a question of eligibility of the person during the time that he has been covered. The point which I have made and which I thought I had made quite clearly, was that those people mentioned by hon. members on the other side of the House, were people who were eligible for benefits which they did not claim. If they were eligible for benefits which they did not claim, how can they want refunds? If you pay up money for protection and you do not claim that protection, it does not mean that the protection was denied you.

Mr. St. JOHN: Sir, this is not a Pension Scheme. It is a comprehensive scheme dealing with sickness insurance also, but this is the point. The hon. member says that if you make a contribution to a private Insurance Company in respect of a motor car or whatever is insured and you do not draw on it, you do not get back your money. That is true. It is because of the fact that these funds are known as lapsed funds; it is because of the profit element - the exorbitant profit element - that the Insurance Companies all over the world can make - and I would say that that is one of the greatest cases for the nationalization of insurance.

5.00 p.m.

This is what we say. It is reasonable that that small proportion of people who would not be eligible for pension, but who paid up money should have this concession at least granted to them. You say that a man would be eligible for sickness benefit, but since he was not sick, you do not want to encourage dishonesty.

The Minister keeps harping on the fact that the man could have called for sickness benefit; but he still had to be sick first, and a doctor would have to say that he was sick. Here is a clear case where you can prove that this man made his contributions, and whatever contributions he made are to profit. You could give him back at least half because you cannot say that he has amounted to any charge on the Scheme.

There is no contingency element, nothing at all. Everything is liquid as far as the Scheme is concerned. The contingency element is out, as far as the National Insurance scheme is concerned and

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I would like to give the hon. member the assurance that I would go into this whole matter further and there is no need to carry on the debate further today. I will do anything that is reasonable for these people. There are only three of them, and it is only the innovation of the scheme. I will get in contact with the Director and his staff and discuss it and see what can be done to alleviate the position.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well done, would the hon. member move.....

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that further consideration of this Resolution be now postponed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

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

NOTICE OF RESOLUTION

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister of Community Development is asking leave of the House to give notice of a Resolution of which notice could not have been given earlier because the appropriate file was not present.

Mr. SPEAKER: Unless there is any objection leave will be granted. There being no objection, leave is granted. Let the Hon. Minister proceed to give notice.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of \$2,163 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1968-69 Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1968-69 No. 13 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

I also beg to give further notice that I will be asking for leave to deal with this Resolution in all its stages today. Copies are here to be circulated. This is a matter which, I believe, will be non-controversial. It deals with the furnishing of the House of the Assistant Medical Superintendent of the Barbados Mental Hospital.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I suggest that these copies be circulated and that other business be proceeded with now, and the feeling of the House be taken when hon. members have read their documentation.

RESUMPTION OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Leader of the House indicate what he first proposes to deal with now? The next Order of the day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House and it is No. 5 under the Orders of the Day in Government Business. It is to move the second reading of a Bill to provide for the establishment of an educational institution to be known as the Barbados Community College and for matters connected therewith and incidental thereto.

Mr. St. JOHN: Before the Minister calls this Order, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out the position of some members on this side. The first time we got this Bill - I know that because I was checking - the hon. senior member for St. Joseph and myself communicated on this matter on Saturday. Your Honour's came on Saturday.

We were looking out for this Bill for some time. As I have said, Your Honour got yours on Saturday and the junior member for St. George got his on Saturday. So even on that side some members did not get theirs before Saturday.

Mr. Speaker, I am appealing to the other side. This is an important bit of legislation. Looking at the legislation itself, I think that we on this side certainly want more time to be able to cross-check. It does not give us ready reference to the sources of the various sections of the legislation.

It is true that the Standing Orders were suspended, but I feel that this is such an important matter, that more time should be given to this side. There is no desire of any of us on this side to prevent the Government from pursuing its plans, but the Opposition feels that where important measures are concerned, proper time should be given.

This Bill went to everyone on Saturday and it did not happen at 12 o'clock either. I was on the telephone with the hon. senior member for St. Joseph in respect of this. It was late Saturday. I would be glad if other hon. members could indicate to Your Honour what their position was.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support that. In my case it was definitely so. I get a mail on Saturday in addition to the midday mail, sometimes at 6 o'clock and my copy was by the 6 o'clock mail.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am really in some difficulty to understand the point made by the hon. senior member for Christ Church. My experience has been that Saturday is the day when Order Papers go out. I do not know what part of the day, but very frequently, from my experience they go out in time for the midday mail on Saturdays. 5.10 p.m.

That is not the case as it was, say, with the Bill we had last week - I cannot remember what it was - when we postponed it for a week because everybody was able to say, which is true, that it was not printed early enough and members only got it the day before the meeting, on the Monday. I would think that if we received draft legislation at the beginning of the week-end, by Tuesday would be a reasonable time to peruse it. Hon. members are putting me in some difficulty.

Mr. St. JOHN: I have the post stamp on mine, and it was posted at 10 a.m. on Saturday. It was put in before the last mail was shoved in the box down there. It comes to my office; it does not go to my home. It came to me well after twelve o'clock when people are leaving.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, it seems to be the wish of my colleagues, on this side of the House, or a suggestion with which I concur, that I ought not to press this Bill on the House at this mo-

ment. This is all right with me, but I would like hon. members to realise that we view this legislation as having some importance and some urgency, and therefore I would like to have an assurance from the other side that I am going to proceed with this Bill next Tuesday, or if they can meet me halfway and decide to come out another day this week and let us do it.

Mr. St. JOHN: Let us fix the Budget and this Bill.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Do you want to come out next Friday?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: No, next Tuesday.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition must learn the art of compromise. I am willing to postpone proceeding with this. Can he not meet this side halfway and come out on Friday?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I will tell the hon. member why I said no. With reference to the art of compromise, I got the senior member for St. Joseph to approach the Leader of the House on these two questions: this Bill, and the Budget Debate. Trying out the art of compromise, I asked the senior member for St. Joseph to say to the Leader of the House - and he said it this morning and then reported the conversation to me - that we would be prepared to leave it to the Leader of the House to say which of the two he prefers to start with next Tuesday: the Budget Debate or this Bill. Whatever he says, I will agree to. That is the art of compromise.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition's intimation was faithfully conveyed to me by the Chief Whip, although I thought that the hon. junior member for St. James was their Chief Whip until last Tuesday. Nevertheless, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph did convey the message, and I told him that I did not see my way to accommodate him then. However, since the hon. member puts it that way could we settle for this: We will do this first thing next Tuesday, and then the Budget, but could we come out at ten o'clock? Let us do some horse-trading, Mr. Speaker, across the Floor.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes. In so doing it across the Floor of the House in respect of ten o'clock, may I suggest to the legal members, as I cannot descend into the arena, to do a little horse-trading as to that early hour?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the question of the fixing of time, commonsense would surely tell both the Leader of the House and the Leader of the Opposition that you cannot ask a Broadcasting organisation to come in here and have its microphones hanging around on the off-chance that another debate will have finished. If there is going to be a broadcast debate, you must have a fixed time for the broadcast. Commonsense will suggest that.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I take the rebuke; I am not always known for commonsense. I think I am known for filial piety, though.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Leader of the House must not allow the junior member for St. Thomas to encourage him in naughtiness. I would have thought that it is obvious that you must fix a time for the Budget Debate. I would mention to the House that it would be more convenient to commence it at an hour like four o'clock or any other hour; Mr. Speaker, 4.30 p.m., perhaps, if the hon. member agrees.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: As a matter of fact, the hon. and learned member for St. Thomas may, probably, have made a mistake here. It would not matter what time it is done because it will be broadcast in the Government Programme on the same night or nights, as the case may be and, therefore, it would not matter when it is recorded.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker we got some very sudden and unexpected revelations at certain times. Our understanding was that the Budget Debate was going to be broadcast live. That was our impression. It might have been our mistaken impression, but that was our impression. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I can say that, in any case, the hours between 5.30 and 7 p.m. would be interdicted for myself, as far as the Budget Debate is concerned. It would not be easy, if possible, for me to take part at those times. I was, in fact, thinking that it would have taken place under Private Members' Business or at the end, just as the Prime Minister dealt with his Budget Speech.
5.20 p.m.

At any rate I was not anticipating in any way having to speak between 5.30 and 7 o'clock on the Budget.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The point is this, Mr. Speaker. If 10 o'clock is going to be inconvenient, naturally we will have to meet at 12 o'clock; but with respect to the Budget debate, at whatever particular hour on that day hon. members find it convenient to start it, it will be all right. The proper arrangements for recording it will be made; but we were not talking about that so much as the postponement of this particular Bill which I accept for next Tuesday; so next Tuesday at 12 o'clock we will do this first.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am not too clear on this point. Is it agreed that we meet at 12 noon on Tuesday next?

Mr. SPEAKER: If such a motion passes.

Mr. SMITH: I was hearing something relative to the broadcast and I want to know from the Hon. Minister if our broadcast will be live. Before he answers, I want him to guarantee the same conditions which the Government had. The Government had it live and we want it live. The Prime Minister had it live and we must have it live too; so I should like to find out

that from the Leader of the House through you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I want to make myself abundantly clear. My understanding of the undertaking is that the Opposition should have equal time, that is, the same 78 minutes or whatever it is which the Prime Minister has. (A VOICE: And the same conditions.) No, this is not my understanding. It has never been so and I could not give this undertaking. The undertaking is that there shall be equal time given, and certainly the facilities will be provided for this; but as to whether it should be given out live at the time they are making the broadcast was never the undertaking, and I would not like hon. members to press that on me as I should have to resist it, because it is not my recollection of the undertaking.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, if I were a betting man, I would be a rich man now that the hon. member has sat down, because I was prepared to bet that he would come in here and contradict what he promised, and that is why I asked last Tuesday if he would kiss the Book on what he had promised. I knew he would back down on it, that being his nature. What else could we have been asking for but the same conditions? The hon. member talks about certain facilities. The word "certain" was never used. We want all the facilities and all the conditions which the Prime Minister enjoyed. It was only up to us to say whether we were going to have one reply or whether we were going to divide the time between different members of the Opposition. I would have sworn, I would have given my life in betting that he was going to go back on his word, and he has. When hon. members on that side try, as they do occasionally, to accommodate the Opposition, like the hon. member who is dealing with the question raised by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph who showed a willingness to give way when we rose, these acts make us wonder why the Hon. Leader of the House cannot do the same and do it always. Let him say something that he means, that is truthful, and stick to it. I turned to my colleague and told him to listen to the hon. member going back on it next week, and it has happened.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, with respect to this question of broadcasting, you gave permission to bring in the apparatus for the purpose of a live broadcast by the Prime Minister. I know you cannot tell these people what to do, but out of sheer decency I would say that, regardless of the excuse which the Hon. Leader of the House may want to make now that we did not specify whether our broadcast would be live or dead, any living human being who listened to us last Tuesday would have believed and understood that we were fighting for the same conditions that the Government had. I am appealing now to the Hon. Leader of the House to give the same conditions that the Government had. Failing to do so, Sir, - I am not threatening him - I would not be too nice in my speech, because it would show that they are still intent on muzzling the Opposition and the electorate of this country.

The hon. senior member for St. Thomas said on the last occasion that his speech was not broadcast live; it was recorded and the person recording cut off his speech halfway. If ours is recorded, we may not get anything on the air at all. This is a very serious matter, and I am asking the Hon. Leader of the House to take it seriously as I am serious. I would never expect the Leader of the House to trick me in any way; but if our broadcast is not live, then I was tricked, and I would be satisfied that I was well tricked; but it would not be too nice. This mouth of mine has no cover, and I would be dirty, because I would be disappointed. I am appealing to the Leader of the House not to tell us now that it is different. Those were the conditions we wanted. C.B.C. is the property of the people, and they cannot do more than what the Government tells them. If the Leader of the House or the Minister in charge tells C.B.C. that he wants the apparatus here for the whole day and not to broadcast anything else, they have to do it. C.B.C. is not like Rediffusion, and we are paying for it through our noses. I know how the people feel about it, but the Minister may not know, and the people will be very disappointed if they do not hear the broadcast live, and I will stir them up and make it as bad as possible for the Government. Do not fool me; honour your promise. Let the Leader of the House give it to us as we want it. I thank you.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I have been in politics long enough not to expect generosity or fairness from my political opponents, and I do not mistake the sometimes easy manner which exists between myself and hon. members opposite for any fundamental agreement on matters of principle or of politics.

5.30 p.m.

At the same time, however, if I stand in my place in this House and I say that such-and-such is my understanding of an arrangement, I mean that that is my understanding of the arrangement. I have no interest therefore, in going back on an undertaking given. I have no interest in pulling wool over the eyes of hon. members. So far as I am concerned, if it rested with me and with me alone, I would televise it. (Mr. HINDS: And lose your seat). However, in the last resort, it is a question of fact. It would appear that the majority of members around this Table believe that the understanding was that equal facilities were promised, and if that is the understanding of the majority - and I say advisedly the understanding of the majority - around the whole Table, if that is the understanding, although it is not my understanding, I am prepared to take that interpretation of it. Therefore, if hon. members are looking forward to a live broadcast, a live broadcast they shall have, but nobody could make me believe that I am mistaken. I still maintain the right to my private judgment and my private interpretation that the arrangement was that they should have equal time and no more; but it would be a negation of democratic principle on my part, if some other members on this side held the same interpretation that is held by hon. members on the other side. It would be a negation of democratic principle on my part to go against that, although I noticed that in my

case last week, similar courtesy was not given to me, because a single person could prevent the whole House from hearing me.

However, Sir, all these are the ups-and-downs and the rough-and-tumble of parliamentary life. I have been in it long enough to know, as I said before, that you ought not to expect generosity and fairness from political opponents, because if you are to expect generosity and fairness from them, they would not be political opponents. Therefore, I will let the matter rest there: and if hon. members say that the granting of equal facilities was the undertaking which was given, I am prepared to abide by that, but I maintain the right of private judgment and to think that my interpretation is the one which is right and the rest are wrong. That is all I would like to say.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, does the hon. member forget that truth is one by itself, but each persons' interpretation of the truth he is at liberty to have?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, if each person's interpretation of the truth is a genuine one for him, how can the hon. member always call me a dishonest person, a liar or something like that? In other words, I am no better off in this respect than he is, and he is older than I am. *(Laughter)*

Mr. SPEAKER: For a long time now there has not been any motion before the House.

LEAVE TO DEAL WITH RESOLUTION

Mr. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister of Health and Community Development is asking the leave of the House to deal in all its stages with the money Resolution for the sum of \$2,163, copies of which have been circulated to hon. members, and of which he has given notice earlier today. If leave is granted, it is my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at this Sitting to deal with this money Resolution in all its stages.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is seeking the leave of the House to deal at this sitting and in all its stages with a Resolution for \$2,163 of which I am satisfied that copies have been duly circulated to hon. members. Unless there is any objection, leave will be granted. *(AFTER A PAUSE)* Hearing no objection, I declare leave to be granted to the Hon. Leader of the House to proceed with this Resolution.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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, and that it be an instruction of the House when in Committee of Supply to deal with the Resolution for \$2,163.

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

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1968-69 No.13

MENTAL HOSPITAL - FURNITURE AND EQUIPMENT

A Resolution for the sum of \$2,163 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, as the Addendum to this Resolution sets out, this sum is required for the purchase of basic furniture for the quarters of the Assistant Medical Superintendent of the Mental Hospital. The quarters occupied by his predecessor were unfurnished, but basically furnished quarters are a condition of service.

The position, Mr. Chairman, is that the residence known as "Fernihurst" in Deacons Road at the Mental Hospital until recently occupied by the Assistant Medical Superintendent of the Hospital, is being converted to other use, and funds have been voted for building a new house to replace it. Meanwhile, the Medical Superintendent will soon be going on leave, and an Assistant Medical Superintendent has recently arrived and quarters have to be provided for him. As an interim measure, until this new house is built for the Assistant Medical Superintendent, it has been recommended that the quarters at the Mental Hospital recently vacated by the Head Male Nurse should be used to house this Officer who is required to live near to the Mental Hospital. The house occupied by his predecessor was unfurnished, only a refrigerator being provided, but basically furnished quarters are required as one of the conditions of service.

Sir, I do not know if hon. members would like to hear what the furniture will be, but the breakdown of this amount of \$2,163 is as follows:

One dinette set, one side board, one book case, one Morris set, two Morris chairs, two folding verandah chairs, one coffee table, two occasional chairs, four divan bedsteads, four spring-filled mattresses, four headboards for above mentioned bedsteads, two dressing tables and one gas stove, amount to \$2,163.
5.40 p.m.

This furniture is urgently necessary in order that the Assistant Medical Superintendent be on the premises and be able to carry on when the Medical Superintendent goes on leave very shortly.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, just one little point. I understand from the Minister that the Assistant Medical Superintendent has arrived. I wonder where he is living now. I also understood him to say that the House "Fernihurst" is being converted. I see that he intends to put this Assistant Medical Superinten-

dent in quarters formerly occupied by the Chief Male Nurse.

I am wondering if the Minister is doing justice to this Medical Officer by housing him in the building of which - if I know it correctly - one half was occupied by the Chief Male Nurse and the other half by the Matron. I am wondering if we are referring to the same building. Is it the intention of the Minister to house the Assistant Medical Officer in one half of the building and the Matron in the other half of the same building?

As I asked earlier, I want to know to what use "Fernihurst" is being converted. One other point. When is the Medical Officer due to vacate the house that he occupies?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: According to the decision that has been reached "Fernihurst" is to be converted into a Workshop, at least a headquarters for tools for the Housing Authority. There are five to six acres of land. That is the last decision, although I must say that the matter since then, only recently, has been under further consideration, and the question as to whether or not the Workshop could be more ideally sited on lands near to the Ministry of Communications at the Pine or some other site is being further investigated.

This was investigated prior to the preparation of this Paper. If the Workshop does not go there we would like to get it for a Children's Home in St. Michael to get the children out of the Almshouse. There are many other uses to which it can be put. It is a lot of land and it is ideally suited for that purpose.

In reply to the question as to where this officer is at present, as far as I can gather he was at Paradise Beach Club. He arrived in Barbados on the 28th June and stayed at Paradise Beach Club for three days. He is now being accommodated for a few days at a house provided by the Queen Elizabeth Hospital until his quarters are ready.

I take it that the hon. member seems to know more about the Mental Hospital and the quarters occupied than I do. He seems to be a regular visitor there; I hope not as a patient. He seems to be very conversant with the conditions down there.

I would say that it is hardly to be expected that we would put the Officer at Paradise Beach Club and then transfer him to the Head Male Nurse's quarters if those quarters were not satisfactory to him. We are not trying to push him around. This is a temporary arrangement and I understand that he is satisfied. If he is satisfied, I have to be satisfied too.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, this property known as "Fernihurst" is on the left when you go through Black Rock and Deacons Road and butts on the first land ever bought by the Housing Board, now the Housing Authority, for the siting of wooden houses. I believe I am right in saying this.

I wonder if the Minister would not go into this matter. You do not need three quarters of an acre. Take off land and use it for development purposes. I do not agree with this idea of making this into a Workshop. I know "Fernihurst". You can take off five or six acres of the land and put it into development.

The first lot of land bought by the Housing Board was three acres, and this land adjoins that. I wonder if you will keep doctors in quarters like these in the end. I doubt that very much. I believe myself that you should give further consideration to it. I am not opposing the Resolution, but I am asking the Minister to go further into a matter like this - and also the Minister of Communications who, I suppose, will have something to do with it.

This is a good house that you will destroy. If the Minister told me that the house was dilapidated or broken down I would say yes; but I cannot see you turning this House into a workshop.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but I made it clear that a final decision had not yet been taken. I said that up to the time that this Paper was prepared, that was the intention on the matter and only last Friday was it considered, and other sites for the establishment of the Housing Authority's workshop in particular were under consideration.
5.50 p.m.

I spoke of a site adjoining the Ministry of Communications and Works as one site, and there is another site somewhere at the back of the Harbour which is not very valuable land; but we want a place where it will be easy for transportation and haulage and things of that sort - a place that would be centrally located. Some of the Harbour sites will be vacant for another ten or fifteen years, and it may be possible to find somewhere suitable there which could assist in effecting great savings and so on. But the whole matter is still in the melting pot. I further said that I would like to try and secure "Fernihurst" for a Children's Home in order to remove the little children from the Almshouse - there are about a hundred out there, as the hon. member knows. I am trying to see if I can get "Fernihurst" for a Children's Home, which was the original intention. In matters like this, there has been shifting all around, but there is nothing final as yet.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I apologise, and I appreciate what the Hon. Minister says. I did not hear what he said about the Children's Home. I knew that they had been talking about a Children's Home in the area. You have six or seven acres of land with this house and, of all things, do not try to convert this place into a Workshop. You have six or seven acres of land down there and you can make a Children's Home there. You do not need a Workshop down there for the Housing Authority. This is absurd; cancel this idea; this is wicked. We are not so wealthy in this country that we could take a home of this nature and turn it into a Workshop! I support the Resolution

and I hope the Hon. Minister will consider the question of the Children's Home.

You will know that I suffered the fate of having some people remind me that all the 120 children at the time of the inquiry into the Children's Ward should have been with their mothers and fathers. It is fortunate for some people to have mothers and fathers, or to have mothers and fathers who would want to have them. I have done this job for about twenty-six to twenty-seven years, and I know that when one man said in evidence that only 10% of the children should be in there, I know it was the most wicked statement ever made by a human being - by one who did not care anything about human beings. I thought by now, since there has been a change over, seeing that I had 120, you would have had only about 20, and you would have found the mothers and fathers of these children whom I have been taking into my arms and putting in there just because I wanted to get votes and get a seat. Of course, those children could not vote for me.

I see, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister still has them there because he has a soul. At least he is not prepared to throw them into the gutter and have them thrown by the wayside to be picked up. Anyway he still has 120 children to look after. I urge that you use this place to provide accommodation for them.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I want to appeal to the Minister to have a word, if possible, with this Doctor again on the question of having him housed in this place formerly occupied by the Chief Male Nurse. I think I know my Barbadians well enough.

This place has not had any extensions done to it since the Chief Male Nurse vacated it. What this Doctor will, eventually, find out is that, the moment he occupies the house, he is going to be considered even amongst certain of his staff at the Mental Hospital as just another Chief Male Nurse. *(ASIDES)* That may sound like a joke to some people, but I know that this Doctor is going to be sorry if he lives there. Some of his own friends, when they hear that he is going to take up residence there, will tell him not to do so.

If the Doctor is presently housed, however temporary it might be, at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, I ask the Minister to tell me when is the other house which is now occupied by the Chief Medical Superintendent going to become vacant? If this Officer is presently housed at one of the houses belonging to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, unless he is causing some serious dislocation there, I am asking if he cannot remain there until the Medical Superintendent goes on leave and then be transferred. I am sure that the Minister is convinced that what I am saying is right in a case such as this. The Doctor is doing himself considerable harm, and he does not know it now.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of explanation. What the hon. member is trying to make out is entirely unknown to me. I have had no intimation whatever that the proposed accommodation which we are

going to give this Doctor would be inadequate. I will tell the hon. member that in matters of accommodation, staffing, discipline and things of that sort, the Minister does not have that amount of *au fait*, or control, as he may believe. These matters are not directly controlled by the Minister, but I will investigate this Doctor's case and see that he is made comfortable.

What the hon. member is speaking about today is unknown to me. A case is being presented that this Doctor is dissatisfied. I am not aware of that; nothing is on the file; no information has been given. A case is being put forward as though we are doing this Doctor an injustice, or we will be doing him an injustice. I am trying to tell this Committee that the Doctor came down on the 28th; he was put at Paradise Beach Club, and that is proof that he has been properly treated; he was then given a house at the Hospital compound, and he must have accepted the accommodation which they gave him.

Anyway, I will have to investigate the matter. For us to get in here and make a case and start some sort of confusion on this, may cause the Doctor himself to become dissatisfied long before he ever thought of becoming dissatisfied. That is all that is going on here now. We are trying to tell the Doctor that he should be dissatisfied with this accommodation. Let me investigate the matter first, and then you can prance up in here if you have a case.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, it was the duty of the Hon. Minister to investigate the matter before he came to this House and asked us to vote money for this item. The Doctor has friends, and very, very soon the Hon. Minister will be coming back to the House asking us to vote more money to provide additional accommodation elsewhere for the Doctor. I know what I am saying. I want the Minister to do justice to the Doctor, and to treat him in a way which will not eventually cause the Minister to be in a state of confusion, which he is trying to make people believe that the members on this side are in. That house is no place to put the Doctor. (Mr. ST. JOHN: Go to England and see where they live.) I know that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply.

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

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

6.00 p.m.

On separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, the Resolution was read a first time and agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day, No. 6, stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Motor Vehicles Tax Act, 1960.

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, 16th July, 1968, at 12 noon.

The Order Paper having been fixed for Government Business.

I expect hon. members opposite will re-arrange their Order Paper to coincide with their plans for next Tuesday.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, since hon. members wish their broadcast to start, I believe, at 4.30 p.m., would this mean then they wish Private Members' Business postponed until 4.30 p.m.? We will suspend the Standing Orders to take care of that. I want to get a clear understanding so that I cannot be blamed for breaking my word. Is this the understanding that Private Members' Business would start at 4.30 p.m. so that from 12 noon we will do Government Business? (A VOICE: Yes.) Then Order No. 9 will be the first Order under Private Members' Business.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, arising from what the Hon. Leader of the House said with regard to broadcasting facilities, if the live broadcast of the Opposition is going on at 4.30 p.m. and we are to enjoy equal facilities as the Government had, this would mean that we would be entitled to the same prior announcements that were made for the Prime Minister's broadcast.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: This will naturally appear in the programme of the Station for the particular day, and it will be done beforehand.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I take it, and I am being very careful, especially, as the hon. member says

he does not want to be attacked, that whatever facilities were given for re-broadcast at night will be given to the Opposition.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Now, Mr. Speaker, the answer to that must be "no". How could the answer to that be "yes"? You are speaking in respect of equal facilities to put out what the other side has to say in response to what this side had to say. How could you then ask for another broadcast at night?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: All we ask is for the simple reason that the Government had it, and if the Government is getting two advertisements, we want two and not one.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I only wish to say this: I want to make my position absolutely clear. I am a member of a Cabinet and we are supposed to have collective responsibility. I have never yet since I have been a member of this Cabinet ever threatened to leave it, but if my colleagues give in to the other side on this point, this will be where they and I would part.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I think, Mr. Speaker, all of us would regret that, but I am glad to see, especially when the cat is away, hon. members can talk for themselves and have their own feelings. Surely you do not in a democracy retire because the majority are against you. You give in gracefully, and there are few people, if any, in this House who can give way more gracefully than the Leader of the House. But our whole attitude is this: it is not democratic, it is not fair for one side or the other to have advantages which the other has not got. You can tell C.B.C. not to reproduce it at night; but if they reproduce it at night, they are only doing it with your permission, and therefore if they repeat it once, we are entitled to have it repeated twice. That is what I understood the facilities to mean. Whatever the Government had, the Opposition is entitled to have.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 16th July, 1968, at 12 noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

6.10 p.m.