

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, March 12th, 1968.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.15 p.m. o'clock today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANKER, 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; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister of Trade Tourism, Co-operatives and Fisheries); Mr. R. ST. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Hon. N. W. BOXILL, (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD, (Chairman of Committees); Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (Minister of Agriculture, Labour and National Insurance); Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; Mr. L. S. CRAIG; and Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, M.A.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

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

I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a letter dated 8th March, 1968, from the Hon. Leader of the Opposition wherein is stated:

"His Honour the Speaker,
The House of Assembly,
Bridgetown.

Dear Sir,

In view of my unavoidable absence from the Island and from my Parliamentary duties for about a month from tomorrow 9th March, I beg to notify you that my place is being taken by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the senior member for Christ Church, who will act in all respects as Leader of the Opposition.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your humble obedient servant,
Grantley Adams."

PAPERS LAID

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

Statement of sums of money paid over to the Accountant General by the Commissioner of Police during the quarter ended 30th September, 1967.

Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for eleven months ended 29th February, 1968.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY and Mr. LYNCH entered the Chamber took their seats.

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 \$23,406 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1967-68, Part 1 - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1967-68 No. 65 which forms the schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to place the sum of \$106,658 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1967-68 Part 1 - Current as shown in the supplementary Estimates 1967-68 No. 66 which form the schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to approve the loan to the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation of the sum of \$2,100,000 by the Bank of Nova Scotia for revising the financial structure of the Corporation, and to appropriate the said sum to supplement the Estimates 1967-68 Part II - Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1967-68 No. 67 which form the schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

A Resolution to amend the note to Item 42 of Head 43 - Ministry of Health and Community Development of the Approved Estimates for 1967-68.

Mr. HUSBANDS entered the Chamber and took his seat.

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 106, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, is ready.

Also, Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 125, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, is ready.

Also, Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 128, asked by the hon. junior member for St. John, is ready.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 130, asked by the hon. junior member for St. James, is ready.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

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

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I see that the hon. member is suspending certain Standing Orders, but he hinted last week that he was going to meet until the Estimates are finished; and if this is so, and he is calling us back out until the Estimates are finished, why suspend the Standing Orders? We are willing to accommodate the Government; but while the Government is doing some work, private members want to do some, too. I could understand if he wanted to carry through the Estimates between today and tomorrow; but we should know the reason, unless he is going to give us the assurance that he will set aside a day for Private Members' Business only. If he gives us that assurance, by all means he can suspend; but he should let us know something. He should give us next Friday

or some other time to do Private Members' Business, but he should not expect us to come here every day to accommodate them, and yet we are not getting on with our business.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: First of all, I think the hon. member would recall that I said, when we were taking the adjournment on Friday, that we would start the Appropriation Bill and the Estimates in Committee of Supply today, and work through from day to day until we are finished. If we are going to do this - and there was no objection to this suggestion - and we are meeting every day, if you adjourn from day to day, it requires the preparation of a new Order Paper every day; therefore I am suggesting to the House that it would be better to suspend the Standing Orders, have suspended sittings from day to day - if it is for two days, or a day and a half - clean up what we have, and then we will have our regular sitting next week when we can do Government Business, as well as what Private Members' Business there is before the House rises. There is nothing underhand or sinister about this.

12.25 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, you will pardon me again.

Mr. SPEAKER: Actually, the hon. member has already spoken on this motion.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: (Seated) If, as the Leader of the House says, you are going to follow on with suspensions, then that would not be correct. Your Honour said "this meeting." Is that in order?

Mr. SPEAKER: The meeting is today.

Mr. MOTTLEY: (Seated) There is something wrong; it means that you will have to suspend the Standing Orders every day.

QUESTION TIME

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

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

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

ROADS AND BRIDGES IN ST. JOSEPH ST. ANDREW

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 106 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph; it is on page 9, right hand column.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker,

to enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

In view of the promise given to this Honourable House by the Honourable Prime Minister in reply to the Honourable Senior member for St. Joseph, that all the roads and bridges in the parishes of St. Joseph and St. Andrew of which he complained, would be immediately started on repair work after the completion of the Victoria Bridge; and (2) in view of the fact that the Victoria Bridge has been completed; will the Minister state if it is his intention to have these roads and bridges repaired in time for the start of the 1968 reaping season, including the tenantry roads?

2. If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, will the Minister please state at the next meeting of this Honourable House when such repair work will start?

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

- "1. Repairs to the roads and bridges cannot be completed in time for the start of the 1968 reaping season, but it is proposed wherever practicable to make damaged roads passable.
2. Repair work was started on 20th January, 1968.

Mr. SMITH: As a supplementary question, Sir. Can the Minister let me know if the St. Joseph's Church Road leading to Vaughans and Fruitful Hill has been started, or if the necessary provision has been made for the people to get out their canes?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the senior member for St. Joseph did not go with me when I visited Vaughans, but the road there has dropped something like over 6ft. and it is really impossible to make this road passable within this short space of time. The people who live in Vaughans can go around, as he is well aware, the other side and go through Frizers which is passable. We are trying to see what we can do to facilitate the people in this area.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Minister has said that it is impossible to make this particular road passable in so short a time, I am asking him if he was not informed that, if the particular area was graded off, the lorries would be able to pass?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the hon. member means by saying "If I was not informed." I told the Chief Technical Director that,

wherever practicable, he should take a bulldozer and push off the part of the hill which had dropped so suddenly in order to level it off so that a lorry may be driven out. The reason for this is that you have underground water running there, and after a time it pulls out the mould and the road eventually drops. That is how we get these landslides.

Now, you cannot go into Vaughans and spend an enormous amount of money just to make the road passable, because you would not have rectified the problem. You would have solved the problem of getting out the canes, but you would not have solved the problem for the people who live in the area to get in and out of their homes. As a matter of fact, the crop that is there, as far as I have seen, would not be one-sixteenth of the amount that we would have to spend to get it out. In Vaughans the road has dropped in two places, Mr. Speaker. When you go in from below the Church you will see the damage there, and when you go above the Church you will see the damage there too. What we have decided to do is to use a bulldozer and grade off the road as much as possible in order that lorries may go in and take out the canes. I hope that this answer satisfies the hon. member.

Mr. SMITH: Not yet, Sir. I would like to know from the Minister why they waited until the very last moment to start on this particular area? Why have they waited so long after the other road was done over a year ago? Why wait until the crop has started before doing anything in this matter.

12.35 p. m.

I want to know about Fruitful Hill too.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the answer to this Question is simple. If probably we had tackled Vaughans, the question would have been: "Why did you not do somewhere else?" That is all there is to it. You must remember that Barbados is not the United States, and even the United States has unemployment. It has its problems just as any other place. It is supposed to be the richest country in the world. We can only do things with the amount of money which we have. At one time the question was when was the Government going to do Coggins Bridge. Then the next time it was when were we going to do Rock Hall; and then it was Fruitful Hill. We cannot do all of these places. I do not have any intention to waste the taxpayers' money just to appease a few people. If I am going to do a job, I intend that that job should be a job which will stand up, not for ever, but for a long time. It is no good our going into these places - to begin with, we have to work with the Soil Conservation Department in order to make sure that we can have the area drained properly; otherwise we will be wasting the taxpayers' money just to facilitate a few people. It is better that the people wait a little while and get a proper road which will be stable than just get an ad hoc thing that will not last and the money is going down the drain.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, as a Supplementary Question, the Minister said that the roads and bridges

in the parishes of St. Joseph and St. Andrew would be repaired; I wonder if the Minister would be kind enough to tell this House what is the position with Coggins Bridge; if they have started any work there and what is the actual position.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the Reply to the Question formally posed was this:-

"Repairs to the roads and bridges cannot be completed in time for the start of the 1968 reaping season; but it is proposed wherever practicable to make damaged roads passable.

Repair work was started on 20th January, 1968."

That would, I assume, include Coggins Bridge. If the hon. member who has just asked the Question can remember, some time ago when I was going about the different places of the country, I specifically mentioned that Coggins Bridge would cost the taxpayers about \$105,000 to make it passable.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, in reply to my Supplementary Question, the Minister said that he could only start the work when he got the money. I would like to ask him if he has spent all of this money which was allocated under these Heads for roads and projects last year. He said that he did not have any money.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, in reply to that Question, if the hon. member would tax his brain, he will remember that when we came here, this was an immediate matter which took place and we asked the House to vote over \$144,000 to make the roads passable. That was really to facilitate the people to get in and out of their homes, but not to make the roads as good as we would like to make them. Let us take the Question which was asked about Coggins Bridge. It is true that we could have gone and fixed Coggins Bridge for \$30,000; but who is to know when we will get another set of rain, like that which we had in 1966, which would wash out the bridge again? I would be the person who will be getting the blame. People are always looking for a scapegoat and whether the Minister can put down a stone or mix one shovel of concrete, he is the person who is personally responsible for the taxpayers' money. As I said before, I have no intention of being pressurised into spending the taxpayers' money wastefully. It is true that we have to find work for people, and I am always looking out for ways in which to employ people; but at the same time we cannot go and do things in an ad hoc fashion. We must have proper plans so that when we set up something taking measurements, depths and so forth, we know that this thing, even if it does not last forever, will at least outlive all of us in here.

Mr. J. M. G. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, is it not a fact, as the hon. member did not appear to understand the last Question, that the full vote for Highways Rehabilitation was not spent last year?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member knows that to be a fact, I do not know it.

Mr. J.M.G. ADAMS: Will the hon. member say whether he can read, and if so, whether he has read his own Estimates?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister need not answer that Question.

Hon N. W. BOXILL: It is not a question at all; it is impertinence; it is ignorance.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, as a Supplementary Question. The Minister has said that he would need \$105,000 to repair the Coggins Bridge. Will the Minister state whether he would consider spending that money as a priority to repair the Bridge which one would consider as through-way.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, will you ask the hon. member to repeat the Question?

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member repeat his Question?

Mr. CRAIG: Will the Minister consider the re-pairing of Coggins Bridge as a priority inasmuch as he considers it would cost \$105,000 to repair it? Would he consider spending that money as a priority in order to make that road passable - a road which is almost a through-way?

Mr. St. JOHN entered the House and took his seat.

Mr. SMITH: While the hon. member is waiting, this is another Supplementary. Is the Minister aware that in Item 9 under the Head "Capital Works," there are a revote of money for the repair of these same roads referred to? Is the hon. member aware of that?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that there are a revote; I am aware that there is a revote of this money. If you come to the House of Assembly and you vote money to do a particular job and it has not been completed, it is quite obvious that you have to come back to the House if the financial year has passed, because no money will be allocated for this particular project. You have to ask the House to revote this money in order to carry on this work. There is nothing strange or fantastic about this. This is what happens, and this is what has been happening before the Greeks first formed the Government, and I guess it will go on long after the Greeks have gone out.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I put a Supplementary Question to the hon. member, and I would be very grateful if he would give a reply to the Supplementary Question which I have put.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I am willing to answer the hon. member's Question. I have nothing to hide, but I do not understand the hon. member's Question. If he means that if this \$105,000 which we propose to spend on Coggins Bridge is considered to be priority, the answer is: Yes, it is a priority."

because the people who live up by the school or those from St. Andrew who want to get over to that part, use Coggins Bridge in order to get into St. Joseph and other parts. It is not only that the people who have to take the canes to the Scotland Factory usually come down that road, but because the Bridge has been washed away, it means that they have to make a detour on the East Coast Road or go another way; therefore this is a priority for two good reasons. One is that we do not want the people of St. Joseph to think that because they did not give us a member in the House, we are going to spend the taxpayers' money in any one-sided way as other Governments have done, and the other is that it is finding work for people.

12.45 p.m.

LAY OFF OF EMPLOYEES AT SEAWELL AND MANGROVE ASPHALT PRODUCTION WORKS

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 125 standing in the name of hon. senior member for St. Thomas.

Mr. J. M. G. ADAMS: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

1. Is the Minister aware of the fact that, recently, employees of his Department working at Seawell and Mangrove Asphalt Production Works have been laid off without any information being given to them as to whether they will be re-employed or, if so, when?
2. Is he aware of the fact that some of these employees have given as much as 10, 12 and 15 or more years of service?
3. If the Minister is not aware of the above will he enquire of his Department and so obtain the facts?
4. What policy, if any, does his Ministry adopt in matters of the laying off of employees?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the replies are as follows:-

1. No, Sir! The employees were not laid off.
2. Does not arise.
3. The facts are that the employees who might have been affected by the temporary cessation of work either went on vacation leave or were engaged on other projects.
4. Whenever it is necessary to reduce any section of the labour force employed in the Works departments, workers with the least years of service are normally laid off first.

EXTENSION OF WATER MAINS TO HOTHERSAL TENANTRY

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 128 standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. John.

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

Will Government (a) extend the water main passing through Edgecliff to Hothersal to the junction of the road leading to Hothersal Tenantry and (b) erect a standpipe at the uttermost part of the said village so as to provide the inhabitants thereof with water?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the replies are as follows:-

“(a) No, Sir! The extension cannot be undertaken at this stage due to the inadequacy of the water supply in the area;

(b) It is however proposed to consider the proposal to erect a standpipe in Hothersal Village during the financial year 1968-69.”

There are Question of Members the replies to which I had given notice of, but which were never answered due to the fact that the members who asked those Questions were not in their places.

There are:

Question No. 77 asked by the senior member for St. Joseph;

Question No. 96 asked by the senior member for St. James;

Question No. 97 asked by the senior member for St. James;

Question No. 101 asked by the senior member for St. Thomas; and

Question No. 111 asked by the senior member for St. Thomas.

Notice of these questions were formally given before.

TELEPHONE INSTALLED AT DAY NURSERY AT THORPES

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 130 standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. James, who is not in his place because he has been given two months' leave from his duty as a member of this House.

If an hon. member is willing to take care of that Question in the hon. member's absence, I would allow him so to do; otherwise I can let it stand over until he returns.

Mr. CRAIG: On behalf of the hon. junior member for St. James to enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Will the Minister take steps to have a telephone installed at the Day Nursery at Thorpes Housing Area, St. James to meet cases of urgency - such as

seeking medical aid in case of sudden illness among the child population at the said Nursery - occurring there?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the replies are as follows:-

The Housing Authority applied to the Company about the installation of a telephone at this Day nursery quite some time ago. No lines have been available. An installation will be made shortly.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am reminded that there are other answers to Questions which are ready. Of these, the first is Question No. 77 standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph.

BRIDGE AT COGGIN'S St. ANDREW

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

1. Is Government aware of the hardship caused to the people of St. Andrew by the long delay in reconstructing the bridge at Coggin's St. Andrew? Is Government further aware that this bridge was out of use since late last year?

2. If the answer is "yes", would Government expedite the reconstruction of this bridge in an effort to alleviate the hardship caused to the people in the area.

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

1. Yes, Sir.

2. The reconstruction of Coggins Bridge has commenced.

Mr. SMITH: Has an alternative road been provided to get their canes out to the factory?
12.55 p.m.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I think this last question has gone beyond my Ministerial duties. It is not the duty of the Minister, as far as I know, or the Government for that matter, to get out canes. What we have done, and this was under my instigation, was to cut cart tracks to facilitate people wherever possible in getting their produce out, because we felt this is helping the economy; but it is really not the Government's responsibility, as far as I know. In reply to that Question as to whether a make-shift road has been cut to get canes to the factory, no one can answer that because the answer to that could be "yes" if you are going over the hill to Vacluse or any other factory, and if they are going to other places, they can still go around the East Coast Road. I do not think, therefore, that I can answer that question. I have just been told that you can go down Goodman's cart road to get to the factory.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I will try and put another supplementary. My time will come to reply and

talk to the Minister. Is the Minister aware that there are two representatives in the parish of St. Andrew whom he can ask what is being done with the road? He does not live in St. Andrew. Is he aware that there are two representatives, one on his right and one on his left?

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of explanation.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think a point of explanation is necessary nor is a reply to that Question necessary.

QUESTION RE UNAVAILABILITY OF WATER IN ST. ANDREW

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 96 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. James.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, the Question reads as follows:-

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

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

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

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

"1. No, Sir! It should however be explained that during a period of low rainfall as had been experienced in August, 1967, water consumption increases substantially and consequently water levels in the reservoirs fall sharply. In these circumstances it is necessary to shut off water, and this is usually done between 9.30 p.m. and 4.00 a.m. when the demand for water is low.

2. It is expected that the water supply to the St. Simons and King Street districts will be improved as soon as the Reservoir and pumping Station at Applewhaites have been completed."

QUESTION RE LOW WATER PRESSURE IN ST. JAMES

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 97 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. James.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, the Question reads as follows:-

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. Is Government aware of the great inconvenience suffered by the residents of Hoyte's Village, Hall's Village, Holders Hill and Thorpe's Housing Area all in the parish of Saint James due to the low water pressure in the said area?

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

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

"1. Yes, Sir.

2. Proposals for the improvement of the water supply to the districts mentioned are under consideration."

QUESTION RE ROAD THROUGH ROCK HALL ST. ANDREW.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 101 stands in the name of the Hon and Learned member for St. Thomas.

Mr. J. M. G. MADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the question is as follows:-

To enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works:-

1. Is the Minister aware that the road leading through Rock Hall, St. Andrew, has been impassable to traffic for over nine months, and that the inhabitants of the district are having the greatest possible difficulty in travelling in and out of the said area?

2. If the answer to the foregoing is Yes, will the Minister cause the necessary repairs to be carried out without further delay?

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

"1. Yes Sir!

2. The repair of the road leading through Rock Hall, St. Andrew, was started on 20th January, 1968."

QUESTION re COMMEMORATIVE POSTAGE STAMPS

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 111 stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned member for St. Thomas.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows:-

To enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works:-

1. Is the Minister aware of the revenue to be raised and the publicity to be obtained for Barbados

from the issue of a judicious number of commemorative postage stamps at regular intervals?

2. Has the Government got a policy on the issue of such stamps?

3. Will the Minister give consideration to an Annual Christmas issue, with or without a surcharge for charity purposes, to be put on sale on or about the anniversary of Independence Day?

4. Is the Minister satisfied that the Post Office is adequately geared for proper consideration of potential new issues, and for proper servicing of philatelic buyers of Barbados stamps?

5. Will the Minister appoint an advisory Committee to give assistance in selecting subjects suitable for commemoration on stamps?

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

"1. Yes Sir.

2. Yes, sir.

3. Consideration will be given to a Christmas stamp issue but not on an annual basis.

4. The need for the establishment of a Philatelic Bureau within the structure of the General Post Officer is being examined.

5. The need for such a Committee will be examined."

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Can the Minister say why no stamp was issued for International Tourist Year, bearing in mind the importance of tourism to Barbados' economy?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, some time previously we had this same discussion, but apparently members on the other side like to repeat themselves. I specifically pointed out why we did not think it fit to bring out a stamp on the tourist issue, because tourism is something that is always with us, and you do not have to commemorate tourism in any particular year. A stamp will eventually come out on tourism, but as we had seen it, there are other things that we felt we wanted to get ourselves into in preference to tourism since - and I pointed this out specifically - any stamp coming out of a country is an advertisement for that country, whether it be tourist-wise or otherwise.

QUESTION re POST BOX AT ORANGE HILL

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 119 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. James. That hon. member has leave of this House for two months. 1.05 p.m.

REMOVAL OF POST BOX FROM ORANGE HILL

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

Is the Minister aware that the post box which was formerly sited at Orange Hill, St. James, and which served the needs of such surrounding districts in the said parish as Bay Woods, Gilkes Village, Whopping, Taitts, Apes Hill and other villages has been removed?

2. Will the Minister have a post box erected immediately at Orange Hill, siting same in one of the columns of the gate at the entrance leading to St. Silas Junior School or at such other site as the Minister may deem fit?

I ask this Question on behalf of the hon. Junior member for St. James.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the answer to this Question is as follows:-

This is a question of taking the meat out of the rice.

"1. The posting box was removed at the request of the owner of the property, Mr. C. Belfield Searles.

2. A posting box has been installed in a wall-pillar at the entrance of the St. Silas' Junior School."

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: As a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister state the reasons, which are well known to him, for Mr. Searles asking for the removal of that posting box?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, according to my information, the reasons were that, because the people in St. James did not vote for Mr. Searles, it was like taking the meat out of my rice. He asked us to remove the posting box.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, is it not a fact that in this Honourable House the Minister has admitted that for a long period of years when Mr. Searles, I think, was selling stamps and was permitted to pay the money, or something like that, to itinerant collectors, that the Post Office then informed him that he would have to bring the money up to Bridgetown? There were some series of facts such as these, and as a result of a dispute between the Post Office and Mr. Searles the box was removed. Has not the Minister gone into this matter already in this Honourable House? He is now maligning Mr. Searles by saying that because the people did not vote for him in St. James it was removed. When was it removed?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, that might be another reason, but, as far as I know, I would not know the reason. To say that I said on the floor of this House that this is the reason would be another untrue statement.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary question to the Minister. In his reply he said that Mr. Searles asked to have the box removed because the people in St. James did not vote for him. Will the Minister please state in what year the post box was removed?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, it is so easy to trap certain members in this House. I never said that it was because Mr. Searles did not get in. I was asked a supplementary question and I said that is my belief; I was told that, but I never said so in the reply. In my reply I said that the posting box was removed at the request of the owner of the property, Mr. C. Belfield Searles. I said "in my opinion"; I was told that. I said that that was another reason why the post box was removed.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: He has not yet answered the question, Mr. Speaker. When was the post box removed? Mr. Speaker, will the Minister agree that since he does not know when the post box was removed it was a malicious act to say in this House that it is his belief that the box was removed because of the rejection of Mr. Searles by the electorate? That is a malicious act, if he does not know when the post box was removed.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what is meant by the statement made by the last person who has just sat down when he spoke about "a malicious act."

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: The truth is that I really do not have to answer, but I am trying to accommodate members on the other side. The information requested is not stated here in the file, Mr. Speaker, but I can endeavour to get the facts for them, which will most likely bear me out.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, may I inform the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that you cannot do that.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister accept that the post box was removed between the years 1966-1968, and Mr. Searles did not contest the election in 1966?

Mr. SPEAKER: There are no more answers laid to Questions. Accordingly Question Time is now closed.

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.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 2 be the first Item of the Day. The hon. and Learned senior member for Christ Church was not in his seat when I spoke about this, and the reason being to allow the House to dispose of two small Supplementary Resolutions in Committee of Supply before we deal with the Appropriation Bill.

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 2 is the instant Order of the Day. It stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House, and it is to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Island.

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

Hon. 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.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1967-68 No.63

A Resolution for \$614 was called.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, this is a small amount, and I do not think it should be too controversial, although I would be willing to answer any questions on it. As the Addendum sets out:

"Supplementary provision in the sum of \$614 is required to meet expenses to the end of the financial year in connection with the hire of plant to the public. These expenses are recovered as revenue under Head 8 - Revenue of Government Departments and Services."

What has happened is that the Highways and Transport Department is the biggest owner of heavy-duty equipment and light equipment. You do have people like Mrs. Rock and C. O. Williams who rent out this type of equipment. I know that hon. members will ask whether the prices are commensurate. Yes, the prices are commensurate to the private people. This money is to carry us to the end of the financial year. Sometimes people may rent a tractor, roller, or compressor, and the money is to pay the wages of the operators. I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, as the Minister has said, it is a very small Resolution. The Addendum

states: "..... in connection with the hire of plant to the public." Is it a cane plant, a flower plant, or what kind of plant?

What kind of plant? The Minister is now playing that he is very pretty. I got up here just now and I made mention of "there are" and he got up and wanted to be funny or nasty and said that he does not know about "there are", he knows about "there is". He is going to pay for it from today on. A few minutes after he got up and said "there were".... (Laughter) when it was "there was". What I want to let him know.... (Asides) He was wrong. Yes, he was wrong; anyhow, I am not arguing that. That is nothing to argue. He wants to be pretty and he got up saying that he does not know that "there are" he knows that "there is"; but when one is nasty with me, I can be more dirty. I want the Minister to understand that I can get up in here and talk as I like and as I care to talk. I never sat any examination or anything, in English or anything at all. I want the hon. member to understand that I am not professing that I am this big collegian and I am showing up my colours. I know that I can afford to laugh without looking into any man's face to see if he is vexed or pleased. I can look into his face and tell him anything I like and I cannot be sacked. You go along with your pretty, pretty talk and you do not have a dollar bill in your pocket! Two years from now there is a possibility of your begging your bread.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member proceed with the Resolution which is before the Committee?

Mr. SMITH: If you start with me, I am ready. I want you to understand that it can be with you when these people want to be funny.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let the hon. member get along with the Resolution.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I want to know from the Hon. Minister if he will define the word "plant". There can be anything used for "plant". I will read the Addendum to the Resolution for him again. This is what it says:-

"Supplementary provision in the sum of \$614 is required to meet expenses to the end of the financial year in connection with the hire of plant to the public."

If the Minister were doing his job, he would not bring this in here so. He is this pretty man and is an English master and he read this in the same way. It says here:-

"Supplementary provision in the sum of \$614 is required to meet expenses to the end of the financial year in connection with the hire of plant to the public"

Let me hear what is the meaning of "hire of plant to the public."

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry if I have offended the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. He wants to know about the word "plant". That is another word used for equipment. For instance, you will get a power plant, which is an engine. It is generally referred to as heavy equipment. Anything which is heavy equipment is considered as plant. You take the factories; you say that you are working in such-and-such a plant. It is equipment which is considered as plant. The word "plant" is used, and not the words "plants", because you are not talking about trees. This is a common word used wherever you go. It is like dominoes. The word "plant" is one which is used for any sort of heavy equipment. For instance, you get tractors; these are big pieces of heavy equipment and they are considered to be "plant". If you take the Barbados Light and Power Company you talk about a welding plant. The hon. member is always talking about fixing-it-right and he knows that the first thing he will hear Mr. Bullen ask is: "Have you seen the welding plant?" All of these things are considered to be "plant" and the hon. member knows that. I am not here to waste time. The explanation is that the word "plant" means heavy equipment.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the English master is saying that the word "plant" means any kind of equipment. He has just used the words "welding plant"; but how do you know what plant it is? It is a plant for welding.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: If the hon. member would give way, I am on a point of elucidation.....

Mr. SMITH: I am not giving way.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. When I started to address the Chamber, I said specifically that the Highways and Transport people are the biggest suppliers of this kind of material and if he wanted a list of the things referred to, he should have asked for it; but do not let him get up and ask what "plant" means. "Plant" means a tractor, compressor, traxcavator, bulldozer, roller, - all of these things are included in the word "plant".
1.25 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I still maintain that the English master is wrong. Now, Sir, the Resolution reads: "in connection with the hire of plant to the public." He has just said something about traxcavator bulldozer and all sort of plants. I put it that way. I want to know which this is. "Plant" means one. If it is a roller, if it is a traxcavator, if it is a champion, or whatever it is, say what it is. It says "plant", and I want you to iron out or say what plant you are giving the green light to.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I really am at a loss to understand the hon. member. I am bound to be. It means rollers, and included are rollers over six tons which brings in the Highways and Transport Department's vibrators, rollers, the six ton caterpillar, the tractor bulldozer plus all the caterpillars tractors, the traxcavators, the bulldozers, blades etc.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not want that.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Well, Sir, he said that he does not want that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: This thing says "plant". What you are reading out there is what you have privately. Do you mean a piece of machinery? That is a blade: that is a "bucker" or whatever it is. That is what he wants to know. There is a blade of a traxcavator and a bucket of a traxcavator. When you are saying plant, do you mean a piece of machinery?

The Opposition is entitled to know from the Addendum what it means. It says "in connection with the hire of plant". Now, let me put it this way. Can anyone rent a blade? Can anyone rent a bucket? That is all I ask you. What do you mean when you say "plant"? I do not know what you mean.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: If you look at page 96 of the Estimates (ASIDES) What I was trying to point out is that at Item 91 on page 96 of the Estimates, you will see "hire of plant". This is a supplementary; this is not a new estimate. This money is not to buy any equipment.

(ASIDES)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: While a member is speaking, all hon. members shall be silent.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I am really at a loss, Mr. Chairman, to understand.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is not what I want.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: You want to know if it is to rent out a bucket.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If the hon. senior member for the City would only observe 29 (6).

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: This is what I am saying. The amount of \$2,000 is included in the 1967 - 68 Estimates. What is most shocking is that the hon. senior member for the City above anybody else in here knows exactly that. On more than one occasion, when I was a Parliamentary Secretary and when I was a Minister, when he wanted to use a traxcavator for the levelling of stuff at the Mental Hospital, I was the first person to try to get this plant for him.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It was not for me. I did not want to hire plant.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There are two honourable members on their feet.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chariman, I never said that he wanted to hire anything for himself. If he wanted anything, he would have to pay for it, he could not get it for nothing.

This is what I am trying to point out. The plant which I referred to are the things which I have called out. The sum of \$2,000 was included in the Estimates for 1967-68 under Highways and Transport, Item 69 and the note reads "Hire of Plant to meet the cost of labour in connection with the hire of Ministry's machinery and equipment to the public." I specifically said so at first and I am not going to say so again. The hon. member wants to give me the impression that he does not understand.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If you read this, you will see that this is not properly written. I am nothing to do with any estimates. It says in the Addendum:

"Supplementary provision in the sum of \$614 is required to meet expenses to the end of the financial year in connection with the hire of plant to the public."

Are you hiring plant? Does that mean that you are hiring plant? Does that mean that you are hiring out? Do you still admit that this is written right?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: In connection with the hiring of plant to the public, these expenses are recoverable under Head 8 of Revenue.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What I am asking, Sir, is this. Can you rent out a bucket? Can you rent out a blade? I suppose you can. These are expenses which are recoverable; in other words, these are expenses out of which you pay the operators, for the gas, oil and so on.

I was trying to help out the Minister, but I would leave him to the senior member for St. Joseph; let him clear you up.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, he is an expert on English, but he does not know anything about his portfolio. Let me explain it for him. Item 59-Hire of Plant. The Addendum says:

"Supplementary provision in the sum of \$614 is required to meet expenses to the end of the financial year in connection with the hire of plant to the public. These expenses are recovered as revenue under Head 8 - Revenue of Government Departments and Services."

Now, Sir, I take this to mean that this is something the Government is hiring out. It could be a roller, a tractor or something like that and you want this \$614 to pay for it. That is how I feel about it, but he cannot buy the traxcavator, the motor roller, the tractor or the lorry at the same time. If the Government is renting out these things, they would be more than one. It may be a particular plant that is being rented out, or in other words, the word "equipment" should be used. It should be "for the hire of equipment" and finish with that.

Now, I leave the English master to get around that. Instead of his getting up here and pleading guilty

and stopping there, he is going to allow me to keep him here until tonight.

1.35 p.m.

He knows I do not give him any trouble. I always try to help him, but he has started this here today. I did not know the hon. member was an English master; otherwise I would never have tried to help him before. I will help him now, but down. I would ask the hon. member to define the word "plant". You cannot tell me it is so many things. What is it that Government is renting to the public? It could be a motor roller, it could be a lawn mower, for what little I know. They do not rent out all the things; so this is wrong. The word should be "equipment"; so it is up to you to admit it is wrong, and if you were doing your homework as an English master, you would see that this is wrong. It should never be "plant"; it should be "equipment".

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Just before you put the question, Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the hon. member who has just sat down, I heard some protest from the other side when the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works was trying to explain that this is a supplementary estimate. As far as we are concerned, the Addendum is absolutely correct. What is more important is that it could not deviate from the explanatory note in the main Estimates for 1967-68. If this is a supplementary estimate, it has to be for the same purpose; it is supplementary to the main Resolution, the Estimates which were passed in this House last year. Now these objections were not raised last year. This little duel that has been going on is probably inspired by someone else, and I suggest that hon. members retain their own personal relationships, and not let anyone turn them up to create confusion and trouble in this House and in this Island. We have too many mischief-makers going around.

To come back to the main point raised by the hon. senior member for Bridgetown, I am all for the glossary of Barbadian terms. It is interesting. When the hon. senior member for Bridgetown said he wanted to know whether we are hiring or hiring out, I know that he is well acquainted with the glossary of Barbadian terms, and I know he was only pulling the hon. member's leg. But you know Barbadians talk about two verbs; you reverse and you reverse back. We never rent machinery; we hire the machinery; therefore when we say we are hiring machinery, we are not renting it. This may be a little subtle thing on the verb "to hire" and "to hire out". I think I will have to add to my dictionary of Barbadian terms. But I wish hon. members would not go in for this personal thing and let us get on, because we have 106 Heads, as far as I can remember, in the Estimates, and if on every explanatory note we are going to waste an hour, we will never get through by 31st March.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1967-68 No.64

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, we are asked to supplement Item 18 - Electricity, of Head 23 - Ministry of Home Affairs. Hon. members might like to be reminded that the sum voted in the Estimates covers the cost of electricity for several Government Departments, for instance, Government Headquarters, Town and Country Planning Department, Government Printing Office, The Old Education Office which is now the Training Office and the Lands and Surveys Department. It has been estimated that the sum of \$816, say \$820 will just cover the cost to the end of the financial year, and this is why supplementary provision is being sought.

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.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply, and ask for leave to sit again.

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

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

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

RESOLUTION TO SUPPLEMENT THE ESTIMATES
OF THE PORT DEPARTMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 5 be the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: This Resolution stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve under Section 10 of the Barbados Harbours Act, 1960, the expenditure required to supplement the Estimates of the Port Department for the year 1967-68 as shown in the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, as the Addendum sets out, the sum of \$51,069.00 is required to supplement Annexed Estimates - Port Department Item 61 - Marine and other Equipment to meet the outstanding balance due the Crown Agents in respect of the purchase of two barges and one buoy with winker beacon.

2. An amount of \$179,994 was provided under Item 61 of the Port Department's Estimates during the financial year 1966-67. Included in that amount was \$129,806 to meet the cost of two barges and the buoy. The barges were received on 10th December, 1966 and the buoy on 20th January, 1967 but the final bills were not received until 3rd April, 1967. Of the total provision the sum of \$71,280.00 was paid on account of the purchase price of the barges and the buoy, leaving a balance of \$58,526 which lapsed at the end of the financial year.

3. The account with the Crown Agents showing actual cost of the items, including attendant charges, and the amount due is as follows:-

Two barges	\$ 93,139.20
One buoy with Winker Beacon	1,814.40
One set of buoy moorings	297.60

Charges	
Freight	\$ 24,710.40
Inspection of barges	1,729.68
Crown Agents Charges	657.60
	<u>\$122,348.88</u>

Less amount paid	<u>71,280.00</u>
Amount due to the Crown Agents	<u>\$ 51,068.88</u>

Say \$ 51,069.00

4. No provision has been made in the current estimates to meet the outstanding balance, and it is therefore necessary to seek supplementary provision.
1.45 p.m.

Now, Mr. Speaker, members on the opposite side of the House, and in particular the senior member for the City, are always, more so than not, using quite a lot of cross-talk to me when I am speaking - whether I am speaking or not - but that has nothing to do with me. All sorts of things are said in here about me which I always take in the light in which they have been said, but I have noticed that the moment I retaliate, everybody wants to have my head on a platter. If they want my head, they will have to fight for it. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I think it may be convenient to take the luncheon recess now. I beg to move that this sitting be suspended until three o'clock p.m.

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

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

On Resumption;

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to draw your attention to the fact that there is no quorum.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the bell be rung; there is no quorum.

Mr. DEPUTY CLERK rang the bell, and a quorum was obtained.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 1 be the next Order of the Day.

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

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

APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, and it is to move the Second Reading of a Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Consolidated Fund and to appropriate the same for the year ending on the thirty-first day of March, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-nine.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, it is customary that before the House goes into Committee of Supply to move the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill. The Estimates for 1968-69 show a total expenditure of \$56,120,475 and a revenue of \$50,956,831. It is, of course, in respect of the expenditure that the Appropriation Bill is concerned. All the revenue which we raise and which is contemplated by the Estimates of approximately \$51 million is already authorised to be raised by various Acts of Parliament such as the Income Tax Act and the Customs Tariff Act and so on. Although the Estimates of expenditure is \$56 million, the Appropriation Bill, which is our immediate concern, asks for the approval of expenditure of approximately \$42,562,178 to be paid out of the Consolidated Fund and for the supply of services for the year ending 31st March, 1969.

I do not know whether members have the correction in the Bill, but the figure is \$42,562,178. For the benefit of those hon. members who may not be aware of the procedure, I may say that, although the expenditure is \$56 million, we need only ask for the approval to spend \$42,562,178, because the balance of approximately, let us say, \$13 1/2 million is already authorised by law.
3.05 p.m.

If hon. members would look at any Head in the Estimates, he would see; statutory expenditure for so much, other expenditure and totals. There are three columns. Prior to this year, the first column used to be headed: "Fixed by law." The salaries, for instance, of the members of the Public Service are

regulated by the Civil Establishment Orders which the House approves from time to time. The exact quantum of the salaries of the public servants are regulated; therefore the first figure which will have to come out is in respect of these gross salaries which are fixed by law. It does not mean the total emoluments, because there are some emoluments which are not fixed by law; but all the salaries which are regulated by the Civil Establishment Orders under the Civil Establishment Act or the established posts that we have deducted from the overall issue of expenditure before we arrive at the net figure. It is a very straightforward procedure. In the Appropriation Bill every item of expenditure which the country has had to undergo or has to undergo has to be authorised by Parliament, and even after the end of the financial year, all the Supplementary Appropriation Bills have to be embodied in a single Supplementary Appropriation Bill and passed as an Act of Parliament. For a period of about ten years the Supplementary Appropriations were not so sanctioned by Parliament because no Supplementary Appropriation Bill was brought. You will remember - not during the regime of the present Government, of course, - that it was some \$19 million which we had to come for, in 1959-60 - somewhere around there. After ten whole years no Supplementary Appropriation Bill was brought because it was assumed quite erroneously, of course, that once we passed the money Resolutions, that was the end of the matter. It is now contained in the Constitution that at the end of each and every year, a Supplementary Appropriation Bill should be passed. Anyhow, we are not dealing with that. The Government will be coming to the House as soon as possible with the Supplementary Appropriation Bill which will contain all the Appropriations which were voted for by Resolutions during the course of the year.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to emphasize something which - tradition dies hard, of course, - may not be generally known, and it is that this is not a Budget. This is an Appropriation Bill for the approval of expenditure, the voting of supplies for the Government. The Budget deals with revenue, with the receiving of revenue, but this Bill deals with expenditure, not with revenue. This Bill deals purely and solely with the approval of expenditure. It is my practice when the out turn figures for the financial year become available within a matter of eight or ten weeks, to present to the House my proposals for bridging the gap, as it were, between expenditure and revenue and income and raising the necessary funds to meet such deficits as there may be in the Estimates. We are not concerned with revenue in this exercise; we are merely concerned with expenditure. Since we are so concerned and the House goes into Committee to deal with the respective Heads in greater detail, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Prime Minister has done us the honour on this occasion to obey the direction to the Financial Ad-

ministration and Audit Act in attending at this Hon. House for the purpose of carrying out his Statutory duty of moving the second reading of the Appropriation Bill and laying the Estimates. Like him, I do not intend to make a long speech. As the Prime Minister has said - I should, of course, be referring to him as the Minister of Finance - we will be dealing with the Estimates Head by Head, Item by Item, and detail by detail. However, the Prime Minister has not failed to take the opportunity of making one of his very well known mistakes in his introduction of this Bill, and I think it is only fair to our Party to point out the fact that if an Appropriation Bill was needed after Supplementary Appropriation, that was to the best of my memory, first realised when Ministerial Government was coming in and when the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was becoming the Minister of Finance, and not in 1958-59 at all, and it was the fault, if of anybody, of the old Colonial Officials. I have not had the opportunity to get hold of the 1964 laws of Barbados which, I believe, will contain the Bill to which the Prime Minister has referred, but I would suggest that he remembers it well because it was the time before he had even lost his seat in this House, when he was still a member of the Government.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, just on a point of correction. I was never.....

Mr. SPEAKER: On a point of what?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, a point of explanation. I have never been a member of any Government prior to 1961. I would like to get that clear. I may have been a member of a so-called Party which was running the Government, which is a different thing altogether. We had no means of communicating even on the floor of the House when the so-called.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Prime Minister has made his point.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Whether it is a point of order or a point of correction, I welcome it. The so-called Party to which the Prime Minister refers, seems to have caused him a great deal of heart burn then, as in other times, because it was that so-called Party that got him out of the House in 1956.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are we not dealing with the Appropriation Bill?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The so-called Party caused him to lose his seat.

Mr. SPEAKER: But this is not a so-called Appropriation Bill; this is a real Bill. (Laughter).

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I appreciate Your Honour's wit. If I may be of assistance to Your Honour, if at any time the Prime Minister wants to interrupt me, he is welcome to do so. I am well able to protect myself, and the Prime Minister can take care of any so-called interruptions.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will be taking care of both sides.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: As a general remark on the Estimates, we, on this side, do not like to see the Government expanding every year as a matter of course. We do not measure the prosperity of a country merely by the size of its Estimates. Inflation can be the cause of the increase in Government expenditure which occurs every year, and not any real expansion of the services which the Government is providing for its people. It must be remembered that we, in Barbados are proud of the rate of economic growth which we have been able to maintain over the last ten years under Parties of different complexions in the seat of Government at different times. We are proud of that, and there is no doubt that in the way in which our national statistics are prepared, the expansion of Government expenditure is largely responsible for the apparent expansion in the national income statistics, and that is quite frankly realised in the Economic Survey last year. 3.15 p.m.

This year they amount to 64.3 which, as far as I can find out, is the least amount of Government's expenditure for the same ten years, and at some stage I hope that in his Budget Speech, the Minister of Finance would give some explanation to this Honourable House as to why the Government, so to speak, had to bend in its horn in the matter of development expenditure, especially it is only a case of influences due to inflationary pressures, especially those caused by the devaluation. I can see no explanation other than that attributed to inflation, that which devaluation has caused.

As far as we are concerned, the records and the evidence of these figures is concerned merely to marking time this year with the economy of Barbados. The Government is doing no more than marking time when it comes to development expenditure; the Government is actually leaning backwards. Some years ago, the Government propounded a Development Bill for \$50 million for five years. At the rate they are spending now, they cannot meet that figure because the capital expenditure proposed is down to \$8,183,338 a drop of \$3 million in the Barbados Development between last year and this year.

We do hope, Mr. Speaker, that Barbados as a whole will be free of some of the immense economical difficulties that have beset newly independent countries in this part of the Caribbean. In Trinidad, where there is a man widely regarded as a really able Prime Minister, the Government found itself having to sell off its properties in order to meet needs after Independence. We hope that we would not come to do such things in Barbados. True enough, we have not made economies by selling off properties, but the Government is making the economies by seeming to carry out a properly balanced programme of capital development.

We are down \$3 million, Mr. Speaker. I would remind hon. members that those are the figures. Now, Mr. Speaker, last year we draw to the attention of the

House that it was the hope, and it was the bee in the bonnet of the Government, to overestimate very substantially on capital votes, especially in the elections which preceded last year's Estimates but carried over into last year's Estimates, so that the Government can make wild promises to which the Democratic Labour Party has lent its name for the last six, seven, eight or nine years. The Democratic Labour Party makes wild promises at election time and at other times in respect of development without having either the intention, the capacity, the will or the ability to carry out those promises. Seven years ago a policy was declared by many speakers on the Democratic Labour Party's platform and in their Manifesto that agricultural workers would have five days a week guaranteed employment. Seven long years later, only a severe industrial crisis has persuaded the Government by law to give them what they had been getting all along anyhow - an average of three days' work a week.

Seven years ago, Mr. Speaker, the Manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party said such things as a shoe factory providing plastic shoes which all the Ministers would wear; a cement factory; a World Fair and such things. We commend several phases of that Manifesto. I look at members on the other side and observe the beautifully polished shoes of the Minister of Health; I observe the suede shoes, if I am not mistaken, of the Minister of Trade; I also observe the beautifully polished shoes of the Minister of Communications; but I see nothing of plastic over there. Those promises have at long last come home to roost. The Democratic Labour Party realises that it is incapable of doing what were their promises to do, and they have come down in these Estimates to a reasonable figure of \$8 million for capital expenditure, a figure which we who are not in Government made a joke of.

When we built the Deep Water Harbour, when we planned for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and going back many more years, when we were rebuilding secondary schools - the Combermere School - where were the D.L.P. Secondary Schools, we ask, Mr. Speaker? They have not built one; at least we rebuilt the new Combermere school.

The Estimates which are the Schedule of the Appropriation Bill, Mr. Speaker, will be dealt with at expenditure level, Head by Head; but it is only fair that at this stage we have to mention something which we may not have the opportunity of dealing with quite fully because its financing has been so beclouded and wrapped up in figures that we for years have been trying to unravel the reel of thread knotted by the Minister of Development, by the Prime Minister himself, in respect of the Hilton Hotel.

I will only draw hon. members' attention to the fact that the Government lost \$1,799,335 on the Hilton Hotel in 1967-68, and it sat then and invited the House to agree that the amortization of capital should not be charged during the first year of operation; but now we are in the second year of operation, and far from making a profit, the Hilton Hotel is showing a greater

loss. The loss has gone up by \$300,000 and the same notice is still there that it is not considered desirable that the charge to amortization of capital should be made during the first year of operation.

Well, that is one of the happy traditions of this House. I can see it appearing as long as the Democratic Labour Party is in power. Every year a little note would appear in the Estimates that the Hilton Hotel has lost money and it is not considered that the amortization of capital should be charged during the first year of operation. And when we are retired, Mr. Speaker - retirement would come perhaps a bit sooner for some of us than others - with long, grey hair, looking at our children and grandchildren managing the affairs of this country, no doubt each successive D.L.P. Government even then, would be trying to pay off for the Hilton Hotel and would even be then trying to justify its being one of the most expensive hotels in the world. They would still have that note in their estimates "amortization of capital cannot be made during the first year of operation."

Mr. Speaker, the Hilton is a disgrace, as far as we are concerned, and we are only concerned with the cost now up to \$9.927 million. We are only happy that the cost would not any further rise.
3.25 p.m.

What we are a little bit at a loss to understand is how, if no money was voted - and as far as my researches at present reveal no question of any million dollars was voted for the Hilton last year - the cost has in fact gone up between the years from \$8.8 million to \$9.9 million. I very much hope that the Minister responsible for Finance will lift the blinkers from my eyes and lead me through the tangled by-ways of these Estimates to show me where \$1 million was spent last year on the Hilton Hotel, how the Estimates permitted it and how in fact it was spent, because the Hilton was opened for Independence. How the cost could have gone up from \$8.8 million to \$9.9 million without a vote during the course of last year is a matter that passeth human understanding, but I have no doubt that the Minister of Finance and the Leader of the House will do their best to assist. I think it is a bit unfair to the Leader of the House to leave him to have to face the guns that will be fired across here when in fact it is the Prince of Denmark himself whom we are attacking, because this is one particular case where we do not see how Horatio can play Hamlet's part, but Hamlet has gone to meditate. No doubt he will be found by a willow aslant a stream. Hamlet has gone. I did not believe it, Mr. Speaker, when I was told by older members on this side of the House not to worry, and that as soon as the blows begin to fall the Prime Minister will run. I did not believe it when I first came to this House, but we have all too often come to realise it. Perhaps it is for the best, because we want to get on with the Estimates. We want to advance the debate on this document before us, and we want it advanced without red herrings; we want it advanced without accusations; we want it advanced without quarrel.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, it is all to the good that he has left us to conduct our business in peace and

harmony, and Mr. Speaker, this is clearly not a Bill that the Opposition opposes. On behalf of the Opposition I said what our general remarks are on the Estimates. We will reserve any more detailed comment until we come to read the Budget, and we are hoping to join battle, Mr. Speaker, on the document which lays before us - the Schedule to this Bill.

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

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 the House be instructed when in Committee of Supply to deal with the Estimates arising out of the Appropriation Bill.

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.

HEAD I - GOVERNOR-GENERAL

Head 1 - Governor General - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$33,439 under Head I - Governor-General - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 2 - SERVICE COMMISSIONS

Head 2 - Service Commissions - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$592,708 under Head 2 - Service Commissions - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 3 - PARLIAMENT

Head 3 - Parliament - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$82,694 under Head 3 - Parliament - stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, it is gratifying to see that the refreshment vote is exactly as we had suggested on an earlier occasion when we came before the House to pass a supplementary appropriation which by the way, Mr. Chairman, I do not

see entered. I do in fact distinctly remember a vote being passed, but I see no record of it here. I am drawing this to the attention of the Hon. Leader of the House, Mr. Chairman, since I distinctly remember that there was supplementary appropriation under Item 18, but the Estimates do not show there was supplementary appropriation last year, nor is there any correction in the amendment to be made during consideration in Parliament which was circulated to us. I do not know who is here - I was going to say from the appropriate Department - but of course the Deputy Clerk is here and no doubt he will take note of this. This is a matter which unless I am mistaken will have to be the subject of amendment.
3.35 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I wonder whether he would repeat the substance of this argument so that I may be better seised of it. I take it that he is reminding the House that the House supplemented this Head in this financial year already. What was the further point he was making? I did not catch that.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I have a feeling, Mr. Chairman, that the Estimates was supposed to show the Refreshment and Supplementary Estimates. Last year's vote was not \$4,800, it was \$4,800 plus the supplement; therefore the Estimates will have to show that. At some stage, presumably, you will have to recommit this Head to include the supplementary.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is quite right. What has probably happened is that when we supplemented this Head had already passed the Estimates Committee and gone on to be printed and it slipped us in the Cabinet to correct it when we were looking at it.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, there are several of these omissions. I will, as far as I can, try to help the Minister.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Is it really necessary to recommit it merely to make this correction? If I knew the figure now I would move the amendment in that column, or we can come back to it later.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If you get the figures I believe it would be all right. The Parliamentary experience of the Leader of the House is so much greater than mine that I would not presume to tell him how exactly that aspect of the mechanical work in respect of the Estimates has to be done.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Inasmuch as it is really a vital point, the total expenditure in this Financial Year ought to be shown in the column next to it. What I would suggest is that we postpone consideration of Head 3 so that this figure could be put in. I beg to move that further consideration of Head 3 be postponed.

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

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

HEAD 4 - AUDITOR GENERAL

Head 4 - Auditor General - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$8,984 under Head 4 - Auditor General - stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, we noticed in the Estimates in this Department that new provision has been made under Item 14 for the provision of visits abroad by the Auditor General and his staff. Anybody who has looked at the latest Auditor General's Report in our hands and at the Report of other bodies, in particular the Report of the Registrar of Trade Unions, would see that something has to be done in this country as a whole about the auditing of public accounts.

The Auditor General's Department is supposed to audit not only Government Departments, but now it is called upon to audit the Ministry of External Affairs Overseas. If an increase in the staff or some other new methods were not introduced, it means that proper auditing of the accounts of the Government in this country cannot take place.

Anybody looking at the Auditor General's Report would also see that it is obvious that he does not have the time to supervise the auditing of all public accounts. Indeed, the hon. member who has just spoken, during his tenure of office in the Education Department - they have not sent in any up to now. I do not understand why the Auditor General, in his Report, did not have some very strong strictures to make upon the Accounting Officers in the various Departments who failed to obey the law in this country.

You yourself, Mr. Chairman, will remember the number of times in this House when we have had letters from the Auditor General saying that he is unable to comply with the financial provisions of the Audit Act because other Departments were not complying with the Regulations. I caution the Government that this is a very, very, serious state of affairs. The total Estimates of expenditure amount to a large sum of money, and I would hope that some thorough investigation departmentally is carried out, directed by the Cabinet, to see to it that the Auditor General has adequate staff facilities at his disposal, and that steps are taken to ensure that the Departments and Accounting Officers comply with the law.

A little later we will deal in the appropriate Committee with the state of affairs up to 1966 which we have just received in 1968. Now going into our financial year 1968-69, we are now getting the final accounts of the Auditor General's Report for the financial year ending in 1966. We did not get it before 1967 when it was laid on the Table of the House, and it was not too long circulated. The other day we read in the newspapers about the Auditor General of Canada being able to criticize the accounts of the Canadian

Government for Expo' 1967, and a year has not yet passed. Why cannot we have the same standard of efficiency in this country? It is a matter that we over here cannot accept as something that should be tolerated.

The question that the sum of \$8,984 under Head 4 - Auditor General - stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 5 - JUDICIARY

Head 5 - Judiciary - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$54,731 under Head 5 - Judiciary - stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the sums that have to be voted in connection with Head 5 are nearly all of them, as far as I can judge, ancient items that have been gone over time and time again; therefore, I do not want to spend time going over the particular bits of activity involved. But there is no doubt, Mr. Chairman, and I speak as one who is in constant contact with the activities of the court, that the juries today - I am looking particularly at Items 13, 14 and 16 - do not feel that they are getting paid enough for the work they have to do.

Now, I note that under Item 16 there is the following note:

"Decreased, taking into account special ad hoc provision made in 1967/68."

It seems to have escaped the draftsmen and the persons responsible for preparing the Estimates that there are 7 murder cases to be heard and pending at present, and this is bound to increase the expenses of juries. Certainly, since I have been practising at the Bar in Barbados, this is the largest number of murder cases pending at one time. These murder cases not only increase the cost under Item 16 in that they involve staying out for the night at long trials, but we have seen too many murder juries disagreeing and having to be reformed for a new trial at the same Assize. We are seeing too much of that. 3.45 p.m.

Seven murder cases might well result in twelve murder trials, and it is likely, in my submission, that that particular item is going to prove inadequate. Of course, it is not in our place to suggest to the Government to increase any particular item; but as far as jurors generally have to be concerned, I think that the Government will have to take account of the fact that many people do not like doing jury service because the money is too small. I have been in the Chief Marshal's Office and I heard people complain about three dollars a day for attending on a jury. Then a man explained that he has forty acres of land in St. Thomas and they are only paying him \$3.00 a day for attending on a jury. I am not too sure about the amount myself, but that is something at which the Govern-

ment will have to take a look. This rather skimpy provision for jurors contrasts with the rather lavish provision for witnesses' expenses which, even though on the face of it there is a decrease, their actual expenditure last year remains at the high level of \$3,600 which was voted on the last occasion when the Estimates were before the House.

We would like to have some idea of what the policy of the Government is with regard to witnesses from overseas and the expenses of bringing witnesses before the Courts generally. Again, the same thing is true as to witnesses' costs. In criminal cases in the Magistrates' Courts, witnesses may be forced to attend the Courts; they cannot be forced to attend the Civil Courts, but they can be sent for by Police van and forced to attend the Criminal Courts and not get one penny of recompense for their time. Despite the fact that they can bring plantation managers in the middle of the crop season and they can bring lawyers from another Court where they are earning their daily bread - I myself have been on more than one occasion finding myself giving evidence before the Courts - despite the fact that witnesses can be brought for nothing, the Government which is not willing to pay those witnesses to attend the Court in criminal cases, still found it possible last year to spend more than \$1,000 on bringing a witness from overseas. We did not have the opportunity of going into it when the particular supplementary provision was passed, but we believe that the particular reason for the expansion of the revised estimate was the bringing back of Sir John Stow to give evidence in a political prosecution. Mr. Chairman, the cost of that by itself was one-third of the whole cost of all the other witnesses which appeared in the Courts of Barbados last year. What kind of policy can we say this is? Because it was wanted to persecute the hon. junior member for St. Peter, the sum of \$1,200 was spent; those who assisted the Police in the Magistrates' Courts did not get as much as a penny spent on them, and they are lucky if a Police van comes and picks them up and brings them to the Court. If they do not reach the Court at 9.30 o'clock a.m., the Magistrate will say that they have no respect for the Court, he will talk about issuing a warrant and of sending the police van for them; and when they come to the Court they are told by the Magistrate that they are not wearing a jacket or tie or some such remarks are made, and they are asked why they could not be there at 9.30 o'clock. The bus leaving them is never an excuse. I hope that the Hon. Leader of the House can say something of the Government's policy in this matter of witnesses' expenses.

Nobody could think of a prosecution for criminal libel, the like of which, I dare say, at Assizes has not been seen by any member of this Hon. House. It has not been seen now in Britain for twenty long years. It has not been seen in the United States in this century; nevertheless, it is rated to be so important by the Government that over \$1,000 can be spent in bringing back a Public Officer who has his own travelling allowance and a large salary, to give evidence against the hon. junior member for St. Peter. Mr. Chairman, I have appeared in cases and Mr. Speaker

- has appeared in cases; and I remember that he advised me on some occasions that a useful tactic - and these are serious, criminal cases, where it is discovered that a witness is going away - is to cross-examine him up to 4 o'clock when the Courts must close and then say that you have not finished your cross-examination and you are not going on after 4 o'clock, so that that witness can leave the island, because we can approach these cases with some confidence that the witnesses cannot be brought back. I am thinking of a well-known street-corner supporter of the Democratic Labour Party who once carried a gentleman to Seawell Airport in his taxi, stole his bag and carried away some of his money, was charged on the gentleman's temporary return to Barbados, and was committed for trial at the Assizes; but the gentleman had gone away and a nolle prosequi was entered against him. At the same Assizes at which Sir John Stow was brought back, there was a witness in a case where two people had been killed, and he had gone abroad and was not brought back. Mr. Chairman, what can we think of a Government which brings back a witness for criminal libel, something which has been left in Barbados for years and years to the Civil Courts of the country? What can we think when we hear that an amount totalling one-third of the whole vote for witnesses' expenses appears in these Estimates?

Mr. Chairman, a lot has been said at different times about political pressures and political persecutions. After all, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition got damages against a newspaper whose proprietor is on a Board headed by the Prime Minister with the Hon. Leader of the House and other members on the opposite side as other members of the Board, and no prosecution was taken against the Prime Minister, far less any money being spent on a witness being brought back. The Prime Minister should have been prosecuted for the lies, the malicious, scurrilous, false, foul, filthy lies, which appeared in the Democrat concerning the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. The Prime Minister and the Leader of the House should have been in the Dock at the Assizes for telling those lies. I am not saying that they, personally, told them, but the law says that they are responsible and they could be in the Dock for that particular article which appeared in the Democrat. The Director of Public Prosecutions did not prosecute them. It was left, quite properly in our view, to the Civil Court. We will not worry with that, but, apparently, the Government's policy is that it is the kind of thing which must be worried with at the taxpayers' expense. We think that this \$3,600 is not an excessive amount, so we are not moving to reduce it; but we would like some re-assurance from the Hon. Leader of the House that those bad, evil days are now behind us.

3.55 p.m.

The next other re-assurance is that the lesson was learnt.

I would like to know what Minister took the decision after a clear understanding was reached that the witness in question would not be coming back, so that the legal advisers of the hon. junior member for

St. Peter had to expose their hands and cross-examine the witness at the Court below. I would like to know who was responsible for spending \$1,200 to bring Sir John Stow back after that. It was a piece of straightforward double-dealing, apart from the waste of the taxpayers' money because any competent lawyer - and I say this as a reflection on the Attorney General and the D.L.P. - would have advised the Government that there was no chance of that prosecution succeeding.

We think, Mr. Chairman, that that prosecution was purely, entirely political. We would not be led into prosecuting Senator King, the Prime Minister or the Leader of the House. We would not be led into that because it has been done to us. We do not believe in tit for tat and cuff for cuff. We can do it. Do not make any mistake about it. Senator King is as guilty of criminal libel as.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think that the hon. member should observe Rule 26 (9).

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am obliged to Your Honour. I will observe it. The facts, however, are there, nevertheless.

Mr. SMITH: Before the Minister replies, I think that he would be able to reply to this. My point is very small. Under Item 15, Witnesses' Expenses, I want to draw to the Minister's attention that, when a witness is being summoned to attend the Court at nine o'clock, sometimes when eleven o'clock comes, you do not see the Trial Judge, and sometimes he is inside his Chambers sitting down smoking, and playing a game while there are people sitting down outside until he comes out. Now, Sir, I do not feel that it is fair that you should be summoning one to attend the Court.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for St. Joseph should also observe Rule 26(9). The rule says:-

"The conduct of Her Majesty, Members of the Royal Family, the Governor-General of the West Indies, the Governor, Members of either House of the Legislature, Judges, or the performance of judicial functions by other persons shall not be referred to except upon a substantive motion."

Mr. SMITH: Are you finished, Sir? I am not referring, replying or saying anything about the Governor-General, any Judge or any Magistrate, as you have drawn to my attention. That is why I like you to read these rules rather than calling the numbers of them, I like the rules to be read. I am saying, Sir, that a witness is being summoned by the Court to attend. Does a Judge summon a witness?

I had been summoned as a witness to attend the Court and to appear at nine o'clock, and sometimes when ten or eleven o'clock comes, you do not see any one appear to try the case. Now, Sir, something should be done in the matter and I would say why. I had to attend the Court for about five times and the Trial Judge did not turn up on those five successive occasions. I was late the sixth time by about fifteen

minutes. The Trial Judge turned up on that occasion and threw the case out. Is it fair to me, after going there five times and nobody turned up and the case was put off, that on the sixth occasion when I turned up fifteen minutes late I found that the case was called and it was thrown out? That is when luck is against you. When luck is against you, although the train has stopped running, it would still kill you.

I lost the case and had to pay the costs.

Now, if the law or the rule is such that I must attend at nine o'clock, there should be someone to see that the Trial Judge attends at nine.

The hon. member who has just spoken before me raised this point about witnesses. If the Government saw fit to pay out of the taxpayers' money the passage for a witness so that he may come here for a nay-nay case, then I know of a chap who carried away over \$2,000 from a particular Department and they did not care about sending for him to stand trial. Now this is an unusual sum which has been taken away from this Department. It is falsification of nearly \$2,000 and the man is somewhere about, out of the Island in England playing a game, may be; but now they would suffer and they would gladly pay \$3,000 to bring back a witness to attend a case which could have been set aside. They could say that when the witness returns, they could try the case and in that way the Government would not lose anything.

The Government made sure to spend money to lose a case, and a man falsely took away over \$2,000 and nothing was done about the matter. I hope that the Minister makes a note of these things and see to it. Privately, I would tell the Minister the Department - I would not say it here - as well as the name of the person who took away the money; but do not be so unfair only because it may appear that it was a policeman who was in a way speaking one-sided that you did everything possible to bring this kind gentleman back to Barbados out of the taxpayers' money.
4.05 p.m.

If you were going to bring a witness in a case of murder, by all means spend all you possibly can to bring him because you are protecting the country; but as I have said, this was an ordinary case which came to nothing and the Government actually sued themselves. This is one time I know that a person can sue himself. The Government sued themselves and had to pay the penalty themselves. They have all the top notch lawyers and solicitors, and still they sued and fined themselves. They should be locked up too. They fined themselves and made everybody at the Legal Department look foolish, because if they had come to me for advice I would say that this is no case. I am not a lawyer, but my commonsense would tell me that this is no case to spend so much money on, and you should let it go through the window. You were trying to carry a little fellow through the eddoes and put him on the scaffold and would try to spend every cent of the taxpayers' money, but the individual is still here sitting with us and the money has gone. \$2,000 have gone and there has been no refund. Why don't the legal

expert set about trying to get this amount back in the country? This is one time that I know one can sue himself, and the Government have done it to themselves, and have barely got away from being in gaol themselves.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, over the page, if I may just ask, because I have been reminded that the Minister did say last week, I think in the House, that he would be able to give us some information on the position of the Magistrate's Court at District "D". Now, Mr. Chairman at District "D" Counsel, Probation Officers, in fact several Counsel and the Probation Officer all have to squeeze at a very small table indeed, perhaps not much bigger than the Reporters' tables in this Honourable House. There are no chairs to sit down in; you have to sit in the window seat. The Probation Officer gets squeezed, and he or she has to back up against an old broken-down cupboard of which they do not seem to be able to get the doors opened. If you are doing a case for assessment of land upon a notice to quit, the two assessors have to sit down below where the Magistrate sits over on another side, you are right up underneath the Police, and as Counsel trying to work at District "D" Court, you cannot reach your client if you want some last minute instructions or you want to give some last minute advice. The waiting space is not really very adequate and we have been promised a new Court room, but it is my experience and my belief that it is going to take the Chief Justice and the Registrar and everybody else some time to decide what exactly to do about the District "D" Court room. I hear the proposal is to bring St. Thomas cases into Bridgetown. That in my view would be a great hardship on the people who live in Chapman's Village, Carrington's Village and Welchman Hall.

Throughout Barbados of course, Mr. Chairman, you see this business of people sometimes taking the law into their own hands and nothing ever getting into the Court, because of the distance of the Court. You do not only get it in St. Thomas where you see far fewer Welchman Hall cases in Court than you would if there were a Police Station nearer to Welchman Hall. You get it in Christ Church where people from Silver Sands and Oistins are unwilling to go to Boarded Hall, and therefore you meet a lot of situations where the travelling puts off people from asserting their legal rights. This is a stage, in my view, Mr. Chairman, for the Government to tell us what exactly its plans are for re-organisation of the Magistrates' Courts. The only satisfactory plan of which I got wind so far is the proposal to move Bissex Hill Court to Horse Hill. This is something for which the Barbados Labour Party has been fighting for years, to re-locate Bissex Hill Court. Bissex is not even pleasant for the people who work there, because the position of the Court on top of the hill, although it might be thought windy and airy, yet in fact it is very hot and very airless at certain times, and also no water can be obtained up there with any convenience. If you want a drink of water, Mr. Chairman, you have to be let out into the back of the Police Station to a place where they have filled up a big iron drum, and they will draw off a little water for you and put some ice with it. It

is easier to make ice sometimes than to get the water from which to make it at Bissex Hill. If you had the water you could get the ice made because electricity runs up there; but the difficulty is getting the water. These things must all concern us.

Nobody wants to see an expansion in the work of the Courts. It must not be thought that I am hoping to see Courts move so as to incite people from Welchman Hall or the people from Silver Sands to be more litigious. I am not seeking for that at all; but you want people to have a little more convenience. For myself, getting back to District "D", I do not think that District "D" Court is necessarily ill-located. Wherever you put a Court in St. Thomas, it is going to embarrass the inhabitants from somewhere; but while the matter is being gone into, I would be glad if the furniture and equipment of the Court is improved. Furniture and equipment is not such a very expensive item. I do not know how it could reach \$2,195 to re-equip with four chairs, two cupboards, one desk and so on, but no doubt the Minister can explain how a few swivel chairs, clocks, desks and cupboards can come to that. I do not know how just that could reach up there, but District "D" should have more chairs, and if it is going to take two or three years, as it has already taken two or three, to provide a new Court room, let us have some more chairs, let us have the railing removed and put the prisoner and people in the dock a little closer to their lawyers. They do not need the advice of the Police. Let them get closer to their lawyers; give the lawyers and the Probation Service a little more room. There is no room at the District "D" Station for the Probation Service to carry out its duties. Even the lavatory at District "D" is contained in a thin compartment behind the Magistrate's Bench and the lady clerks and typists are just on the other side - a little narrow confined space there which you have to pass if they want to pass from the Clerk's office into the main part of the Court. Do not keep people in that condition.

While we are waiting to hear what is going to be done in the Court, let us have some more furniture and equipment. District "D" has a lot of advantages. That part of Barbados is the coolest part of Barbados. You can always get a breeze and always be in comfort there, and as I have said, I for one do not necessarily think it is a bad place for a Court and Police Station, and it is not only these other places that need these things. St. Thomas needs them as well.

Under Item 29, the sum of \$450 is needed for legal publications and Supplements for Magistrates' Courts. We should move to amend that note to "purchase of legal publications and Supplements for barristers who are missing them in their own offices", because I can only presume that all the legal publications and Supplements vanish into the offices of persons concerned in the law, because you go to a Magistrate's Court and it is impossible to see any legal publications and Supplements. They are either locked up in a cupboard to which the key has been lost, or else if they are not locked up in the cupboard they are not there. I would challenge anybody to go to the same District "D" Court and get out a

law book. As far as I am concerned, they have a better library there than many lawyers, but I have never seen the cupboard opened. They have books I would be proud to have in my chambers.
4.15 p.m.

I have seen books I would be proud to have in my Chambers, by purchase, of course, Mr. Chairman. I have seen books at District "D", I would be glad to be able to afford, and I have never been able to open one yet, because on the occasions on which I have asked to see those books, the key was not there. The Magistrates and lawyers would be glad to have a chance to refer to certain books. What is the point of buying legal publications and supplements for the Magistrates' Courts, if they are not available to those who need them?

I would find it inconceivable that the Magistrates, even at District "A", could comfortably go and put their hands, say, on Archbold's Criminal Pleading and Practice. I would find it, perhaps, not inconceivable but very surprising, and at the country Courts extremely difficult. I do not know what are the legal supplements referred to in this Item, but this is something I would ask the Government to consider taking up with the Registrar very seriously: is any purpose served by the present system of book-purchases for these Courts? Are the best books being bought and, if so, are they available to those who need them?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, two hon. members, I think, raised questions arising out of this Head which, I think, are significant. I think I can dispose of the hon. member's question and the points which he made about District "D" Court. Yes, I did tell him that I would give him an answer, but I did not remember that I had said so. At the time I gave the undertaking, I myself ought to have known that provision had already been made in the Capital Estimates of \$24,700 for a new Court in this year, which we have not, for some reason, done. The hon. member, my colleague, may be able to speak on that aspect of it. I should have known myself that it was in the Estimates, but I did not look at them at that stage. It has been drawn to my attention that we have put in a re-vote of \$24,700 for the erection of the new Court at District "D". I think, therefore, it would be in the hon. member's interest, from time to time, to ask us how we are getting along in the current financial year.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The amount of which the Minister speaks has been re-voted for years. There is a question about it on the Order Paper even now, as far as I can remember.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: That is true, but I believe that the plans are being drawn up currently and that hon. members in the House will hear something to their advantage shortly with respect to this Court. I am also told that plans are afoot for the removal of District "F" Court to Lammings when the development there gets underway.

The hon. senior member for St. Joseph made his point about the alleged unpunctuality of judges. It would, of course, be grossly improper for me to make any comment on this matter, but I have no reason to believe, Mr. Chairman, that Judges or Magistrates are worse in this respect than anybody else, nor have I any reason to suspect that Judges would wilfully refrain from holding their Courts, or doing their scheduled work. It is quite possible - and this is the experience of almost everybody - that, for reasons which have always proven sufficient, important people cannot always be punctual in honouring their assignments. There may be a good reason why a Court does not meet for the first few minutes after it should meet.

I would not like the hon. member to go away with the impression that the Judges are in any way shirking their duties, or that this is a practice. I do not know, but I believe that, when it does happen, there must be some good reason why if a Court should start promptly at ten or nine as the case may be, the bench is not occupied until ten past nine or ten past ten. I would ask him to exercise, perhaps, the same indulgence in respect of Judges as he would to himself, or in respect of any busy persons in the discharge of their duties.

The hon. senior member for St. Thomas raised some points on Items 13, 15 and 16 relating to the stipends for Jurors and Marshals at Criminal Assizes; the Witnesses' Expenses, and Jury Expenses. First, with respect to witnesses. Oddly enough there does not seem to be a great increase over the years in this expenditure. The provision this year is \$3,600; in 1965 and 1966 it was \$3,096; in 1966 - 1967 it was \$2,647; and in this current year it would be about \$4,500 in view of the special circumstances which we have just been told about, or rather, with which we are familiar, and which the hon. member has just drawn to our attention.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is quite understandable how, on a matter like this, the hon. members opposite should wish to speak their minds, and, certainly, on my part there could be no objection to this. I think it is one thing to protest against a certain kind of expenditure which you do not think to be justifiable, and another thing to try to make out that this expenditure has been incurred for specifically political reasons. Now this is arguable. It has never been part of my experience that members of the Cabinet, either singly or collectively, have ever, by breaching the provision of the Constitution of this country, mixed themselves up in matters which come before the Courts to advise or to refrain from advising, as the case may be, the appropriate authorities.

It is, therefore, not true to talk as if the decision to bring a witness back to participate in a case before the Supreme Court was a decision taken by politicians in order to spite another hon. member of this House. This I resent. No member of the Cabinet could ever be responsible for this kind of decision; and, certainly if this kind of decision has to be taken to bring a prosecution witness back, it must be done on grounds which the people responsible for prosecutions, or the

people who run the Courts, regard as justifiable by themselves. The only thing that would puzzle me, and I speak now in my personal capacity as a citizen of this country, and certainly incur my deepest resentment would be this: if it turned out to be a fact that money could be spent on a prosecution witness, but in a case in which a defence witness was vital to the proper administration of justice such a request was denied. I would feel myself, personally, that this would have no place in the proper administration of justice.

I would imagine, myself, that in the same way in which a decision could be taken by the appropriate authorities to facilitate the coming back of a prosecution witness, the same kind of people could take the same sort of decision in bringing back a witness for the defence. This, to me, would be a proper understanding of what justice requires; therefore, I would think that the hon. members would have more to quarrel about, if it turned out that this was a one-sided policy on the part of whoever makes these decisions, and that is a case in which the proper defence of the accused could not be carried on because a vital witness was overseas and could not be brought back. I would feel that this would be a most legitimate ground for resentment and, certainly, I would lend my support to any protest in that respect.

4.25 p.m.

With respect to the question of the books, I have been informed that the Magistrates are always asked to say what they want, and only then are books purchased. With respect to the Jury expenses, that was \$2,500 and it has been increased to \$3,000. It has been anticipated that they might be longer sittings of the Assizes in 1968 and this has necessitated what looks like a 20% increase in the vote. It was not known at the time of the drafting of the Estimates that there were seven murder cases. The hon. member has reminded us that there are six murder cases for January alone, but there may be none for the April or July Assizes. On an average it is believed that a greater increase than 20% is not anticipated.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. There are seven murder cases which will be for April and subsequent Assizes, and that is by itself. You do not get seven murders as a rule in a year. It is this financial year which we will have to deal with in Barbados.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The hon member's point is well taken. I imagine that the authorities who have control of these matters will ask for supplementary provision as they are entitled to do, if they find that what is provided is not enough. There is one last point which I would like to make with respect to the provision - I was to have added with respect to books - that it is my understanding that the books are provided for the use of Magistrates only.

The question that the sum of \$54,731 under Head 5 Judiciary - stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

RECOMMITTAL OF HEAD - 3 - PARLIAMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 3 - Parliament - be recommitted.

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. Chairman, the hon. member who is not now in his seat had questioned the fact that we had supplemented the refreshments vote recently, anyhow this financial year, and that the column to the right of the column to be voted did not record the total to include the supplementary. I have been informed that these figures will be corrected and adjusted when the Approved Estimates are printed. It will be a matter then for the Ministry of Finance generally, and the appropriate Department specifically, to put in all the corrections. I am also informed that this does not affect the work that we are doing now because we are only considering the expenditure which has been voted in this financial year. The point is that what is left out and what is at the moment uncorrected does not affect what we are doing now. I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that Head 3 be recommitted.

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

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I think that what the hon. member was bothering about was the fact that the vote as represented for 1967-68 is \$4,000, whereas for the year 1968-69 the sum of \$10,000 is being asked for; and, in his opinion, since it is remembered that a supplementary amount was granted by Parliament during the present financial year, that supplementary amount ought to have been included in the 1967-68 column. Now the Hon. Leader of the House has said that that will be made right when we have the Approved Estimates, that these are the Draft Estimates and we are going to have amendments. After we have passed these Estimates, what we will get will be amendments and corrections and they will be Approved Estimates. But if we do not amend and correct now, what are the Approved Estimates? As a matter of fact, you are really confirming something to date. We have the Estimates in draft here before us. We are going to vote these sums of money, we are debating this Schedule and we are going to come across certain irregularities, certain errors which will need correction now. When we conclude this exercise, we get then the Revised Estimates - well, let us revise now.

I am told that the Appropriation Bill, as amended will contain them, but they must still be contained in the Revised Estimates when we get them. This can be postponed, as it has already been postponed; but the Minister said that he has information at his command and I thought that he would have been offering it and offering to correct it now.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If the hon. member would give way, what I did say was that I had an answer;

I did not say that I had the information which the hon. member required. The amount voted under a particular supplementary Resolution would not be remembered by any member of this House, unless he had special reasons for recalling it; but the point I am making is this; this does not prevent us from doing what we are doing now, because all of this is going to be corrected in the Revised Estimates. That is my understanding.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Well, let it remain as having been postponed then.
4.35 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: But suppose it happens that you had that with every single Head to make that kind of opposition to a supplementary estimate already passed! Would you suggest that you postpone every Head because of this, though it does not affect what the Committee is now doing? The Committee is voting supplies for the next financial year and the amounts are set out under each item under its particular Head. What we are arguing about now is an amount for the current financial year which has been supplemented and this is shown in the column on the right as its true figure; but, Sir, when it is appropriated and financed, it does not affect what we are doing.

Mr. HUSBANDS: If in fact you had expenditure of \$20,000 last year and in your column on the right, you have \$5,000, of course, it does materially matter with what is happening now. It is only \$10,000. It may be at variance with that; but what I am saying is that if the Estimates are to be a proper one, if this copy is to be a true reference, let us do it now before we get through the debate on the entire Estimates. If it is postponed, it may as well be postponed - and, as far as I understand, it is postponed. The Minister thought that he had given us as much as would please us. But he has not.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, one member wants to know one thing, I want to know another. It appears to me that it is an increase and a large increase on this year's vote; so I would like to know, if it is an increase, what is the purpose for the increase because we can do nothing more. We cannot sit any more; we cannot do anything more. I would like to know, if it is an increase, what is the reason for it.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I would have thought that the hon. member's colleague now sitting at his immediate left would have made this clear to him. It was his suggestion that we should increase the vote because we had to supplement it by 100 percent in the same financial year. As a matter of fact, the out-turn might make us see that what we would have to spend in this financial year under this item might be exactly or nearly \$10,000 or perhaps even a little more.

The hon. senior member for St. Thomas, the shadow Minister of Finance, suggested, when we were doing a supplementary, that it might be a sensible idea to put it in round figures, that is to say \$10,000. because that is what it seemed that we were likely to

spend. Now, we have done this, thinking that we were rightly interpreting the wishes of the House in this respect. That is all. There is no ulterior reason.

Mr. SMITH: Well, Sir, I was thinking wrong. I was thinking that, because the Jews are keeping away from the Samaritans, the increase was for the purpose of setting up another dining hall, another new outfit, and so on. However, it does not appear, Sir, to be so from the reply.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am coming to the Jews and the Samaritans (right now because we have to be absolutely sure that the new dining hall idea is scotched. The Leader of the House promised that he and the Leader of the Opposition would get together and have a Kitchen Committee or something like it to reorganise the eating and the refreshments of hon. members. I have every trust in the Leader of the House's talents for organising refreshments and matters of this sort. I say that quite seriously. No sarcasm is meant; it is nothing like that.

I really believe, especially after seeing and welcoming the Leader of the House to our dining room - and I have to say our dining room - Mr. Speaker and ours - on Friday, I think it was or, may be, it was last Tuesday - I was looking forward to his telling us that he has decided to organise this Kitchen Committee and that we would have no more of the confusions, the alarms, and excursions which were characteristic of the last few weeks where food is concerned in this Honourable House.

This item is the only contentious item, and I think that in view of what the Hon. Leader of the House said on an earlier occasion, he should tell us now how far he has been able to get with his plans for putting an end to the segregation. I know that Mr. Ian Smith is not very much in the favour of the Prime Minister since he has hanged our brothers in Rhodesia. I remember the Prime Minister has not only got into this Honourable House but on an earlier occasion he said that Mr. Harold Wilson should not use force. Well, last Saturday he said that he once said that he preferred the company of the Rhodesians and the South Africans to our company. I know the Prime Minister has a deadly wish, but I did not know he had it in quite so well a developed form.

Let us sit down, Mr. Chairman, and hear from the Minister what is he going to do about the food problem. Instead of the lunch hour being what it is, having a Kitchen Committee to run the dining room, cordoning off the Prime Minister in a little box in the corner overlooking Rickett Street by himself without the unwelcomed company either of the hon. junior member for St. Andrew whom he attacked on Friday or of the hon. member of the Opposition who apparently polluted the air. Whatever the solution is, let us hear it from the Minister.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I must say that I listened to the hon. member and if the Prime Minister did not exist, then it would not have been necessary to invent him. I do not know why the Prime

Minister appears to loom so largely in the hon. member's thinking. The Prime Minister is only a member of this House like the rest of us. Outside of this House he has certain constitutional responsibilities which he discharges with efficiency, if I may say so, and despatch. There is no need to be harping about what the Prime Minister will, or will not, do because we can get along without talking about that.

The hon. member asked me when I propose to sit down with the Leader of the Opposition to work out - he said desegregation - but I prefer to say a proposal for more commodious arrangements for the comfort of members of this House. I would have been only too glad to do so, but the Leader of the Opposition has gone away for a few weeks and I shall have to wait until he returns, unless the Deputy Leader who acts for him in other respects would act for him in this respect. If so, we can get together on the matter. As a matter of fact, I make bold to say that in these circumstances I am likely to reach a quicker and more honourable solution to the problem. I mean no offence to the member who is the Leader of the Opposition. In these circumstances, if I can discuss this matter with the acting Leader of the Opposition, I am certain that I can get matters straightened out to everybody's satisfaction.

While the hon. senior member for St. Thomas did not press this point which caused me to reopen Head 3, I would like to say that the column appearing in the Estimates 1967 - 68 must show only the amount approved by the House when it last met in Committee of Supply on the Estimates. It therefore cannot show a supplementary which was subsequent to this. Supplementary Provision would of course be included in the 1967 - 68 Revised Estimates when these are done; so it is really no problem.

The question that the sum of \$82,694 under Head 3 Parliament - stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 6 - LEGAL

Head 6 - Legal - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, there are some amendments which I have to propose to Head 6. They are on pages 12 and 13. The first is on page 12. We delete item 8, Administrative Assistant and the provision of \$5,145. Amend Total Personal Emoluments by substituting "\$156,263" for "\$161,408". 4.45 p.m.

Amend Total Legal by substituting "\$163,887" for "\$169,032".

Amend Net Increase by substituting "\$60,669" for "\$65,814".

This does not affect the total vote, but it is just as well that this should be done now rather than giving us trouble later

I beg to move that the sum of \$7,624 under Head 6 - Legal as amended stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I see under Item 18, \$750 and the note says "To meet costs and incidental expenses in cases to which the Crown is a party." That seems to me to be woefully inadequate especially in view of the fact that the Crown nowadays has to be involved in litigation with our Crown Proceedings Act, and it must be within the knowledge of the people responsible for the preparation of the Estimates that not so long ago a judgement was delivered where costs were awarded against the Crown in the sum of \$20,000 in connection with the failure in the past of the then Attorney General who is one of those fortunate people, who because of his incompetence and inefficiency gets promotion - he is now an Ambassador abroad - to bring down the legislation that was necessary to implement the agreement made with respect to the identification system and the photographing system for election time. We know that this is a matter of great embarrassment to the Government, the fact that they have to come and pay this because it was purely the incompetence of one of their advisers that caused this expenditure. The sum of \$750 cannot begin to pay any costs. In addition to this, the Crown in its capacity as owner of a number of motor vehicles right through Barbados from time to time does get involved in litigation, and costs are awarded against it; so I really think that another look should be had at this figure.

The question that the sum of \$7,624 under Head 6 Legal - as amended stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD - REGISTRATION

Head 7 - Registration - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$46,883 under Head 7 - Registration - stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, dealing with the registration of documents, Sir, I wonder if the Minister can tell me what is the Government's view in relation to employing more modern method of recording documents in the Registry, particularly in the section dealing with the registration of deeds and documents, because for some time now we have been asking whether the Government has considered the possibility of allowing certified photostatic copies; and although there has been a re-organisation and a shifting in respect of the provisions of Birth and Baptism Certificates and things of that kind, if one only has to write abroad to another country and ask for a Birth Certificate, one gets back a photostat; one does not get back a hand-written copy. I wonder whether the Government has considered this matter, because I am sure that it would really speed up the process, and I am sure that there is other work in the Department which needs to be done so that there will be no question necessary of any person losing his job and being put out of work. It is certainly a much more

efficient system than the one obtaining at the present moment.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has raised a very important point. We did go into this matter. I recall that the Chief Justice had asked the Government Archivist to examine the possibility of introducing new techniques - photostating, micro-filming or whatever it is - and the Archivist presented a report, the details of which I do not now remember; but I recall that one of his conclusions was that it would be very difficult at present to do this, and he recommended keeping things as they are with some improvements here and there for the time being. I regard this matter as important enough for a more definitive statement to be given to the House on it, but the House has me at a disadvantage because I did not anticipate that this particular point would be raised, I shall certainly have this matter gone into and answer more fully perhaps later in this sitting.

I think I would like to give the assurance that we did have it investigated, and it was only because we were advised by expert opinion that we could not immediately put these techniques into operation that we have not done so. My hope would be, of course - and I expect the Government would like this - that I would like to have been able to take - technical difficulties apart, I mean they are there to be overcome anyhow - some, if not all, of the same staff who are now employed in this laborious and probably time-wasting exercise of hand-copying, and have them trained, or as many of them as show aptitude in these new techniques. Then, of course, there is this problem that all documents cannot be copied in the new way recommended by the experts; but we are considering how to do this as well as to preserve such documents as need preserving.

It would appear also, Mr. Chairman, that with respect to deeds, a change in registration of titles is pending and that this has to await the work now being done in the Surveys Department. The proper registration of titles will, I am informed, do away with the whole system of recording as at presently done.

The question that the sum of \$46,883 under Head 7 - Registration - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

4.55 p.m.

HEAD 8 - CROWN SOLICITOR

Head 8 - Crown Solicitor - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$7,123 under Head 8 - Crown Solicitor - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 9 - MINISTRY OF FINANCE

Head 9 - Ministry of Finance - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$1,212,278 under Head 9 - Ministry of Finance - stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, Item 13 - National Insurance Contributions. I want to draw to the Government's attention that since the National Insurance does not provide for workers over 65 years, and there are a lot of workers who are still working over the age of 65 years, that some provision should be made for them. You have these old workers who did a lot for this country by way of cheap labour; they worked very hard and are still working, and you have workers who have just come into the labour movement and are well provided for.

One who is working at the age of nineteen or twenty is provided for, but the 65-year-old, according to the Act, will be thrown away. If the employers should call on these workers to leave and they do not provide any work for them, what would be the result? They would have to go home, but they would still have their wife and children to support. They may have to go home and nurse their fingers.

I feel that the limit should be 70 years in order to include those people who are not provided for and should be provided for. You will be doing a service to these people. If one started to work at 16 or 18 years of age and one even slipped for a time, things might turn out all right. The young people have a better chance of making their way in life than the old folks. I know a lot of people who are working cutting canes, driving lorries, and so on at the age of 65. What is going to become of them? They were working for the last 30, 40 and 50 years in some cases, but no provision has been made for them.

Under the National Insurance Scheme some workers are entitled to \$100 death benefits, but the old people are not entitled to it. While you are trying to help certain people, you are closing your eyes to those who are 65 years of age and over. These old people should be considered much more quickly than the young ones, because the 16-year-old, or the 18-year-old, has not yet made any serious contribution to the economy of the country. These young people are provided for, and I am not saying that they should not be provided for. I am saying that the 70-year-old should also be provided for.

I remember hearing some night last week over the air, on the programme entitled "Fifty Years Ago", that a plantation had advertised for a manager at \$20 a month. You can imagine at that time a manager would have a bookkeeper, an assistant, and a superintendent under him. If the man at top was getting \$20 a month, then you can imagine what the watchman, the canecutter, and the woman in the field weeding the canes, would get! That was 50 years ago, but you still have some of those people working today.

I think that last week Blackman's Plantation advertised for a bookkeeper at \$16 per month. What would these poor workers get? Now the Government has made ample provision for the 16-year-old for 16 years ago, put it that way, and has forgotten those who were in existence 50 years ago. I know that some cane cutters, when they work for a whole week for 60¢, were counted as big shots. They could not raise a dollar too easily. Women were weeding the fields at 16¢ or 18¢ a day at the time, and some of them are still in existence today. I know of chauffeurs who received the handsome wage of \$1.92 or \$2.40 a week. I am sure that some of them are still at plantations driving trucks today, but they are not provided for.

I hope that the Minister in charge will draw it to the attention of his colleagues in the Cabinet with a view to going into this matter again to see what can be done for people over 65 years who are still working. They cannot stop working; but, as the law stands today, the employer can call on them to pull up their stakes and go home to look into an empty kitchen or an empty larder.

5.05 p.m.

The ordinary three days a week which they are getting by way of Old Age Pension cannot measure up. Public Assistance is still, I believe, one dollar a month in some cases, and in other cases, it is 50 ¢. That cannot help them and they still have a home to provide for; but it would be very nice, it would be very handsome, if the Government would see to it to protect them under the National Insurance Scheme by way of helping them with the necessary benefits; otherwise you have not done anything, because the majority of the workers today will not be sixty-five years in a hurry. You may have them now at 30 years old, and they still have another 35 years to go before they retire, but these people cannot go another 35 years in the employment of an employer. The numbers 65 and 35 total 100, and there will be very little in that particular worker or individual for him to do much; therefore the thirty-year olds and the twenty-five-year olds have all the chances, and they are getting all the chances, but there is no chance whatsoever for the sixty-five-year olds, and we should do something to help them. I see that the Hon. Minister is looking in a way to make me feel that he is in sympathy with these workers, but if he is in sympathy with them, let him not simply look, but act. We all have old people in the country. Very few of them on that side may have, because they are not country men; but all the country men have old people and we will have to protect them. The ones who are living down here, the people who were born and bred in Bridgetown, do not get old people. For the little time that I have been down here, I have been seeing all young people; I have not seen any old ones; but if you go into the plantations and the villages, you will see the old people walking with sticks and they are not blind. Their grandchildren are leading them and they are not blind. What is that, Sir? Too little to eat and drink and they work very hard. Those who are working are working very hard still, but they are not happy. I have never thought of it until they called on

me and I believe that they must have called on the Minister too. If the manager tells these people: "We cannot take your name down because you are over age", they would be disappointed because everybody who has heard about the National Insurance - everybody heard from the platform that in the same way that the Civil Servants are called upon to resign you will be called upon to resign, and you would get a pension; but now they are disappointed. They would not be getting any pension, and since the employers are called upon by law to give a minimum week's pay, one can expect to look forward to see what is going to happen with these 65-year olds. If a plantation has 10% of these people, you must expect that the employer will tell them to go, so as to make room for the others, and he will carry out the letter of the law, to find work for three days during that time for the ones who are under age; but the law does not provide, as far as I can remember - if I am wrong I will be glad if the Minister will stop me right way - but the law does not provide this minimum wage - a guarantee to pay for the 65-year olds who must work, and they are still working.

I do not want it to be thought or said by the people that the Government is only looking out for the young people. (Asides). But one can only say that if the Government does not try to do something for these people, it can be said that this is the young people's Government because provision is made by the National Insurance Scheme up to 65-years and by the Minimum Wage Bill you are providing for them, and what about these workers? That is a serious thing. The Government cannot see everything at the same time. I would not accuse them of wanting to ignore that type of worker. They may be thinking from the point of view that it may be too expensive. I was somewhere not far from here on Sunday night, and a Minister said that they are providing for over 68,000 people and it will be under the National Insurance Scheme. If that is so, they will have to provide for another 5,000 or 10,000, I do not know; but regardless of the cost, you should not close your eyes to those people.

Now, Sir, the Minister is very clever. He did not say that they were providing for people up to 65; that was not his duty or his business at the time. He was only trying to make right with these 68,000 people, but people to whom he was talking cannot feel good. I do not know if they cheered at the time because, from where I was standing, I could not hear him too well. I do not know if the people cheered when he boasted about these 68,000 people and that the other Party did nothing. He termed the other Party to be something called a corbeau. (Laughter). That was a very big nasty insult to me over here, because I am a member of the Opposition and I know what is a corbeau. (Laughter). So that when the particular Minister termed me as a political corbeau, carrying about all filth and dirtiness, well, you cannot expect anything worse.

5.15 p. m.

This is what one would get when one is representing poor people in this House. One of the corbeau is drawing to the attention of the Government

that they have forgotten these old people. Well, I do not want to stir up any strife: I will not say the person was. I am not doing it; but if they should reply to my drawing attention to this Item in the Estimates, I am going to fly in on him and give him the meaning of the word "corbeau". I am going to lick his blouse clean off him. But, I will not do it yet because, after all, I am a human being; I am a man like him.

What is wrong with me? Why term me to be a big nasty bird flying about looking for filth? There could not be a worse term. Well, my colleague on my right does not know the meaning of the word "corbeau". A particular gentleman said that if you go to Trinidad at a place called La Brea, you will see these corbeau, you will also see them in the nastiest places in Trinidad. Why have I taken it so seriously? If he called us political corbeau and went along, just as I would call anybody else and go along it may be all right: but he defined it for the people: that is to say, if we were passing by their W.C. they must shout for murder. They must shut the door. That is what he wants to make these people to believe that we are. If you go to the front door, it is all right talk with us, but if we go to the back, shout for murder because we would clean up everything.

Well, I will still be decent; I am not going down there. But I can go down there. I am not going down there yet because if one person can get on the platform and say anything, I can come back tomorrow night and reply, and nobody can better me when I am right.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I go back to the point. I warn the Government that they must do something in this matter. It can be responsible for their downfall because you still have a lot of old people who are voters. If they take it seriously - and I know that they are supposed to take it seriously because the Wage Bill which we have just passed - I am not leaving out myself - is one of the best things which this Government has done to save the country.

I am still wondering why the Government came here with the Bill for "A" class workers to receive \$4.14 instead of making it \$4.80. These employers - those people on the plantations - are asked to provide three days' work per week for the workers. In order for them to save money, they are going to throw these people into the hands of the Public Assistant - Officer. But that Fund cannot cushion the shock which they are going to get because the public assistance which operates in the country areas is only a small amount.

The Government would have to do something. They would have to increase Public Assistance so as to help those people when they are thrown aside. They have a chance now because some of the old people are still working, and their children will be able to try to help them. They may not be able to work for as much as the young ones, but when they are thrown aside, that is what is worrying me, and it should worry the Government. You will see it from July 1st

this year. No work will be provided for them; it will be provided for the younger ones and I sincerely hope that the Prime Minister and the Minister will both get together in spite of the coubeau and do everything to help that type of worker.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, Page 18, Head 9 - Minister of Finance. We understand that the Minister of Finance is responsible for all the money to be spent in this Island, and I can assure any one that since this Government came into existence, they have not for one moment neglected one of the people of Barbados. In every category, you can look and see that this Government is taking care of everyone of them.

It is very good for certain members to get up and say what they like, but I want to say, Sir, that future good conduct cannot better past disobedience. For the last twenty - four years, the last Government was in existence. They never thought of the poor; they never thought of Social Security; they never thought of increasing pensions to this high standard but on all manner of things that they put forward today, they get up and speak.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would give way. I am not following the hon. junior member for St. Andrew. I would be very grateful if the hon. member would tell me on what he is speaking.

Mr. CORBIN: That is not a point of order. He is not following my speech. Mr. Chairman, why did you not call on him? I am not speaking the German language. Do you think that I am going to sit down and let you all talk as you like and nobody else is allowed to talk?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Can the hon. junior member for St. Andrew oblige us by saying which Item he is speaking on?

Mr. CORBIN: Item 30.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Was your question addressed to the hon. junior member for St. Andrew or the hon. senior member for St. George? I have heard the hon. senior member for St. George answer it.

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

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me as if education really turns certain men foolish. That is what I can see. The biggest fools that I meet today are educated men. That is what I find.
5.25 p.m.

Now Mr. Chairman, I can assure anyone that there is a Committee which this Government has set up to go into the Provident Fund to reward those old people who were not fortunate enough to come into this present scheme up to 65 years of age. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph is asking that the age be extended to 70 years of age. Good dear, even God

Himself has allowed seventy years, and when a man gets to 70 years, what more can he do? Who is going to exceed that? (Interruption) It is a pity you are not properly educated! Mr. Chairman, I am assuring anyone that the last Government suffered from the sins of omission; the things they could have done they did not do. They had it in their hands to do whatever they liked to do; they refused to bring about Social Security to protect the people. Even when Serverance pay was introduced to them, they refused to sign that with the Barbados Workers' Union. All this was to help the poor people today, but they failed to do these things, and now they are coming in here saying that this Government should do this, that and the other! We are taking care of our responsibilities. This Government is not lacking in understanding. I can assure anyone that what this Government is doing is beneficial to the people of this island. Lift up your eyes towards the fields and see the work that this Government has done since they came into power. What are you telling me? The hon. senior member for St. Joseph was in here for a long time and recently celebrated, I think, twenty-four years as a member. He is very fortunate. For all the years he was in here, he did not ask his Government anything about the poor and why they would not make provision for them when they get old. All the things they are suffering now are because of the sins of omission, and I am telling you that you can run from the East to the West and from the North to the South, and I predicted on this very spot that as far as the Barbados Labour Party was concerned, especially the old folks who were in it, the God of Heaven would shake the tree and the fruit would fall never to be gathered again. I have never seen a Government get corrupt and fall like the last one. Everyone had to go because they failed to do the good, but now you say this, that and the other! Take your time; don't rush the brush. The people are going to get through. Every man is going to get something.

I have said already and will say again, Mr. Chairman, of the Prime Minister that God has provided the right man to meet the right day because I can assure any man that the work he is doing today no Government in power has ever done in Barbados, and he is going to do more. You all think that when you are running about and frightening people and disturbing the spirit of the people and refusing to let them be at peace that God is sleeping. The Government is not in the Prime Minister's hand; it is in the hands of God and He gives it to whomsoever He will. He searches the heart of man; He tried the reins of man and He gives to every man according to his ways and according to the fruits of his doings. He looks at the desire and the purpose of man - the past, the present and the future; and therefore I am pronouncing this afternoon again that the Barbados Labour Party did not do the job they should have done, and they are like King Solomon. God has taken it out of the last Government's hand and given it to the neighbour that is the better man.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I cannot let him.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for St. Peter caught my eye.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, to revert to seriousness, speaking under Item 13 - National Insurance Contributions, I heard just the winding up of the remarks made in Committee by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, and as a matter of fact I intended to speak along that vein on that particular item. On more than one occasion in the past I have pointed out to the hon. senior member for St. Andrew, the Minister of National Insurance, my concern about this, and of course the Minister gave me certain assurances. It may be amusing to hear the other hon. member for St. Andrew speaking as he did, and we must have a little amusement anyhow; but to revert to seriousness now, many a worker reached the age at which he could not remain in employ; he could not even begin to make a contribution to National Insurance as far as that applies to agricultural workers who have in some way some measure of security provided for them under a standing agreement between the employer and with the knowledge of the Government, and I speak about those who would benefit from the proposed Provident Fund. On more than one occasion the Minister gave me the assurance that within a reasonable time - I think on one occasion he said within three months - this Provident Fund would have come into functioning. Well, what the hon. senior member for St. Joseph has been telling the Committee is a fact. I believe several representatives of the people are constantly being approached by men who have arrived at the age when they can no longer be employed; therefore these people are not now included and cannot, unfortunately, be included under National Insurance.

Now when we as politicians make laws, we know that no law can be perfect, no matter who drafts it, and you will be up against one or two snags. We are now up against one or two snags, and it is in the interest of the working-class people who unfortunately did not come under the ambit of the benefits of National Insurance that we are now making some redress. The appropriate Minister - I think he is the member for St. Andrew still - I know, is willing to listen to any sensible and pertinent remarks on this particular subject. I am saying that when the law came into effect, it had to come into effect by a particular day, and any law must come into effect on a particular day; but I say in the particular circumstances that until that Provident Fund was ready, the day of its coming into operation might have been extended in order that such workers who did not come within its ambit would not suffer, at any rate, for long. These people have now been suffering for a reasonable length of time.

Only day before yesterday a worker in my constituency approached me on this matter. He is suffering; he cannot be employed. He is not on National Insurance nor is he yet enjoying his Provident Fund, and it is on that score that we raise this matter. Mr. Chairman, we are not here to talk about recriminations and to make representations that are not true, saying that the Barbados Labour Party did nothing

about Social Security. Any member of this Parliament who can get in Committee and say that the Barbados Labour Party did nothing for Social Security does not deserve to be called a politician, because that member should know that the Commission that was appointed to investigate the setting up of a scheme of National Insurance was appointed by the Barbados Labour Party, and the Hon. Prime Minister should instruct those of his Party present in the House as to these things, and do not let them get up here and talk things that are not fact. It is most lamentable to hear a man who has got the confidence of the electorate and who has been returned here to Parliament get up here and betray such absolute ignorance of political facts. It is really lamentable. I mean, that man should be pitied. We should not get with him; we should be sorry for him.

5.35 p.m.

He is gone now; we should be sorry for him. I have spoken in the same vein of thought as that which was being represented by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, and that is that these people who cannot get benefit from this Provident Fund are really suffering. They cannot get National Insurance, and negotiations on behalf of somebody or some party - not the sugar estates, because I have got into contact with managers of sugar factories and plantations, and they have told me that they have paid in their quota of what is expected of them to be done into this Provident Fund. If the Government has to pay now, let the Government do its bit. It is as simple as that; it is nothing contentious.

We are not going back and saying what somebody did not do, and what somebody should have done, and misrepresenting the facts. We are only asking the Government in power to see to it that these aged people do not continue to suffer and remain in their present plight.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, in any part of the world where there is the operation of a National Insurance Scheme there must be an age limit. The Government of Barbados on arriving at the age limit of 65, did so on the recommendation of the International Labour Organisation expert who came here to advise the Government. He was an expert who knows what National Security is, what is the pattern of National Security, and National Insurance and Social Security worldwide. In no part of the world do you find National Insurance and Social Security extending over that age.

Now, the position is that in introducing National Insurance and Social Security into this country, there would be workers over the age of 60 who would still be working, and the Government has leaned over backward to satisfy the needs of these people. For example, before one can qualify for a pension or a gratuity under the National Insurance and Social Security Act, one must have made 500 contributions. The Government has made it possible for the man who was 63 last year and who is still working to benefit, in some measure, from a gratuity from the Na-

tional Insurance Scheme under the present Act by crediting him with as high as 300 contributions which were paid up more or less by proxy. It means that the man who was 63 when the Scheme began is still entitled to a gratuity as soon as he works until he is at the age of 65. The Government has leaned over backward to facilitate the man who is over 60.

Now, if the Government had made it between 60 and 65, in ordinary circumstances a man could not be more than 60 to be covered by the Scheme. We have allowed those who are 63 to be covered by the Scheme, so we have made provision for them. Perhaps if the former Government had accepted the recommendation of Professor Richardson in 1954 and, three years later, as we have done, implemented a system of Social Security, then the same people for whom the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is advocating assistance for now would have been entitled to it. From 1957 to 1967 would have been 10 years, and they would have made more than 500 contributions.

The position is that in any sort of legislation somebody must have some sort of hardship. We have introduced Social Security, and these people are not now meeting any greater hardship than the people who were 65 in 1960 experienced. But because there is a form of Social Security, then the Government must be criticized because there is an age limit to the benefits of this Scheme!

With regards to the Provident Fund, it is there to assist those people who came out of agriculture as far back as 1956 and were unable to work. I want to make this clear. It is no fault of the Government that the Provident Fund has not been implemented. We set up a Committee under the chairmanship of the Chief Labour Officer to go into the ramifications of implementing the Provident Fund Scheme. We can only take action in the Ministry after receiving a Report from that Committee. After we receive the Report, we have to go through it with the officers in the Ministry. It means that legislation has to be drawn up. All of us are aware that there is a shortage, and there has been a shortage for some time in the personnel of the Legal Department. What are we to do? We must wait on them for the work; we do not do it ourselves. We will be getting the Provident Fund Scheme working soon, and the hon. senior member for St. Joseph would not be worried any longer about these people. The point is that we could not go any further under the National Insurance Scheme. We cannot go above the age of 65, and you must remember that this Scheme is a contributory Scheme.

I am amazed at the conflicting arguments of the two hon. members who spoke on the other side. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph has pointed out that these people are working and they cannot contribute to the Scheme. The hon. senior member for St. Peter said that these people are not now employed. His argument was in favour of the Provident Fund Scheme, and the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is in favour of the National Insurance Scheme. Also it was raised on the other side that these people, be-

cause of the new Wages Bill which was introduced here last week, would be dismissed. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph has pointed out that, in order to reduce the number of people employed at the plantations, these people would be dismissed. If they are dismissed and not working, then they cannot be covered by the National Insurance, because it is a contributory Scheme and is for employed persons.

The hon. member should look at the Wages Bill again. If the people are able to work and they have worked for 480 hours in the last three years with the employers, then they cannot be dismissed as long as they can work. (Mr. St. JOHN: Sugar.) The hon. member was referring to the Wages Bill which we brought in here to protect sugar workers. I am just replying to the points made by him on this Bill. It is not a question of dismissal; if they can work, then the people would have to prove that they cannot work. If they have been doing the job efficiently over the last three years and they have been dismissed, then it would call for some sort of investigation as to why they suddenly could not do the job.

5.45. p.m.

We all have sympathies for these people who have reached that age and they cannot contribute. The hon. member spoke as if those people, because they are 65 years of age and cannot be covered by National Insurance are denied work. There is no part of the Social Security Act which provides that a man, because he has passed the age of 65, should not be employed.

MR. HUSBANDS: On a point of order.

HON. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I was referring to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. I do not know of any point raised by the hon. senior member for St. Peter that he should rise on a point of elucidation. What I am trying to explain to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is that it is not because a man has reached the age of 65 years and he cannot be insured under the National Insurance Scheme that he is denied employment. He can work. The law does not say that he cannot work; as a matter of fact if I had an efficient man working with me over the age of 65 years, I would employ that man, because I would be saving something; I would be saving the National Insurance contribution. If the man has reached the age of 65 and he is still doing an able job, there is absolutely no reason why he should be dismissed because the employer does not have to make a contribution to National Insurance for him, and if he does his job efficiently he should be employed. Therefore the introduction of the National Insurance Scheme does not mean that a man at the age of 65 years must be dismissed. That was the point I want to make. That point was raised by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph and I made the point here where he said, and the words he used were: "We cannot take your name down" so that the employers have been telling these workers at the age of 65 that "we cannot take your name down because you are over age." But that does not mean that they cannot be employed. Any employer who is telling that to the workers is only mis-

leading them and he would only be a fool because if they are doing their job efficiently, he is saving money. He would not have to contribute to the National Insurance Scheme for them. There must be a line drawn somewhere, and the line is drawn at 65 years. The average employee in the Civil Servant has got to stop working at 60 years, and if the casual employee in the Government Service has got to stop working at 60 years and we allow National Insurance for general workers to go to 65, how much more can we go? We could have said that 60 years is the age of retirement in the Civil Service, but we know that there would be some kind of hardship imposed and we extended it to 65 years. We not only extended it to 65 but we allow a man who is 63 years old to benefit by crediting him with 300 contributions. What more can we do?

I will promise hon. members to get the Provident Fund Scheme implemented as soon as possible. I am not employed by the legal Department. When we can get the legislation ready when we can get over our staff problems, we will be able to push our work faster. It is not the fault of the Minister or of the Cabinet or of the Government; it is because of the paucity of the legal people to do the work. We are trying to improve the personnel in that Department, and we will be pushing the work as quickly as possible. It is pointless to be harping over this. We appreciate the plight of these people and we are doing something about it; therefore there is no need for all of this hullabaloo; something will be done about it soon. I hope that that explanation satisfies my friend, the hon senior member for St. Peter.

MR. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied to a very appreciable extent; but to put the record straight, the Hon. Minister who has just sat down said that if the Barbados Labour Party in power had accepted the recommendations of the Commission of inquiry which was set up to establish the system

HON. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of elucidation. "Of Professor Richardson who made recommendations in 1954 for the implementation of the National Insurance and Social Security Scheme." The point I made was that if these recommendations were accepted, and three years were given for the implementation of the Scheme, the people whom we are worrying about today would have been implemented under the Scheme. That is reasonable.

MR. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, that is just drawing a red herring across the trail. If a Government who is so mindful of its people as to set up a Commission of Inquiry to establish a system of National Insurance, after it gets recommendations from such a Body turns down those recommendations, there must be some valid reasons for doing so. I am perfectly sure

HON. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order. There was no question of the turning down of Professor Richardson's recommendations. They were not even considered, far from being turned down.

MR. HUSBANDS: That is shouting on the house top. It does not mean that it is a pronouncement of

fact. This Committee is not armed with the recommendations in that Report and we cannot be in a position to examine the facts and make a condemnation of the Government then in power. This is just a political jibe. The Minister has also said that he hopes that this will be the end of this probing about this Provident Fund. As a Minister of Government and as a member of Parliament, when he was in here, he is a Parliamentarian just like me, and I do not give him any guarantee that I will sit silently for another term if I do not see the benefits which he has promised that is a release of money from this Fund. If the money is not forthcoming, on another occasion I will be in my place to question the Minister about it. I understand that the Legal Department is short of personnel; and if that is so, that the work cannot be pushed forward, I can tell those who approach me what the Minister has said and I hope that they will read it in the Press, and they will be considered. But, Sir, it is my duty to question the Government on matters which I think affect the people of this Island. That is what I am here for - not to sit silently and be hopeful that some good day the Minister will tell me that it is all right. I have to keep him on his toes: other wise he will fall asleep. He should be glad that it is a politician who will keep him living. That is his position here. I realise his position of responsibility, and he has got to realise that I am on the other side of the fence. I have got people behind me, people who can approach me much more easily than they could ever hope to approach him. There is no red tape where I am concerned. I am a man-about-town, and I am a man-all-about; I meet my constituents here, there and everywhere.

5.55 p.m.

I am giving him no assurance that I would not pester him further. I would pester him again if too long a time elapses before the Provident Fund comes into operation. But I am reasonable. He has a reasonable respite, but not a perpetual one. No respite in perpetuity.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: There is only one other point that I have omitted, and it is that one of the reasons for the Bill for the provision of the Provident Fund Scheme not being implemented already is that when the recommendation was made by the Committee to the Ministry, the level of benefits that were recommended and the figures worked out were such that the Ministry was not satisfied that they were enough for the people, and we sent it back to get a revised scale of fees.

We could have brought it here before, but then the people might not receive the level of benefits that we thought as a Government that they should have, and we sent it back and we increased the benefits by 66 2/3 per cent.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, do you see that if I did not probe at the Minister, we would not have known as much as we have known? That is what we pressed for. The Minister gets up now, after being questioned and re-questioned, remembers something to the back of his brain and gives it to me. But, Mr.

Chairman, the Minister would not have any respite in perpetuity.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would just like to set the record straight and remind the hon. senior member for St. Peter of one or two points about Social Security. Professor Richardson came down here sometime in 1953. The hon. member was Speaker, and he would remember that there was tabled in this House a report which was bound in a blue cover. It was a very slender Report. He will also remember that on several occasions on the motion for the adjournment of the House, they were asked questions as to when the Report was going to be adopted in the House.

The then hon. junior member for the City and I, and, I believe, the hon. senior member for Christ Church - and I may even venture to say that the hon. senior member for St. Peter may have queried the absence of debate on this. My memory does not serve me very well on that point; but I remember, certainly before the dissolution in 1956 when we received no satisfactory reply and we requested the Government for an answer, we were - I would not like to say reassured or dismissed - but the statement was made that the Government hoped to find oil shortly, and when Government found oil they would implement the Social Security Scheme.

The only difference between us and them is that we have not waited until we found oil in the quantities which they wanted it. The irresistible inference which I must draw appears to me to be that the employers could not afford to pay for a Social Security Scheme, and therefore the country would have to find oil first. Well, I am just throwing oil on troubled waters.

I go back to the question of the Provident Fund. I have been very disturbed that the Provident Fund has taken such a long time. It is true that the National Insurance Scheme now to a certain degree renders the Provident Fund almost a redundant scheme, but the hon. senior member for St. Joseph who first raised that would know that this is where the Provident Fund can come to supplement the efforts of the National Insurance Scheme. Even before the present Minister of Labour was in office and we had another Minister of Labour, we were told that the two organizations - the employers on the one side and the workers' representatives on the other side - kept backwards and forwards for various reasons and so on.

In a thing like the Provident Fund where it relates only to a particular industry, we have to sit on the side lines waiting for them to sort their difficulties out; and then right at the last going down - say, about two and a half to three years ago when I thought we were able to come into the House with the Provident Fund Scheme - they said that they wanted an actuary. Well, actuaries are scarce to come by; but I understand that all the actuarial exercises are all completed, and the Minister has given us the assurance that it is only the work of a draftsman to be done.

I would like to make it clear to elucidate a point which the Minister was making at the time when he

was speaking. He said that there was a paucity in the Legal Department. I am sure the Minister did not mean the quality of the draughtsmen that we have, because we have some of the best in the West Indies. As a matter of fact, a former Solicitor General of the West Indies asked me just day before yesterday, why do not we send two of those bright Legal Draftsmen that we have down to the Conference week after next? I said that if they are so bright, then they need only to take one. The other one is a Puisne Judge, who is a very good legal draftsman, well trained by Sir Roger Drayton in Jamaica.

The point is that it is not a question of the legal draughtsman not having the legal ability to cope with the work; it is that we do not have enough of them, and there has been a tremendous volume of legislation and other matters like the Regional Development Bank that the drafting has to be done here in Barbados by Barbadian draughtsmen for the whole region, and these are considered priority matters. Therefore, I hope that clears up any misunderstanding that may have caused the delay in the implementation of the Provident Fund.

I entirely agree with the senior member for St. Joseph that this is where the Provident Fund will come in, but two other things are not mentioned. The Provident Fund, of course, will assist the people in agriculture. Down at the Harbour they have their own Provident Fund and that will look after the people over sixty-five. It will go back from 1956 in the agricultural sector - the people who were sixty-five in 1956.

But there is another aspect which has been ignored. Outside the National Insurance Scheme we have National Assistance; so there is no complete dereliction of people over sixty-five. At the age of sixty-eight, they are entitled to National Insurance, and we have increased National Assistance, I believe, twice. It is also true that National Assistance is not to the same level as a man getting two-thirds of what he used to work for during his working life, but that is some guarantee that there is no citizen in this country over the age of 68 years who is entirely destitute.

Now, what happens between 65 and 68 years - which is regarded as the normal retirement age before the National Insurance Scheme - is that some people go on working, and it is not correct to say that the effect of the Agricultural Workers (Guaranteed Minimum Wages) Act for 1968 is that the employers cannot pay them after they reach 65 years because there is no official retirement age in the sugar industry.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, it will appear that the two members - not the Prime Minister because I credit him with more sense this time - from the other end of the Table who have spoken on this matter do not appear to me as if they were in the House at the time when I was speaking.

6.05 p. m.

I never criticised the Government. I tried to point out something to the Government, but what do you find? I find an empty vessel keeping noise. Now the Hon. Minister came in and this is what he wants me to understand; when the employer employs these people of over 65 years of age, they will not have to contribute anything to National Insurance. They would be getting away with murder. Now, imagine you have two workers; one is under 65 and one is over, and you are compelled now to find three days' work per week, but you can find six days. The one that you have to contribute to, you will give the three days by law, and the one you do not have to contribute to, you give him six days. Who would be losing? Who would be gaining? That is what the Minister is telling me in reply. That is not fair. You would not be knocking them off; you will be working them harder. They would be getting work, but no contributions would be made. Imagine, you say at 63 years they must go, and you bring them in at 63 years and at 65 years. If this continues with the 65 year olds, after five years the employer gets away from contributing to him, but he is getting the same service and, I dare suppose a better one than he has to contribute to. Now tell me if that is fair! He is telling every employer to get tough and look for all 65 year olds if he can find them; That is what he is telling me would do no harm. If it would not harm him, it would kill him.

I simply said, in drawing it to the Government's attention, that you have these people who gave of their time, and now that this has come in they are not provided for. Do you know why? The Government would not be losing anything; nobody would be losing anything. The same worker would be contributing and the employer would be contributing. It would not harm me as an employer today if I have six or eight sixty-five year olds at my place working. I would not lose anything so long as they can work, because I have to contribute to the ones that are younger, and I should do this; and so long as they are working and can satisfy me that they can put in a good honest day's work, they should not be debarred from the National Insurance, because the National Insurance would not be losing anything either. Both the employee and the employer would be contributing; so why should you put an age limit, or whatever you care to call it, at 65 years? If, in truth and in fact, you have people working just as good for the next five, six or eight years, why limit them? The hon. junior member for St. Andrew said when they get to 70 years, they are of no use. He may be thinking in terms of himself, because he is no where near there and he is of very little use.

Mr. CORBIN: On a point of order, it is a pity that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph cannot stick to the truth. I did not say they are no use. I said that is the age that God has limited them, but by good conduct He may cause them to exist a little longer.

Mr. SMITH: The hon. member said that at 70 years you would not be any use and would not be able to work. The hon. member said so, or it must be the

hon. "Old City" who was speaking at the time. He asked what is there in a person at 70 years and said they would not be able to draw the money. His colleague would tell him that he said so. This makes me understand that this water is too deep and too blue for him. He does not know what is going on. All he knows is to get up and praise the Government. Imagine him getting up and praising the Government for everything they do! Of course there is nothing wrong with that. One thing that I credit him with, and it is that he has enough sense not to bite the hand that feeds him. There is one thing I am going to say here and now, and it is true. I do not know if when I say it now you will forget; but what is to be will be; but I am saying to the Hon. Prime Minister that the same junior member for St. Andrew is going to be a member of this Party. It might be the next six, eight or ten years, but look out for it if you are living. I may have died and gone to Heaven. I would not get up here and praise the Government. I did not criticise them or curse them at the time. I was pointing out something to the Government and the Hon. Prime Minister and the others who have sense would understand what I said; but the hon. member has to be careful when he is going into deep waters, because he will drown. He cannot swim in these waters; it is too deep and too blue. I am not a legal man or draughtsman, but my commonsense tells me that as long as one can work and is satisfying his employer, the employer contributes to his National Insurance and he himself does. No age should debar him. He should be debarred as soon as he cannot work, because there is a time when he would not be able to work, and then he would be provided for like the others. If you feel that you are not encouraging people to work until they come to the grave, and you want them to go off at 65 years, you should make some provision for them even if you have to tax for it, because they have contributed already. They did it before I was born and before any of us was born. The Minister is saying that if the Barbados Labour Party had implemented the Scheme at the time, the workers whom the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is talking for now would be in it. I wonder if the Minister knows that if National Insurance had come forty years ago and you had put a ceiling on the age, you would still have people at that time who were sixty-five years of age. Does he know they would still have got trapped? Let us say that the Labour Party had brought this ten or fifteen years ago and made an age limit at 65 years, do you know they would still butt up against the same snag and that you would have workers at that time at that age? 6.15 p.m.

I was very, very vexed, and I did not feel too happy when Frank Walcott called him by his name, but he has substantiated what Walcott said about him. He is trying to get out of something, and he is substantiating what Walcott said about him. If the Democratic Labour Party wants to throw stones, then let it do so. It was pointed out that if the Labour Party had done its duty things would not have been so hard, and I would not have been talking now. Even if the Labour Party had done its duty then, we would still have had people at 65 years of age. It makes me feel funny now.

Now if you have nothing to say, especially when you are replying to me, you must be careful because I can pick holes in even what the Prime Minister has to say, and he is a lawyer. I maintain that so long as a worker can work, he should be able to contribute to the Scheme. You should not stop him from doing so. If you cannot do anything to help him, then you should not stop him from contributing. He needs help; if he is sick and cannot work, then he cannot work. If he is 63 years, in two years he will get the same thing as if he were 40 years of age. Here it is, I am 65 years of age and I have not been debarred from contributing. You have allowed me to work and contribute, and when I reach the age of 67 it will be the same thing. At the age of 63 you will qualify when you reach the age of 65; at the age of 65 you will qualify when you reach the age of 67 or as long as you can work. Get out of that now if you can, but I am not talking foolishness. I merely want to show you that these people can be helped.

I hope that an employee is not in here, apart from myself, to hear you say that an employer would not have to contribute to the National Insurance Scheme for a worker who is over 65 years of age. The employers will now get around that and work afresh. The manager will tell his bookkeeper: "Mr. John, you have 8 people who are 65 and 8 under 65. The law calls on us to provide three days, but we want six days' work. Give three people 6 days; give the others for whom I do not have to contribute 6 days, and that is all. Who would lose? The worker would lose. I hope the Minister has seen that. He has certainly opened my eyes to it. It is going to happen, and I do not want it to happen. The Act, or whatever you care to call it, could be amended. If a worker can satisfy his employer up to the age of 70, then he should be allowed to contribute to the Scheme. Let him go on and qualify himself, and that will be the end of it.

The question that the sum of \$1,212,278 under Head 9 - Ministry of Finance - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 10 - ACCOUNTANT GENERAL

Head 10 - Accountant General - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$74,840 under Head 10 - Accountant General - stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, the note to Item 14A states:

"To meet the cost of light and water used by all offices in the Treasury Building."

One looking at the Treasury Building from the outside may be impressed by what has been held out to the public about modern architecture, or whatever else one may be tempted to call it, but it is on the inside that one has to look at this time, especially when one hears the Minister of National Insurance's reference not long ago to the staff shortage in other

Departments. It is in a building such as this where you will find conditions that must make for staff shortages, inefficiency, wastage of human resources and labour and the like.

Now, Sir, in this building, let us say the Treasury Department, there are something like forty-seven to fifty persons working. What lavatory accommodation do we find there?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I am glad to see the hon. member descending to the lavatory. I would like to explain that this is not electricity. He is talking about the sanitary conveniences. The position is that when the Treasury Building was designed, the Accountant General's Department was not supposed to go on the first floor. About four or five months before the building was officially opened we had a Committee look at all the accommodation around this area, and we decided that the first floor of the Treasury Building would be a more convenient place for the payment of salaries and pensions and so on. Therefore the Accountant General was shifted over to that floor as well as the Commissioner of Inland Revenue, and whoever else were to be on that floor were shifted up higher. The result is that on the floor now, which was designed for an office of a different capacity, we have large numbers of the general public coming in.

The Public Works Department has prepared plans to spend \$20,000 on improving the facilities on that floor. The reason why the accommodation, which the hon. junior member for St. Peter has spoken about, is inadequate is that it was not originally designed to accommodate so many people. The Hon. Minister of Communications and Works have informed me that the original plan conforms to British specifications and the Bureau of Standards.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister said that he can understand my descending to the lavatory. He would not have to descend there; he carries it with him in his bosom all the time, but let us get on with it. What I was saying is that there is still a staff of about forty-seven persons employed in the Treasury, and the lavatory accommodation is inadequate. (Asides) I am glad to hear, in an aside, that it is being taken care of. If the introducer of this Head had the information in his possession, then he should have given it to the House in order to avoid any unnecessary debate under any Head on any item. 6.25 p.m.

But you might find the Prime Minister rushing to defend the absence of proper accommodation there.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. I should just like to correct the hon. member. I was informing him, even before he got down to his argument or submission, that we were aware of the problems. Although this Head is really for electricity and water, I suppose you can say that you use water in the wash room, and I was pointing out to the hon. member that we are aware that there is a problem and I gave him the reason why the problem existed. It is because

a different Department catering to large numbers of the public has been moved into the Treasury Building. As a matter of fact, the building is now named after that Department. You will remember that, for a long time, it was described as the Financial Building, whatever that means, but the building was not ready and no name was actually selected until the final disposition of offices was made. The point is that there is no provision here in these Estimates for this accommodation because after the Estimates were printed - there are no "move-ins" - but there will be a supplementary Estimate for \$20,000, I believe. The work will not be started between now and the end of April, or rather, the 31st March. Anyhow, any new works like that will come in April by way of Supplementary Estimates, and I am actually giving the figures, I think it is \$20,000 for this new accommodation. However, the House will not be asked to do this between now and the 31st March, but soon after the 1st April we will be coming for that Supplementary.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I am beginning to get the feeling that the Prime Minister is afraid to hear me on this.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. Nobody is afraid to hear the hon. member. I just want to get the position clear. The hon. member made a mistake when he said that I was defending the shortage of accommodation - sanitary accommodation - on the first floor of this building. I was on my feet to point out to the hon. member that far from defending the shortage, I reiterated that there was a shortage and gave him the reason for it. I said that we would do something about it. How can I be afraid to hear him?

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I now know what is a point of order, and therefore I do not have to fear. What we must concern ourselves with at this stage is this; the absence of water for however short a period must create some inconvenience to a staff of 47 persons or 50 persons. One quite appreciates what has been said about the further \$20,000 expenditure on the ground floor or on any other part of this building: but, nevertheless, at the moment if a staff of 47 persons or 50 persons is suffering any inconvenience, that staff cannot be expected to give of its best. That is our first concern. When you have a staff not being able to give of its best, who suffers? The public stands to suffer, don't mind how much money is to be spent tomorrow or the day following or any other time in the future. It is a fact that with these Estimates before us today, as the Prime Minister has admitted, the condition is exactly as I have stated; it is that this Item is to meet the cost of light and water used by all offices in the Treasury Building. I do not know what it is that is pricking the Prime Minister so that he does not want to hear about all the offices of the Treasury building and the light and water requirements, because.....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of elucidation. If the hon. member would just give way, I should like to say this. If he were to look at page 185 of the Capital Estimates Head 102 - Item 15, he will see in connection with the Treasury Building that there is

a revote to pay retention fees on contract and to provide additional lavatory accommodation. That is for this Treasury Building. If the hon. member would look at this, it would save some debate. It is not that anybody wants to forbid the hon. member from speaking or to stifle debate or anything like that; it is just to expedite the matter. Also, if the hon. member would look at page 185 of the Capital Estimates, Head 102 - Item 15, Treasury Building, he would see that there is a matter of \$25,373 in the Estimates in this connection.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, there is nothing for which I would ever have to thank the hon. member who has just sat down. What I am concerned with is this; under Item 14 A there is a provision of \$6,000 to meet the cost of light and water used by all the offices in the Treasury Building. All the offices, no doubt, should be my concern at this stage, as far as their water and light requirements or else are concerned.
6.35 p.m.

One had been hoping that even the sum of this water and light requirement had been much looked forward to. It would have been for the Government Savings Bank. If the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Communications and Works jump to their feet to explain that the Government Savings Bank is not now one of the offices for which water and light is being billed under this Item, I would be very glad indeed to hear because it would bring out of them exactly what really does go on to cause the Treasury Building to be as it is today.

Mr. Chairman, undoubtedly there has been a change of design somewhere, and from what we might be told at a later stage this water and light expenditure might have sprung from the necessity to move lights from here and placing them elsewhere. That is the type of thing which we might be facing today and which you ought to know. The only way we can know is by asking exactly what has brought about the situation that is now being complained of.

Why are there some parts of this building where some people are still wondering when we are going to see light there that you can play football inside? Nevertheless, this is the Treasury Building and, as I have said, there is no point anyone attempting to rush to offer an explanation before questions are asked, and people may be attempting to prove themselves as mind-readers or what not.

Mr. Chairman, you will see that there is the necessity for us to pay very special attention to this particular item. There is also, Sir, need for us to query these points as to the general inconvenience that is suffered by members of the public who have to transact business in the Treasury Building. I am sure the opportunity is going to present itself for discussion on this particular item at a later stage and I leave the Minister to say what he has to say on this particular item.

The question that the sum of \$74,840 under Head 10 - Accountant General - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 11 - PENSIONS

Head 11 - Pensions - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$701,376 for Head 11 stand part of Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 12 - CHARGES OF DEBT

Head 12 - Charges of Debt - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: There is nothing to be appropriated under Head 12, Mr. Chairman.

HEAD 13 - CUSTOMS

Head 13 - Customs - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$81,436 be appropriated under Head 13.

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

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

HEAD 14 - INLAND REVENUE

Head 14 - Inland Revenue - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that the sum of \$29,143 be appropriated under Head 14.

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

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

HEAD 15 - STATISTICAL SERVICE

Head 15 - Statistical Service - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$61,235 be appropriated under Head 15.

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

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

6.45 p.m.

HEAD 16 - PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$216,486 under Head 16 - Prime Minister's Office - stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, under Item 4, we see here "Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister". As far as I know this post has been vacant for some time, and if we are asked to vote for this, I think it only fair we should be told whether or not it is contemplated that the post is going to be filled again in the near future.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The House has the assurance that if the post is not filled, the money will remain in the Treasury.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: That is not an answer to it. I expected somehow that if the post was not filled the money would remain in the Treasury. There is, after all, no need to put your hands into that money when you can put your hand into Item 21. Now Mr. Chairman, if it was only Item 21 that we had to worry about, it would be one thing; but we have dealt year after year with Item 21 - \$400 a month that the Prime Minister pays himself tax free out of it - and he concealed that fact when the debate on raising his salary was proceeding - the \$100 a month that Ministers receive even though they may be recluses who have never bought a drink for their sisters, far less entertained anybody out of it. I think it is time that we get some account of this money. I really think it is time that we hear from the Prime Minister who controls this vote subject to reference to the Cabinet how exactly it was shared out last year. He took about \$5,000 of it and it seems that only about half perhaps was actually shared out between the Ministers. What we would be glad to know is whether any regular payment was made to anybody else, has Government hospitality increased that we had to have a supplementary sought for Permanent Secretaries' hospitality, has there been a lot more pressure on the hospitality vote, or is it that the cost of living is going up and therefore Ministers have to get a slightly increased whack at this vote or not. I cannot recall ever hearing or I certainly cannot ever recall ever reading any explanation for the expenditure herein sought.

Now, Mr. Chairman, just to go back up the line to Conferences and Delegations, there is \$90,000 in the Revised Estimates, \$75,000 in the Approved Estimates, and now an increase in all of \$50,000 over last year's Approved Estimates. What Conferences does the Prime Minister's office in particular have to finance, because I anticipated that External Affairs has its own budget? We will get to Head 22 in the fullness of time, but what is it that so particularly has to be done that warrants this enormous increase, one of the largest increases as far as I can see. I think it is the largest we have come to so far, Mr. Chairman, to the best of my memory of the whole Estimates. The largest in fact is to be found under Head 11 where there is an increase in pensions, but the proportionate increase is surely the largest we have yet dealt with. Where are these Conferences, Mr. Chairman? Is this the price of the horses down in Rupununi or wherever else these rest cures are

being spent in mutual back-scratching exercises? We do not have this Federal exercise to use the Leader of the House's favourite words - we do not have that exercise to contend with anymore. The Government of St. Lucia, so far as I know, will still not sit down with the Prime Minister; so we will at least be saving some money in that direction. Why this vote?

I know the Prime Minister is continually repeating that he hopes to have the Prime Ministers' Conference here. I think that would cost a little more than \$125,000 if they came, but again I have the feeling that that is an unlikely expenditure to be speculating and providing a vote against. Let us hear something, Mr. Chairman, about what this increase is needed for.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, in the first place, the hon. member said there is concealed payment to Ministers of entertainment allowance, or some nonsense. Way back in 1961 before the hon. member was a member of the House, the whole question of entertainment allowance was debated and it was explained at that time that Ministers are expected to meet any expenditure up to \$25 out of their own pockets. That is, they receive an entertainment allowance of \$100 a month and over and above that every single Ministry - and it is not only the Ministry, but the Heads of Departments and Permanent Secretaries, because we have not passed a separate entertainment allowance for them - puts in their requisition if they have distinguished people coming to the Island or counterparts from other territories or from overseas. There may be a meeting, say, of Commissioners of Police or something like that; then all these requests including requests from the Ministers come to the Cabinet. It is under my portfolio, but it is not under my control. In other words, I do not have unfettered discretion on how this money is spent. Sometimes we are asked to throw parties for not strictly governmental organisations - let us say, the Football Association, or somebody like that, may be having an important series or, they may say: "Will Government provide any hospitality," and the hospitality is provided by the Government invariably, if it is considered to be of sufficient national importance.

In so far as the hon. member asking about Conferences and Delegations is concerned, we are satisfied that with the level of activity now going on, the vote for last year was inadequate and indeed we not only came for a supplementary provision, but we brought a complete break-down. Now it is virtually impossible for us to bring every single Government file in here - because these Estimates cover every single activity of Government - to give a breakdown six weeks or two months after we have given it on the various Missions and Conferences and that kind of thing that went on. There are certain Conferences which come under External Affairs, and there is a separate item, as far as I remember, under External Affairs for that; but there are large numbers of Government Departments and large numbers of meetings and things like that going on. Let us say

now that there may be one with Auditors-General. I think there are two coming up this year, one as far afield as Tokyo. That does not come under External Affairs.
6.55 p.m.

The Auditor General must, when he goes to Japan or wherever it is, stop in at Ottawa, New York and London; he is routed that way, and that sector of his journey will be paid by the Department of External Affairs because he is the Inspector General, in other words, who has to investigate their systems and so on. The main trip to Japan will come out of this vote, but his subsistence and hotel expenses in New York, Ottawa, and so on will be paid by the Department of External Affairs. If there is an O.A.S. Conference, the expenses would come out of External Affairs. I would like to point out that this is not a Ministerial vote. It is true that Ministers go to Conferences sometimes, but the preponderance of expenses under the Head for Conferences will be for Civil Servants.

Now, from April to December 1967 alone there were 60 Conferences in which we participated. (Asides) An hon. member says that there is no Federation going on. All I can say is: "Praise God from whom all blessings flow." We have more important exercises and less time-wasting exercises going on. I am not blaming the hon. member for anything that happened in the past, but I am just telling him not to make the remark that there is no Federation going on, because that is the greatest time-wasting exercise in which we have ever indulged. We have had 60 Conferences between April and December, and the hon. member is still trying to find something to talk about.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, under Head 16, Item 21 - Government Hospitality, I am not particularly happy about this vote. I know that members on the other side, especially the hon. senior member for St. John and his Party, are the most honest people in the world, unlike the last Government. I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that, in spite of this, it is but fair that we on this side should have more light thrown on this matter. \$33,000 is a lot of money to be under the control of the Prime Minister, subject to reference to the Cabinet. This is a lot of money, and I am not particularly satisfied with the hon. senior member for St. John's reply.

Let us take Item 22, Culloden Farm, where there is \$12,500 voted. The vote states:

"Includes provision for wages of staff, uniforms, lighting and fuel, water, furniture and equipment and contingencies. The Prime Minister pays into General Revenue a fixed annual contribution of \$450 towards the wages of the staff."

Mr. Chairman, this is really a joke. I have just worked it out. In 52 weeks a year the Prime Minister has contributed approximately \$8 a week towards all the staff at Culloden Farm! The Prime Minister pays \$450 a year. The Governor-General is paying \$1,500 a year.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I would just like the hon. member to understand that I am not responsible. The staff at Culloden Farm have to upkeep the grounds and do other things that I have not asked the Government for. Now the sum was not arrived at by me. The sum was worked out by the Finance and Establishment Officer on the basis of what is done at Government House. You have first to go back to what you have been paying the white Colonial masters and paying all of those people for all of these years and what you now pay the Governor-General, and the proportion of the staff operating at Government House in relation to what is operating now.

This figure was not fixed by me at all. I want hon. members over there to know that if they want to live in that house it is all right with me, because it is only a burden as far as I am concerned. I have a house in Black Rock that belongs to me. I have never asked anybody to buy a house for me. In addition to that, they are now calling on me to pay income tax to live in the house as well - some considerable amount of money. The hon. member should not think that because I am Prime Minister I can fix the figures. I did not fix the figures. This matter is related directly to what the Governor-General pays.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I can really appreciate the senior member for St. John's reply, but I would also draw to his attention that the Governor-General does not get three times his amount; yet he pays in \$1,500 to General Revenue. (Asides) The gardeners at Culloden Farm are paid by the Ministry of Agriculture; so when the senior member for St. John gets up here and talks about the white Colonial masters, he should be the first person to improve the standard of living of the same gardeners that he has at Culloden Farm.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member does not understand. The staff is paid at regular Government rates, and the Establishment and Finance sections have worked out the proportion per month. How much do you pay your servant? If the Establishment Section, or the Financial Secretary, worked out the computation tomorrow and say that I have to pay \$900 instead of \$450 based on what is standard practice for the Governor-General, I would then decide, at that point, whether it is worth my while staying there or living in my house. I do not see why I should pay more than the Governor-General. It is the office of the Prime Minister. The people are being paid standard Government rates as they are paid at Government House. What kind of nonsense is he talking?

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, my chauffeur is in sympathy with me, while the police will drive around the senior member for St. John for nothing, or he will borrow a car from a garage which has on garage numbers at night. It is as simple as that.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I want to speak plainly now. It is really the Prime Minister's fault that this kind of debate should take place. Do you know why? He had no right paying anything at all. I feel

that certainly if he does it, it is against my advice and it is against the advice of all the Ministers of his Cabinet. We do not say that he or anybody else is bound to be the Prime Minister. All we are saying is that if you are the Prime Minister and you hold the responsible position as being the head of a Government, then there are certain things which should be attached to the office whether you hold it for a day or your opponents held it for ten years. That is how we feel about it. All of this thing about wanting to find out what the Governor-General pays and paying a proportion of it is nonsense, and it is his fault entirely that this sort of thing is asked.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, do I understand that the Leader of the House feels that the Prime Minister should not only live in Culloden Farm, but he should not pay \$450 a year as a contribution? I admit that the amount is small. I thought the Prime Minister was offering \$900.
7.05 p.m.

He gets two-thirds of the salary of the Governor-General. I know that the two of them together do not get one-half of what Mr. Luckoo gets in London. He has not reached that yet.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. That is not correct. The Governor-General gets \$23,040 a year plus \$9,600 duty allowance. This \$1,500 comes out of the \$9,600 and all the Governor-General's salary is free from income tax. I pay income tax, I am not ashamed to say it, at the rate of 40%. I have a big row going on with them now because they are taking out \$500 or \$600 (Mr. MOTTLEY: You are feeling the income tax. I am feeling it too. I know what it is). I am seriously thinking of bringing a case against the Attorney General. (Laughter) I do not see why I should be working for nothing. I just wanted to correct the hon. member on the point when he said that I get two-thirds of the Governor-General's salary. The Governor General's salary is tax free.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, let the Prime Minister tell me how much the Governor-General gets out of the hospitality vote, and how much he, the Prime Minister, gets, both in the \$400 a month and in the vouched for amount and above the expenditure of \$25.00, because that is what the Governor-General's \$9,600 is for, which is \$800. The Prime Minister gets \$400 tax free plus the rate of vouched for amount which is larger than \$25.00. (Asides) That is what the Prime Minister said today, and the Hon. Leader of the House said earlier that this allowance out of the hospitality vote is intended to cover expenditure of less than \$25.00. That is what I heard the Hon. Leader of the House explain at length.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister - forget that I am the Prime Minister - is given a hospitality allowance of \$400 a month, and the reason for that is because frequently we have to entertain other people - Heads of Government, dignitaries and so on - at dinner parties. On no occasion

is the Government charged for any entertainment done in my house other than Ministerial parties which I do not have. If the Ministry of Education had a Conference which is going on here, or the Ministry of Agriculture had a party at Colloden Farm, then they would pay for that. That is not my entertainment; that is 500 or 600 people at \$6.00 a head, that makes the whole thing out for six months. The entertainment vote for the Prime Minister is to cover the cost of the kind of items you have to provide, which, normally, I would not be eating. Normally, I do not have these three wines at dinner: so therefore get that out of your head. I cannot afford it. If we had the Head of a State at dinner (Asides) I mean three different kinds of wines, I do not mean three rums. (Laughter) If we had Mr. Lester Pearson coming here and he is entertained at dinner, he is a Prime Minister, and therefore a certain standard has to be observed. I do not go to the Cabinet for that; that comes out of my hospitality vote. I can tell you that this is not really adequate, but I am not asking for any more. Sometimes I have to ask people to come in and assist with the catering and I have to pay them out of that vote as well. One of these days about thirty or forty years from now, hon. members will find out what it is like.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I have been in the custom, as a member of the Opposition, of criticising from the Governor's vote back down and, frankly, it is not important to me whether it is John Brown, Adams, Barrow or anybody else, but the office is that of Prime Minister. I do not object to a policeman driving the Prime Minister as one is driving the Governor, and the Prime Minister is not always going to be Prime Minister. (Mr. SMITH: How do you know?) Don't be foolish, whatever goes up must come down, and he is not always going to be Prime Minister. I do not object to that at all. On the question of running the home, I agreed in here when the home was bought, and the home must be bought. I do not subscribe to small arguments. Whoever is Prime Minister, it seems to me, must carry the office with a certain amount of dignity. I happen to know although I never got the money for it, what entertaining means when I had a certain office. I do not think we should quibble over that. The Governor-General, we know, pays no income tax, and I am very happy to hear that the Prime Minister is beginning to feel the weight of the income tax at 40%. It is really squeezing, you know. We are hoping to get some sort of relief in this respect.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, I should just like to tell the hon. member that since I would have a vested interest in the release, I cannot promise it. I would have to resign before he can get a release from that. It would not be fair because people would say that I am relieving myself. (Laughter) I am not going to relieve any income tax.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has always heard of the old adage that charity begins at home, so if he cannot relieve himself then he cannot relieve us.

The question that the sum of \$216,486 under Head 16 stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 17 - TRAINING DIVISION

Head 17 - Training Division - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$145,732 under Head 17 - Training Division - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 18 - ECONOMIC PLANNING UNIT

Head 18 - Economic Planning Unit - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$552,502 under Head 18 - Economic Planning Unit - stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, under this Head we are asked to pass an amount under Item 6 for the expenses of the Development Board, and this year those expenses show an increase of \$60,980. It has long been in conversation that all is not well at the Development Board. From the time that the Development Board has been expending all the Expo' Funds, \$750,000 of which one member of the Cabinet said that nobody knew how the money has been spent besides Senator Morgan and the Prime Minister, doubts have been cast as to how well the Development Board has been conducting its affairs. Accusations are made from time to time; for example, it is commonly alleged that firms which apply to the Development Board for subventions, although this is more correctly to be dealt with in the Capital Estimates, nevertheless the allegation is there that they arrange to insure their premises - in fact, they do insure their premises with the Standard Agency, I think it is, with which the Chairman of the Board has a connection.

7.15 p.m.

There are the kind of allegations, Mr. Chairman, that in the Government's own interests should be cleared up before they ask the House to pass these monies. Clearly, if the Chairman of the Development Board has been importing out of Item 6, if his duties as Chairman have any conflict of interest with his private business, this should be a matter of Government concern.

Nobody would suggest that the Chairman of the Board is putting it to any prospective development that he has to insure it is with the Standard Agency if he wants to get a development loan. Nobody would suggest that without evidence. Nevertheless, many respecting people would feel that in order to evade such accusation, the Chairman of the Development Board should lean over backwards so as not to allow

anybody who is going to ask for the Government's money to involve himself in financial dealings with officers of the Board from himself, the Chairman, back down to the least member.

These are all matters of public concern. Again, we observe that the same official is connected with an industry which although it has not sought the Development Board's promotion, yet, it has been said that this new soft drink industry has been given permission to make diabetic soft drinks where long established soft drinks industries in Barbados have not received such permission. All of these things, Mr. Chairman, may have a perfectly innocent explanation, but they can lead to accusations in Government.

Mr. Chairman, there is a question that is down on the Order Paper for some time. There is a number of visits paid to Canada by the Chairman of the Tourist Board who has been there for sometime. It is known that some of these visits were made out of funds under the control of the Development Board. All these matters need querying. Before I am prepared to vote on this matter, I want to hear something from the Minister on all these points, and, I dare say, there would be some other hon. members who would be expanding and amplifying these points in due course.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, Sir, having heard the hon. member who spoke previously, and the sentiments and the remarks which he alleged to have taken place in respect of the administration of the Development Board, it would seem to me that it is in the interest of this country as a whole that the responsible Minister on the other side should reply in this respect. I do not want, myself, to repeat what he said; but what I want to say, and what I would like to hear, is the Government coming out quite openly and clearly, making it positively clear that as far as the Ministry of Finance is concerned, as far as capital is concerned, that it is not their policy that any of those office holders who attempt to use their offices on these grounds for the enhancement of their own private business or anything of that kind.

I know, Mr. Chairman, that a lot of talk goes around in this country, and a lot of rumours have it that certain of these Boards, and this Board particularly, attempt to join work in this direction or that direction. Anybody who has looked into the history of Barbados would find that after the Vestry system, this was the Vestrymen's method of getting payment.

Now, I hardly believe that it would be in the interest of Barbados today that a Board as important as the Development Board whose functions are as important as they are - that anybody should be stupid enough that they should try to sell to investors in Barbados the idea that if they want Government's permission they should go through particular channels, hire particular lawyers and go to particular people. That would be very bad, and it is something which I would be very glad to hear an authoritative statement coming from a responsible person on the other side expressing his disapproval of any such thing.

Now, all this suspicion that one gets concerning the expression on Expo' 67 and things of this kind, can be easily cured by those responsible, instead of giving out to the Press and "Time" magazine releases to make political capital out of everything, presenting an objective report to the public as to the cost involved as to the revenue derived, and so forth, so that the public would be able to see if this is an intelligent proposition and why this was the fact, this was the amount expected and this is how much was spent in this way; therefore they would be able to see that if there was corruption the amount is insignificant, or that part of the amount has gone to charity, or legitimate expenses were such that one cannot quarrel with. But immediately as you attempt to hide certain facts, the Barbadian with his capacity for inventing and imagining that corruption is going on would immediately give rise to it and say that it is so.

But I do not think that this is a good thing for Barbados at all because just as the hon. member on the other side can accuse us of corruption and we can accuse them of corruption and we can go before the electorate of Barbados and have this thing settled, many people abroad may think that when we say so that in truth and in fact, all the administration and everything that take place are in a corrupt manner. I am sure no Barbadian would like that impression to go abroad.

7.25 p.m.

Now, Sir, there is one other point I would like to mention on this. This Item asks an increase of \$60,000 I want to know this: I see that the Development Board has separate offices in London, in the United States of America and in Canada as I understand it. Now I would like to know what is the relationship between these Boards and the Embassies in the United States of America and the High Commissioner in Canada. Are they under their jurisdiction or are they independent entities, or are they completely controlled by the Development Board here in Barbados?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: In the first place, I cannot answer statements where members abuse parliamentary privilege to make unsubstantiated allegations against people who are contributing to the public life or the economy of this country. Some of the things I hear on the floor of this House I never dreamt I would hear anyone in his right mind coming and giving vent to in an Island like Barbados. The hon. member has asked whether the Government will make a statement that we do not expect people who are on Statutory Boards to take advantage of their position in order to make any unjust reward or something like that. I should not have to give that undertaking. This is understood by every single person who is appointed to a Statutory Board, and this is the principle under which the Government operates. They are not Civil Servants, it is true, but no person who is in a position in a quasi-Government authority where public funds are being expended, is supposed to use his position to take advantage of anybody else.

Now it is inevitable when you are dealing with the private sector of the economy that people would

put a construction to certain things which are quite capable of innocent explanations, and you will get people who are disappointed. For instance, people who do not know the Financial Administration and Audit Act and Rules will always say somebody has got a contract for stone because he is friendly with a particular Government officer or friendly with a Minister or something like that. You hear that kind of nonsense all the time, when it is impossible for a Minister to do this unless he over-rides the Tenders Committee, in which case whenever he intends to over-rule the Tenders Committee he has got to go to the Cabinet and state why he refused to endorse the recommendation of the Tenders Committee and, as far as I know, the contracts of the Development Board are awarded by the whole Board and not by the Chairman of the Board, because the Development Board comes under my jurisdiction, and I hold fortnightly meetings with the Chairman and the Manager and the Director of the Planning Unit, and we have a report every fortnight of what is going on in the Development Board, how the programme is coming along and so on. It is very easy for people to say that because Mr. So-and-so is Chairman, he has got the insurance on a building or something like that. This is not so. The only insurance that I know about is in connection with the Hilton Hotel, and what has happened in the case of the Hilton Hotel is that the Chairman invited all the Companies to come into the insurance of the Hilton Hotel; so they are all in it; all the Association Companies, all the Tariff Companies; so everybody has got what the hon. senior member for St. Joseph calls a berry. Mind you, there is good sense in this too, because if there were any major catastrophe, one company would not have to pay out all the money. We like to see things operating like that where all the people who have to pay taxes in Barbados, we feel, should benefit - when I say people, I mean all the institutions, companies, business people - from Government activity. It should not be monopolised by any individual or one section.

Let me give you another illustration when you come to the airlines. (Mr. MOTTLEY: I would like to know how the Minister of Communications paid less than I paid.) Because I said they were not to pay any more. We book passages now through travel agents. I myself queried this practice of booking passages through the travel agents, and then it was pointed out to me that if you book directly with B.W.I.A., they do not pay any tax and the travel agents pay tax. It is standard practice all over the world that 7% or 7 1/2% goes to travel agents; so when you go directly to B.W.I.A., that money stays in their pockets, we do not get any income tax or companies tax out of them, because they do not make a profit; but all the travel agents pay tax. So this is a good system, although I was the person who queried why we should have to go through the travel agents. You do not get the passage any cheaper by going to B.W.I.A. There was a time when they used to give us a 25% rebate on all Government travelling when they first started. We get none of that now; so the general policy of Government, to answer the hon. member directly, is that the people on Boards are not supposed and should not be in a position to take any advantage of their position,

and this is natural. This is nothing that we have to go into a huddle in Cabinet about to make that pronouncement. I think I have already answered the second point.

The question that the sum of \$552,502 under Head 18 - Economic Planning Unit - stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 19 - BARBADOS REGIMENT

Head 19 - Barbados Regiment - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$112,350 under Head 19 - Barbados Regiment - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 20 - CIVIL AVIATION

Head 20 - Civil Aviation - was called-

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$346,223 under Head 20 - Civil Aviation - stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, speaking on Item 7, I had occasion to be up at Seawell some time ago, and it seems to me as if things up there are getting out of hand. I saw a lot of little boys and, I would say, men making a nuisance of themselves and embarrassing the passengers going in and out. I feel that the authorities up there should see to it that these occurrences do not take place with soliciting of alms and things of that sort when the passengers arrive.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. member a question. He said this is Item 7. Now Item 7 is the Air Traffic Control Assistants' salaries. Is the hon. member suggesting that an Air Traffic Control Assistant was annoying passengers? I want to know because I am Head of the Department. I do not mind the hon. member discussing that under building or maintenance, but it seems to me to be a reflection on the Air Traffic Control Officers if he wants to discuss that under Item 7. 7.35 p.m.

I do not mind your discussing any complaint about Seawell. You say that the Customs Guards or the Policemen should take care of that up there. I would like you to relate it to some specific item of expenditure, so that I would be able to take the appropriate action. If he mentions this when we are discussing the salary of the Air Traffic Control Officer, one may think that he is one of the little boys.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, believe me, I am losing out on the Prime Minister, too. It seems to me that the majority of them over there are losing out. If this is his portfolio, I am drawing to his attention

that boys are soliciting alms from incoming and outgoing passengers.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is not appropriate.

Mr. SMITH: It is not appropriate, but you and the Prime Minister understand what I am saying.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. senior member for St. Joseph debate this matter under a different item?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I told the hon. member that I would like to hear the complaints but I would not like any reflection cast on any individual officer. If you pick out a single officer's salary and say that you are reporting boys for begging alms, then some people may get the impression that the Air Traffic Control Officer is going around worrying lady passengers, begging alms and that sort of thing. Can't you pick out another Head and debate the matter? Perhaps Item 14 may be in order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There are quite a number of Items under which it could be debated.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, that is all I have asked the hon. member to do.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the only thing I would say to the Prime Minister is that he knows that any item that is not fixed by law in the Estimates can be discussed by a member. That has been the practice and custom here for all these years. If you take the Estimates up you will find "Other Expenditure". "Other Expenditure" is not fixed by law, and you cannot criticise something that has already been passed into law. The hon. member is entitled to talk. The Prime Minister is saying that he should not use this Item because it may affect so-and-so, but he is entitled to talk, and I do not see how you can stop him from doing it, as long as it is not fixed by law.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, you have several items here; I see that something is going wrong at Seawell. You do not have an item called "Begging Alms"; you will never see that in here. I am drawing to the attention of the House and the Minister that certain people are making a nuisance of themselves and the passengers. I am not going to spend the whole night on this matter. If you do not want me to say anything.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I would prefer the hon. member not to mention any item at all. You can say that you are speaking on the whole Head. The moment he mentions the Air Traffic Control Officer, the next thing you will read in the newspapers tomorrow is that the Air Traffic Control Officer is interfering with passengers. I do not like that. He can refer to another item. I am not trying to prevent him from discussing the matter; I want to hear about it. I have to protect the officers. I would like him to withdraw Item 7; that is all.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, what is to prevent me from getting up here and saying Item 7, and then

say whatever I like about any Air Traffic Control Officer up there? If he is afraid of them, and he does not want me to say anything about them, I can get up here and say whatever I like about them and he cannot stop me. It is only childish to say that somebody up there will be blamed. I did not even mention the explanatory note; the newspapers would not know, the Air Traffic Control Officer would not know, and they would only hear that I was complaining about the nuisance up there. Around the Wharf or anywhere else you will find the policemen running down the people who are begging alms. I am merely asking not to allow people to beg alms up there. I was up there yesterday and I saw it for myself. I do not think the Prime Minister has seen it, because no sooner than those boys see him they will run. Those boys are demanding all sorts of things and making a nuisance of themselves. If he is responsible for it, I am asking him to take it up with the authorities and ask them to see to it that the boys are kept away from the cars and from begging alms from the passengers. That is all I have asked, but the Hon. Prime Minister got up to muzzle me. There is nothing wrong in that. I would never see an item here called "Begging Alms".

I am now going to rule as if I were in the Chair. Mr. Chairman, before you were in this House items used to carry the words "To be voted". This Government means the same thing, but it is only different. It is stated here "Other Expenditure". I can talk on anything that is to be voted. I can afford to do that; no Speaker can stop me; no Chairman can stop me. It is not fair to me for the Prime Minister to get up here and say that the Air Traffic Control Officers up there would think this and that. I suppose they would be only too glad to hear that a question like this was raised in this House. I would like the little boys to get a "berry", because I do not think they would be going up there begging alms unless they were hungry, but it does not look good and it is a nuisance.

I would like the passengers to go to and fro without being troubled by boys begging alms. In Bridgetown you can find policemen hounding down beggars as well as people who are blind. You cannot have that sort of behaviour in Broad Street, and I do not see anything wrong with my raising the question here.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I just wish to endorse the remarks made by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. I am speaking on the entire Head. I am speaking on votes for Heads which are not set out here by law. Only a few nights ago I was at the airport, and I was very hurt not only to see these youngsters, as the senior member for St. Joseph said, begging alms, but to see grown-ups in the waiting room of the terminal building dancing to music from a transistor and they were not passengers. It is not the very best thing which we can hope for. Where there are no bright lights in the villages off Seawell Airport, one would expect that these people would congregate in these places as a matter of having some sort of entertainment as they have no community halls around there.

I would like to draw to the attention of the Minister that it would be a very good idea if the Airport's

Supervisor, or the Director of Civil Aviation who is responsible for the entire Airport - this is not casting any reflection on the Director of Civil Aviation - would get his staff to see after these things. When he is in his bed, he could get the Customs Guards or the watchmen to look after these people. I would like to see a better example set up there. These Customs Guards should make sure that these grown-ups in particular do not make themselves a nuisance. 7.45 p.m.

You see passengers getting off their cars and going to the Airways counter, and between the passengers you can hear this blaring music from Transistor radios and these young boys are doing all the fancy dances and singing. I do not think that that is really in the interest of Barbados if we are looking forward to tourism as a great part of our economy now; and if we are prepared to provide the best facilities as possible, some of this must be altered.

As regards Item 34, "Maintenance of Equipment" the note says: "To meet cost of maintenance on the baggage conveyor installed in the new Customs hall." I would like to congratulate the Government on this because it is a rather outmoded idea of people bringing in their baggage and having to stand up for hours with the "Red Caps" lifting up the baggage. This is a modern Airport and we expect the best out of tourism, and I dare say that we have to face up to the needs of the people and the needs of the passengers as they come in.

What I would also like to find out is this; what are the Government's views not only of having this conveyor at Customs where they check you out, but which is also in great demand at Seawell Airport? It is not a conveyor, but something that when they bring the baggage off the plane, they can shoot it off from the people who bring in the baggage. You have it at Trinidad and at Kennedy Airport whereby you can take up the baggage. You have the "Red Caps" hustling out the baggage and I know that they are overcharging the people. I think that there should be a notice posted up there letting the passengers know what they should pay for each piece of baggage. I am not critical of the Government for this, but I would like to draw this to the attention of the Government.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the conveyor is not merely a counter or where the officers operate, but they do bring in the baggage from outside. We do not have the circular distributor which we see here taking baggage upon the chute and the passengers have to scramble. The point is this: in other words, they will not be pushed in a cart any more and the baggage will go on to the counter by the conveyor belt from the outset. The hon. member has congratulated the Government on introducing the conveyor, but he had better wait and see if it works before he congratulates the Government on it. As to the way in which the Public Works is functioning nowadays, anything can happen.

The hon. senior member for St. Joseph spoke of the presence of delinquents around the Airport. I have

never seen it myself, but I will have to check on this and impose very stringent measures in relation to people loitering around the Airport because, personally I agree with hon. members that this does not present a very good image of Barbados. One of the things which we were previously congratulated on in this country is that when people go to other countries, they have people annoying them all the time. You do not have to go as far East as Egypt, but here in the Eastern Caribbean which is supposed to be wealthier than we are, you cannot walk along the streets without being molested in the main capitals of these countries. We do not want to develop this kind of reputation and I can assure the hon. member that I will take action on this, if it does exist, and I take it that hon. members either saw it themselves or have it on fairly good authority.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, this amount of \$900 seems to be rather small as an allowance for the Director of Civil Aviation. You have the Director of Civil Aviation living in a house at \$80.00 a month with the house rent what it is today. You have no house now, of course.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, on a point of explanation. When the Director was appointed it was one of his conditions of service that he should live at the Airport, but then it became impossible for the Director to live there, firstly because the building which the Customs officer occupied as a residence had to be demolished in order to provide for the new extension, and it was more important to accommodate the Customs Officer. The Director of Civil Aviation need not be there after 4 o'clock in the afternoon, but the Customs Officer has to work all hours of the night. It was more important for the Customs Officer to be on the spot; so the Customs Officer has moved into the D.C.A.'s former residence, and the salary is calculated on what he would pay, I cannot remember what the formula is, but it is about 10% of his salary, in view of providing him with a house. At the Hospital we have to pay \$350 a month for some of the doctors. (Mr. MOTTLEY: It is rather small.) I appreciate that. As far as I know, there are only two officers in this position; the other one is the Commissioner of Police whose house is used for the Police Band, and it will cost us more than \$80.00 a month to run the quarters for the Police Band. In this particular case, both of these Officers have their own houses, services and allowances. We are not paying them to rent a house, but for the inconvenience of not being able to live on the spot.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I just missed one part of which I made an enquiry. It is one of those conveyors which bring the baggage up to the Customs Officer, that, I think, will also help to speed up the traffic at Seawell. Now, in the Air Traffic Control Office, I do not know if I was out of bounds, but I was taken up there by one or two officers, and I must say..

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I should just like to assure hon. members that any member of this House is entitled to inspect any Gov-

ernment premises at any time, and then they will be able to speak with authority - and not waste our time. I am glad that the hon. member went up there to see in how narrow a space the Air Traffic Controllers work; so that the Government is not objecting to a member of the House of Assembly going and looking at Officers. We welcome that kind of thing. I would like the hon. member to come in my office and see how I have to function with about eighteen Ministries and five people.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to make the point about how hard these Air Traffic Control Officers work. I have not really heard them complaining myself, but as to the actual space they work in - I mean the room in which they have to operate - one can only marvel at how they get in there.
7.55 p.m.

Sometimes I see in there myself three or four trainees at night; two are sitting and two are standing, while the two officers that are in charge are working. I really cannot understand how they make out. I hope that the Minister under whose portfolio this comes will give that information to me.

The question that the sum of \$346,233 under Head 20 - Civil Aviation - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 21 - ESTABLISHMENTS DIVISION

Head 21 - Establishments Division - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move that the sum of \$310,165 be now appropriated under Head 21.

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

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

HEAD 22 - MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Head 22 - Ministry of External Affairs - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move that the sum of \$2,404,680 be appropriated under Head 22.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, if you have a long memory you will remember that last year you started at this point, Head 22. We have stopped very long to get to this Head tonight. It has taken us from all day today until now to get to Head 22.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: If you want to adjourn, I would ask the Leader of the House to adjourn now; but I just want to impress on you that I am ready to do Head 22. I am ready to go on with it.

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

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

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended for 1 1/4 hours.

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

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

8.00 p.m.

On Resumption;

Mr. SPEAKER: Immediately before the suspension the House was in Committee of Supply.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the Committee was last in session the hon. senior member for St. Joseph was speaking on Head 22. He may continue.

Mr. SMITH: I would not worry.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, Sir, it is clear that the Government itself is embarrassed over this Head, for this was the Head that was run through this House last year with indecent haste, and with all that one would regard as trickery that could be done in Parliament.

But on this occasion, Sir, we still have the opportunity to point out, first of all, that one of the greatest lies ever told in this country was contained in that famous document which was issued in 1965 which stated that it was possible for external relations in this country to cost between \$500,000 and \$600,000.

The appropriation under this Head is not \$500,000 or \$600,000. It is \$2,640,395. But there are a number of implications arising out of this. One of the things which small countries have got to be very careful about is that they have been foisted upon the world stage and indulge in champagne tastes when they can only afford mauby. Here is a Government that is willing to retrench on other occasions. Here is a Government that is expending the sum of money which I previously quoted. It is true that when we were discussing the Head of the Development Board, I asked the Minister about the different agencies abroad and their relationship to the Ministry of External Affairs, and on that occasion the Prime Minister did not reply to that part of the question; but on this occasion; we have a debate here and I want to ask some question on it.

It is not set out clearly in the Estimates at all. We see under High Commissioner, Item 13, \$124,500 and we see the note, "Barbados Government's share of expenses of joint High Commissioner for Barbados and Guyana". What I want to know is that when we go to Appendix "O" under the Estimates, we see that certain allowances increase in certain cases. It seems that not only in this diplomatic service, but in all the services certain allowances are granted.

As it is, the High Commissioner for Barbados and the United Kingdom get the additional allowances too. This is the first question which I want to know something about, because, Sir, as we understand it under Item 22, the sum of \$60,000 is voted for certain allowances and if you work out arithmetic on this, it appears that the High Commissioner in the United Kingdom also receives these allowances. Appendix "O" sets out these allowances. The overseas allowances consist of a free fully-furnished house for the High Commissioner. The United Kingdom High Commissioner gets this. There is no exception in the notes in Appendix "O". It says: "Provision included for the payment of Foreign Service allowances to officers on the permanent establishment."

Well, the High Commissioner in England is not on the permanent establishment. The High Commissioner in Ottawa is on the permanent establishment; so presumably he gets it. I also want to know if the High Commissioner in London, besides getting this \$24,500, gets the 75 percent overseas allowance.

9.20 p.m.

Now it seems to us passing strange too that you are going to pay your High Commissioner in Canada \$12,000, your Permanent Representative to the United Nations \$12,000, and I understand that you have an Ambassador to Washington now. Presumably it is your Permanent Representative to the United Nations whom you have designated as your Ambassador to Washington. What is the reason for the discrepancy? Now I am not for one minute saying on this side that we do not regard external relations as necessary. Naturally; but we must evade what the Prime Minister said in his document we must evade; we must not allow ourselves to fall into the trap in attempting to posture upon the world stage - to use the Prime Minister's words - in a manner which the economy of this country cannot afford.

The vote for external relations has caused important services internally in Barbados to be cut. You cannot get light; you cannot get water; you cannot get tenantry roads done right through Barbados. All the hon. members in here who represent country areas will know that it is a fact that less work has been done now that the Government has taken over Local Government and its service than before, and one of the excuses given is because of the fact that Government has assumed obligations such as external relations which are costing a tremendous amount of money additionally. Naturally it is not \$600,000. Some lunatic in the Other Place - I believe he is there now - I am not calling his name, but everybody will know whom I mean - once said that there is no reason why you could not do it for \$500,000, and he even produced statistics to prove it. Well, it seems that one cannot take seriously anything the bearded men around Barbados say nowadays. One must regard them in the light in which the Hon. Prime Minister regards them, as mischief makers and purveyors of mis-information to the public.

When we come and look at the total expenditure under this Head, the Prime Minister should have used his pruning knife. I have nothing against Sir Lionel

Luckhoo personally. I do not suppose one can find a slicker man. (Mr. MOTTLEY: What is the meaning of that word?) I do not suppose one could find a more hospitable gentleman, a more suave gentleman than he, but I do not suppose one could find a person on whom one has to keep one's eye more regularly than you have to on him; but he has certainly utilised all of his talents to persuade this Government that he must get in - treatment and that his worth to this country is far greater than any other High Commissioner or Ambassador. One can understand the position of a gentleman like the High Commissioner in Canada because he is a Civil Servant; but I do not understand how a Permanent Representative to the United Nations and the Ambassador to Washington can sit down and accept and tolerate the obvious inequality of treatment that is meted out.

Of course, as I said before, being posted to the United Nations and to Washington was a promotion for his incompetence and inefficiency as Attorney General. They had to get rid of him. He cost them \$20,000 unnecessarily. I suppose the farther away you put him from the Cabinet, the less it would cost, and somebody has got to do it; and the Kiaki King having been dismissed, they had to get somebody else to do it. When you look at the totality of this vote in relation to other vital services in the country, you will see that you have just given the Development Board an increase of \$60,000; that is all. What is the increase in this vote? You will find in the Memorandum accompanying the Estimates that it is \$614,943. Services abroad have to be provided; nobody can dispute that; but is it necessary to provide them on as lavish a scale as has been provided for in these Estimates? If devaluation has had the effect that you have to curtail and reduce your development expenditure - you can only give the Development Board an increase of \$60,000 - and you have had to reduce the grant to the Tourist Board, and could only spend \$614,000 in agriculture last year which is most important, then how can you possibly justify giving the Ministry of External Affairs an increase of \$614,000 this year?
9.30 p.m.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, Head 22 is almost a joke now. Last year, as the hon. senior member for Christ Church has said, the Government was so afraid of it that they threw it in before anybody could really get his teeth into it. It is really an expenditure of \$2,225,000. The salary of the High Commissioner is \$25,000 a year plus an Overseas Allowance. All of that was put in last year, and it was spent while, for example, the old Capital Estimates went in at \$6.7 million and came out at \$6.6 million. Mr. Chairman, \$6.6 million is all that we spent on the Capital Estimates last year on development in this Island, and this was spent by a Government that talked about a \$50 million Development Programme when it first came into power. But these matters have been dealt with by the hon. member who has just sat down.

I want to concern myself particularly and intricately with Sir Lionel Luckhoo. Now under Item 13 -

High Commissioner, London - we are asked to vote \$24,500 for the High Commissioner, and an Overseas Allowance of 75% is also payable in connection with him. Now 75% of \$24,500 is \$18,375. He is, therefore, getting a salary and an allowance of \$42,875 from Barbados alone - more than the Prime Minister and the Governor-General. Point No. 1 will be; What is he getting from Guyana?

Mr. Chairman, you cannot believe that the great Government of Guyana, the Magnificent Province with horses and Rest Houses in the Rupununi, would pay Luckhoo less than we are paying him. He is one of them, anyway. They have to pay him for more reasons than we have to pay him. They have to pay him to keep him on Burnham's side and to organise the votes for Burnham in London at the forthcoming election.

I, personally, believe that he is getting \$40,000 from Guyana as well. That is what I believe, and the Minister of External Affairs will have to answer how much he is getting on that account. This is the largest amount of money ever paid out by the Government of Barbados to any one individual. This is twice as much money as any individual has ever drawn from the Public Treasury in this Island - Governor-General, Prime Minister, and the lot of them. Let us get things clear in our minds.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we do not often have in this House, at least during my experience here, to move to reduce a vote, but, in the circumstances, I would be failing in my duty if I did not, at this stage, move that this vote be reduced by \$1, and I have so given notice to the Clerk. I formally move, Mr. Chairman, that the Ministry of External Affairs' vote be reduced by this amount for the reasons which I have just given and which I intend to pursue further.

Now, Sir Lionel Luckhoo's salary cannot just be considered in isolation. We have our own Mr. Williams, who is the High Commissioner in Ottawa, and he gets a salary of \$12,000 a year. Since we are asked to vote it as \$12,000, it can only be in Barbadian money. His Foreign Service Allowance, which would be paid in Canadian dollars, is 75% of his basic salary - it would be another \$8,000 a year, according to my arithmetic. His total is \$20,000 a year, which is - I am not too sure of the figures - about \$12,000 or \$13,000 at its Canadian currency equivalent.

Mr. Chairman, not only is Sir Luckhoo getting twice as much from us alone, not to speak of what he is getting from Guyana - and I think he is getting the same \$40,000 from Guyana and a free furnished house - but he is getting other things. It has been suggested that the Guyanese are paying half of their share in the house, and we are paying in cash. I am sure the Minister will explain that in due course. Not only is he getting more than twice as much as the High Commissioner in Canada, but he is getting that in a Sterling country whereas the High Commissioner of Canada has to convert his money in an unfavourable

rate of exchange. Now why is this favouritism, Mr. Chairman, given to Sir Lionel Luckhoo?

It is a bad arrangement anyhow, Mr. Chairman, to have one man representing two countries. It is bad diplomatic arrangement. The Americans would not have it, and I challenge the Minister of External Affairs to deny that. But the British with the cynicism that we have observed in recent years - the kind of cynicism that allows Guyana and Barbados to appear as marvellous and magnificently viable economic entities is the same sort of cynicism that allows Sir Lionel Luckhoo to serve as Ambassador for two countries - unprecedented. Of course, Mr. Chairman, we are paying him a big salary. His half from us is bigger than we have to pay the other Ambassadors. Luckhoo's half is bigger than Vaughan's whole and Williams' whole. Where is the saving? If it is thought to be an arrangement that would reduce the cost of Barbados to share an Ambassador, then that would be an arrangement worthwhile looking at; but this is an arrangement to inflate the cost.

Now, there are some people who say that Sir Lionel Luckhoo got his appointment because he is prepared to contribute to the funds of the Democratic Labour Party. I do not believe that; he is much too clever for that. He would compromise, but he would not come across; he would not give his money to anybody when that person is committed to pay him. He is too crafty to do that, but he is not too crafty to avoid criticism in the Barbados House of Assembly. All the champagne parties in the world, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe could save him, or would save him, year after year, from the criticism that he is being paid too much money. \$42,875 a year is our share alone.

Mr. Chairman, the last salary I saw the British Ambassador to Washington was getting was £8,000, which is less than this amount here. The British Ambassador to Moscow is getting a little less. The British Ambassador to Paris would get a little more. I do not know what the American Ambassadors are paid, but it is said that they always lose money as a result of taking these Embassies.

I used to hear an argument that one of the reasons for having Sir Lionel Luckhoo in London was that he was rich and could afford the hospitality that his position would demand. If he is a rich man and he can afford the hospitality, he should be able to give good service. Mr. Vaughan is not a rich man although he should be. Mr. Williams is not a rich man, but they are suffering in the minor league of \$1,000 (BWI) per month. Sir Lionel Luckhoo is in the champagne league, and he forgets the fact that he represents a country where the people are poor, where the Capital Estimate of \$11 million was cut in half, apparently, to provide for External Affairs. He forgets that the people want water, lights, schools, roads and houses. Sir Lionel Luckhoo must get his \$42,875 as our half share for his work in London. Is anybody worth that to Barbados, Mr. Chairman? Could the Prime Minister come in here and ask for \$36,000 a month? Could he come in here and ask for a salary for himself of \$42,000?

I have heard the Hon. Leader of the House complain that the Prime Minister does not ask for more money. I do not believe that, in his wildest dreams, the Hon. Leader of the House would come here and ask for \$42,000 as the Prime Minister's salary. We were happy to pass the Governor-General's salary, but it would have been a mistake, Mr. Chairman, to think that we would have been happy to pass a salary for him on the scale that Sir Lionel Luckhoo has had his salary passed. This is the absolute midsummer of madness, Mr. Chairman. This is financing gone crazier than we could have conceived.

After all, the Kiaki King was being offered something like \$300 a month in the days when he was still the Permanent Representative at the United Nations. No matter what we might say of Mr. Walcott, or what we might think about him, How can our self-respect allow us to say you can pay a Permanent Representative to the United Nations \$3,600 a year, plus hotel, subsistence, travelling and reasonable entertainment? How can we say that someone who was a member of this House for 22 years is only worth \$3,600 a year whereas Sir Lionel Luckhoo is worth \$42,000? How would our self-respect allow us to say that a member of the Senate of this Island should be paid at a rate like that, while Sir Lionel Luckhoo is getting \$2,000 basic and another \$1,500 as Overseas Allowance?

9.40 p.m.

I want to hear what the Minister of External Affairs has to say about this, because I cannot believe that he is now satisfied with his own handiwork. I cannot believe it when in London we heard how he has been taken around to No. 10 Downing Street by Sir Lionel Luckhoo to get Independence. All of these rumours we heard and I wonder if they are true. I rang Downing Street and could find no trace of their being true. Nevertheless, it may be that in return for what was the gift of Independence, the Minister of External Affairs would have promised anything. I urge hon. member to support this reduction because I am giving the Minister of External Affairs a chance to explain to Sir Lionel that the House of Assembly would not swallow the money, that he will have to do a little retrenchment and that, finally, Barbados will be able to bring a little more reason, in this respect at least, into the bill for its overseas representation.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, while I rise to support or rather to second the motion for the reduction moved by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, which I now formally do, I cannot really sit here unless I, myself, make a comment. First of all, this is something I only do when I am satisfied beyond any shadow of doubt, that the person is worthy of it, and I wish humbly to apologise to the Prime Minister here tonight when I made one or two criticisms of his hospitality vote and also about Culloden Farm. Only a man who is in his modest dreams could come before this Hon. Assembly and ask it to give a non-national of Barbados a \$42,000 guarantee, but could only find \$13.44 to guarantee an agricultural worker. It would take that worker, 62 working years to earn \$42,000; and out of the sweat of the same people in this country, when the Prime Minister boasted about

how he provided for them a guaranteed weekly wage, - he has also guaranteed Sir Lionel Luckhoo a salary of \$42,000 a year. Since I have the courage to get on my feet and apologise to the Prime Minister, I feel it is the duty of the Prime Minister - it is not always necessary for us to be big and we have to humble ourselves sometimes - to vote for the amendment whereby, when he sits in the Cabinet, they would have a chance of reviewing the salary of this one man.

I differ from my colleague, the hon. senior member for St. Thomas. I am confident that the Prime Minister of Guyana would not even think of paying a national of Guyana \$42,000 a year which, I believe, would be one-half of the other half that the Barbados Government is paying. I know that there are some wealthy people all over the world, but I would like the Prime Minister, and I am sure that he is capable of getting up and giving a reply, never mind what other scathing remarks he might choose to use while giving his reply, there is no reason - and I am confident about it that when the Government members came in here on the last occasion on which they laid the Estimates on this Table, they had their reasons for railroading this particular Head through Parliament, because I firmly believe that never again in the history of this country, anyone would ever open Estimates and start off like this: "Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 22 stand part," and before you could even look around, before the Chairman could even say: "The question is" the Government members said: "Aye", just as if something had struck them, in order to get through Head 22. It is not going through so tonight. We will go down fighting on this amount of money. It is not fair. Don't tell me that you can look around the entire world and you cannot find a Barbadian decent enough, with dignity and academic ability, to serve this little country which we call a paradise, as High Commissioner in London?

Mr. Chairman, let me remind the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance of some of the finest lines of Othello. As a matter of fact, I shall always keep the Budgetary Proposals, because when the Prime Minister was making his introductory speech to the Budgetary Proposals he said this: "To open up what has been closed, to let the fresh breezes blow into the nasty corridors of corruption and let the light shine in the dark corners of conspiracy," I do not believe that my Prime Minister - not only yours, Mr. Chairman; when I am abroad I speak highly of him because I am proud of my country and I respect the office of any man who is Prime Minister of Barbados; but when he is in Barbados, I am prepared to hang him just as how he told me yesterday that he would like to hang me. He has the same Ian Smith's blood. The difference between him and Ian Smith is that he is of a different colour. Therefore whatever gloves I can change on him I will change on him for this policy, this wicked conspiracy for which, I believe, there would have to be something between the Prime Minister and Sir Lionel Luckhoo. I am sure that the Prime Minister as Minister of Finance, Chancellor of the Exchequer, guardian of the Treasury of this country - we are the watch-dogs, and we are watching you now, Sir. Could

one imagine that the Prime Minister, the economist, would pay Sir Lionel Luckhoo \$42,000 a year and then provide him with somewhere to live too? Oh no, Sir. Something is wrong; something is wrong; so said Lord Blakey. I believe that, as Prime Minister, it was his duty to this country in which, I am told - and he has confirmed it - that he was born, if there is \$42,000 a year to be paid out, let the Prime Minister come in here and we will support him in getting a salary of \$42,000 a year; but not that salary for Sir Lionel Luckhoo, who has never done anything for this country outside of lobbying and having champagne parties from what today he is probably earning as sweet reward. I do not believe that the Prime Minister of Guyana, Mr. Forbes Burnham, is paying a nickel towards this.

9.50 p.m.

I would like to see the Estimates of Guyana. I would like to see them to see what they are paying Sir Lionel Luckhoo who is joint High Commissioner of Barbados and Guyana. That is not possible; that is not fair. Sir, you have a man like Mr. Williams, an able, decent man - not a trickster - who is getting a paltry \$12,000 a year, and Luckhoo, a coolie, a man who is wearing a wig which somebody should hold and burn it off so that we can see what is under that wig that can draw \$42,000 of the Barbados taxpayers' money.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that all will go well with the Prime Minister, as Minister of Finance, one who, I am confident, is quite able and capable of doing the job which he has set out to do, and who because of the hands of democracy, has given this high post to Sir Lionel Luckhoo, I was told today when in the Clerk's office that one night the steering came out of the car of the Prime Minister and he was seen outside on the road pushing the motor car. Well, if I had seen the Prime Minister outside on the road that night pushing a motor car, I would have got out of my car and would have dropped two lashes with a bull pistol. Just fancy our Prime Minister pushing a motor car.

It is not fair to be paying Luckhoo \$42,000. I do not agree with this, Sir, and I am going to oppose it if I am the only person on this side that does so. How can it be? I am glad when I see the Prime Minister in his Humber Hawk being driven by a policeman. He should have a body-guard. After all, he is the Prime Minister of Barbados. We come in here and give him a few blows, and outside on the platform, we are going to give them to him too; but I am not supporting this \$42,000.

Not only that, there is something else which we have here too. We are finished talking about the \$42,000. Do you know what Sir Lionel Luckhoo is getting too? He is getting a fully furnished house, and I can well imagine that it can only be furnished with antiques as well as I imagine, Sir, it has oak tables. I sincerely hope that while I formally second the motion by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas for the reduction of this vote by one dollar, the Prime

Minister will give us the amount of the full salary of the High Commissioner in London.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: First, I regret that hon. members have turned this debate into a personal attack on one of the most distinguished West Indians. If you are a racist, Fascist, Englishman, you would describe people living in Barbados as negroes, people living in India, Guyana, and Trinidad as coolies, and you will refer to the Chinese as chinks. You will refer to the French people as frogs, and you will refer to the Americans as goddamyankees - one word.

Well, I never thought, as we are undoubtedly a persecuted minority race in the world, that I would hear members of the House of Assembly to say that their accredited representatives are coolies. Imagine the hon. senior member for St. James referring to a man who is High Commissioner for two countries, a distinguished lawyer, as a coolie. That is how you get racialism. Yet we protest over Ian Smith and against Dr. Verwoerd. This shows the amount of malice and mischief which is being created in this country.

Now, neither of the hon. members could resist the temptation of getting up and making this a big whipping post on the Government that there is some conspiracy. One actually accused me of having a conspiracy with Sir Lionel Luckhoo. The same people talked about regional co-operation. We are the only country in the Commonwealth that has got together with another country to do exactly what they accused us of not doing - to reduce the overseas representation.

Now, if the hon. members, instead of attacking the Government, would ask a simple question or even read the Estimates and take them at face value, they would see that if you put in the Estimates \$24,000 for such-and-such an item, then they would not make the tragic mistakes which they made here a fortnight ago because nowhere in the Estimates do I see that I pay Sir Lionel Luckhoo \$32,000 or \$42,000. We have said that officers are paid under certain circumstances an overseas allowance which I would explain. If you look at Appendix "O" on page 52, you will see that allowances are paid in the currency of the country in which the officer is recruited.

"Allowances will be paid in the currency of the country in which officers are posted. Persons recruited in the country of employment and paid at current rates in that country will not receive foreign service allowances."

Under High Commissioner we have "free fully furnished house." How many High Commissioners have we? We have part of a High Commissioner. We have a High Commissioner in London; we have part of him although he is our High Commissioner, but he is also somebody else's High Commissioner. We have a High Commissioner in Ottawa. Mr. Williams is only getting his same salary and so on. Mr. Williams is getting \$12,000 which is the salary of a Permanent Secretary plus he is getting \$9,000 (Canadian) which

is pretty close to \$18,000 (West Indian). That is \$30,000. Then Mr. Williams is getting a free house fully furnished. The Ambassador to the United States is in a similar position.

Let me do a little arithmetic here to see if any of the accusations against the Government of treating our own officers more unfavourably than what we are paying the High Commissioner whom we are sharing with the Government of Guyana. Now, the Deputy High Commissioner in London is getting \$11,040 plus \$5,520. That is \$16,560 plus \$4,080, which is something a little less than \$22,360. In other words, what I am submitting now is that what we pay to Mr. J. C. King, who is Deputy High Commissioner in London, is only a matter of a few hundred dollars less than what we pay Sir Lionel Luckhoo.
10.00 p.m.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister must not misrepresent the Estimates. There is no way that the arithmetic of a foreign service allowance of \$60,000 can be related only to the statutory expenditure for Mr. J. C. King back down without including a further \$18,000 for Mr. Luckhoo. Let the Prime Minister say, if he is a man, that Mr. Luckhoo does not get \$18,000 more than the \$25,000.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Why don't you wait? You interrupted me. I sat down and I did not interrupt, despite all the vilification. I did not interrupt a single member of the other side. I am giving them a breakdown. In other words, External Affairs in respect of High Commissioners and their staff would be found under Head 22 on page 43 of the Estimates, and then you are referred to Appendix O. What I am saying is that these are the allowances which are paid. The High Commissioner in Ottawa - that is Mr. Williams - and the only one we are concerned about, gets \$12,000, then \$9,000 Canadian which is 75 percent of his basic salary. He gets \$12,000 E.C. currency because he is paid at the rate of Permanent Secretaries; then he gets 75 percent of his basic salary, because after discussion with all the Commonwealth Governments who had offices, they said that the cost of living is not exactly 100 percent. In other words, before devaluation, even, the Canadian dollar only purchased about 25 percent more. Put it the other way. It would take \$1 3/4 Eastern Caribbean to buy in Canada what you can buy here over-all. I am not saying that certain items like chicken legs would not be cheaper, but I am saying what the over-all picture is, and this is after consultation on what the other people were paying, and what the attending increase in cost of living happened to be. So this is what the overseas allowance is for. The overseas allowance is not to afford you to live on a higher scale, but to live on the same scale as if you were a Permanent Secretary in Barbados; but you get certain things that Permanent Secretaries do not get. You get a free house. That is the High Commissioner in Ottawa. His salary is \$12,000 plus, let us say roughly \$18,000, though it is slightly less than that, because the Canadian dollar is not as high. It is paid to them in Cana-

dan currency. He is paid \$9,000 in Canadian dollars, which is 75 percent of his basic salary, but in the currency not converted; so if 75 percent of \$12,000 is \$9,000, it is \$9,000 Canadian dollars.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, I must interrupt the Hon. Prime Minister again. Is he then saying that Mr. Lionel Luckhoo gets 75 percent of \$25,000, but it is paid in pounds? Does he get £18,000 on that being 75 percent of \$25,000?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Every time the hon. member interrupts me, he is getting deeper and deeper into this morass. When I got up, I said it would have been better, as we used to conduct the affairs of this House even when we were in Opposition, or when I was a member of the Government Party, to get up and ask the Minister questions; but they come in here with a big lot of what they consider to be ammunition and they are not even fizz bombs. If they would listen, they would understand. Every one of the charges they have made is untrue about our discriminating, and that is why I am trying to illustrate, but you have to keep the good wine until the last. You do not let off all your ammunition. I pity the hon. member because there could be nothing more malicious and vicious than the attack which is launched against me personally and the High Commissioner here this afternoon; and when you hear the facts the public would be able to judge who is right and who is wrong.

Now \$9,000 Canadian is what Mr. Williams gets as his overseas allowance because he is a High Commissioner. The other officers working with him get 50 percent of their basic salary in Canadian dollars, as the case may be. Mr. J. C. King would get his 50 percent directly convertible; but the people in London get their 50 percent in the currency of the country. This is the principle and it goes all the way down the line to Mr. Brewster, Mr. Holder, Mr. Maynard and the others. This is well established by all the Commonwealth Missions. If you work out the position with the High Commissioner in Ottawa, his total emoluments then work out to approximately \$27,000, let us say, plus a free house. In the case of Mr. King it works out to about \$22,360. Nowhere in the Estimates does it say that we pay Sir Lionel Luckhoo 75 percent. We only set out the principles in Appendix O. I know what I am talking about. Why don't you listen? You will see what a fool you have made of yourself. If members did not come in here primed with mis-information and were willing to ask questions, they would not make the cardinal error of making fools of themselves. The point is that the explanatory note says that \$24,000 is paid as Barbados' share of the expenses of the joint High Commissioner for Barbados and Guyana. In other words, Barbados does not pay Sir Lionel Luckhoo's salary; we pay a contribution of \$24,000, not to Sir Lionel Luckhoo but to the Government of Guyana. In other words, they regulate his salary; they fixed his salary, terms and conditions and so on. It is not 50 percent; it is 40 percent, as far as I remember. We pay 40 percent and 40 percent of Sir Lionel Luckhoo's total expenses - except his secretary's salary and so on - is \$24,000. Do members understand now? This is what

I am categorically stipulating, a categorical imperative. These are the things that are covered by the \$24,000: his salary, his house rent and maintenance of his house, the cost of maintenance of his car and the salary of his chauffeur and his entertainment allowance.

I am so contemptuous of hon. members' vile attack that I refuse to say anything more. I am saying that these are the facts: and if hon. members had simply got up and asked a question and then allowed me to answer the question, they would have been justified if I had said it is \$42,000 for Barbados alone. I am saying that it covers his salary, house rent and maintenance, the cost of maintenance of his car, his chauffeur and his entertainment allowance, and we pay the Government of Guyana \$24,500. (Mr. MOTTLEY: No more?) No more for these things, and I do not know about anything else except he may have paper clips in his office, and I do not think we pay anything for that. He goes every Friday and spends half the day at Kensington High Street. I do not know that we have any more expenses down there except maybe the secretarial services we provide for him which are part of the mission. I am so disgusted, and I think hon. members on the other side owe the general public and Sir Lionel Luckhoo an apology, because the whole thing could have been clarified simply by asking a question which we are here to answer; but it is not fair to get up and level all kinds of accusations against me for extravagance and discriminating against Barbadians when the person who is working under him only gets about \$600 from us, less than we have to pay for his services. This is the whole rationale of having a joint High Commissioner, because if we did not have this arrangement with the Government of Guyana, it would be something like \$60,000 which it could possibly cost us for keeping a High Commissioner, because this has to pay for the man's house, chauffeur and everything. These are the facts. 10.10 p.m.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, there is some mathematics in this. First of all, I know that the Prime Minister does not want to get up again, but we are not all idiots over here. Mr. Chairman, let us just look at these facts. The foolishness about \$9,000 Canadian because it happens that the currencies of Barbados and Canada are both described as dollars is merely a foolish joke. I am saying categorically that I do not believe Mr. Williams gets any Foreign Service allowance of \$9,000 in the currency of the country in which he is working.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I am saying that Mr. Williams gets a Foreign Service allowance of \$9,000 in the currency of the country where he is working. He is working in Canada. I am Minister of Foreign Affairs and Minister of Finance, and if I tell you so, it must be so. I cannot remember if it started off at 75%, but when we discovered that we had made a mistake when we were given this information about Trinidad, Jamaica and all the other Commonwealth countries of the rates in the United States and so on, we thought that it was 75% of the basic salary plus. Then we discovered that it was 75% in the currency of the country.

In other words, it could have been more than 100% if we had converted it directly into the local currency. I am saying, as a fact, that he gets it. I said so and I am not apologising for it. We are the people who are accused of discriminating against Mr. Williams. I think the gentlemen of the Press will have the decency to do something for the country instead of high-lifting or going on CBC-TV flashing the ugly faces of people who do not deserve to live in this Island, far less to get any publicity. They are unpatriotic.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I do not like those remarks. If the Prime Minister now makes a statement and says that he, as Minister of Finance assures us that all the money the High Commissioner of London gets is \$24,000, we must accept it. He could not be so rash as to get up in here and make such a bold statement which will be going into the Hansard and the Press if it is not true.

I am not talking about anything discriminatory now, but I am wondering whether it is a wise thing to have this gentleman as our High Commissioner. Now the post is here and it is here to stay. We must have a High Commissioner in England. Guyana is independent, and Barbados is independent. We are looking for trade. Do you think, Mr. Chairman, or does the Prime Minister think that, if it came to the question of a recommendation, the High Commissioner would think of Barbados first, or of Guyana? That is what I am concerned about.

I was worried myself, not over any discriminatory talk, but I was worried when I saw it in the Estimates that the High Commissioner in London was drawing \$42,000 a year. There are offices in the Ministries, there is the Auditor General, and there are other people who could give the Prime Minister the lie if it was not so, and he could not be so brazen to get up in here and tell us that it is \$24,500 when it is not.

Therefore I am primarily concerned that it is a fact that on the last occasion - I was somewhat incapacitated and could not attend the meeting - Head 22 went through without a debate. I understand as a fact, Mr. Chairman, and I heard this myself where the hon. member for Christ Church said it was represented to us on more than one occasion that this would cost us around \$500,000 a year. Those who knew anything about it knew that it could not be so, and we represented as a fact that it would cost \$2 million a year, and it is costing us \$2 million a year.

Now that it is here, I do not agree with the Prime Minister, and I do not agree with the Government in having Sir Lionel Luckhoo represent Guyana and Barbados, too. This is just not going to work. I cannot see -- (Hon. E. W. BARROW: "It is working good.") It is not working good. Sir Lionel Luckhoo is a suave gentleman, a learned gentleman, and I suppose he knows his way around London and England, but I cannot believe for the life of me that Sir Lionel Luckhoo would make greater representation for Barbados on a question of trade, as we are trying to develop in Barbados, than he would make for Guyana.

If it comes to that he is going to put the best foot forward for Guyana first.

Under those circumstances, Sir, I think it should be known that last year when the vote came up and it went through like this, the hon. Gentleman who was a member of the Senate represented there and all over the Island that it would be \$500,000. We represented - when I say "we", I am thinking of my Party - that it would not cost anything less than \$2 million. If the High Commissioner in Canada is getting, as the Prime Minister said, \$9,000 Canadian, we have to accept that because he has the facts. If he does not have the facts, we can ferret them out in other directions. He could not prevent the Auditor General or somebody else from giving us the facts. I think he would be reckless to make an untrue statement.

I say, personally, that the time has come - although it is only one year - when we should have a High Commissioner for Barbados alone. If it cost us a little more, it would be much better. If you are getting investors from England and Europe - I understand that the High Commissioner represents us in Europe and so on. If we have to pay a little more in this respect, I would prefer to pay it.

I have absolutely nothing against Sir Lionel Luckhoo. As a matter of fact, I was one man who did not attend the Champagne party. I did not go, but I consider Sir Lionel Luckhoo to be a gentleman. I feel that Sir Lionel Luckhoo has his roots in Guyana just as Williams has his roots in Barbados. Mr. Chairman, Guyana has not suggested to us to use Mr. Williams whom we have sent to Canada. At least it has not been told to us.

10.20 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Sir John Carter does not go up to Ottawa. Mr. Williams is the man on the spot, and they are sending up the junior to Mr. Williams - I cannot remember whether his grade is First Secretary or Minister, Counsellor or what - to work in Mr. Williams' office, to handle the urgent matters. (Mr. MOTTLEY: We do not know this.) That was my understanding right from the beginning; I think I said that a long time ago in here, and there is a Report which we circulated today setting out the whole operations for the year 1967.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If you gave us the Estimates last week and you give us the Report on External Affairs today, how do you expect us to digest this?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: If you go through the Departments in Barbados, you will find that there is not a single one which has a Report more recent than 1965. The Ministry of External Affairs has produced a full Report of 42 pages, or something like that, of all its complicated operations in several parts of the world in ten weeks, and you say that you only read it today? When is the last Labour Report you had? (A MEMBER: 1965.)

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member must not draw a red herring across the trail. You are just trying

to do that. What I am saying is that this Report on the Ministry of External Affairs was given to us today, and nobody could digest this today in order to be able to talk on Head 22. You are dealing with Estimates and how could anybody digest 42 pages of the Ministry of External Affairs today? What I am saying is this: let us forget that you always represented that it would cost \$500,000; we represented that it would cost \$2 million and it is costing \$2 million. What I am arguing now is this. We have a High Commissioner in Canada, but we have it jointly with Guyana in England. Now for the first time I am hearing, because I have not been able to read this Report, that Guyana is saying that they will send up some officer to be in Mr. Williams' office. Now, tell us if they are going to pay something or if they are going to pay Mr. Williams jointly with us. We accept the Prime Minister's word that the cost is \$24,500. Our half, (Hon. E. W. BARROW: Our Contribution) well, our contribution then, is 40% (*Asides*). You have to accept what he says. I can know from the Auditor General's Office. He has not got all the friends up there. He cannot make a statement like that which was not true. What I am worried about is this. What I would like to see is that we have a High Commissioner - I am not prejudiced against Sir Lionel Luckhoo - but I would like to see a High Commissioner for Barbados alone, in England. (Hon. E. W. BARROW: It would cost us more money). If you are out to build up trade in Barbados, if you were a Barbadian and you were High Commissioner in London, would you be prepared when the time comes for building up trade and having discussions with businessmen to say, Guyana first? I do not think so. On the other hand, we have a High Commissioner in Canada, and I wanted to find out whether Guyana is sharing the responsibility with us in Canada; but it is a question of our ties with Canada and our looking forward to Canada for industrial development in Barbados. Is Guyana willing to share with us the responsibility of running a High Commission office in Canada? You have already set up an Ambassador in Washington. Guyana has already got an Ambassador in Washington, but they are separate and distinct. As to Canada, we have one, but are they willing to share the responsibility with us? That is what I am worried about in this matter.

As far as I am concerned, I would urge on the Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs that this step should be taken, and taken as soon as possible. I cannot see Mr. Williams, the High Commissioner in Canada, not wanting to press everything for Barbados in industrial development. If he had a meeting at one of the Hiltons to set up the question of development in Barbados, he would certainly have to press for Barbados first, and I feel that Sir Lionel Luckhoo would be honest enough to press for Guyana first. If it is going to cost us a little more money, what difference does it make? If you are spending \$2 million when you heard that it would have been \$500,000, let us put up a High Commission in England for Barbados alone. If you are there, you are there. That is how I feel about it. I accept the figures because I do not think that anybody could be reckless enough to misrepresent the position. This is only 40%. You do not pay this to him, but you pay it to the

Government of Guyana. That is what we understand it to be.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, the arrangement in Ottawa and the arrangement in Washington as set out on page 3 of the Report which has been handed to us today is a completely different type of arrangement from the one in England; therefore, it is clear that the Guyanese Government is not paying anything towards Barbados' High Commissioner in Canada, nor are we paying anything towards the upkeep of the Guyana High Commissioner in Washington. All you are doing is getting a little desk in the office, and your officer is primarily concerned with the particular Government in Canada, according to this Report. In Ottawa, the Government of Guyana, while not establishing a full High Commission, has arranged to post in the office of the Barbados High Commission, a senior diplomatic officer who will, from day to day, look after the interest of Guyana in that country. (*Asides*) They have not said that they are not paying anything. I want to get back now to the Prime Minister and this point about the foreign service allowances. Do not let us doubt at all in our minds; the Auditor General and the Accountant General must accept these Estimates and the notes. When you look at Appendix "O", this idea about paying in currency.... (*Asides*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for the City must be aware that the Reporter will not be able to write if he is hearing three or four voices at the same time.

Mr. St. JOHN: I was saying, Mr. Chairman, that when you look at the position in Appendix "O", and you read it in the context in which it is written, it says this: "Allowances will be paid in the currency of the country in which the Officers are posted. Persons recruited in the country of employment and paid at current rates in that country will not receive foreign service allowances." It says: "Overseas allowances, High Commissioner, 75% of basic salary." I can get 75% of my basic salary which is equivalent, let us say, to \$100.00. When you take \$100.00 you will see what that \$100.00 will buy in Canadian currency, and you get it in Canadian currency. This is what that says whether you mean it (Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not mean anything.) I do not mean you, Mr. Chairman, I am using "You" in a different type of term. I do not mean you; you do not mean anything, Sir. (Laughter) Whether the author of this document means to explain that the 75% of the salary - if it comes to \$100.00, that you must get it in \$100.00 Canadian is a different matter. According to my understanding and interpretation of that, (*Asides*) it is not for the Prime Minister to interpret that; it is for the Auditor General and the Accountant General to do that.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. It is not a question of my interpreting anything. I am stating what the position is and I volunteered that information in case hon. members were in doubt about it, that we are able to build up a case about how much less we were paying Barbadian nationals and I pointed out that quite apart from the 75%, that this is paid

in the currency of the country as set out at the top of the document.

Mr. St. JOHN: The position is that the Prime Minister also read the document and said that the external affairs would cost us \$600,000 and it is now costing us \$2 million.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. I have the document to which the hon. member refers here and he has made a direct statement which I want to correct.
10.30 p.m.

I am going to quote from paragraph 110 on page 48 of the White Paper on the Federal Negotiations of 1962-1965 and Constitutional Proposals for Barbados where it was laid before the Legislature by order of the Cabinet in August, 1965.

Paragraph 110 states:-

"Some people contend that the 'trappings' of Independence are so costly that very few countries can really afford them. While this may be true, it may be emphasised that many independent countries so successfully honour their international obligations without these costly 'trappings'. For example, several independent countries, some of them Commonwealth countries, have external affairs agreements with each other, designed to share the cost of diplomatic and consular representation in foreign countries. This is a well tried practice in international relations and Barbados will follow it with a lively hope of success. In any case the protection and furtherance of Barbadian interests will not demand representation in more than half a dozen centres in the foreseeable future."

Now this is the important part. Paragraph 111 says:-

"Dr. Carleen O'Loughlin in her 'Suggestions for a fiscal structure for the proposed Eastern Caribbean Federation' estimated the net cost of the federation to Barbados at \$1,521,000 (one million five hundred and twenty one thousand dollars)."

Paragraph 112 states:-

"The cost of overseas commissions for the proposed federation was \$500,000."

Paragraph 113 states:-

"Assuming overseas representation for Barbados alone to be on the same scale as for an independent federation, the cost of federation to Barbados would be \$1,021,000 more than the cost of an independent Barbados."

That is with a subtraction of the sum of \$1,021,000 from \$1,521,000, it gives you \$500,000.

Now, I want to go further. When people state that I said that it would cost \$500,000 I was quoting from

the expert. She and Miss Ursula Hicks put it at \$500,000, but an Act of Parliament's Regulation persuaded her to amend it to \$600,000.

Now, the cost of External Affairs paid here of \$2 million includes not only the cost of the Commissions, but certain items which we pay directly to International Organizations which amounts to \$700,000. They are:-

The United Nations Development Fund,

The Economic Commission for Latin America,

The Economic Supply Fund, (these are the things which we have been paying for even before we became independent. We were subscribing to these organizations even when we were a Colonial department.)

The Home Meteorological Organization,

The International Labour Organization,

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trades,

The International Review,

The International Sugar Bureau,

The Food and Agricultural Organization,

The Commonwealth Agricultural Bureau,

The Pan American Health Organization,

U. M. I. C. A.,

The United Postal Union,

The International Telecommunications Union,

The Commonwealth Parliamentary Association,

The Commonwealth Secreteriat,

The Commonwealth Foundation,

The United Nations Organizations and the O. A. S.,
- \$110,000.

In addition to all of these, there are other items that we were paying for even way back in 1960. All of them come under this vote approximating to \$170,000.

In addition to that we contribute to Regional Organisations such as:-

The Regional Shipping Service,

U. N. T. A. B.

The Seismographic Research limit,

The Oils and Fats Agreement,

The Regional Development Agency.

We come to other Regional Organizations such as the Regional Secretariat. These are things which we in Barbados have put under the External Affairs vote.

10.40 p.m.

Mr. St. JOHN: That is not a point of order, and I am not going to give way. Let us go ahead and make my point. It is not under that Head that Luckhoo can draw this money; it is under Item 22 that he is going to draw the money, and it says "Foreign Service Allowances - Provision included for the payment of foreign service allowances to officers on the permanent establishment serving in overseas missions." Let us come back to this now. If that is true, I want to know whether His Excellency Mr. Hilton Vaughan draws an overseas allowance. I am not going to give way; the hon. member can reply when I am finished. Is he on the permanent establishment? What permanent establishment! These notes are drawn in such a way as to conceal the true facts from us. (Hon. E. W. BARROW: You are blaming the notes for your malice.) I am not blaming the notes for my malice; I am blaming the manner in which you present it because you want to come in here and have an out, but these are facts. The only way I would believe your word is if I see it myself, and unless I see it I am not accepting your word on this, not in these Estimates, because as the hon. senior member for St. Thomas will point out when he comes to speak, you cannot reconcile the arithmetic of \$60,000 for foreign service allowances if Sir Lionel Luckhoo does not draw with the statement and the notes.

When the hon. member is finished with that, there are other items which we have to question. There is another Item for \$400,000. Try and get the explanation for that before we get to it.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Now Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister has got up and said a lot of things about \$9,000 Canadian. It may or may not be true. Because he said so-and-so, we must take it, but he does not convince us. After he said so, the Hon. Leader of the House got up and went - I cannot say who is in the House, but if I could, I would say he got up and went to the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of External Relations and asked him if what the Prime Minister had just said was true. Get up and deny it and let us prove what you are.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I deny it.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Well, he denies it. I am sorry I provoked him into denying it, but I was looking at him when he spoke. Mr. Chairman, first of all, let us look at these Estimates and the way they are prepared. There is no item on statutory expenditure against any High Commissioner. All the High Commissioners' salaries are specially voted; therefore no High Commissioner is a part of the permanent establishment within the meaning of that phrase as used in these Estimates. Let us go forward piece by piece. The permanent establishment are the persons

for whom there is statutory expenditure. Everyone of their salaries is voted; therefore these notes and all this talk about permanent establishment can have, in my view, no application to High Commissioners.

If Mr. Williams in Canada gets a foreign service allowance of \$9,000 Canadian, although we have to vote his expenditure tonight, it is not paid by law, and there is no reason why Luckhoo and Vaughan are not going to get it too. Is the Prime Minister saying that Mr. Vaughan is expected to maintain himself at a salary of \$1,000 a month and not a penny more?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not know what the hon. member understands. The Ambassador in the United States of America is part of our set-up. The High Commissioner in London is on the Guyanese pay-roll and we pay a contribution towards his expenditure, as the explanatory note to Item 13 says. How many times have I got to say that? Hon. members are so disconcerted now, having come in here primed with all this propaganda, that they are trying to turn it upside down.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Now let us look carefully at the arithmetic of the vote for the High Commissioner in London. First of all, the Deputy High Commissioner. The Prime Minister is going to have to tell me whether he gets his \$8,280, because that is three-quarters of his basic salary. I beg your pardon; I have that wrong. It is 50 per cent. Now the Prime Minister, first of all, is going to have to tell me whether where he gets 50 per cent of the basic salary payable in the currency of the country concerned, Mr. King in fact gets L5,220 overseas allowance, because the logic that would allow Mr. Williams to get \$9,000 Canadian overseas allowance must irremediably lead to Mr. King getting L5,220, because if half is to be paid in the currency of the country concerned, if you have a figure of \$9,000 for Mr. Williams and it is in Canadian dollars, the figure of 5,220 for Mr. J. C. King must be in pounds. Can't the Prime Minister understand logic? If he would watch "Star Trek" on Saturday nights and see Mr. Spock, he would at least learn the meaning of the word. He has told us that three-quarters of Mr. Williams's salary is \$9,000 and since he is in Canada, it is paid in Canadian dollars. Half of Mr. King's salary is \$5,220, and since he is in England it must be paid in pounds too.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: It is not 5,220 bolivars; it is \$5,220 and by the Eastern Caribbean Act our dollar is directly linked at 4s. 2d. to the dollar; so what is the problem there? This is by law. You have made a mistake; pass on to the next thing or a new point, but certainly do not go developing foolish points.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister still cannot understand. He must not be misled by the fact that the unit of currency in Canada has the same name as the unit of currency in Barbados. They are both called "dollar". He must not be misled by that fact. Suppose you were in Hong Kong where it is \$3 to the pound, do you mean to say you are only going to pay a man one-third of his overseas allowance? Can't the Prime Minister under-

stand that what he has done in the case of Mr. Williams is to assure us that this 75 per cent which comes to \$9,000 is paid in Canadian dollars, but he cannot see that by that logic it is clear that the 5,220 must be paid in pounds?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Let me ask the hon. member this since he says I do not understand. Why is it not paid in shillings and pence? If you say it must be in pounds, I have heard of shillings and pence; you should say it should be in pence too. This is ridiculous because I am stating as a fact what the position is, not what he thinks it should be. As far as the United Kingdom is concerned the officer receives \$11,040 and then his 50 per cent which is \$5,220, and then his house allowance is \$4,800. How could they be pounds? These are the facts. We are only concerned with facts here, not about foolish arguments. They think that the House of Assembly is a place to come in and argue nonsense or to show you are clever or a smart alec.

10.50 p.m.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the Ministry, obviously, does not realise that it has been mislead, if it really pays Mr. Williams \$9,000 (Canadian) and pays Mr. King \$5,520 (BWI). It has been mislead by the fact that the unit of currency has the same name in Barbados as in Canada. That is exactly what has happened, if what the Prime Minister says is accurate. You cannot translate the \$5,520 arbitrarily into pounds unless you are going to translate the \$9,000 into Canadian dollars, too. It cannot be done. The Prime Minister sees it as a clever or tricky argument. In fact, I would be glad to hear that Mr. Williams is getting the \$9,000 (Canadian). But what does the explanatory note to Appendix "O" mean? It means that it should be \$9,000 translated into the currency of the country concerned. If, in fact, Mr. Williams is getting \$9,000 (Canadian), then Mr. King should be getting L5,000 (English). Mr. Williams is not getting 9,000¢ (Canadian) to pursue the Prime Minister's foolishness there. The currency of Canada is a dollar, and the currency of England is a pound. The subdivision of the currency is a subdivision and not the main currency. The Leader of the House would not understand these things, and he need not worry with them. That is point No. 1.

I hope that the Press to whom the Prime Minister has appealed - I see some of his acolytes in here making sure that they keep their finger on the misrepresentations for which they are famous. I would appeal to the Press, too, to follow this point, if they are capable of so doing. The Prime Minister has said that Sir Lionel Luckhoo's salary does not include an Overseas Allowance. The \$46,000 mentioned in Item No.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I did not say that Sir Lionel Luckhoo's salary did not include an Overseas Allowance. This is the responsibility of Guyana, and I believe Guyana pays Sir Lionel Luckhoo an Overseas Allowance. I am saying that our contribution to his total emoluments is \$24,500. I, at no time, stated that his sa-

lary does not include an Overseas Allowance. They were trying to say that we have to pay 75% on the basic salary, which they deem to be a salary of \$24,500. What I was saying is that we are not paying either his salary or an allowance; we pay a contribution for the items which I have listed and which I do not want to go over again. Do not accuse me of saying that he does not get an Overseas Allowance. If he does get it, I do not care. Everything is included in that \$24,500, and that is all we are concerned with.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, just let the Opposition say what we are concerned with. We are not concerned with the money that actually goes into Sir Lionel Luckhoo's pockets; we are concerned with the money we are voting. Now let the Prime Minister understand that. The Prime Minister says that the \$24,000 is complete. Let us turn to Item 21 - Non-Established Staff. There are to be 10 officers: 1 Field Officer; 1 Secretary; 3 Clerical Officers; 3 Stenographers; 1 Receptionist; 1 Messenger. Ten Non-Established Staff drawing a total salary of \$46,000. Now none of that salary is subject to Overseas Allowance. Let us get it quite clear, because these are people recruited in the country of employment and paid at current rates in that country and, therefore, excluded from Appendix "O". Therefore the only salaries for which an Overseas Allowance need to be provided are the salaries in the Statutory Expenditure column, and the salaries in the Statutory Expenditure column total \$65,378.

Now all the officers who draw salaries in the Statutory Expenditure column are entitled to an Overseas Allowance of 50%; so 50% of the Statutory Expenditure is \$32,689. Can the Prime Minister say why when we had to vote \$60,000 under this Head, if Sir Lionel Luckhoo is not included, why do we have to vote \$60,000 when by law only \$42,000 is to be paid out?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, it is very easy. Do you see how malicious the hon. member is? He will not ask for information; if he is capable of a normal conversation or debate; and he must always have something specious in mind. He says that we are concealing this. If he looks at Item 22 - Foreign Service Allowances - and the explanatory note, he will see:

"Foreign Service Allowances -

Provision included for the payment of foreign service allowances to officers on the permanent establishment serving in overseas missions - \$32,689 for Overseas Allowances to -

Deputy High Commissioner	...	\$4,800
Senior Assistant Secretary	...	\$3,600
Assistant Secretary		
(recruited overseas.)	...	\$3,000

If these had been recruited in Barbados, then they would have to be paid a house allowance.

"Senior Executive Officer	...	\$2,400
Administrative Assistant	...	\$2,400
Accountant	...	\$2,400
Executive Officer	...	\$1,800
Another Executive Officer	...	\$2,400

Another Executive Officer

(making 3 Executive Officers). \$1,800

A fourth Executive Officer \$2,400

which makes a total of \$27,000. Add that to \$32,689 and you will get \$59,689. We have decided to add the other \$300 to it and round it off and call it \$60,000. The most that Sir Lionel Luckhoo could get out of the vote is \$300.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Prime Minister would also explain to us, where that is concerned, where Item 59 comes in, but I am going to leave that to other points. Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister said, and I think he meant me, something about not being able to carry on an ordinary conversation. Let it be quite clear; I said: Will the Prime Minister explain why he wants this money? I sat down to let him explain it. I asked a straightforward question. Anyhow, Mr. Chairman, at the end of all this the Prime Minister has shown that instead of Sir Lionel Luckhoo getting \$80,000 a year - Barbados' \$42,000 plus Guyana's \$42,000 - he gets \$60,000 a year. That is what he has said. He said that the \$25,000 is 40% of Sir Lionel Luckhoo's overall salary. All right, \$60,000 a year is what Sir Lionel Luckhoo gets.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, it is not 60%, it is 40% of the cost of the High Commissioner to the Governments, and the total cost including his house, including his chauffeur allowance, entertainment allowance and so on. I made that quite clear. Now he is saying that it is \$42,000 plus \$42,000, which is 50% and 50%, and then he says that our \$24,000 is 60% of the salary. It is not 60% of his salary; it is 40% of the cost of having a High Commissioner as a High Commissioner as distinct from the other offices. In other words, it will cost us \$23,000 for Mr. King. The cost is \$24,000 for Sir Lionel Luckhoo. (ASIDES).

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Well, it will cost \$24,000 plus whatever happens at 58 Donnington Road. 11.00 p.m.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are also one or two little things, something about Mr. King having to pay \$300.00 for rent at Donnington Road. There is some little item there (Asides) Mr. King has to pay \$674.00 for renting a house at 58 Donnington Road (Hon. E. W. BARROW: \$644.00) and that is all expenditure. What is the relationship to the \$644.00 a year which Mr. King has to pay for No. 58 Donnington Road?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: If there is a house provided for an officer, he pays a percentage of his salary. Can the hon. member tell me the item to which he is referring?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am asking the hon. member to assist us with a relationship to the joint expenses of all these offices in the London High Commission.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I thank you, what page?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Page XIV-Roman 14. This is really relating to Item 70 which is the main-

tenance of official house at 58 Donnington Road. You will find that Donnington Road is mentioned both in the Estimates of Revenue and in the Estimates of Expenditure.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. King is not the first Secretary; he is Deputy High Commissioner. The first Secretary is Mr. Brewster. What happens in Mr. Brewster's case is this. You will remember that I read out a list just now of the various officers. If you check back on your little scribble that you made, you will find that I did not mention the First Secretary in that list. I said: "Deputy High Commissioner," and I went straight to Senior Assistant Secretary, Assistant Secretary, Senior Executive Officer, Administrative Assistant, Accountant - four Executive Officers, one Accountant, an Administrative Assistant, Senior Executive Officer, Assistant Secretary, Senior Assistant Secretary and the Deputy High Commissioner, and if you add up those, you will find that they come to the \$27,000.00 that you asked me to account for. Mr. Brewster is the First Secretary to the Commission. The last Government bought a house for him at Donnington Road - the Welfare Officer for Migrants - which he occupied. Therefore Mr. Brewster pays the Government a certain percentage of his salary, but he does not get a house allowance because we provide him with a house. We came and found him living in this house; so we asked him to pay the same kind of rent that the Civil Servants pay at the Garrison or wherever they are provided with quarters; so he does not get any house allowance. In other words, he can vacate that house and then he would be entitled to \$3,600.00 as house allowance; but he has a house and he pays rent for this house.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, after all of these explanations and the confusion about Mr. Williams and his \$9,000.00, and so on, we still find that the expenses of Sir Lionel Luckhoo amount to some \$60,000.00 in all. The Prime Minister has succeeded in reducing him to \$60,000.00. We thought that it was \$80,000.00 and they have come down to \$60,000.00. I was talking on the basis of \$42,000.00 (Laughter). Mr. Chairman, I heard the voice of the Minister of Agriculture ringing out, "We understand that or some such words". It is \$60,000.00 to Sir Lionel Luckhoo, but is he worth it?

There is another matter on the policy of the Department as a whole to which I wish to advert.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: As to the policy of the Department, I have circulated a full Report of its workings and I am prepared to set aside a day, whenever hon. members indicate to the Hon. Leader of the House, to discuss Foreign Policy; so I think it is better to wait until you have read the Report because you will not fall into the same errors and traps that you find yourself in tonight. (Asides)

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I take it that the Prime Minister is suggesting that we postpone the consideration of this Head, and it will be delayed because without even making a reduction, we can discuss the policy.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If the hon. member will give way, I would just like to explain this. The Ministry of External Affairs was established on 1st April 1967, this financial year, and its administrative year would therefore end on 31st March this year. We could have kept this Report until after this period and brought it in then, but we thought that it would be interesting to hon. members to be able to follow, if they could within the space of two or three hours, the development and the ramifications of the Ministry. But, as the Prime Minister has said, we are quite willing, now that a year of the Ministry's work is passing, to have a debate on External Affairs. We could not have one before. Another point which I would like to make, because this is very vital, is this. Hon. members still talk as if we put some trick on them last year on this occasion. It was no trick; it was just that you were not here. (*Asides*) One last point which I would like to make; it was not even possible last year for hon. members even to make the contribution which we have made now, because the Estimates are set out in breakdown form, and last year the matter was under one Head because we did not develop in administration, and therefore we could not give the information which is given here now.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, although the Prime Minister does not want to discuss the policy certainly there are a lot of things in the Report to which I would not advert this evening, because we have come here to talk about particular things and we are not necessarily going to follow the form and the general Report for which we must, no doubt, congratulate the Permanent Secretary for so quickly and readily getting it out to the House. I would be glad if the other Departments could get out their Reports for the Auditor General far less their Reports for the House; but there are one or two aspects of policy which, I am advised may be dealt with generally even although we have moved a reduction in the vote. There is a Question on the Order Paper asking what the policy of Barbados is in connection with its alignment in relation to the countries of what are known as the East and what are known as the West. And, Mr. Chairman, of course, we also have a statement by the Prime Minister which has been ingeniously reconciled by the actual acts of the Government in connection with the position of Communist China at the United Nations.

11.10 p.m.

I certainly admire the admirable reconciliation between the fact that Barbados in common parlance voted against the admission of Communist China to the United Nations and the Prime Minister in common parlance said that he was in favour of Communist China's admission; but I am going to say, Sir, at this stage, even in advance of the debate, it makes no sense to try to ride both horses and get the best of both ways on a point like this. When the United Nations, Great Britain, France, Jamaica all voted in favour of seating Communist China and Barbados voted against this action -

(*ASIDES*)

Mr. Chairman, can I be free from heckling?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I can hardly hear the hon. member because of noises to the left.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Barbados voted, as people understand it, not to seat Communist China in the United Nations and the Prime Minister says that he is in favour of it. He need not explain himself because I am fully aware of the Prime Minister's explanation. He does not need to get up to put it any further at this stage. That explanation has been appearing in the "Times" magazine for years, and those of us who can read, read it at the same time as the Prime Minister. What I am suggesting is that it does not make sense.

There is no proposal before the United Nations to seat Communist China before the Republic of China. Barbados in fact, it appears to me, jumped with both feet into an anti-Communist pool, and now the Prime Minister finds that the water is colder in that pool than he thought at first. He recognised the Republic of China. I do not know if the Prime Minister has accepted an invitation to Formosa. I would refer him to the "Time" magazine which showered contempt on the French African nations whose votes were bought - and I am using the expression of "Time" magazine - by the goodwill tours to Formosa.

I would advise the Prime Minister not to put himself in the position of inviting the contempt of journalists or, in fact, not only journalists but all free states and super states of the United Nations. He realises that since the two Chinas cannot in fact agree on the compromise which the Prime Minister says that he supports - it is a compromise which has been put forward by certain people and supported by others - nowhere would you find support from either of the two countries' friends that they both want the United Nations.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I have said that.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am glad to hear the Prime Minister admit that he said it. What he is in fact admitting to is supporting an impossible compromise because he has put Barbados into an impossible situation. When the twelve million people of Formosa want to be recognised as a nation of Formosa they might be recognised, but that is not what they are asking for. They are asking to be recognised as the Government of China.

The Prime Minister is disagreeing with both sides. He has contrived to disagree with both sides. Mr. Chairman, I have never before seen a man who has shown his hands up in that light. He has taken up a position that nobody likes to take up. There are two sides to a dispute and he happens to disagree with both. Well, I remember a statement of a British politician which I have now to adapt to the Prime Minister. "If he sits on this particular fence too long, the iron would enter his sole." I think he is really choosing one of the most illogical international positions that it is possible to choose. I admire him for one thing to

get out into the particular foreign policy that he finds himself in: but, Mr. Chairman, it is a sad commentary that the principal supporter for it is the junior member for St. Thomas. This is the best commentary for it. I am attacking it, but the junior member for St. Thomas is supporting it. Sensible people can take their attitude.

The question that the amount voted under Head 22 be reduced by one dollar was put and resolved in the negative, the committee dividing as follows:

AYES: Mr. St. JOHN, Mr. HINDS, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, and Mr. SMITH - 5.

NOES: Hon. J. C. TUDOR, Hon. E. W. BARROW, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Hon. N. W. BOXILL, Mr. LOWE, Mr. CORBIN, Mr. SPRINGER, Mr. WEEKES and Mr. MOTTLEY - 11.

The question that the sum of \$2,404,680 under Head 22 - Ministry of External Affairs - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 23 - MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

Head 23 - Ministry of Home Affairs - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$209,504 be appropriated under Head 23.

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

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, under this Head, Item 30, Life Guards Services, the note states:-

"Contributions of 50% of the annual cost of operating two fulltime guard stations at Rockley and Greaves End Beaches. Formerly Head 27; item 68."

Mr. Chairman, for some time, I have been one of the persons very much concerned about this whole system of Life Guards. I think we can safely pay some compliment to Mr. Best for training these young men as Life Guards. I would also like to say how grateful I am on behalf of the Party for the assistance given by the Jaycees for doing whatever is in their power to help in this direction.

I firmly feel, Mr. Chairman, that the sum of \$2,956 is really not enough. Sometime ago the Minister under whose portfolio this falls gave me the assurance to a question asked, that in the not distant future he will make sure that the Life Guards are increased. What are we doing here? They are asking us to vote \$2,956 for the Life Guards.
11.20 p.m.

Now they have not said here whether or not they are going to increase the Life Guards for Barbados. All they say here is the annual cost of operating two full-time guard stations at Rockley and Greaves End Beaches; but you have beaches, Mr. Chairman, like Dover where the Hon. Prime Minister gets his swim on mornings and his masseur "Coloured", has him

exercising up and down the beach. Some mornings I go there when I want to swim myself and I have to turn back because of what I see Coloured having him do - deep knee bends and sit-ups, - getting off his tummy. At that time of the morning there is no Life Guard there. (AN ASIDE:) Man you don't understand what is happening!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do understand what is going on.

Mr. CRAIG: I was not addressing you, Sir. I said "man". I would never treat you with that discourtesy in spite of your suspending me, not knowing what it was about. I pay the Chair its full due. I will get around to you some day.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to see the Government increase the services of the Life Guards not only at Rockley and Greaves End to which they are apparently devoting all their time, but to many of the other beaches which you have in Barbados. To bear out the point about these beaches requiring a Life Guard or two, only a few months ago a young boy saw a tourist in difficulty at Maxwell Beach and his friend was trying to help this tourist. His friend got into difficulty and the boy who went out last got drowned, the boy who went to save the tourist was drowned, and the tourist was eventually saved by another person. I feel you should have a full Life Guard service operating in this country, or wherever possible the hotels should follow the example of the Hilton which, I think, employs its own Life Guards. Some of the hotels on the West Coast employ Life Guards to protect the lives not only of the tourists, but also of many Barbadians. It is strange to know that most Barbadians cannot swim and that is why they get into difficulty.

It is high time with the boon in the tourist industry that Government pay some attention to the Life Guard service of Barbados, which is undoubtedly an essential. I am not satisfied that the amount of \$2,956 just to keep the two stations at Greaves End and Rockley beaches is worthy of support. I would rather see Government have a bigger vote through which they could increase the Life Guards. As a matter of fact, they are very much underpaid. Some of them only get \$22 a week, and that is the job of a specialist. I do not know if "Coloured" can save anybody. I know Waite can massage, inspite of Government giving him the boot by refusing him a work permit and asking him to get out.

I am hoping that the Prime Minister will at least give me a little information on this, because I am a pretty strong swimmer myself, and I would not like to be out there trying to save somebody and see no Life Guard around. It may even be the Prime Minister or the Minister of Communications and Works, although it would be a laugh to see me trying to save the Minister of Communications and Works with that belly. I hope the Hon. Minister under whose portfolio this falls will throw a little light on this. I am hoping the Government will bring down a bigger vote so as to employ more Life Guards, and not merely this \$2,956 for the purpose of employing Life Guards or keeping

the two stations, one at Rockley and one at Greaves. End going. There are many other beaches that need Life Guards and equipment. The Jaycees apparently are doing their part, and the Government should play as important a role in this particular field as the Jaycees themselves. Knowing the Minister as I do, I am quite sure he will throw a little light on this.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, under Item 29 - Registration of Electors, it is really time that we get some proper electoral lists which are lawfully in use. As I understand it - and I hope the Prime Minister if he knows will correct me - a by-Election to be held tomorrow would have to be held on the 1965 list because the validation of the electoral register for the 1966 election related only to a period which has expired. They are making electoral lists over in Bank Hall, but they do not seem to apply to anything, because they are not lists that would be used unless there was special statutory validation. We have two contradictory Acts now or two sets of contradictory sets of circumstances which would apply at a general election even, if not at a by-Election. Namely, you have the Representation of the People Act which says the Island shall be divided into twelve constituencies, and you have the Boundaries Commission Act now repealed, but the effect of which, following the Boundaries Commission Order which is in force, is to divide the Island into twenty-four constituencies.

It appears from the activities of certain hon. members who are seen regularly at Church at St. Silas in the part of St. James which would be attached to St. Andrew that it is not the intention of Government at the present time to make any further alteration in constituency boundaries although we can only guess at this, but it really is time that the position is straightened. The Representation of the People Act must be amended. I do not think by any means that the only amendment should be to alter the number of constituencies and so on, because when you consider, for example, that election expenses were calculated in 1957 on a basis not only of 1957 values, but also on the basis implicitly, if not expressed in the legislation, that in most constituencies two people would be sharing expenses, you will see that this may be another ground for revision. Also, I believe that the Act provides in different places that a man may be agent for more than one candidate. I do not think that provision is one which would lend itself to the system of single member constituencies. There are all these matters to be thought of in connection with the Representation of the People Act.

We are voting this money for registration of electors and preparation of identification cards. I think the Identification cards are a waste of money, anyhow. We got on very well at the elections without them and you had a record turn-out, 90 per cent in St. Joseph and St. Thomas and so on, a marvellous turn out in St. Lucy and St. John - the biggest turn-out ever. In fact, I was told by one person that the only people who did not vote in St. Joseph would have been a few people who were against it on religious grounds, and a few people who were either drunk all day on the former senior member for St. Joseph perhaps having

over-stepped the mark in his enthusiasm, or who were too sick to come out of their homes, because when 92 per cent or 93 per cent of the people vote without compulsory voting as they have in Russia and Australia, you know that no more could vote that day.
11.30 p.m.

I have heard no complaints of authenticated fraud. I have heard complaints of a gang who went around in the City on behalf of one of the losing candidates and tried to case the votes of the people who had not yet voted; but there were so few people who had not yet voted at the time that they were carrying on the operation that they were frustrated. With all of that, I am really against the identity cards. I do not see the necessity for them.

The Government has got itself into a deep, miserable morass; unsuccessful lawsuits - not that this Government has had any successful lawsuits. There is nothing unusual in the D.L.P. Government and the Law Officers carrying on unsuccessful lawsuits. They have got involved in unsuccessful lawsuits in a large expenditure for no result, when the machines were rented not so long ago and all to no avail. If now we tried to take photographs and issue Identity Cards, the majority of the people would have lost their original photographic requisition. I could not tell you where I could put my hands on mine now - the little document that you are supposed to carry to the Photographic Centre to have your picture taken. I would not know where to find mine, at this stage. All of that was a waste of money.

The fast-selling, fast-talking salesmen came down with their machines, and we got beguiled by the very fact that they can take 3,000 pictures an hour - or whatever they can take. If the machines are so marvellous, let them take 3,000 of our pictures in an hour. We were getting on very well without that. We have wasted a tremendous amount of money, Mr. Chairman, and I really think it is time to put an end to this business. Equally, the Registrar of Elections, Mr. Matthews, is there preparing electoral registers, for what? There are one or two officers there checking the deaths in St. Thomas and so on, seeing who should be taken off the register and who should go on, because some people have reached from 17 to 18 now. For what is that list going to be used? I do not know if a list was actually prepared in 1967. For what is it going to be used? Any list that is now being prepared has no legal validity; so this \$48,000 really is to keep the structure of the office in being. It is not a vote that I can think of for any other purpose.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to congratulate the Government on Item 32 - Purchase of 3,000 maps of Barbados. The ordinance survey maps that have been in circulation show a wrong boundary between St. Thomas and St. James. I discovered this by looking at a map and also by observing that, apparently, one of the Registration Officers did not know the boundary and placed a number of persons upon whom I had some reliance, I may say, during the election campaign, into St. James. I very sincerely hope that they will be moved back into St. Thomas in time for

the next election. I just mentioned that the whole boundary was wrongly shown on the original ordinance survey maps between St. Thomas and St. James. They even put a part of Arch Hall in St. James, as you will see if you look at the map.

As the hon. junior member for St. Thomas well knows, Arch Hall is a good 400 yards from the nearest point of the St. James boundary. I hope that that would be corrected, and I do know that many tourists come to Barbados and they want that sort of map, because it is the type of map which people use when they drive around Barbados rather than the maps that just show the main roads and which are at the moment, apparently, the only maps of Barbados which are available. I certainly welcome that particular item.

Mr. Chairman, on the policy of the Ministry of Home Affairs, I want to say something and I want to be brief. Many of us feel that the insistence on clamping down on all the foreigners is being carried, in many cases, a bit too far. I have heard others say and I know, Mr. Chairman, that this is the majority view, but I am prepared in this case to be in the minority. I know that some hon. members on this side and on that side have pointed out that Barbadians go aboard and are glad to go abroad and catch a job where we can. I have lived 12 years abroad trying to work. There are others, I dare say, in the House who are in that position.

We are being, I think, too stern, Mr. Chairman. I feel that the Ministry is being too stern with some of these cases. Also the new severity lends itself to a lot of pettiness on the part of - I am not blaming the Minister or the Permanent Secretary for this - Immigration Officers and Police. They can threaten persons who happen not to be born in Barbados and with whom they are temporarily in disagreement. I know of a case, Mr. Chairman, where a young lady, a St. Lucian, who has only been here about three or four years, but her mother has been here for many years. She had a disagreement with the people in her district; she appeared in court; she was triumphantly acquitted, I may say, and the Police the very next day after her acquittal went and asked her for travel document. She was then entering a beauty contest and, naturally, this whole matter had her very upset, because they were telling her that she was not a Barbadian and could not be "Miss So-and-So".

Now, this I take to be pettiness on the part of the Police. We get this sort of thing in all societies, and it is not something that you can legislate against; but if a firmer and more humane policy was seen emanating from the top, the people at the bottom would not, I think, attempt these small pinpricks and irritating aspects of human behaviour.

Many St. Lucians, and other small Islanders have come here to work, and they come here prepared to do things which a lot of Barbadians are not prepared to do. Cane cutting is one example. It is true that it is migrant labour, but they come here because Barbadians do not want to cut canes any more. We are quite happy to welcome the St. Lucians to come here

and cut canes, because we can see that they are doing something for us, but there are a lot of other jobs around the City that St. Lucians come here and do.

Look at the St. Lucian artisans. In my experience they are filling a place caused by the emigration of artisans to the United Kingdom in years past. You can see St. Lucian carpenters - they may not do a job as well as Barbadians, but there is a shortage of carpenters, plumbers and many skilled trades in Barbados at the present time. All of these little occupations are being filled; Barbadians are not here to fill them, but it is not like a job where the employer can say that there is no Barbadian qualified to do it. This is a question of people trying to catch a living in Barbados. I do not see in many of the cases where they complain of persecution that persecution is warranted. There is a lot more persecution than the actual figures reveal, because very few people are deported. Many, many people get notices from the Police that they have to leave the Island on a certain day; they do not leave, and the Police do not put them out. Apparently, it is policy that they get the notices, but it is not policy when the people make a lot of fuss and say that they have been in Barbados for a long time; they have applied for registration; they have been married to a Barbadian, and then beg. All that happens in Barbados is that a lot of notices are sent out to people; a lot of people are given unnecessary heartache and heartburn, and in the end they are not sent away.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that we should remember that this Report states that there are 54,000 Barbadians in the United Kingdom alone, not to speak of Barbadians in other parts of the world. It is the experience of all of us around here that every Barbadian family has its representative overseas. I have had an Uncle in Brazil; two uncles in the United States; an uncle in Martinique; twenty-five or thirty cousins in the United States; in Britain, and so on, and so has the Prime Minister.

The Prime Minister is testimony to Barbadians travelling propensities. If we want to be accepted, how can we be so inhospitable? I cannot see that the unemployment situation in Barbados is being made worst by the existence of these St. Lucians now. Of course, Mr. Chairman, it is commonplace that it is a great deal easier for ladies who want to be receptionists at the West Coast Hotels to get permission to stay in Barbados, and at the South Coast Hotels even more, than for St. Lucians who want to stay and catch a job in Barbados where one can be caught. It is a great deal easier, and the hoteliers' words are accepted, as a matter of course, that no Barbadians are available to fill this, that, or the other vacancy. I would ask, Mr. Chairman, that the Ministry, as a matter of policy, should seriously consider easing the lot of the St. Lucians and that type of immigrant of whom we have a not unreasonable number in Barbados.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, following the remarks made by the senior member for St. Thomas, I myself find this work permit policy, as it is called, a bit confusing, because I know of an instance here

where permission was granted to a bookmaker to come into Barbados to set up another bookmaker's shop. I cannot understand this at all.

11.40 p.m.

If ever there was a sucker to whom you are giving permission to come into the country, he is a bookmaker. The capital which he is bringing in is small and insignificant, and what he is really doing is to come in and suck the cream off some of the money in circulation and to repatriate the profits. I cannot see how in any circumstances one could recruit such a person as a desirable emigrant. I feel that the time has come when the Government should have a certain criterion in their minds, crystallise it in the form of regulations. You can have it advertised so that the Government's policy as to whom they will permit residence is clearly set out. Obviously, like in the United States of America, in the Immigration Regulations, and the other places, the criterion would be that people should not be allowed in here who are going to displace Barbadians of jobs where we have people available. In addition to that, you must allow people who have skills where we are in short supply. In addition to that, you must allow people who are dependants on other people who have been here and who are citizens; but the basic points which we want established is that we want settled principle and we do not want them around here.... I am going to talk frankly about this issue. When people come to me now with a work permit, I look at them straight in the face and say: "You come to me as your lawyer," and I say openly: "I am giving you the best advice I can give you; don't hire me, go and hire certain lawyers. You have got a better chance there." Now statistics will prove that the percentage of applications put in by one set of lawyers have a better chance, and if you have a client you can charge him nothing for that good advice. I say to them, "Do not hire me, I do not do that class of work." I cannot understand how the Minister's mind or the respective authorities work on this. This could not be right. You can take up the United States immigration laws or the Canadian immigration laws and anybody who has had experience in trying to get constituents in the United States of America will know that there are definite categories set out, and when you put in your application, you know the circumstances. Why do we not get something like that? Any kind of criteria is used by any country and you cannot understand how a bookmaker is going to be allowed to come from any country to set up a bookmaker's shop in this country. I cannot see it and I would like to know what contribution to the economic development of this country this person is going to make.

The other point is this. The position with these people who come down here off ships and so on; if we look at our tourist industry, we have to be very careful. The capital in 80% or 90% of the cases is owned by people abroad, and it is natural that they will try and squeeze in their own people when they are down here and they are so-called stranded. We must have a clear and definite policy on this, and the sooner we get it and have it published so that people will know and understand, the better our situation in this respect will be.

Now, this is the Ministry which deals with beaches. I saw something about Life Guards and beaches here. I sometimes hear the talk about the need for a Beach Control Authority for this country; but if the Minister really studies this - and I ask him to study it very carefully - we have a number of Statutory Boards in this country, and all of them do not operate satisfactorily. You have an experience with the Barbados Marketing Corporation. If you go ahead proliferating these Statutory Boards to administer things where were hitherto administered by the Councils, you will find that you will exhaust the drains of the resources of your political Parties, and you will get the lowest type in your political Parties; and they have speculators and butchers in all political Parties - I mean political speculators. The position therefore is that it is my belief that if you work out a proper replacement for the Local Government Councils and the responsibility for beach cleaning and amenities on the beaches, that can be done by that Body as part of its legitimate functions. If you do not need them, you do not need them. You do not need this separate Beach Control Authority. That is only copying from Jamaica and these other places who have completely different problems from ours. A large percentage of the beaches in Montego Bay and these areas in Jamaica were reclaimed as a result of the action taken by putting in groynes by particular owners of the land opposite, so that the Government had a problem there because they were man-made beaches. They were not natural beaches like ours. In Christ Church along the Oistins area and in Silver Sands we have good, proper, natural beaches, but they are no amenities at all. They cannot even get a tractor and level down the place and have the plants properly done. We have a lovely window on the sea in Christ Church, two lovely areas. In Welches there is a lovely window to the sea and bottles and tins are unfortunately, sometimes, used even as a lavatory, because there are no proper lavatory facilities in that part of Christ Church. That is not right. It is a very lovely area, it is owned by the Government and it is there sometimes that you see men haphazardly planting; but if you look at the terrain of the land you will see that there is no attempt at levelling it. I do not know who is responsible for it. Is the Civic Circle still in existence? They have planted some oleander or something like that, but it is a lovely area. It is on one of the roads that tourists pass every time that anybody is going in or out of the Airport. We, in that area, should not be trying to encourage the type of boarding-house accommodation which we used to get at one time in the St. Lawrence-Worthing View area, because down there has now become a high-priced area, so that they are even a little higher up now. You have a number of guest houses and small hotels in that area making a significant contribution to the economy in Christ Church, and that is one of the areas in which you have one of the best beaches. Fishing boats are hauled up there, but the beach is large enough to accommodate everybody. People can play their beach cricket and everything, but surely, it would be in the best interest if we could have a proper hedge and proper facilities. We do not have to wait until a Beach Control Authority gets there. I am sure that the Ministry can work out a policy or co-operate with the

Minister of Agriculture. One of the things which I see in this Government among the Civil Servants is that if something comes in with a part in this Ministry and a part in another Ministry, the files seem to spend their time passing from Ministry to Ministry, and there does not seem to be any co-ordinated position at all. Therefore nothing can be done, once it impinges upon two separate Ministries.

Now we come to the general policy of the Ministry of Home Affairs. I would like to get these points which we have raised here tonight very clearly. I think it is a very bad thing where there can be uncertainty surrounding the policy of immigration in this country. There should be definite criteria.

11.50 p.m.

After all, where you have large discretionary powers granted under any authority, it is in the interest of that authority itself to let it be known, generally speaking, how the exercise of the discretion is going to be exercised. If that is known, decisions taken in pursuance of the exercise of the decision can be contested as against what has been promulgated as the manner of exercise of this discretion. There is always the exceptional case in any question of limitation generally, but people want to know that the discretion is not going to be exercised either by the person who presents the application or otherwise.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, I wish to make a few observations under this Head - Head 23 - which deals with many of the statutory expenses and other expenses. I have one or two comments to make. I am not in the position of my two colleagues; they are legally experienced. I am not in the position to deal with the legal aspect of this at all, neither do I wish in the course of my speech to throw any reflection at all on the Immigration Authorities like the Police. It would be very unfair; I would be foolish. I always believed in law and order and I feel that the Police should have their rights. They should be respected and should be given all opportunities to make them feel how worthy they are in the community, even "Johnny Salt Bags" in spite of his viciousness.

Mr. Chairman, there are some very peculiar things which I have observed under this Head. We have other people from the other Islands coming to Barbados who, like Barbadians, are going abroad in search of a better way of life. What I dislike about the whole set-up is that when these people from the other Islands come here, we find many of the hotel owners, business people and other people in Barbados hire these people and exploit them. They can pay more salaries. But by exploiting these people they put Barbadians out of work.

If a man is going to get someone to work for him at three or four dollars a week and then that person signs for \$16.00, well then, I imagine that you cannot blame the person who is doing that although I consider him a very unscrupulous person.

You have many of these people coming from yachts. This is what is bothering me. They jump these

yachts, come into Barbados, and then you find one or two of them working as some Manager or Assistant Manager at some project about here. Then you find many of the lady folk getting by. Of course, they have their passport. Many have their own good sense how to get through. Many of them are white.

I have had many clashes with them. Only a few nights ago, I was at Silver Beach Guest House and one of them came outside, and talked with the West Indies Cricketers. I was introduced to her and one of the cricketers said to her: "Be careful how you move around here; he is 'Mr. Government.'" In reply, I asked her, "Are you a resident of Barbados?" She point blank said to me: "Why? Do you have to be a Barbadian? I can get through here." How she is getting through, I know; and I am going to put the Police on her.

Another disgraceful practice is that some of these people are coming here from yachts and they are bringing in dope. I went down at the Discotheque and a woman asked me if I could give her a smoke. I took out some cigarettes and gave her one. She said: "No", and asked if I had a "pop". I was at a complete loss when she asked me if I had a "pop" until I went to the entertainers and asked them what was it. I travel across North America quite a bit and through many of the West Indian Islands. I did not know what is a "pop" until that night. She was looking about for dope to smoke.

I do not expect that the Government can do everything, but I would like Government to strengthen the hands of the Immigration Officers to track down on some of these criminals. They can have one right now. I can give the Police a tip off. I went to a certain club called Independence Inn or something like that, about one o'clock one night and I saw this white man over the balcony. I rushed upstairs to get a pack of cigarettes and found out that he was the only person up there. When I returned downstairs a lady said to me: "Mr. Craig, did you go up there for something?" I said that I was looking for cigarettes. She then said that we cannot go up there now; the man had got off the boat and he is sleeping up there and running the people's job. He is still there. Up to last night when I was going home, I saw him looking over the balcony.

Now, these are things which I must say. They have to strengthen the hands of the Immigration Authorities to make sure that you get out a lot of these people who come here after jumping yachts. I know that the Prime Minister is a keen yachtsman, as well as the Minister of Trade, and they may be afraid to clamp down on these bad practices of people coming here on these yachts and jumping off them. Sometimes you see them down Broad Street looking very dirty. Then at night time you see them painted up in the night clubs. Some of them are the P.M.'s good friends. A man by the name of "Geek" is one of the P.M.'s friends. The P.M. is a very good dancer.

I am not saying that he condones such actions; but I am looking to the Government to assist in

strengthening the hands of the Immigration Authorities to make sure that they get rid of that type of person out of Barbados. Stop harassing the St. Lucians and Dominicans who have come here to assist us in the harvesting of our crop.

Another bad taste is of something which happened quite recently. I cannot escape this. I read in the newspapers that a man by the name of Mr. Waite was asked to leave Barbados immediately and was refused a job permit. This man, I am told, is a corporal in the Jamaica Defence Force and is a certified masseur. He was an assistant to Mannie Alves on the famous English tour with the late Sir Frank Worrell. Mr. Waite was requested by the President of the West Indies Cricket Tour Control to come down here to massage what looks now like a depleted West Indies team, the one time generals of the flannelled fools. They are now reduced, and I know of one particular man whose knee is swollen as big as my colleague's head.

12.00

It was really heart-burning to see that the Ministry of Home Affairs refused this man a work permit and then had the audacity to ask him to leave Barbados immediately. This is not good enough if we are trying to foster good relationships between our West Indian Governments. I know for a fact that Clarence Ward, alias "Coloured", has been massaging people at Kensington for twenty years, but you can only expect something when you do not know better. "Coloured" may be able to rub you down with some winter gree and coconut oil. That is all right; but when you have to get a specialist to do the job, you just cannot treat him that way. I feel it is a slap in the face of the Jamaica Government who gave the West Indies Cricket Board of Control the services of this man, and I believe they were paying him too. I think it is fair to say that when Lance Gibbs, Kanhai and those fellows come to Barbados, you might as well say not to give them a work permit, because they are paid from funds which are collected at Kensington, and I had planned to substitute Gibbs by Howard, take away Murray's work permit and let Boxill play, take away Camacho's work permit and let Greenidge play, and take away Butcher's, Kanhai's and Lloyd's work permit and let Phillips and Rawle Brancker get a play, if you are going to allow "Coloured" to massage somebody instead of allowing Waite to massage them because he is No. 1 henchman for the Democratic Labour Party. This is not in the interest of Barbados or in the interest of West Indies Cricketers, and it is not a kind thing for the Ministry of Home Affairs to treat the Government of Jamaica and the West Indies Cricket Board of Control and West Indian cricketers in the manner in which they were treated by refusing a work permit for Mr. Waite.

You allow Sparrow to come in here and get a work permit and fleece the public and go back out with a bundle of money in his hands. All these half-baked artists come here and get a work permit and fleece the people of Barbados; but now you have a man coming in to do something in the interest of West Indian

cricket, you tell him that he cannot get a work permit. These things are not fair. It is in bad taste, and I feel the Government should even write an apology to the West Indies Cricket Board of Control. (Mr. CORBIN: It is a matter of rules and regulations.) Homie, you don't know what is happening, man! People from the West Coast complain to me, Mr. Chairman, that St. Lucians are working in the hotels, and although they are trained by the hotel school, they cannot get jobs. When you go and make enquiries, you discover that the St. Lucians are paid less money than what the Barbadian would accept, and therefore they accept those people, which means that the Barbadian is suffering. I hope the Ministry of Home Affairs will pay some attention to this. As my colleague, the hon. senior member for Christ Church who is not now in his seat said, you can go into James Street if you want to get a work permit. I only go to James Street at my barber to get my hair cut, but upstairs of the barber shop there are some lawyers who would be able to advise people how to get a work permit. If that is the practice, then I sincerely hope that Government will stamp it out.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, there are many questions which have been raised under this Head. Of course, it is the Ministry of Home Affairs, I should like to point out from the outset, but I will attempt answering Item 30 which has been raised by almost all the members who have spoken, especially the hon. senior member for St. James and the hon. senior member for Christ Church. I refer of course to the question of beach control and beach development. This item formerly might have fallen under my Head, but over the last two years or so, it has not been under my Ministry as such. There is a Dr. Carlozzi who has recently reported. He is an expert on beach control and development, and he made certain recommendations in so far as the extension of the Life Guard services are concerned. He has recommended an increase in the number of Life Guards at the existing Life Guard posts at Rockley and Greaves End; so you will have a better service all day long and especially on Bank Holidays and Sundays, and the creation of Life Guard services at other popular beaches such as Bath, Martins Bay, Silver Sands, the Crane, Paradise Beach and Dover among others, and one or two along the West Coast. This matter is being gone into at present, and in the very near future the Life Guard Service will be improved, and there will be an extension of the services at those popular beaches which I have mentioned among others.

Over and above that, there are certain new staffing arrangements in the proposals which are to be put up shortly by my Ministry to Cabinet in which the post of Community Development Officer is included, and we are hoping - I hope I am not speaking out of turn - to secure the services of Corporal Lorenzo Best who is the expert in swimming, Life Guard and life saving devices, and for improvement in the Ministry as such. So we are taking certain steps and we are hoping to have things on a better footing fairly soon.

In so far as the issue of work permits and so on goes, I think the Prime Minister is more capable of

dealing with that if it needs to be dealt with. In so far as not issuing a work permit to the masseur of whom the hon. senior member for St. James spoke, I understand that he never applied for a work permit. If he had applied, it would have been considered. He never applied before he came and he never even applied when he was here; so like that there was no application to consider.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that such a lot of heavy weather has been made. There is an impression going around that the West Indies Cricket Board of Control applied for a work permit for a physiotherapist or something like that from Jamaica and that the Minister of Home Affairs turned down this application. The President of the West Indies Cricket Board of Control spoke to me and he did not know that this man had been brought into the country until after he had arrived, that is, until the row came up. There was a representative of the Ministry who was in constant attendance. The Permanent Secretary himself worked very closely with the West Indies Cricket Board of Control, and no one thought fit to ask the representative of the Ministry who was working down there - when I say working, I mean he was in attendance down there and did a certain amount of broadcasting - anything about what procedure should be gone through if they wanted somebody to come into the country to do work. It is as simple as that. When the Minister discovered that they had brought in a Corporal in the Jamaica Defence Force, as the hon. senior member for St. James has said, who, it is alleged, is a masseur - he said he is a qualified masseur, but I do not know what makes a masseur a qualified masseur; he is either accepted as a masseur or he is not accepted as a masseur - it was found that he had a substantive job which was not being a masseur; it was being a Corporal in the Jamaica Defence Force, and my information is that he was not engaged in the Jamaica Defence Force as a masseur.

12.10 a.m.

I do not think that any member of this House should be criticising the Minister for not allowing people to come in here to work. If they are coming in for a holiday, yes, but the Minister should be criticised if he is allowing too many to come in taking away jobs from Barbadians.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I would hate to say that the Hon. Prime Minister either has not got the facts or that he is trying to stop them. There is just one little note I made here. He said that whether or not Waite came into Barbados to work for something or for nothing, he did not pass through the correct channels. Now, Sir, Waite never came down to work for anything. The Prime Minister said that he spoke to the Manager of the team on the beach on some day. If Waite had started to massage the West Indies cricketers - I do not know the name of the Masseur and I will make reference to him as that gentleman. I know him for all of my years as "Coloured". The Prime Minister seems to think that I treated him with some contempt. When I am abroad I do not talk about any Prime Minister of Barbados; I make reference

to him and I call him "Dipper" I am not treating him with any contempt; I say "Dipper" did so-and-so. That is how I talk among my friends. If I have to go to his office, I ask: "May I see the Hon. Prime Minister?" I treat him with the courtesy which he deserves; but when the Prime Minister says that Waite did not pass through the correct channels to come to Barbados to work he said: "He either works for nothing or whether he works for nothing or whether he works for something." Waite was seconded to the West Indies Cricket Board of Control to massage the West Indian Cricketers. That is what happened. If Waite had massaged the cricketers for nothing, Mr. "Coloured" could not get any money out of them. It is as simple as that. That is why they told Waite not only that he could not get a work permit but he was only told that he has to get a work permit after he was told that he could not work in Barbados, that he could not massage the cricketers. They told Waite: "You must leave Barbados immediately", because the West Indian Cricketers said: "Since you cannot get a work permit, you can massage us for nothing. We are not going to pay you if you cannot get a work permit" So what am I to understand? If I go down the road and a German doctor is in Barbados on vacation or he is watching cricket and somebody gets ill, do you mean to say that the doctor could not touch him? Has he to get a work permit to do something for him?

The truth about this is that when they went to Trinidad, they went on to Jamaica on the second leg of the tour and the team realised that they were not fit. They started to get fit between Trinidad and Jamaica. Mr. Waite started to massage these men as he did in England, and they started to feel a lot better. When they came to Barbados and Mr. Waite started to massage them, they were not feeling as well as they were feeling in Jamaica; so they asked Mr. Peirce, the President of the West Indies Cricket Board of Control, "Please get Mr. Waite." And Mr. Peirce acceded to the request. Down came Mr. Waite to massage these men and as soon as he came here they said: "You cannot massage them; you cannot get a work permit." The Manager of the team said that he would do it for nothing and they said: "If you are doing it for nothing, go out." Let the Prime Minister deny that he was challenged at the Hilton Hotel at a Party given by the B.A.T. and that when the cricketers tackled him and asked him about it, he said: "You can watch the cricket, but I have to try and represent my man. I have to see after my man first. He has handled people and he can handle me too."

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. That is not true.

Mr. CRAIG: That is not true? I would expect you to say that it is not true.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: That is not true. I spoke to one single cricketer at the Hilton Hotel, Mr. Lance Gibbs, and the Attorney General and I had just finished speaking to the President of the West Indies Cricket Board of Control, and the Attorney General persuaded the Minister of Home Affairs to allow Waite to remain

in Barbados. We are not letting him in except under the conditions that he was not to work. I never said anything about looking after anybody because that was extraneous to the consideration of his entering here and working without a work permit. The representations which were made were made through the former Masseur.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, at least there was one little bit of truth in it that the Prime Minister was at the Hilton Hotel and that he chatted with a member of the team. He chatted about this matter and therefore I cannot accept the Prime Minister's word that he did not say he has to take care of someone. It was after he was persuaded by the cricketers that the Attorney General came in and he said: "Leave this to me, I will take care of it," and the Prime Minister looked over his shoulder and said: "After all, boys, don't get vexed with me. I have to take care of my man. He has massaged me too."

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. I protest that I was anywhere near any cricketers. (Mr. CRAIG: You just said that you were speaking with one.) Until I was leaving the building, going down the stairs, and the matter had been settled by the Attorney General an hour and a half or two hours before we went into dinner. I had no conversation with any cricketers. Halfway down the stairs, Mr. Lance Gibbs approached me and asked: "What are you doing?" I said: "The Attorney General has just communicated to the President of the West Indies Cricket Board of Control, that the Corporal from Jamaica can stay here." I had no other conversation with anybody. Would you like to name the people that I can go and ask them how they turned? (Asides) Who are the cricketers because I would like to challenge them on this.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, the journey is long; we have to go a few miles out. You can go, but it will serve no useful purpose anyhow. I am making my comments on this matter because I feel that deep within myself it is a slap in the face of the Jamaica Defence Force and to the Government of Jamaica. It is when the cricketers got to Jamaica and Mr. Waite started to massage them, that they asked the Manager of the team if they could get Mr. Waite to come down and he said: "I will look into the matter for you: I will have to speak to the President." It is when they came to Barbados that the President gave them the O.K. Whether the President was at fault or not, I would not know. But what I am saying is this: they should not have treated the man in the way they treated him. They told him to get out of Barbados or he can stay and watch the cricket - that was the last remark - "but do not worry to touch the cricketers." The Prime Minister was even directing the policy of the West Indies Cricket Board of Control. "You can remain in Barbados but do not touch the cricketers, because if you touch the cricketers, "Coloured" is going to be out of work." That is the crux of the matter and it is not fair to treat people like that. How would we feel if we heard tomorrow that Gary Sobers went to Trinidad and heard that he cannot play in Trinidad unless he has a work permit? It is not quite

just that you are prepared to foster - Mr. Chairman, I am hearing voices over here. I am just waiting on you, Sir. After all.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like all hon. members to observe Rule 29(6). Let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. SMITH: Name him. (Laughter.)

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I feel that in the interest of West Indian Unity, as the Prime Minister said earlier this afternoon when he talked about joint operations between Sir Lionel Luckhoo and the Barbados and Jamaica High Commission Office, we cannot go on putting down some people and eulogising others. That is not good enough.

12.30 p.m.

I feel that an apology should be given to the Jamaica Government for the way we treated Mr. Waite. (ASIDES) Mr. Chairman, wherever you go, you will find a village idiot. I really could not imagine that a man at that age could be a village clown. What amuses me is to see the way in which they treat the same hon. member and he has to drive from home in St. Andrew to this House and back. Of course, if the "Old City" was open, you would not hear his mouth at all.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking to the hon. member. Would the hon. member refer to Head 23?

Mr. CRAIG: I am very happy, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member who is making these undertones recognises his limitations.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: While an hon. member is speaking, all hon. members should be silent.

Mr. CRAIG: He is only 'wine'; while I am 'wine women and song'.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let the hon. member deal with Head 23.

Mr. CRAIG: Yes, Sir, I am dealing with Head 23. Mr. Chairman, I feel very sad about this whole affair because I know how the players feel about it. They expressed their ill feelings towards the way in which Mr. Waite was treated. I have been hearing one of the authorities saying how would we feel if we go to Australia and we were told by the Australian Government that we cannot bring in the Manager of the team.

What is strange, Mr. Chairman, is that the Government did not question Mr. Jennings who was masseur of the English team when they brought him in, but you can now challenge Mr. Waite, who was masseur of the West Indies team.

Mr. Chairman, there is one thing that I am sure about. The hon. junior member for St. Thomas once told me that he is the only Barbadian who has represented an English Football Team. He was on the Garrison pasture playing football barefooted when he

was asked. We expect him to say so. He is an expert on anything like that.

(ASIDES)

As I have said, Sir, I feel very unhappy about this because of the way how the Minister of Home Affairs would use his discretion. They have claimed before that they have no reason to give why they have asked you to leave the country. But I would like them to put their hands on the right type of people to leave the country at the right time.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I do not want to go on at length in this matter, but I am surprised to hear the Prime Minister get up and defend the arbitrary behaviour which the Minister of Home Affairs has shown towards Mr. Waite. For my part, I have always felt that a lot of people who are persecuted by the Minister of Home Affairs in fact take it too much for granted that they are right when they talk about work permits, and so on.

There is nothing in any law in Barbados saying anything about a work permit, and I suggested on some other occasion that the Prime Minister might perhaps have a look at this. I would not like to see the Immigration Act made any tighter; therefore, it is a point which I do not like to pursue. But the Immigration Act does not have a word in it about work permits and, as far as I am concerned, Mr. Waite could have gone on and massaged the West Indies team and told the Prime Minister and the Minister of Home Affairs what to do because I do not see anything in any Act to justify the extremes to which the Minister goes in telling people that they must apply for a work permit and so on.

(ASIDES)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: All this time I am listening to the hon. senior member for St. Thomas.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am not saying what it is because I am not committing myself to any proposition of law without a fee. But if you read the Immigration Act, it appears to be a tenable proposition to anybody who has lawfully entered Barbados to do what he will as long as the conditions which have been enforced on him are not broken. There is nothing in the Immigration Act saying that; therefore, I think that the Minister's action with Mr. Waite was very high-handed indeed.

The Prime Minister sotto voce is making an interesting remark "Challenge it in the Courts." It is a sensible remark. I have not said that I am sure, but it is a sensible remark. As far as I am concerned, if he has his view, he can not be more sure than I.

The Immigration Act has nothing in it saying that somebody who comes here for medical treatment cannot, for example, also be an intransit passenger, because there are separate grounds upon which an Immigration Officer can admit you into Barbados without deciding whether you are not a prohibited immi-

grant; so it is possible, although the ticket was made out from Trinidad to St. Lucia, for the passenger to stop off in Barbados to get his teeth fixed.

Now, on the face of it, for a passenger passing through Barbados intransit and seeking medical treatment, and for Mr. Waite was breaking his conditions entering Barbados as a visitor by massaging the West Indies team, just as a man who passes through Barbados on his way to St. Lucia and had his teeth pulled out would be breaking his conditions too - because by reason of having a through ticket he would be admitted as an intransit passenger and then he went and sought medical treatment - you can argue just as sensibly that he was in Mr. Waite's position as you can argue that Mr. Waite was breaking the law in some way by working.

I am only sorry that the President of the West Indies Cricket Board of Control and the rest of them were so foolish to take on the Minister of Home Affairs and the Prime Minister. I am only sorry for that. What they should have done was to tell Mr. Waite to go on and massage and do not pay Mr. Clarence Ward a penny. That is what they should have done and let the Government challenge it in the Courts. Again, this is ordering a man out who has lawfully entered Barbados on a permit for which you have to give that man a notice by Section 23 of the Act and given the right of appeal to a Magistrate. You cannot order a man out who has lawfully entered Barbados just like that. There was a lot of high-handedness in this matter. 12.40 p.m.

Somebody told Clarence Ward that he is the Prime Minister's pimp, and he went and told the Prime Minister, and the Prime Minister said he would see what is what. That is how it all started, and it was a disgraceful episode. Now you hear the Prime Minister talking about letting Jimmy Cozier decide to bring in everybody he wants. The only person whom Mr. Jimmy Cozier has brought in here is Mr. Hoyte, the Prime Minister's good friend and journalistic acolyte, who has to be criticised every day for non-objective reporting especially of Parliament. He is the only person who has been brought in from abroad. Is he the one the Prime Minister wants out? Is that how the Prime Minister treats his faithful satellites? It is a disgraceful thing.

I was content really to let the hon. senior member for St. James speak because I thought he had put the case very well. I remember, Mr. Chairman, both Mr. Speaker and the Prime Minister have had occasion to say either in terms or by implication that he did not want to get involved in a civil war in St. James. I have to say I cannot get involved between Shamos O'Brien and the senior member for St. James. I think they know each other too well. They know too much about each other, and if they are not careful, one of these nights they are really going to talk what they know. Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, I do not think it can be defended. Mr. Chairman, it is not even work to massage a man if he asks you in these circumstances, and yet they mistreated this poor man Waite who was brought down here. I am sure it is not his fault he

came down here. I am sure he did not come down here intending to make any trouble or any mischief, and I think it disgraceful it should now be defended. What has been said is exactly and precisely true. I would like to see the permits that Lance Gibbs and the others get to come in here. My belief is that when they come at Seawell Airport they are admitted as visitors. Maybe it will be changed now. Not a word is put about coming to Barbados for the purpose of employment. If they can tell Waite he could not work, they can tell Gibbs he cannot bowl. When Gibbs went down there and turned over his arm, he was breaking the law as much as Waite was breaking it.

The question that the sum of \$209,504 under Head 23 Ministry of Home Affairs - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

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

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended until 12 noon today.

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

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

12.48 a.m.

On Resumption:

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

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

HEAD 24 - LANDS AND SURVEYS

Head 24 - Lands and Surveys - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$61,059 under Head 24 - Lands and Surveys - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 25 - POLICE

Head 25 - Police - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$608,220 under Head 25 - Police - stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, under Item 47, I am happy to see that a system has been instituted whereby members of the Police Force who are working in the Transport Section are being encouraged to keep the Government vehicles in trim. It is undoubtedly a step in the right direction, but it is a situation which brings to mind the question of how much success is being scored in this particular respect. As you will see, it is a quarterly first prize and second prize. Two prizes are awarded quarterly of \$15 and \$10.

We appreciate the fact that the members of the Police Force are salaried people, but we do not see that \$15 and \$10, considering the value of the vehicles involved, is sufficient inducement. You will see that when one vehicle user gets the first prize this time and the next time, it does not leave enough inducement to others. As one hon. member rightly says, the moment the \$15 has been won, there is just the \$10 prize left. We must ask ourselves how many vehicles and vehicle-drivers are involved. We do not want to suggest that there must be ten or twelve prizes, but I will tell you this: if this first prize had been \$50 instead of \$15 quarterly, you would see that maintenance costs of the vehicles would be reduced. You say that your motor Transport maintenance now runs into \$70,318, and we find that even despite the \$15 offered, the Police drivers are still involved in accidents, as these very Estimates will bear out when it comes to the replacement of vehicles here and there.

To my mind \$15 and \$10 will not serve the purpose for which it was really intended. It is not a sound inducement, and I would be glad if the authorities would give the matter further consideration and let us see whether a case has not been made out where there could be an increase of this and other ways and means employed to further encourage policemen generally to take greater care of the vehicles.

Now, this brings me to the point, Mr. Chairman - Item 64 - Regional Police Training Centre. It has been reported that some of the contributing territories or, at least, one has signified its intention of not making any further use of the Police Training School. The cost of the upkeep of the Regional Police Training Centre remains, and we have to adjust our minds to one or two factors. It can hardly be denied that the moral standard of the Police Force is on the decline. What is the training at the Regional Police Training Centre doing to help our policemen go in the right direction? Policemen are today passing out from the Regional Police Training School with chewing gum in their mouths. They leave the Training School not knowing half as much about the laws of Barbados as was taught in 1938 when I happened to be a recruit. 12.10 p.m.

I am to say that if we were to look from the product of the Training School right through the ranks to the very top, and at the same time take into consideration those who are coming into the Service, and take into account the leavers - those who are quitting the service - at the same time we have to ask ourselves if there is not something radically wrong in the struc-

ture of the Police Force. Mr. Chairman, it cannot be denied; it is no secret that the product from the Regional Training School coming on to the Police Headquarters or being posted at the various Stations or posts wherever they might be, ought to be seeing something which he would emulate in the Force, if he is to be in truth and in fact what we mean him to be. It is the duty of the Police to protect life and property, but their main task is not the detection of crime; it is, more so, one of the preventions of crime. You find a situation obtaining where the recruit leaves the Training School today to be trained amongst men who have put in many years of service over him, and he can see little or nothing of rivalry amongst them to stir him up to greater efforts. What does he find instead? What I am saying now is not any secret at all. We have two Assistant Commissioners of Police today, and the only time that there is any communication between one and the other is when there is a case of definite police duties. In other words, they are not on speaking terms, so to speak, and it shows itself right through the ranks, and the recruit from the Training School goes into that type of atmosphere; and then, after he is seeing such behaviour at the top, what is going to be his position in the future? He is taken up as a recruit from the Training School; he is taken out to the scene of a crime because he has then got to learn Police duties. What does he find there? That the constable, the N.C.O., the officer in whose immediate charge he happens to be, goes to the scene of the crime, and the best way he can instruct this young constable is to set about at the scene of crime using language which, if he were not in that privileged position he would eventually land, and it is enough to land him, possibly before the Courts of this island. That is the type of training which the recruit from the Training School is getting. What is he going to grow up to be in later years? He does not come out from the Training School and go amongst the people who are prepared to show him that it is his duty to respect the members of the public so that he can, in return, expect to receive the respect which he has dished out to them. He does not set off in that light at all. That is not the training which he is going to get, so that you will find that we are just having an increase in our crime rate. Years ago we had a Police Force of 366 persons when our population was 150,000. You will see, our Civil List will show you, what is our population today and what is the population of the Police Force. In earlier years, the Island also had the service of the Island Constable. There is not today the activity of the Island Constable to be witnessed in any part of this island.

Those are the things which we need to examine now. What I am saying is that the recruit from the Training School - I am trying to project the atmosphere in which the recruit from the Training School finds himself. Such crimes as rape, murder and hooliganism are on the increase wherever you go about this island today. We find that the recruit from the Training School for the most part, if we were to examine those employed in the offices doing Immigration, traffic licences and other duties, we must see that the street patrol must suffer, and it is on the beat that the policeman, the young policeman, the

recruit from the Training School is going to learn his policing - not in these offices. Much of the clerical work in the Police Force today which entails men who have spent months in training at the Police Training School, is work which could normally be done by civilians. In the Police Force today, we do not need a policeman sitting at a typewriter just waiting for an Officer to come in and give him something to do or something of that sort; that is where a competent secretary, a confidential secretary, could be used and release the policeman, the trained man, to go out on the beat and help to prevent some of the crimes which are being committed about the place. But the atmosphere in which the young constable is thrown is not one where the scene of the crime is always on the highway.

12.20 p.m.

Right inside the Barrack Rooms of the Police Station today crimes are being committed. We want these things stopped. We do not want to encourage them at all. There have been shooting incidents in the ranks of the Force in the Barrack Rooms. There are incidents where cheques and salaries of policemen have been reported stolen, mislaid, misplaced or something else. These things could only have been committed by policemen.

Mr. Chairman, I am trying wherever possible to clear the atmosphere for the future recruit. That is what I am trying to do. But that is not all. There are times that in the Police Force, as in any organized body, any disciplined body, there will be acts for which the offender should be disciplined.

Mr. Chairman, what could be more repelling to a young constable than to be marched into the office of a superior officer and when he enters minus his helmet and his belt, because he is a defaulter, he finds his superior Officer sitting with two feet on a desk! And what does he hear first? The very first words that are going to be uttered out of the mouth of that superior Officer to the constable are insulting and offensive and abusive language. It is not the type of atmosphere which we would like to see the future recruits from the Training School Centre enter at all. In the long run the whole island stands to suffer.

I want you to look at it in this way. Just as a young constable is treated inside the station, if he has to go on duty this morning, before he is marched through the gate of the Central Station, there is a situation where in him there is a feeling of disgust that he feels he is in the wrong place, he feels that he is not treated right and all of those things; he goes out on the street and meets the public who have done him absolutely nothing that is wrong; someone comes up to him to enlist his support, his assistance, in a matter of public interest, but his frame of mind is so conditioned from the disgusting situation obtaining in the Police Force that he can only give out to the members of the public whom he meets what is in him. That frame of mind which is in him, he brought it from inside the barrack room or from his headquarters. So you will understand, Sir, that the situation there is not at all such as to encourage the type of person that can serve the Police Force best.

You will find that there are young men who are being enlisted in the Police service today who spend three or four, may be six months at the Training School, and hardly do they come to render any service to the community for the money that has been spent training them at the Training School. They are just enlisting in the Police Force, spending a few months accumulating enough money to pay an air fare to Canada, United States of America or England. That is all that they are doing. They are just using the Force as a spring board; but we feel that if conditions within the Force were such as to please these recruits, they will stay in the Force.

I had been a recruit myself, Sir, and I will tell you that I found it very, very difficult. The first day that I was in the service I was given a cot cover to fit unto a frame. I had to turn about the back room asking assistance and nobody would assist me. I changed cover after cover in my effort to get one to fit the cot frame, and I remember that I spent the first night without a cover being properly fitted to the frame only to find the following morning that I was to be threatened with a report for not having a cot cover fitting the frame properly.

12.30 p.m.

I am not suggesting, sir, that you are to find that the Police Force is a nursery, so to speak; but when you look at it, you will find that most of the recruits coming out from the Training School ought to meet the disciplined type of superior officer into whose immediate charge this young man or young woman will fall - the type of officer whose every conduct is such that from the very beginning, this constable must see a standard is set, and he must feel within his very bones, with every click of his heels, that he has got something to emulate in this Officer, that Officer, this Sergeant, this N.C.O or whatever he may be. That is not the case today; so you will find eventually that the whole structure of the Royal Barbados Police Force is being broken to bits and the new blood is becoming contaminated immediately it leaves the Training School and is posted either at Headquarters or at one of the other out-stations, and it would seem as if the time has come when the question of stations and the resiting of them will have to be considered.

Here we have Item 80 which makes provision for the replacement of one Patrol Van and three motor cycles, also to purchase three Land Rovers, four speed cars and six scooters. Now, Sir why do we need these things? We do not want to deny that a case can be made out for equipping the Police Force with speed cars and the like, but we are saying that in addition to these speed cars we need to have patrol men on the streets and throughout the villages. There are some villages which are thickly populated that do not see a policeman once in a year in this little Island; not that there is not the necessity for people to see a policeman, because wherever you go today, Mr. Chairman, it is almost accepted as a standard and a sign of goodness that people cannot and will not express themselves without resorting to the use of foul, filthy and abusive language. They feel proud doing it. Let us take Four Roads in your own constituency in St.

John. The Police Station was removed and fire services installed. Our view is that there remains today the necessity for both. Crimes are being committed, people suffer and need protection, and they find it extremely difficult to get in touch with the police.

You will understand that the closing of stations here and there and the mounting of patrols on wheels do not answer the problem which is the prime duty of the police, and that is to prevent crime. After the offence has been committed, you summon the police by telephone, and with the difficulty people have to face to get a telephone message, it means that you would rather leave the whole matter altogether; but Mr. Chairman, the thing is that we need not merely to give the Police Force their speed cars, their Land Rovers and so on, but also to see that these vehicles and the members of the Force generally are so deployed as to bring to the community in general the maximum of benefits through the prevention and subsequently the detection of crime. The offence has been committed, the police are on wheels, they get to the scene much more quickly than if they had to walk or go on horse-back or something else, but are we anywhere by equipping the Police Force with these vehicles? We must seek to equip the men of the Force with a moral standard that can stand questioning anywhere. Have we got it? Are we seeking in any respect to get it?

Mr. Chairman, let the Police Force be equipped with their speed cars. We will admit that the speed cars will serve in tracking down the speedsters on their vehicles who exceed the speed limit and the like, but a policeman in a motor-van or motor-car is not the same policeman as the one who goes between the alleys, around corners and behind business premises. I wonder if policemen going on duty in the City of Bridgetown still pull the locks on business premises as their first act after going on the beat.

12.40 p.m.

I am sure that in 1938 immediately after a policeman was posted on his beat after 6 p.m., when business places were closed in the City in Bridgetown, it was his duty to go and see that all business premises, as far as could be seen from the outside, were securely locked. I remember hearing years ago that some constables were complaining that superior Officers would come behind to inspect them at night and very often they were accused of unlocking doors in order to bring charges against the constables. I do not subscribe to that; but if it did happen years ago I do not think anything like that can happen today.

What we are concerned with today is whether or not after a young constable comes out of the Training School he is being cast into an atmosphere conducive to the good and moral uplift and betterment of the Force. I want to know whether equipping the Police Force with all of these speed cars, scooters, bicycles and so on will really make us have a Police Force that the Island need today for its protection for life and property.

With regard to Item 95, there is a sum of \$576 to purchase two tape recorders for the Royal Barbados

Police Force. I believe that it has come upon somebody in the Police Force that enough frustration or disgust has been witnessed in the past years when policemen were sent to political meetings. On their return to the Station they have to prepare a report for transmission to their Headquarters the following morning. It is after having taken the notes - some mental and some in long shorthand - on reaching the Station they find that what did not happen at the political meeting almost took place in the Barracks Room because there is then a row between the policemen who attended the meeting as to the way in which certain persons said certain things and there is a lot of confusion. Nevertheless, a report of the proceedings of the meeting of the night before has to be ready to be dispatched to the office of the Commissioner of Police the following morning, and the report must be made.

The necessity has now arisen for the purchase of two tape recorders for the service of the Police Force. There is no doubt that there is no Minister of Home Affairs with us in this House, which I regret; but nevertheless, the Minister who is going to reply on his behalf will be willing to tell us and to give us the assurance that these tape recorders are not being purchased mainly to be used at the political meetings of Members of the Opposition, or at meetings not held by members of the Government. We sincerely hope that the methods which are open to the users of the tape recorders - that is, a speech can be recorded but we do not have the guarantee that on the same tape it is not going to be doctored. We are open to all of these things.

I have seen enough and, believe me, Sir, I do not want to say that the police would have to work miracles for me, personally, to have confidence in any policeman. I do not want to say that; but I can tell you that I do not see any member of the present Royal Barbados Police Force, beginning from the first down to the last, in whom I can say I would have confidence. I say so, and I mean it. With the purchase of these tape recorders we do not disagree, but what we are mainly concerning ourselves with is: are they going to be put to a use such as would enhance the reputation of the Police Force? Are they going to be used for experiments on the political opponents of the Government?

We have had it already, Mr. Chairman, where by the use of a tape recorder - I am not saying by the police - crimes have been committed in this place. I am saying here and now it is not totally unknown to the Leader of this Honourable House, and definitely not totally unknown to all hon. members on that side. We want to be very careful. We want to be given something that we can understand, appreciate and believe that these tape recorders are not now being bought to do certain things. You will hear that they are not being bought to be used against the Opposition in the House of Assembly, or any of the political opponents of the Government.

12.50 p.m.

The Police may conveniently use these tape recorders. They will take recordings of meetings held

of speeches made by Mr. "X", but when the Government members get up on platforms poisoning the atmosphere of this good place, using much foul language, abusing very unbecomingly, saying things in themselves bordering on sedition - I am speaking about members of the Government - things bordering on treason - I should rather say sedition - you will find that when the Police are called upon, they will say, or the possibility is there, "Well, we did not use our tape recorders that time." That is what you are likely to find; but when they want to get at somebody else, before the meeting begins, they are all set and they are ready. That is the sort of thing we want to get up against. If the Police are going to have tape recorders, we want to know that they are going to use them at the meetings, that they are going to use them at political meetings, or if they are going to use them for their own departmental purposes, whatever it might be. They might find it necessary, as in the case of the C.I.D., to use them in the case of recording witnesses, when they are interviewing witnesses or suspects, whatever it might be. All we are concerned about is this, that they use the same measure, the same standard, in dealing with another person. Those are the things which we have got to address our minds to. Nobody wants in any way to restrict the activities of the Police Force. We do not want to do that; we were not expected to do it. It would be unsafe for us and for members of the public generally; but we want to see that whatever is done, it is done in a way to project an image which the recruit or which any member of the Police Force can feel proud and happy over.

Now Sir, I think it is at Item 60, "New bicycles". There are six new bicycles which are being bought. This is a case, Mr. Chairman, where we have got to ask who in the Police Force is being permitted to ride a bicycle on duty.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Obviously, referring to the hon. junior member for St. Peter, he is filibustering. The position (Asides) I have not made my point, Mr. Chairman.....

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am on a point of order.

Mr. HINDS: On what point of order? The hon. member gets up and says that I am filibustering. How could that be a point of order?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will hear the point of order.

Mr. HINDS: The hon. member is inviting me to talk until tomorrow morning on this matter. Ask him to sit down.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is repeating sentence after sentence. The position is that we have a lot of Heads to do. Nobody wants to stifle the hon. member. I submit humbly to the hon. member that he should ask questions pertinent to the Heads and we are prepared to answer the questions and we will give satisfactory replies. We

know that the hon. member wants the questions answered. Let him just ask questions and give us time to answer them.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has made his point.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I am glad to see that the hon. member who has just sat down has been further promoted. He is Minister of National Insurance and Social Security, Minister of Agriculture and something else, and he is now Minister of Home Affairs.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That I do not deem to be relevant to Item 60 "New Bicycles".

Mr. HINDS: He was right and I will get on. We have here six new bicycles under Item 60 for the police (Asides) !

Mr. CHAIRMAN: While an hon. member is speaking, all other hon. members should be silent. Let the hon. member continue.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, what we must concern ourselves with is this: Who is entitled to the use of a bicycle on duty in the Police Force? In a Police Force, it is not a case where every member who is sent here or there, because a bicycle is there not being used at the moment, that he can mount that bicycle and go - not at all. Similarly, there are Sergeants and Corporals who have got to do inspection by day and night. This Item 60 is only a question of replacing these six bicycles. Already we are taking into consideration the number of N.C.O.'s and Sergeants who use bicycles when inspecting their patrols at one time, the number of Corporals who ought to be entitled to cycle around depending on the distance they have to cover particularly by night and then there are members of the C.I.D. who have to put the bicycles into use from time to time.

1.00 p.m.

What we are inviting the hon. Minister to do is to examine the situation carefully to see if it is not merely a question of six bicycles being required, but if a case might not be better made out for an additional six or possibly more bicycles, because you must remember, Sir, this. Why am I making this point? There is already dissatisfaction among certain members of the Police Force that when they have to go out on inspection duty, they have to walk while other people can ride a bicycle. Therefore, you have got to look at the structure of the Force. It should be put in Standing Orders who is entitled to ride a bicycle when he has to go out on inspection duty and who is not, so as to remove some of the dissatisfaction in the Police Force.

Now, Sir, Item 45 - Cots - provision is made for \$1,000 and the note states "Provision for upkeep of cots". I must enquire from the appropriate Minister if it is not the intention of the Government to see that policemen are given bedsteads.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I wonder if members would observe 29 (5). - Members shall not read newspapers.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, I am a member who is looking at a newspaper. I am looking at it for the purpose of obtaining material to use later in this debate. It is an English newspaper from which I am obtaining some financial material.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I am one of the members that was also looking at a newspaper. I was looking at the newspaper for the purpose of getting any general information to use in the debate at a later stage in the meeting.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Rule says:

"Members shall not read newspapers, books, letters or other documents, except such matter therein as may be directly connected with the business under debate."

Can the hon. senior member for St. James tell me directly the subject which he is reading in relation to the subject under this particular Head?

Mr. CRAIG: Police.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Can you state the paragraph in the newspaper which you are reading?

Mr. CRAIG: Paragraph 7.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Well, I would have to look at it. Let the hon. junior member for St. Peter proceed.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, Item 45. I am asking if the Minister can tell us if it is not the intention of Government to implement that part of the Data Commission report recommending the provision of bedsteads for policemen. We had a Barbados Police Force for many years. Today it is the Royal Barbados Police Force but what do these men get? The name of our institution has been given royalty, but the men who man the Force are to remain sleeping on bug-bearing cots.

Mr. Chairman, we would like to see and to hear something from the Minister in respect of this matter.

There is at Item 43, Travelling Allowance - Item 37 - Conveyance is the better item to speak on. The note says "Cost of transport for Police when travelling on duty." There are cases where members of the Force have to travel from one station to another to attend Court, and, Mr. Chairman, we are to wonder if this matter is being looked into in the way it ought to be to see that the money is spent in the way it should be spent and not in other respects. Sometime ago, there was a case of a Police Sergeant who left his station in the country district to come to a City Court in a civil matter. He was compensated for attending the Court but, Sir, the question of his travelling from the station to the Civil Court is one which ought to be looked into because our information is that his tra-

yelling was paid. He was given a subsistence allowance for attending the Court in a similar case, although I think I am right in saying what he was paid for attending the Court was enough to cover his transportation and what not.

With these few remarks, Mr. Chairman, I think that I have completed all the items to which I wanted to refer with the exception of Item 68 - Cane Fires Prevention. There is still that incidence and although there are all these cane fires, there is still provision of the sum of \$50 under this Head. The note says: "Provision of rewards payable for information leading to conviction for arson."

1.10 p.m.

Under Item 68 there is still the provision of a mere \$50 as provision of rewards payable for information leading to conviction for arson. With all these cane fires, with the extent of arson on the increase, there is no corresponding increase in this vote. In other words, the police do not hope to spend anymore than the same \$50 they have been spending year after year in a matter like this. We feel there has been a slip up, and it ought to be adjusted and made to look as if the police are really interested in reducing the number of cane fires that are occurring in the Island. We want to see generally that there is an attempt to let us have a Force where you have Officers who are definitely not handicapped in their decisions by political interference, because we must say that political interference in the activities of the Force can create a frightening situation which can spread throughout the Island, because if there is fear within the Force, there is no knowing how far it can spread. I would like to see that the dignity of the Force is maintained, and I am sure that the Hon. Minister will set about to give us an assurance of those things which I have sought to bring to his attention this morning.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I will not be long. Now Item 47 - Motor Transport. Before I start I do not want to be misunderstood, because one may think I am trying to ring my own bells. Under Item 47 - Motor Transport, the note reads: "To meet cost of upkeep of motor vehicles." Now in some of these Departments, especially the Police Department, the Highways and Transport Department does most of the work such as repairs and so on, but when it comes to a flat tyre and repairs to tyres which are light, I am told that three policemen are reserved for doing that work. If the Minister in charge goes into the matter, he will find out that these three policemen could be on the streets or doing something, while the little nay-nay tyre could be sent to a garage and be done for a small amount, in some cases not exceeding one dollar; but you may be keeping three policemen there at \$200 or \$300 a month, and these small repairs therefore cost you \$600 when in truth and in fact they should not exceed more than \$25 or \$30. That is one point I want to raise for the attention of the Minister who is in charge.

Again under Item 68 - Cane Fires Prevention - \$50, I would like to know from the Minister in charge what really is the purpose and how this money is paid.

I would like to know what the particular individual or individuals have to do for that \$50 by way of prevention of cane fires.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, there are just a few queries I would like to make of the Minister. I too, like the hon. member who has just sat down, do not intend to be long.

Under Item 61 there is a proposal here to pay a cycle allowance to writ servers. Every member of the House is familiar with the Honda and that type of motorised two-wheel vehicle which is now all around Barbados. I do not think that motorcycle is the right name for them; they may be scooters legally, but technically they come under a different name from motorcycles. Many writ servers use that sort of vehicle, and I wonder if the allowance will also extend to the users of such vehicles other than the two-wheel pedalled vehicle using man power. I want to know if it includes those who use the Hondas and the Yamahas that are also motorised vehicles, but not legally or technically known as motorcycles or bicycles.

Another query I want to make is under Item 76 - Motor Launches, "to meet cost of upkeep and maintenance of three launches." We have been hearing a lot about air/sea rescue, and we have had the disappearance of at least two people on beaches in St. James who have never turned back up, and I think more recently the Investigator, a fishing launch now owned by a society of Co-operatives operating somewhere in St. Peter, I believe at Six Mens, has met with disaster at sea; but I have heard complaints from those interested in the Investigator that in their opinion enough was not done by the Fisheries Department or the Ministry of Fisheries to assist the owners and the crew of the Investigator.

I would like the Minister if he can to really tell us how far the services of the Fisheries Department work to assist in the recovery or the rehabilitation of the crew of the Investigator, because it has been pointed out to me that on some occasion when some foreigner was seen to have met with some misfortune at sea around Barbados, a lot was done to rush to the aid and succour of the victim, whereas in the case of the Investigator, the crew and owners of the boat feel that too little was done on the part of the Government. So under air/sea rescue, I would like the Minister to give me some information.

1.20 p.m.

Turning over to the next page, Sir, Item 85; I notice that this amount is to purchase one pair of Binoculars for District "E" Police Station. I do not intend to criticize this, but I would like to know what the Binoculars will be purchased for. Is this a question of replacement? I do not want to use my imagination. I would like to know what this is for.

I do not intend to speak at length on Item 95, because my colleague, the other hon. member for St. Peter, has dealt very lengthily with this Item 95 for the purchase of two tape recorders. I am not saying that I have grave misgivings as to the use to which

these two tape recorders would be put, but I think an explanation on the part of the Government Minister responsible would, at least, calm our fears, if we have any. A tape recorder can be very useful, and it is quite necessary for the conduct of the business of the Police Force. I think it is a new item. Formerly, we used to know exactly when something was new, because we used to see the word "New" written over a column in the Estimates. Now that has disappeared and, as far as I remember, this is something new. I think that an explanation should be made by the appropriate Minister.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to hold up the business of this House, but I must, however, draw to the attention of the Minister in Charge of Item 80 - Motor Vehicles - \$60,000 - one or two things. The note states:

"For the replacement of one (1) Patrol van, and three (3) motor cycles, also to purchase three (3) Land Rovers, four (4) speed cars and six (6) Scooters."

Now, Mr. Chairman, such a Force as the one we have in Barbados today, I am sure, should be fully equipped with all of the modern methods of policing, especially when you have this high crime wave which is taking place, to my mind, because of unemployment. Every modern method should be used, and I am one who would surely support any measure that the Police can bring in for the purpose of detecting crime and keeping the crime rate down, but I have a different view on this.

I think the Police, at times, are some of the biggest offenders and you can safely call them, at sometimes, nothing else but road hazards. It is lamentable, Mr. Chairman, when one sees a Police unit travelling on the road at sometimes approximately 60 or 70 miles an hour - I am a motorist myself, and I have an idea of speed - through built-up areas where there are no sidewalks, where children are playing in the street, and on several occasions I have seen one of the Police Vans wrapped around a post.

I believe that with better handling by the Police of these units, knowing that they have a responsibility to the public, they should endeavour to stop this unnecessary speeding in which they indulge. I know that the Minister can safely argue: how can one determine when a policeman is going on an emergency or otherwise? I am sure that when a Fire Engine is being driven to a fire, the driver does not travel at 50 or 60 miles an hour and he uses his discretion. It is true that the pedestrians should give way, and it is true that they do give way.

I wish to pinpoint one example, and this is not casting any reflection on an Hon. Gentleman. Some time ago, during the Heads of Governments Conference in Barbados this year, I saw two out-riders travelling through Broad Street one Friday morning and a car flying the standard of the Prime Minister of Guyana behind them, and I had to skip out of the road. They had absolutely no discretion and no regard

for the public; yet, they are the officers who are responsible for law and order.

Mr. Chairman, I am not making these comments because I feel in any way ill towards the Police Force. I am one of the first people who will, at all times, try to accommodate the Police in any methods they are planning to carry out in order to prevent crime and to curb the crime wave. I make these observations because I sincerely hope the Minister will ask the Head of that Department to warn the Police that speeding on the highways and through built-up areas in particular must be cut out.

As I said earlier, I dare say the Minister would use the logical argument that no one can determine when they are going on an emergency. I have pinpointed what I saw in Broad Street one Friday morning. They seem to think that when they have a Minister of the Government, or some distinguished guest around here, they can take advantage of people using the highways. They believe that as long as they have some distinguished person driving, whether it be a Minister of Government, or some distinguished person from overseas, they can push the citizens of Barbados off the highway.

Well, I do not agree with that. I dare say that when the Government has to spend \$60,000 in buying these vehicles, it will be necessary to come back to the House for money very often. You can go to the Police Department any time at all and you will see crashed motorcycles, crashed vans, and the equipment knocking all about. I am sure the Minister will agree with me.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. senior member for St. Peter in regard to the Air/Sea Rescue Launch and the "Investigator", I would like to explain to him what an Air/Sea Rescue Launch is. An Air/Sea Rescue Launch is not a salvage craft as far as towage and bringing back a boat is concerned. An Air/Rescue Launch is a very high speed launch with medical treatment aboard for saving lives and taking up a crew. In case an aircraft crashes or something like that you can go and pick up people. In the case of the "Investigator" that had left Barbados for a few days it was a different matter.

Some people have a very vague idea about the ocean. You cannot go and look for a craft unless you know where it is. Unless the people in the craft that had broken down had a radio and could state their longitude and latitude, force of currents, direction and force of wind, it would be difficult to find them. 1.30 p.m.

If a man was broken down at sea and he could say: "I am in latitude so many degrees, so many miles North longitude, current setting so and so West, in such-and-such a direction, at so many knots an hour, velocity so-and-so, blowing from such-and-such a direction," then one would be able to calculate exactly where it is and what time, and he could state precisely to the minute, that you could arrive at it. In the case of the "Investigator" nobody would know when she went

adrift and what part of the Island she was at all; so you could not send out anything to search for something. In other words, if any one of us was broken down, say, in a car accident in Bathsheba, you could say: "My car stalled in Bathsheba opposite the Atlantis Hotel," or somewhere like that, and then you could go to the spot; but a boat just going out and not coming back in, you would not know where to set out to go to look for it. That is the position; an air-sea rescue craft is more for life-saving purposes than it would be for salvage because the type of craft used would have to be very, very fast, and fast craft usually have a shallow draft and would not be the type of craft which could be used for towage. It is the type of craft which would make high speeds, but would not be competent for towing. It is usual with the fishing-boats that if one went out today and did not return tonight, nobody is actually perturbed in the Ministry of Fisheries. It is only by next afternoon when it does not return that immediately the Fisheries Department gets in touch with the Harbour Master and Seawell Airport and sends out reports and calls on all shipping or aircraft in the vicinity to keep a good lookout and render any possible assistance; but until something is located, an air-sea rescue craft or any other type of craft is useless to render assistance.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Hon. Minister for making his definition with such limitation of meaning of the term "air-sea rescue operations." I am not such a dud; I will go further than that. When the "Investigator" was known to be missing, was there any air-sea rescue sent to investigate? I know the Minister probably feels very proud of the fact that he has scored his point that location or point of location is very necessary for one to go looking for the object whether that object is on land or at sea. As soon as it was made known to the Fisheries Department that the "Investigator" did not return to its moorings and was missing, was there anything attached to this air-sea rescue unit sent out to discover anything? If anybody goes out to sea - Barbados is a small island and is just 100 miles from St. Lucia - I want to know if it was reported that a launch containing human beings was missing, if any air-sea rescue unit would normally set off to make a survey or try to locate it at sea, if it would only do so or if it was only expected to do so when the missing launch has a compass that is operating and working, a radio operating and working, because these things can break down. If the air-sea rescue unit is only going to work when these other things are working and working well, we can see how much use or assistance or lack of use is this air-sea rescue unit. It is going to attempt to rescue them when certain things are positively known to be working, but if certain things are not known, there will be no attempt at all to rescue anything. Am I to accept that? What was represented to me is that, in that instance, a rescue operation came into play and, of course, they thought that they did so because the lives of certain other people or certain other classes of people were involved. That was the slant given. I am not saying that that was my interpretation, but if I am to be given to understand that because of the improper functioning of certain necessary gadgets at sea that the air-sea rescue is not going to take off at all, when the

report is made to them that there is a fishing boat or a fishing launch missing, I believe that things are in a bad way.

Mr. Chairman, I am not expecting the impossible. This boat, I think, was found in a neighbouring island; some wreckage was found. I understand that the men returned to Barbados, or at least I heard that they were located. I am not so possessed of the facts, because I am not a member of the Co-operative. I was only spoken to by a relative of the Co-operative, and that was the sort of representation made to me. If I am to take it that that is all that is coming from the Minister that because of a lack of pin-pointing the spot on land or at sea - because that is what latitude and longitude will give you and you go to the exact point - if in the absence of that data, there is no attempt to be made by air-sea rescue, I feel that things are in a very bad way. A boat does not leave here and go to St. Lucia in an hour; it takes a reasonable time. It is drifting; after all, it is not even going by its own motor power. If it is drifting even by sail, it is drifting. It is just drifting and the engine is not working. I think that this air-sea rescue is a lot of hullabaloo. We are speaking about conditions of emergency. A man does not calculate when he is going to drift; a man does not calculate when his engine is going to cut out. If you know that a man is missing, you send out to look for him within a reasonable circuit or area; but for you to be satisfied and know for certainty where he is and at what definite point he is on the globe, before you decide whether to start or not, I think that a lot of time is wasted.

The hon. senior member for Christ Church is more au fait with certain of the relative facts about the disappearance - (Mr. St. JOHN: I do not know about the disappearance.) Well, about the incident relating to the "Investigator", and I will sit while he will inform the Committee, and I think the Minister may then attempt to reply.

1.40 p.m.

Mr. ST. JOHN: Speaking, Sir, on this Air-Sea Rescue, what I would really like to discover is that according to the information which I have at my disposal, immediately upon the disappearance of this boat, the Ministry of Fisheries was notified, and after some time information was also given to the effect that the men who were on board the boat at the time were somewhere off St. Lucia.

What I want to know is whether any communication was sent to the various Harbour Masters of the other West Indian Islands where in the past boats have drifted from Barbados: further, whether any information was sent to those other countries in the Western Caribbean as far as the Dominican Republic because it is known that on former occasions boats have drifted from Barbados as far as the Dominican Republic. I remember some years ago, when the Prime Minister was a practising lawyer, that a man called Lampitt from St. John went out in a boat which drifted from Barbados and ended up in the Dominican Republic.

Perhaps it would be useful if we can have a statement from the Minister who is in here on the steps that are taken by the Ministry or by the Harbour Master's Department upon information by the relevant people involved of the disappearance or non-appearance from the fishing grounds of vessels. This would be of help in all the fishing villages of this country. If they can get the procedure well known to the public, I think it will help a great deal because it certainly seems to me that somewhere on the coast line off St. Lucia this boat ended up and was smashed; but if there had been notification to the appropriate authorities in St. Lucia at an earlier stage, or when the information was received by the Ministry, a look out would have been kept and just as the boat rescued the men on board, they would have been in a position to know and proper communications would have been done. I just do not believe that this boat was smashed. It seems to me very peculiar, extremely peculiar, under the circumstances in this case.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Sir, if the hon. senior member for Christ Church was in his place just now, he would have heard exactly what I stated. I would like to tell him that the usual procedure is this. Now normally, let us say that a fishing boat left Barbados, say, at two o'clock this morning and went out fishing. It would not be anything to concern the public if it did not return tonight because, as the hon. member knows, it is quite possible for a boat to go out and sleep out for one night, although usually I prefer fishermen to say or to tell their families that they might sleep out on a particular night.

Well, if they do not return this afternoon, no one is unduly perturbed: but I would say that if by tomorrow evening at three thirty that boat does not come in, then it would be sufficient time for one to believe that something has happened. Immediately the Fisheries Department would notify the Harbour Master and Seawell Airport. The Director of Civil Aviation through the Harbour Master would notify aircraft and shipping would be notified at sea. A cable would be sent out to notify shipping within the area, including all ports and harbours, to keep a good look out and to render all possible assistance, if necessary, to any craft.

Only a couple of months ago, about five months ago, a boat from Silver Sands went out spear fishing with about eleven men on board. Ten were over board diving, leaving one man on board. The one man on board was washed off. The boat rolled and he was pitched over board and the boat was three-quarters of the time running at half speed or left to itself. Well, it would have proceeded I would say for about two hours running at the speed at which it was running.

As the hon. member knows, the usual prevailing currents around Barbados run towards a westerly position covering a west-north-west side current and from Grenada to Bequia is a solid mass of islands with very small channels between them. There is a channel between Bequia and St. Vincent about eleven miles wide, another small channel between St. Vincent and St. Lucia, and another between St. Lucia and Martinique and it would be rather unfortunate or unlikely

to get through those channels. Very few boats have been unfortunate enough to get through one of those channels.

Well, this boat which I mentioned above, was one of those boats which got through the channel and I think it was ten days afterwards that she was sighted by a ship, which was one of the ships notified, and she reported back to Barbados the position in which the boat was sighted. I calculated the very night that I got the information the position in which that boat was sighted, and it was 200 miles south of the Island of St. Croix.

The hon. senior member for Christ Church also mentioned Santo Domingo. There is only one incidence that a boat had drifted to Santo Domingo, and she was also saved. The crew was taken off by a tanker. I think it was the ship called the "Blue Star" belonging to Mr. Lampitt from Christ Church. That boat ended up in Santo Domingo and she finally deteriorated actually in a port on the south-eastern side of Santo Domingo, called La Romano. This boat which was sighted had no person in it because the crew had jumped over board and another fishing boat brought in the crew which were spearfishing. This boat was actually left alone to drift.

Three years ago, I lost one under similar circumstances. A tourist ship took the one man off. She had actually cleared the channel between Martinique and St. Lucia. Nothing has ever been heard about her since.

With the "Investigator" as soon as we got the report, the same procedure was followed; that is, the Harbour Master and the Director of Civil Aviation would have been notified.
1.50 p.m.

By the time that these people had arrived in-shore in St. Lucia and taken to Castries and the Harbour Master was notified, nothing was seen. Then two or three days after, I left Barbados to go to a conference in St. Lucia and nothing has ever been heard of the boat. It is likely that it drifted in the channel. More than likely it might have been run down by a big ship at night, or if the boat was making water, obviously there would be nobody on board to bale it and eventually she might become water logged and would sink; but nothing has ever been heard of it.

The hon. senior member for Christ Church well knows that you must know where a boat is, and unless some other fisherman had said that he had seen such a boat and it was in such-and-such a position, to set out to go and look for something with another boat would be going on a wild goose chase. I have left here on instances to go over 250 miles to render assistance to ships. I left here to go to the Richwill before I was in this Government, following a cable sent by a tanker. I got permission from Cable and Wireless to speak directly with the tanker myself and got the longitude and latitude that the ship was in. She was actually helpless with no electrical equipment, no lights, no anything, and that ship stood there until I had calculated, got its position, made arrangements with its

owners, made arrangements to get another ship to go, for it, and exactly the time that I would have been there, and I told them that at precisely such-and-such a time, so many hours from then to look for a flare, and when they see the flare, return me one. To the hour I was alongside and delivered him his batteries and came back to Barbados two days after I left him. You must know where a ship is to be able to go for it.

In other words, if a fishing boat goes out, I do not know if it is in the south-east, north-west or the north of Barbados. Where could I go to look for it? Usually in these instances of salvage, you require a knowledge of where the ship is. You must know the position of it. If within hours I know what position a ship was in, knew its latitude and longitude, I would assume normally the average direction of your current and the sudden drift, wind velocity and direction, then I could calculate and go within reasonable visibility, but visibility on a low craft would not be more than 4 1/2 miles to 4 miles, because a small craft is practically on sea level and so visibility is dependent on your altitude above sea level. At sea level your visibility of something that is actually on sea level would not be more than five or six miles, and all this has to be calculated.

The laws of International Airports require air/sea rescue craft. Usually on take-off and something happens, the plane can crash and there must be something according to the international regulations within a short space of time to be able to save the lives of the passengers before the craft can sink. As I said, air/sea rescue craft can only render assistance as far as lives are concerned, but it is not the type of boat that would be competent to perform salvage work like towing. Only a couple of weeks ago there was a Japanese ship off here and I was called up in Cabinet - my colleagues here can assure you of this - and told that they had heard a ship on emergency and distress calling saying that it was sinking, they had seventeen men on board, they were all tired and could hardly stand on the pumps any longer. I got in touch with Cable and Wireless, got the position of the ship and made preparations to set out from here immediately to go for it, but I would only have been able to render assistance to lives. Then I listened in myself and found that there were other ships which had left Barbados which could have done a better job than I could have done. They were at closer points and could have arrived earlier and be in a position to render salvage assistance, not only to take the crew off, but to tow the ship to Barbados, which is what happened. I did not have to go, therefore; but in case there was no ship in the vicinity, at least all I would have been able to do was to go and salvage the lives of the people, but with the air/sea rescue craft I would not have been in any position to tow the ship, because an air/sea rescue craft is not a heavy duty, ocean-going salvage type of craft. It is a high speed craft for making quick speeds, speeds up to thirty knots an hour, and that type of craft would not have the draft nor the depth nor the power that makes it competent for towing of heavy crafts.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I just want to query the Minister on Item 37 - Conveyance, to which the

note reads: "Cost of transport for Police when travelling on duty." What I would like to find out is whether this is when police travel on duty and have to take a bus to go from one station to the Law Courts to give evidence, and also whether this money is paid as a lump sum into the Transport Board, is taxi fare.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, so much has been asked that it is difficult to recall all the points that I have to cover. May I just make one general comment. This arises, of course, out of the speech of the hon. junior member for St. Peter. I think he was rightly concerned, as all of us must be, about the general question of whether the Royal Barbados Police Force is maintaining its standards of efficiency and so on, but I think I ought to remind him that it was about two or three years ago that there was an official Commission of Enquiry into the working of the Police Force, and that Commission of Enquiry, so far as I can see, did a good job and made some quite far-reaching recommendations some of which I know have already been implemented and others which are in process of being implemented. I believe therefore that when all these recommendations have been implemented both generally and particularly, a lot of his fears and scruples will possibly be removed, and he would not have to worry about standards of efficiency and behaviour in the Force.

May I now make reference to individual points raised. I take them as I have them here, not necessarily in order, but I believe all of them will be covered. Under Item 61 - there are allowances of \$3 a month for the upkeep of bicycles, \$7.50 a month for the upkeep of autocycles, \$8.50 a month for the upkeep of scooters, and \$10 a month for the upkeep of motorcycles.

Under 85 - Binoculars, these binoculars are required at District "D" Police Station to facilitate the detection of offences under Fisheries Regulations.

Under Item 47, this increase is to provide maintenance for new units, petrol, oil etc., and obviously if there were no new units the increase would hardly be justified.

I think the hon. senior member for St. Joseph asked about Item 68. This is in connection with rewards for information in connection with cane fires. I do not know why it is so small or why it does not increase from year to year. It seems to me, from what I can observe, a useless item, but I would not like to bring my own judgment to bear on this; but apparently if anybody did give information which led to the detection of persons allegedly responsible for cane fires, he would be rewarded or recompensed for his trouble from this vote.

2.00 p.m.

With regard to Item 18, this covers 3 Land Rovers 1 for Hastings, 1 for Worthing, and 1 for Black Rock: 4 Speed Cars: 2 for the Traffic Department, 1 for the C.I.D., and 1 for the Immigration Department. The Patrol Van is a replacement as well as the 3 motor cycles.

With regard to Item 16, the bicycles are used by senior Police Officers and men going on patrol. Six bicycles are replaced every year, and the total number of bicycles, I am informed, will never exceed 71.

With regard to Item 37, a point was raised by the last hon. member who spoke. It appears that the Police travel free on buses to and from stations, and that Government compensates the Transport Board for any expenditure incurred.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I did not hear him. I did not hear the reply to Item 47. It could not be and he could have the matter investigated. He would not have the information at the moment.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, actually two hon. members raised questions under Item 47, and I did not remember that the hon. member also raised one. His question was the advisability of keeping one or two men involved in repairs of tyres and that sort of thing, and he thought that this might be a loss to the Police Department inasmuch as there might not be enough work for two people who could be employed more purposefully in other directions.

I am advised that there is an operation unit, and this involves more than one or two people. There are two apprentices and, I believe, a police N.C.O., and they are fully engaged in maintenance work which is enough to keep three or four people continually occupied. It is not ad hoc repairs, but full maintenance. It may be minor maintenance, but it is enough to employ them on full-time duty.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, Item 68 - Cane Fires. The Minister has replied to this already, but he does not know as much as I do. It seems as though we are all in the dark. I raised this question some time ago, speaking under correction, and I was told that this amount is for a man or two men at District "C" Police Station who had to look around and report fires to the Station. I think it is something like that. The Minister can check on it and give me a reply before we have completed the Estimates.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Very well.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I made a general comment on Item 47, and it would appear to me as if the Minister treated my remarks as if they were nothing. I say this for this reason. There is an increase this year of \$9,400; in the 1966-67 Estimates there was only an increase of \$918. So between 1966 and 1967, Mr. Chairman, the increase was \$918. In 1968-69 the increase is \$9,000; therefore, something would have to be wrong. I do not think we are just replacing the units because they are old.

I thought that the Minister would, at least, have paid some attention to the comment I had made looking at the increase in expenditure between 1966 and 1967 and the difference between 1968 and 1969 - some \$9,000 more. I am inviting the Minister to make a comment on it.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I did not realise that the hon. member had commented on Item 47. I thought he had commented on Item 37, and I answered Item 37 in reference to complaints. The points which he raised, I think can be covered with reference to Item 80. If you look at Item 80, you will see that in addition to replacements there is going to be the purchase of 3 Land Rovers, 4 Speed Cars and 6 Scooters. It would seem to me that the increase in maintenance would be justified by the increase in the number of new units.

I am informed also with respect to Item 68, that this Item represents expenditure payable to any one who reported cane fires, and in the event of this report leading to apprehension and conviction. It has nothing to do with the man or men stationed at District "E" or District "C". Just for additional information, since 1966-67, petrol prices have gone up and this increase also takes care of that.

Mr. SMITH: If that is for paying for information, then it appears that this \$50 was existing before I was born. Things have gone up, and you must make the remuneration in such a way as to encourage people to take an interest and to see to it that we do not get so many cane fires. The public should be told that anyone giving information relating to cane fires would be rewarded. A lot of people would not know that. Sometimes you want to catch a convict, or a man who has done something bad, and you offer a reward of L50. I think you should be able to do something about these cane fires. These cane fires are very prevalent; they are more prevalent now than the mini. We should really make the reward more attractive. You would not expect me, if I saw someone lighting a fire, to waste my time to go and report the matter at a Police Station, when I will only get 6¢ or 12¢! If it were L50 people would go around looking for those culprits who start cane fires. It should be a handsome reward, and the public should be told about it.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I shall pass on the hon. member's comments. I should like to draw to his attention that under Head 31 - Item 45 - under Ministry of Agriculture - there is provision for \$3,032 under the Standing Cane Fire Board, and this pays the fire watchers and meets the expenses of the Fire Prevention Committee.

The question that the sum of \$608,220 under Head 25 - Police - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 26 - FIRE SERVICE

Head 26 - Fire Service - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I am in the hands of the Committee. I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER who took the Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chairman of Committees has reported the progress of this meeting in Committee, and leave is being sought to sit again.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE FOR THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph be granted 6 weeks leave of absence from his duties in the House.

Mr. HINDS: I beg to second that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leave is being sought for 6 weeks leave of absence for the hon. Leader of the Opposition. If there is no objection, leave will be granted. There being no objection, leave is granted.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 3.15 p.m.

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

The question that this sitting be now suspended until 3.15 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.

2.15 p.m.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: When the sitting was suspended, the House was in Committee of Supply. Automatically, there is the resumption of such.

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

HEAD 26 - FIRE SERVICE

Head 26 - Fire Service - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$85,750 under Head 26 - Fire Service - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 27 - TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING

Head 27 - Town and Country Planning - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that the sum of \$23,864 under Head 27 - Town and Country Planning - stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, under Item 3 there is the sum of \$9,000 (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: That is Statutory Expenditure.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The sum of \$9,000 is under Statutory Expenditure.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I am sorry.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, Item 3 is "Other expenditure." What I am saying is this: I want to be told by the Minister if this Development Control Officer is employed to prevent development in this island or if he is employed to stimulate and encourage development. I say this for the simple reason that there has been considerable dissatisfaction in this Department for some time. At this present moment you will find that there is one Officer employed in the Department to supervise development in St. James, St. Peter, St. Lucy, St. Andrew, St. Joseph and St. Thomas - six parishes. There is then another Officer who is responsible for all the development in Bridgetown, and you will find that in the Southern District, in the remaining parishes, there are two officers responsible, but it is a case where these Officers, you will understand, can only attend to or render such services where an application is made for permission to develop; but that is not what we think that a Development Control Officer is so much to be concerned with. It is in controlling the type of development that springs up overnight. Unauthorized development comes after the Town and Country Planning Department has its plans and we would like to see that everything goes according to those plans. But when you find that one Officer has six parishes to supervise, he can only attend to the genuine cases - the people who are good enough to inform the Department that they want to carry out some form of development; but all over the place, all sorts of development is taking place and there is no control whatsoever. The Department has absolutely no control. It must mean from what I said already, that there is a definite shortage of staff. I am sure that the minister will be able to bear me out and give a reply to this. There was a time when there were more persons employed with the Town and Country Planning Department than are employed today. Some of the Officers have left, but no new ones have been taken on and you will find that those who have remained have had to take on added responsibilities so as to keep the Department going. But ask yourself this question; are they getting further remuneration for this particular responsibility which they have had to accept? Certainly not. When such is the case, one must find that the Department cannot serve the community in the way in which it is intended that it should serve.

For years this dissatisfaction has been brought to the attention of the Officer in charge of the Department, you will find that because you have four or five Officers, they are being overworked. They have to visit sites, make inspections and return and make their recommendations, fill in all sorts of forms, and all the Head of the Department is doing is just sitting down and affixing his signature - I do not want to say without reading what he is signing. But that is all he has to do. A Department like the Town and Country

Planning Department ought to be well staffed. There are no two ways about it. There was a time when many people who intended - and it still obtains now - many people who are minded to make application to this Department for permission to carry out development. You will find that on account of having so few Officers for going into the field and carrying out inspections and attending to these matters with the haste with which they ought to be attended to, those who are making the applications are the ones who are really suffering. There is no staff and no work can be done in the time in which it should be done. Many people are minded to carry out development at times and you will find that there are some projects which should be entered upon at certain periods, let us say, during the harvesting of the cane crop; you will find that there are building projects which will not be entered upon now, because some of the same people who normally work in the building programme are those who have gone to help reap the cane crop so that it will be a slowing up with certain people at this particular time. That is a very serious case because when that labour is available and people want to carry out development, you will find this bottleneck, because the Department cannot deal with, or has not got the staff to deal with, the demands which are made on the Department.

That is not a very good situation which should be allowed to obtain, and it looks very good for the Development Control Officer to receive \$9,000 a year. But if there is nothing to control, what purpose can he really serve to the Department? The Town and Country Planning Department needs a survey in itself being carried out on the whole structure, staff and everything else and fit it wherever best we can. We are willing to appreciate the fact that it is not always easy to get staff to fill certain posts in these Departments. All of that is true; but if that is the case the Government should initiate a training programme whereby within a few years' time when, undoubtedly, you cannot prevent an Officer..... As I understand it, the policy of promotion or lack thereof on the part of the Government did not lend itself to encouraging other people to come from time to time to accept certain jobs or positions in this Department. You will find that if the Government were to initiate a training programme, there are perhaps many Officers who might be taken from other branches of the Civil Service who could be trained in a much shorter period of time than if you take the youngster who has just left school.

3.25 p.m.

It is not merely the case of one officer; it is a case where these officers who are presently in the Department are having too much work, much more than they can safely carry out. The whole matter has got to be gone into, and the sooner, the better.

The question that the sum of \$23,864 under Head 27 - Town and Country Planning - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 28 - PRISONS

Head 28 - Prisons - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$69,316 be appropriated under Head 28.

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

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

HEAD 29 - METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE

Head 29 - Meteorological Service - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$155,683 be appropriated under Head 29.

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

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

HEAD 30 - PRINTING OFFICE

Head 30 - Printing Office - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$100,464 be appropriated under Head 30.

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

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

Heads 31, 32 and 33 were called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, in view of the temporary absence of the Minister responsible for these Departments, I wonder whether we can go to Head 34.

HEAD 34 - MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS AND WORKS

Head 34 - Ministry of Communications and Works - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move that the sum of \$4,983,244 be appropriated under Head 34.

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

Mr. SMITH: Sir, this deals with Communications and Works. That is my portfolio. Item 54 - Compensation under Advertisement Regulations' Act, 1956, and the note says: "To meet claims for compensation in accordance with the Regulation made under the provision of the Act." I only want to know from the Hon. Minister something about these particular claims, if they are unforeseeable or if they are regular claims. Small as the amount provided is, what is it really for? You say, "claim for compensation under Advertisement Regulations Act" and the amount is only \$5. (A VOICE: \$500) It looks so to me.

It sounds small.

Now, Sir, Item 55 - Telephones. I would like to know from the Minister if it is really the intention of the Government to provide telephone booths in the various parishes - the far outlying parishes such as

St. Lucy, St. Joseph and St. John where telephones and the Telephone Company are there already.

Sir, you have some outlying parishes where you have to drive for many miles before you can find a telephone. If you are on the highway with your car and you have a flat tyre or a little car trouble, you have to walk very nearly back to Bridgetown to get a telephone call to ask someone to come and relieve you, or to call a garage or something of the sort. I want to find out what is the Government's intention about it, if it is their intention to stay like that or if they are aware of the fact of the inconvenience that is caused to private householders. It can be inconvenience and embarrassment at sometime when they have to allow the public to use their telephones.

At night you get people knocking you up to call the doctor or something like that. It is not fair to that private householder after having to pay for his telephone, then during the night to be interrupted to give someone a telephone call. It is an embarrassment at some times, and the Government should now be thinking of installing telephone booths so that the Telephone Company can instal a slot system or something of the sort.

It is time that you should consider the public by way of giving them that service. When I use the word "giving" I mean that you may have to pay, but the Government should do something about it.

There are quite a few more items which I want to raise, but I do not want to load the Minister with all of them. I would be glad if he would make the necessary notes.

We come to Item 60 - Life Saving Apparatus on beaches. Now, Sir, although I can be termed a country man, when it comes to the beach and bathing at the beach on mornings, I am more regular at the beach at Gravesend than most people. We have a small area up there which is really a health-restoring area. It is called "the pot". Sir, I have seen people go there and others had to lift them into the Pot, and within a matter of two or three weeks, they walked into it themselves.

This beach is crowded at all times and I feel that the Government should consider putting necessary bathing booths there so that people can change their clothes; Government should also pay a caretaker for taking charge. At the present moment, you have a make-out thing up there, but it is not protected by a caretaker, as far as I have found out. You go there to find that water from the bath is running all the time. The rose is taken off and everything pulled to pieces, and the place is in a bad state at some times. 3.35 p.m.

Now you are thinking of your tourist industry - and I am sure there are many tourists now who enjoy that warm lake up there, and it is time that we do something there to attract them. Besides, one may want to take his mistress or one of them there - you know some of us have more than one - and he should

be private when he goes there to change his clothes and so on. I see that the Government has done a very good job there by building a breakwater; it is not finished yet, because I still see materials there; so you can carry on from there and build booths and have a caretaker there. This will pay for itself whether or not you are going to charge, because there are people who would be a charge on the Government, but when they go and bathe in the Pot, as we call it, they would not be a charge anymore because they would be able to work again. I sincerely hope the Minister will take what I have just said seriously and see that proper bathing booths are erected with a caretaker to protect the bathers' clothing.

Now under Item 61 - Contingencies, the note says that "expenditure under this item may not be incurred without the approval of the Minister. Provision to meet unforeseen expenditure on any item for which provision may be inadequate and to include expenditure formerly met from Item, Unforeseen Minor Works." That word "contingencies" is very elastic. I am not going to comment on it although I do not like votes set out like this. In some cases this money is spent on something other than what it is voted for. I am not asking the Minister to comment on this; I am only letting him know how I feel about it. I am very afraid of the words "contingencies" and "miscellaneous" because they can be very dangerous.

Now, Sir, Item 69. Now this question was hanging fire for the longest time. We have inspectors at Highways and Transport who inspect vehicles and also have to attend accidents and things of that sort any time of the night, Sundays and Bank Holidays included. Now there are only two classes of people who do this type of work around the clock, and they are the Inspectors at Highways and Transport, and the Managing Director of Fix-It-Right. The Director at Fix-It-Right is well provided for; so I would not raise the question here; but it is the inspectors at Highways and Transport for whom something should be done. They must be at home when the telephone rings for them to rush to an accident and take measurements with the Police, and I understand that they do not receive any overtime pay at all. That is not fair to them. If you were trying to get away with murder before, it is time you cry halt because you have more machines coming on the road daily and you have accidents practically every minute, and it is not fair to call a man out of his bed after he has worked a whole day. He has to turn up for work at the same time as the other officers who arrive at 8 o'clock or whatever the time may be, and while the others go home at 4 o'clock or 4.30 o'clock, they have to answer calls at night with no remuneration whatsoever. This was hanging fire for very long. Speaking under correction, I think His Honour the Speaker had asked a question about this same thing when he was on the floor of the House and nothing has been done, and there are other officers who are getting over-time allowance from the Government. Why is it that these officers do not get any over-time allowance when they are doing a very important job in the community? I hope that that is sufficient to let the Minister know how I feel about it and, I dare say, how the officers feel about it, because they work night and day for the same pay.

The Government should set that example, because they are only asking me to demand my employees to do the same thing. This type of officer must have been born for this job, because if I were in their place I would be out whenever the telephone rings and nothing would be done until next morning. I can remember that this office was asking for an inspector for the last twelve years, and it is only about last year or two years ago that they got the officer. You cannot blame the Minister for the Department; it is the Head of the Department. The Minister is not there for the administrative side; he is there for making policy and things of that sort. I do not know how to believe that the Head of Department could have made a recommendation for overtime allowance for his employees and allow it to remain like that all the time year after year.

Under Item 78 - Guard Walls, Mr. Chairman, this has drawn itself to my attention, and I hope that the Minister will forgive me and do not think that I want to travel in his Constituency or try to represent it. However, I was going home one night and I almost went over, because another car was approaching and the lights struck me in the eye; and if the brakes of my car were not working as they should, I would have gone overboard. I think the place would be called Carrington's Village, but there is a pipe nearby, there is the Brethren meeting room and around the corner is the entrance to the Trust at Welchman Hall. I think the Minister will understand me. I think there are houses below the level of the road; there is no guard wall whatsoever, and one could easily go over on the houses. This drew itself to my attention because although I was passing there for years, I never took notice of it and it is very dangerous.
3.45 p.m.

I know that the Minister can remember the particular site. I think it is Carrington's Village, and I hope that he will see about it. It will not cost much to put up a guard wall up there so as to protect the travelling public, including himself, too, because he may fall into the same trap that I nearly fell into that night.

Item 81 - Car Parks and Bus Stands. First of all, to begin with, it is high time - I do not know what the Minister was thinking. I passed down the Harbour Road and saw people in the Bus Stand practically burning up in the sun while waiting for a bus to arrive. With a few galvanized sheets and wallaba posts, a shed could be erected there so that the people could shelter from the sun. The evening sun is very steaming down there, and the people have to be standing all the time in the sun. Sometimes when the rain is falling the people get wet. When you get weather of that sort, it is possible that the undertaker would get a job. It is not fair to these people. You changed the bus stand, you changed the routes, and you changed everything; so it is time to provide a shelter for these people now. We are approaching the New Year; so do not let this year pass without paying attention to this shelter for the people in the bus stands.

With regards to the car parks, I really do not understand it. There is a car park in Hincks street, and you have two Banks nearby. If a particular customer

steps into one of these Banks for five or ten minutes and he leaves his car in the car park, he will have a Car Park attendant running him down for money. It has happened to me. I know that they would not like me, because I do not belong to the D.L.P. Government. They would not care anything about me, and I know that.

Any customer, whether he is a member of the public, an M.P., J.P., and all of those P's, who steps into one of these Banks for a few minutes to do business after leaving his car in the car park, should not have the Car Park Attendant running him with a book and shouting; "You owe me fifteen cents; I want fifteen cents." That has happened to me. (An hon. member: "You take too long to get a loan.") I do not have to take long; my name is good; I can do that by telephone. It is only when I have to sign that I go to the Bank. It is only the tight-fisted ones who have to go to the Banks and form fours.

Now, Sir, I am saying that it happened to me one day. I do not know whether the chap knew me or not. He told me: "You have to pay me fifteen cents". I asked him for what; I attempted to drive off, but another car was approaching and I had to stop. He ran to me again, practically haranguing me for fifteen cents. I did not remain at the car park for a long period. I could understand if you were charging fifteen cents per hour or half hour, and your car took up a space for a long period. I want to be protected from that type of behaviour from a Car Park Attendant, and to protect other customers from that sort of thing. I believe he has a book, and he must be making notes of when a car stops and how long it remains. I believe that must be the purpose of his book. If he sees a car staying for fifteen minutes, he should not charge for that. It is not a question of taking up the space for half day. You have to stop your car somewhere when you are doing business. As I have said, two Banks are nearby.

Mr. Chairman, if this man had continued, I would have struck him in view of the way he approached me and there would have been a fight down there. I would not care. They can lock me up at any time. The Car Park Attendant should be given instructions. The people who are responsible for these Car Park Attendants should be told, according to the hon. junior member for St. Andrew, that some latitude should be given to the time when a car is parked there. One should have half an hour free, or fifteen minutes. The Car Park Attendant should be on the spot to see that a man did not park his car in the car park and walk down Fontabelle and back. When he sees that you are just going to one of the Banks nearby, he should be told that he should not harangue such people for fifteen cents.

You must bear in mind that the car park belongs to the people; they are paying taxes; every drop of gasoline that you put into the tank you have to pay taxes on; the people contribute to the Car Park, and they should not be harangued by a Car Park Attendant for fifteen cents because they have parked their cars for a few minutes. By right, I feel that no one has any right to pay for parking a car at all. The people are

paying the Car Park Attendant. It is Government funds; the taxpayers' money is contributing to the upkeep of the Car Park. Every time you buy a part for your car, you are paying for it. If it is the wish of the Government to make one pay for parking a car, then one should be given some grace for a few minutes without being harangued by a Car Park Attendant. I am not saying that I am too great to be harangued. I am speaking for everybody. It can happen to anybody using the Bank.

Formerly, I used Barclays Bank, but, in view of the fact that I had to park so far away and then walk back there, I had to transfer my business to the other Bank in order to get a little ease in parking and walking too.

With regard to Item 82 - Special Reserve for Extraordinary Road damages, I notice by my note here that in 1967 - 68 you asked for \$68,000, and this year you are asking for \$50,000 - \$18,000 less. That may be because you actually spent \$22,000 of the \$68,000. Now, I do not think the Minister would be able to tell me that he had no money to repair the extraordinary damages to roads, because the money is here and it has not been spent. Nevertheless, the extraordinary road damages have not been repaired. This sort of thing was hanging fire for nearly two years.

As a matter of fact, only \$22,000 has been spent out of \$68,000, and that is a handsome sum to lapse. However, the users of these roads are still embarrassed by not getting them repaired in order to take out their crops, to go to church, and so on. You have not repaired the roads and yet you have the money to carry out the repairs. You have the labour force to do it with. Some time ago a lot of people were laid off and were told that there was no money to do anything; yet from the figures before me you had more than \$18,000 and work could have been done.

3.55 p.m.

I hope that the Minister will be able to give an explanation of that too, because the people are hungry and yet the money is there in the Treasury. They want the roads done, and yet the money is in the Treasury. I feel that it is not fair to the public, to the people or to anybody else.

Item 94 "Improvement of street lighting". The Note says: "To meet the cost of carrying out improvements to street lighting facilities, Oistins to Seawell. Revote".

Mr. Chairman, I do not like to hear about these revotes. It means that you are asking us to vote money all the time and you are only asking us to do it because you can do so. I feel that when you are asking us for money, you are ready to spend it and you are prepared to spend it; but you are asking for the money and allowing it, after a year has passed and it has not been spent, to go back into the Treasury and come back out again. Something is responsible for that; it is that you are only asking for it because you can do so, or because you just do not care if the job is done at all. And

there is a lot of unemployment, the people want work and the money is going back into the Treasury all the time. That is not a good feature.

As to Item 107 "Governor-General's House" the Note says this:

"Repairs to dining room floor, main entrance and stairways. Cost and installation of a lift....."

Mr. Chairman, I may sound antiquated, but the name "Governor-General" was only given a few months ago, but this House has been there for all of these years, and why are you now going to install a lift up there? I know that they will put a lift in a private place and that is only to accommodate the aged and the infirm - people who cannot climb the stairs and you get a lift so as to relieve them; but the present incumbent up there does not look so old to me; he does not look weak or sick at all. In fact, neither of them look so, and therefore I would like to know the reasons for installing a lift up there at this time. If one is in office and you are providing quarters or a residence for him and he is so weak and feeble that you have to install a lift, that person should not be in office. I do not have anything against the present incumbent. He is one of my brethren, but why are you installing a lift at this time? The incumbent there knows what to use and what to take to keep away rheumatism. He is a doctor and he knows how to keep himself fit. Therefore I doubt that this lift will be installed for him. After all of these years, it is time enough for us even to get rid of this place and rent it out. As far as I am concerned, since we have become independent and so on, the time has come when we can do away with this house altogether and rent it out rather than be spending this \$34,857 - well, all of this will not be for the lift. I do not know what will be the cost of the installation, but I feel that it is a waste of money to be installing a lift at this time at the Governor-General's house when the incumbents up there are hearty and strong. As I said before, if you have to install a lift in a residence for any official due to the weakness or feebleness of the incumbent, you should ask him to resign, but not to be spending that money in order to accommodate an incumbent of that sort. Neither of them looks to me to be feeble so as to want a lift, so that you will only be installing a lift because we are independent and we are independent of the stairway, or you are getting away from the stairway and going to the lift. I can remember years ago that it was a particular member who, every time the vote came around for a carpet or anything else, he would blow off the top of the Assembly, but I am not doing that. You must have your carpet and so on, but I do not see the necessity for a lift. I hope the Minister will be able to tell me if it is really necessary because I do not think the incumbent knows anything about it. I can be sure that if he knew anything about it, he would say: "Do not do that, because the boys down there will think that I am too feeble to use the stairs and they will make it appear as if I am unable to get up the stairs." I do not think that he knows about that at all. If he knows about it, then I will have to start and think differently; but he does not look as if he wants a lift.

4.05 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, Item 43. There is an increase mentioned in the Note with respect to Item 43. I shall read it: "For the details, see Appendix D. Paid at Key Scale Rates. Increase of provision for subsidizing public employees on leave and for payment of overtime."

Is this increase due to integration of Public Works and Highways and Transport Departments? The Note makes mention of an increase, but I see here that the amount of money asked for under this item shows a decrease of \$34,133. I find that there are only 14 persons less on the Unestablished Staff in 1968-69 than for the period 1967-68. In other words, for 1967-68 you estimated 777 persons but presently, you are estimating for 763 and the decrease in the sum under the Estimates shows \$34,133.

I am sure that the Minister would be glad to explain to us that where the Note makes mention of an increase due to integration of the Public Works and Highways and Transport departments, wages have not. We see where there is a decrease of 14 persons and there is a decrease of \$34,133, but the Notes states that there is an increase due to the integration of the Public Works and Highways and Transport Departments. I feel that the Minister would be in a position to say what this is all about.

At Item 50 is Lighting of Streets and Public Places. What I do notice is that the Note to this item reads: "To meet the cost of lighting of streets and public places." However, we must note that there is more than one street to be lighted. Now, this street lighting programme is one which we are sure that the Minister ought to spare no pains in telling us something about. Tell us how many street lights he estimates or plans to install during the coming financial year - and not only how many but where, in which parishes he intends having these street lights installed. There is no denying the fact that there is growing need for improved street lighting both in those places where persons already enjoy it, and in those places where it does not exist up to the present moment. One can quite very well imagine this.

In my own constituency, St. Peter, we have the district of Boscobelle, there is the Cabbage Passage walk, even at Diamond Corner where there is electricity at the moment, then there is the Mount, parts of Ashton Hall - in all of these areas there is a dire need for street lighting, especially in these days where there is growing anxiety by people not feeling safe walking the streets after dusk or at night as they did in the past.

Street lighting is something which ought to be stepped up. It should be considered as a priority and it is one of the programmes for which the Minister would find himself receiving the praise of every living creature in this island. We are not suggesting that the Minister has the over-all or any control whatsoever over the Barbados Light and Power Company; but we are sure that the Barbados Light and Power Company extension programme or community programmes or whatever they might call them, are so geared or can

be so arranged that they will, or can, carry out programmes in areas where Government has a particular interest in seeing that people in a particular area are served from time to time. There can be a meshing together, so to speak, of the programme of the Government and the Barbados Light and Power Company so as to meet street lighting and the lighting of public places - something probably easier and simpler than might appear to us in the very beginning.

Now, in addition to knowing from the Minister what plans he has for street lighting, and so on, we would also like to know what public places he has in mind to be illuminated. In my own constituency, the absence of a Community Centre is something that we just cannot tolerate any longer without drawing it with all the force at our command to the attention of the Government. Any lighting programme at this stage should certainly be touching the parish of St. Peter, the parish of St. Lucy and the parish of St. John.

There are complaints from every quarter owing to the absence of electricity: and if Government were to address its mind to this question of street lighting, we are sure that it would not be doing a bad thing at all.

4.15 p.m.

Now, Mr. Chairman, under Item 77 there is an amount of \$157,780 asked for, and the Note reads: "Maintenance of approximately 586 miles at an average of \$1,077 per mile." The labour cost is at Appendix K. Some attention has been paid during recent months to maintaining some of these roads, but what we do not like about it is that not enough attention is being paid to roads in parishes like St. Peter, St. Thomas which the Minister of Communications has the honour to represent, St. James, and roads in the northern parishes generally.

In 1964 certain parish roads were taken over by the Ministry of Communications and Works or Department of Highways at the time, and if you were to run the list down here which is pretty lengthy and which I would not like to venture upon at any length at this stage, you will see that you have roads at Black Bess in St. Peter; you will see Farm Road which is a road very much in use. What has really been done at Farm Road? It may be said in the case of the Alms-house gap that soon there may be no more almshouse at St. Peter and therefore there is no necessity to repair the gap; but while that may be so, there is no knowing at the moment that the Government has any intention of disposing of the property. There is Major's walk, Goddings Alley and Bullens Alley. You will bear with me, Sir, but these are places where people live and the roads are very necessary to the existence of those people. There is Collins in St. Peter, but before I get to that, let me refer to Tom Bend road. You will find that already on both sides of Tom Bend road people have built their homes, but what is the condition of the road? It is being said here and there that Government went ahead years ago and built a road at Tom Bend without seeing that the legal machinery had been put into effect so as to make it absolutely.....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order, I do not want to interrupt the hon. member, but I just want to make one correction. The hon. member said that the Government built Tom Bend road, but that is not true.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, if the hon. junior member for St. Peter would give way, it is within my knowledge that the Government did in fact, in connection with making access for the Ashton Hall Waterworks and other reasons, surface the road at Tom Bend gap. I have often been over it, and the Government had requested my assistance in straightening out certain matters of title. I did not intend to speak on this subject because I was engaged in it professionally, Government surveyors had visited me, and I have shown them plots and assisted in connection with doing this road at Tom Bend; so I do not see how the Minister can say that the Government never built Tom Bend road.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, if Local Government built the road and Central Government liquidated Local Government and took over, that is what I am saying. Nevertheless the condition of Tom Bend road is now the concern of the Ministry of Communications and Works, regardless of who built it. Human beings live in Tom Bend gap and it is the concern of the Minister to see what he can get done. I am to tell the Minister further that there are cases where the legal machinery has to be applied, because things are sometimes delayed, but if the services of knowledgeable people connected with the parish are drawn upon, he will find that what would take many days, weeks and months before the Law Courts, could be settled amicably between the parties concerned so as to have a clear access for the fixing and repairing of Tom Bend road. This road definitely need proper drainage and proper surfacing. The road has to be rebuilt so that the people who live in the area can feel that they are part of it all.

4.25 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, what worse road can anybody find in any part of this Island than Indian Ground? It must be remembered that buses owned by the Government have to travel in those areas. When roads are in the condition such as I have tried to describe to this Honourable House, the wear and tear of the buses must be greater. I urge upon the Minister that he should see what can be done to have the road brought into a condition that would make it serviceable to the people who would have to use it from day to day, week to week, and month to month. I am making this request not merely for the people who live there, but for even the Minister himself who might have to go there from time to time in the course of his duties. Lonesome Hill is also in need of repairs. The road to French Village also needs to be repaired. I can go from parish to parish and direct the Minister's attention to all the roads which have been neglected.

In this Hon. House, I think it is my colleague who tabled a question in respect of Gay's Road, and there can be no greater need for any road in that parish to have repairs done to it than Gay's Road. It leads to the Boscobelle Boys' School. Let us think of the little

children who must use this road sometimes four times in one day going to and from school. These are the things, Mr. Chairman, that I would like to ask the Minister to keep before his mind, and approach them in a manner not that he is doing them for the hon. member for St. Peter, but that he is doing them for the people of the parish of St. Peter.

At Boscobelle there is a bus terminus, and the road is in need of very urgent repair. The beauty of it is that the Minister has at his disposal his road-paving machinery. It is not as in years past when we had to depend on manual labour. We cannot, for the life of us, understand what could have caused the delay. With regard to the 586 miles of road, he will be able to tell us exactly what roads are being taken into consideration, so that we would be able, through a process of elimination to know exactly what roads would remain in a state of disrepair. Now, this is as far as parish roads are concerned.

We come now to Item 93. I see that \$1,865 is provided to purchase ten chairs, one cushion, venetian blinds, two armchairs, one ceiling fan, etc. I am sorry that I did not address my mind to the number of sets of Venetian blinds and the money that will be spent throughout the Estimates. In almost every part of the Estimates you will find something about Venetian blinds, curtains, ceiling fans, and so on. We do not want to deny any member of the staff any facility whatsoever, but we can hardly believe that the Head of the Department, or Senior Clerk, is going to have the benefit of these Venetian blinds. I have seen throughout the Estimates Venetian blinds and curtains. Surely, the Minister would be willing to offer us some sort of explanation on these items, small though they may appear to him, because the money involved is \$1,865.

Now, there is at Item 94 a re-vote of \$7,000 and this is to cover improvements of the facilities from Seawell to Oistin. My contention is, Mr. Chairman, that there are already lighting facilities between Oistin and Seawell Airport. We might be willing to hold out to the outside world that that stretch of road might be considered a showpiece by night to tourists coming here, but, in a situation such as this where there are so many areas and so many villages and districts crying out for street lighting, to spend a further \$7,000 improving the street lighting between Seawell and Oistin and neglecting the major portion of the parish of St. Peter, to mention only one parish, is not good enough.

4.35 p.m.

I want to make it clear, Mr. Chairman, that we are not suggesting that the area between Seawell and Oistins cannot stand some improvement; we are not suggesting that at all. What we are suggesting is this; let him who is hungry, who has never tasted, get something to wet his lips, rather than go and spend just to make this area a show-piece for tourists.

As to Item 99, there is an amount of \$7,000 to continue the programme of special drainage in St. Andrew and St. Joseph, and labour costs are involved

in this. Mr. Chairman, if we really want to be serious and to face up to the drainage problems as obtaining in these two parishes, St. Andrew and St. Joseph, we must ask ourselves what can \$7,000 really do where drainage is concerned in these two parishes? The time has come when improvements connected with St. Andrew and St. Joseph have got to be approached and tackled completely, and coming to this Hon. House for \$7,000 in this connection today is a joke. Drainage in these areas, St. Andrew and St. Joseph, must run into something bordering on \$7 million; so what can \$7,000 do? Go down the drain and be washed away?

At Item 110 we see that at the St. Andrew Post Office the ceiling of the building needs repairs, and that a lunch room and toilet facilities are now to be made available at the Post Office. These are situations which, when examined, according to the information given in the Notes, can pose some very serious questions which, I am sure, the Minister will be very reluctant to answer, because they can cause him some embarrassment. We go to Chance Hall in St. Lucy, at Item 116 where there is going to be a telephone service provided at the depot there. Let the Hon. Minister bear this in mind; that the moment a telephone is installed there, you are going to find that people who have been without such services for many years will be making attempts, when the occasions demand it, to get telephone messages. We are to ask the Minister to be good enough to give instructions that wherever possible, provided that it does not interfere with the work of the depot, or that it does not entail any unnecessarily lengthy conversations or anything of the kind, that people who are living in the Chance Hall, Rock Hall and adjoining areas be allowed wherever possible, the use of the telephone. Let it be known that in cases of emergency and in cases of sickness, this telephone is there installed, it is the Government's telephone and it is principally for business; but wherever possible, and the occasions arise that the use of the telephone can be of assistance to the people of the area, it will be made available to them; but they should be educated into not abusing any such privileges that might be extended to them. In other words, we do not want a situation occurring where we have learnt that a caretaker was to determine who was to put through a telephone call and who was not to put through a telephone call, and because it is believed that somebody does not like a particular political Party or something else, that that person is denied the use of the telephone. We do not want anything like that to occur, if it is at all possible.

Mr. Chairman, I think I have covered the few points which I thought ought to be taken up with the Minister, and I feel that he would be willing to give us an explanation wherever possible on the points which have been raised.

There is an Item No. 87 where there is an amount of \$4,000 for the maintenance of workshop equipment, but the Note says that this is to purchase tools and equipment for the general maintenance of the workshop. You see, Sir, the details of expenditure show that this is for the maintenance of workshop equipment, but the Note says that this amount is for the purchase

of tools and equipment for general maintenance of workshop and that there are also labour costs involved in this. We would like to hear the Minister explain those little points which have been raised.
4.45 p.m.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a few observations on the entire Ministry of Communications and Works: but speaking first on Head 34, I wish the Minister or his Parliamentary Secretary would make a few notes so that they would not be feeling around as I speak on these Items - Items, 34, 44, 56, 60, 70, 78, 96 and 113.

Now, Mr. Chairman, anybody can safely say that the Ministry of Communications and Works is one of the most important Ministries in this country. It is a big Ministry and it calls for a big man, whether big in size, whether big in thought or big in heart. I must first commend the Minister for carrying on his Ministry with whatever little efficiency he has carried it on with during the last financial year. It is lamentable, however, the fact that the experts thought it best to have the Department of Public Works and the Department of Highways and Transport integrated because the integration has started wrong.

The whole of the Department of Highways and Transport because of this integration has suffered, and I challenge the Minister when he gives his reply, if he cares to - although I feel that it is his duty to the State and a credit to his own Ministry to do so - to deny that the entire Ministry is now a Ministry of confusion, and it is certainly so because there is too much tell-tale in it, this bringing this person's name to the next person. That is the whole problem with the Ministry of Communications and Works.

Now, Sir, we have under Item 34, Construction Superintendent, the sum of \$2,028. I am not an expert in this field - I am a little aware of that - but I am under the impression that this is a person who sees after the construction of whatever there is to be done at Highways and Transport like a building, or something to do with work construction, or he is the chief constructor or whatever he is.

I would say this. If he had anything at all to do with the box that this Ministry built at the Seawell Airport as an addition to the present Terminal Building, this vote is not worthwhile voting for. There is hardly any space in this present building now. The conveyor belt which you have up there now is what I am talking about. I am told this by some of the engineers that work there, some of the Customs Clerks and some of the Airways staff. They say that it cannot even hold a quarter of the people that the present Terminal Buildings hold. It is an absolute farce. It is not worthy to be part of the Seawell Airport. It is a poor design as far as I am told by the architects and engineers with whom I am very friendly. I know them very well and I have no reason to doubt them. It is a complete waste of money by way of stealing of the materials. That particular Department needs to be tightened up. It is there where

thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money go down the drain.

Speaking on Item 44, Casual Staff, this is a big joke. The amount to be spent on Casual Staff is \$1,614,643. Now, I would invite hon. members of this House of Assembly to go up at the Department of Highways and Transport to see the Minister ducking about inside there, and the large number of people looking about there for work to do since that Department has given much of its work to International Construction Company and Mitchell. I do not know what is the reason for these two firms being given the majority of the work done at the Ministry of Communications and Works.

I want to know if any of the 44 men from this construction works built the house for the Minister of Communications and Works. I do not know that, but what I do know is that the same Minister had people from the Public Works Department working at his house. That is true. Let him get up in here and deny that. I would call the names of them to him too. It is very hard to throw these blows at the Minister, but as he has said in here already, he has a hard skin. He has the skin of an elephant or something so. I think he has an elephant's face, not skin. You have to throw blows at somebody when they are deserving of them.

The Minister is my Minister; he is a Minister of the State; therefore he represents me. He should carry his Ministry with the dignity that it deserves. Rather than griping and quarrelling which is part of his contribution to his high office and making scathing remarks about people on the other side, he should only look over his left shoulder and say "I have climbed the ladder and I am happy to be here." I believe many of his colleagues over on that side criticise him. Some of them may even call him a monumental idiot. He would not have found himself in this awkward position if people were unable to make criticisms of his Ministry.

We are going on, Mr. Chairman, with Item 44, Head 34. This is a Ministry which carries with it a lot of responsibility. I firmly believe that the integration of both the Department of Public Works and the Department of Highways and Transport came at a time when they were not really ready for it. You have a jostling of engineers up there. I know this as a fact, and if Joe Clarke gets into the Minister's office first with some news, that particular engineer or whoever it is has gone overboard.

4.55 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, it is "first come, first served", not on ability; and the first question they ask you is whether you have your passport, and when you ask what passport they are talking about, they ask you if you have a passport from the D:L:P. That is the policy of employing people there as casual labourers, and then you hear the Minister come in here and quarrel and say they took their time to build the Treasury Building. They must take their time to build the Treasury Building when you have this sort of Head of Department. I do not mean the Permanent Secretary

when I say that; I mean the Minister who is prepared to go down to the same Treasury Building and fight with and beat one of the same casual workers. How can they respect the Minister? If you cannot respect the Minister, how are you going to respect any of the other people down the line? The whole problem there is that you have too much carrying of people's names.

Under this Item the vote is for \$1,614,643, an increase of \$227,239, and the Minister must satisfy me on this Item since there was less work done in 1967-68. This Government cannot boast of one capital project for 1967-68, only a carry over of the Treasury Building and Seawell Airport, one or two extensions to schools, and a few wings here and there.

On Item 56 - Lighting of Streets and Public Places - I have a Question on the Order Paper since 20th June, 1967, asking the Minister to extend his street lighting programme along Highway 1. I am not unreasonable like some other people who would come in here and ask him to carry it under somebody's cellar and around every corner. I am not prepared to be any parochial politician; I am prepared to make my name in a manner in which I feel I should make it, in spite of being suspended illegally. But I am like a good race horse; "Never say die." Since June 1967 I asked the Minister to extend street lighting along Highway 1 which no single person can deny is in great demand. All you have to do is to drive from Paynes Bay corner to Porters Woods, and you will see that there is not a single street light between that distance. You get light from Sandy Lane, and you have hotel workers walking along the streets with no sidewalks to walk on, exposed to the cars driven at high speeds by persons who have in their liquor coming from the different hotels. Through common decency the Minister could have replied saying what his policy is on this. That road, Mr. Chairman, is about two and a half miles long and there is not a single light. Sometimes I wonder if this is really possible. The first thing he asked me one day in the Lobby was why I did not get a torch light and give all the people in St. James to walk about with. That is the sort of childish, stupid talk coming from a big, old silly man.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I hope the hon. senior member for St. James is not referring to any hon. member of this House.

Mr. CRAIG: I am confident that you would not allow me to stand here and make reference to any member of this House as a big stupid man, because to the best of my knowledge there are all hon. members in here. (ASIDES) That is the most you can do.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must not pay attention to asides.

Mr. CRAIG: It is you to pay attention to asides, Mr. Chairman, and if you don't, I am going to because you are the person who always quotes Standing Order No. 29 (6), your favourite Standing Order, and all I can hear from the Hon. Minister over there is some grunts because he cannot do it at home.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That forms no part of Head 34.

Mr. CRAIG: He cannot go home and put up these grunts. "Gerts" would throw him outside in a hurry. She is six feet two inches and weighs about 240 pounds, and she would eat up poor Prophet.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will hardly say anything on Life Saving Apparatus because the Minister of Health and Community Development, a very affable gentleman, gave us his views on this already. He is very conscious of the great need for life saving apparatus. Sometimes when the Life Guards have to swim out depending on the distance, they get pretty tired. I reckon the apparatus should be in the form of one of those small ski rafts used for skiing.

Under Item 70 - Traffic Signs, \$9,000 is required for "the marking and maintenance of an increased number of traffic lanes, bus stops and pedestrian crossings. Includes provision for repairs and replacement of traffic signs." Now these things must be done. With heavy traffic you must have proper signs to guide motorists; but what I would like to draw to the attention of the Minister in charge is that the people marking the lanes should make sure that they do not put the road repair signs the same place they are working, because it is only when somebody runs over one of them that they are going to realise how stupid they have been. You are a motorist yourself, Mr. Chairman, and you see people working in the road, and when you see a sign marked "Men Working Ahead" you are right on the men. I draw these things to the attention of the Minister in charge, although I know he is a busy man. There is also another bad policy with these traffic signs and road signs. I have had the experience of driving at night and seeing a lantern half painted. These are things to improve, because it is only when something happens and Government has to pay out some big sum of money or some person gets both legs amputated that you are going to hear where the sign should have been placed, and then you will put the blame on the men who had to put up the sign. You can drive around at night and see some of these lanterns not painted red - the red has gone on a spree - some are not burning, or you see a piece of red flag or some red dress hanging over a stick. These things are not good enough. You are not doing a good job on \$9,000; so you might as well come and ask for an additional \$2,000 or \$3,000 and do a better job.

5.05 p.m.

You look at some of the signs, Sir. There is a sign in Grazettes Road, which is broken off and thrown across the road. The sign and the post are thrown aside. I know that the Minister cannot see all of these things, but they have Inspectors. When you come here for \$9,000, let us make sure that the money is spent in the very best way.

Now, Item 78, - Guard Walls. I am just drawing the Minister's attention to one guard wall, because I feel that somebody will be killed there sooner or later. I refer to a Guard Wall on Pine Plantation Road where the Government has just repaired the road leading

from Government House to the Pine Plantation Road. It is near St. Winifred's School. I think this Guard Wall is either the property of a Bank Manager, or he lives in the house.

I know that the Minister travels this road very often. Every morning you can look at the Guard Wall and see white paint and in the evening blue paint, and the wall is damaged almost every day. I am wondering whether the Government cannot make it possible to acquire a portion of the land so that something may be done with that Guard Wall. It may be necessary to remove a portion of the wall in order to avoid vehicles from hitting it. There is a sharp bend in the road, and buses are now using that road as the road to Government Hill is under repair. Some of these bus drivers have no discretion whatsoever, and they tell you that the vehicle is the Government's. I believe that the bend is really a traffic hazard, and that the Government should endeavour to acquire a piece of that land.

With regard to road repairs, I challenge the Minister, since the roads under the control of the Local Government were taken over by the Central Government, to say whether they have repaired 6 roads in St. James. From February 21, 1967, I queried the Minister about upper Carlton Road where you have people living in the area. They have canes on both sides of the road, but there is nothing but mud and grass there. People have to pick their way through that road. Lights are out of the question, but the people will be happy with a good road.

Of course, the Minister will come here with a fancy story again. He said here that he went into Risk Gap, and the people told him that they had no trouble with the road. On Sunday last I went in Risk Gap from house to house, and they asked me who Mr. Boxill was. I told them that he was a short, big-bellied fellow. I was trying to describe him to them. I said that he was the Minister who was supposed to have come to Risk Gap to see the road. The people never saw him there. He still came in here and said that the residents of Risk Gap are all satisfied with the road. Let him get up and deny that.

Mr. Chairman, under this same Item, I want to refer to the flooding of St. James. It is the Government's fault that a woman lost her child there due to the bad administration of the Government. The homes of people were flooded in Hometown just below Discovery Bay Inn. The Government has a contract to construct half of a tunnel from the pipe which is north of Discovery Bay. When they were handing over the land to Discovery Bay, they agreed with the Engineers who constructed Discovery Bay Inn that they would build one-half of a tunnel from the pipe running south to Discovery Bay, and Discovery Bay would continue from that point and take the tunnel to the river. The engineers who constructed Discovery Bay Inn wrote the Minister repeatedly asking him to start the tunnel and let them know the dimensions so that they would be able to carry it on to the River. You and the other bloke at your side can get there and smile.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not smiling; I think the hon. member should always address the Chair.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I said: "Get there and smile". If you were smiling, Sir, I would be very happy, because you are always very serious. You are staked out there like a goat all the time, and I can imagine how difficult it is. I am not really addressing you, Sir. I said: "Get there and smile with the other bloke beside you." I did not mean you. Mr. Chairman, if you feel that I meant you, Sir, I tender my humble apology.

Up to this very day they have not started on that tunnel, and if the rains come again these people are going to suffer the same fate as they suffered the last time. Since the building of Discovery Bay, the wall north of Discovery Bay would not allow the water to drain off from the people's land, as it did before and went into the River. The Engineers have a contract with the Government to pick up the tunnel half-way and drain it out to the River. Nothing has been done in this matter.

The only person that went with me to that side is the Minister of Health. The Health Department had to put oil in 18 inches of water. Some 11 houses were flooded. A woman lost her child there; she was trapped and we had to get the Firemen from St. James to take out the woman and her child. The child was taken to the Infirmary, and it died about twenty-four hours after admittance. The Minister should be charged for that murder. If the Minister had constructed the tunnel as the Government had promised in the contract and stop denying the people in St. James the things they should have things would be better. The people in St. James are paying millions of dollars in taxes. If they had done that, they would not have had this problem.

Mr. Chairman, some people seem to believe that they are going to find themselves in a certain position all the time. Governments rise, and Governments fall. (ASIDES)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When an hon. member is speaking, others should be silent.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I have made a few points on a few items, which I think are reasonably constructive. I will await the Minister's vague replies, which I know he is very capable of giving.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to indulge in as long a debate as any of the other members who have spoken so far. As I said last year when we were debating the Estimates, in particular when we were dealing with the Heads in the Estimates in respect of road maintenance and road repairs, if a policy had been adopted on the taking over of the Local Government administration of roads, and an administrative set up had been introduced before or parallel with the take-over, the problems that have arisen would not have arisen.

5.15 p.m.

What has happened is that certainly in the whole of the Southern area including St. George, St. John and Christ Church, less roads have been done than previously. That is a fact which nobody can deny. It is very regrettable because of the fact that one of the planks in the arguments used for the taking over would be that one would have a more efficient staff; but experience has proved, so far, that this is not so. As I understand it, the Councils used to repair the parish roads, reconstruct parish roads and specifically there was a grant for what were known as new roads - brand new roads. I would like to hear the Minister on this. Those new roads were - and any member who was on the Council would be able to tell you - these were areas which consisted of chattel house spots owned by private people, but because of the long period of time that the land was devoted exclusively to housing, grants were given and new roads used to be constructed thereon. I want to know now whether that is the policy, because I have been reading some accounts in newspapers of speeches allegedly made by the Hon. Minister that the Government is not going to repair any roads at all in privately-owned lands until the owners repair them and hand them over in a proper condition. I do not know if the hon. member was correctly reported. I can understand the situation whereby this policy is adopted in one respect, that is in respect of these post-1946 tenancies, because if the Board of Health was doing its job efficiently after 1946, you would have found that the Board of Health should not have allowed a tenancy to come into existence without proper roads and water; but there must be an exception to that policy, because there were tenancies before 1946 and there was no law, other than certain Sections of the Public Health Act which is in existence today in Barbados. Last year I asked the Minister to check on it because under the Public Health Act, 1954, there is a provision which says that where there is a road which, in the opinion of the - in those days it used to read: "Council", but now it would obviously mean the appropriate Ministry - was not properly paved, drained and so on, the Council, now the Ministry, could issue a notice on the owners and call upon them to do it and they would make a contribution. That is how some of New Orleans Pickwick Gap, and so on, was done. The City Council did it. The City Council had issued - I used to be the Legal Advisers for the Southern District Council and I know this by heart, because I have investigated it. They sent out notices and all the people did not obey the notices - in Belleville, where Dr. Gibbons was, they did not obey the notices.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Just to set the record straight, I want to draw to the hon. member's attention the fact that all the roads along Baxters Road, opposite Westbury Cemetery and all of those gaps were done during my term of office as Minister of Communications and Works. There were dozens of other gaps not done by the City Council.

Mr. St. JOHN: I did not say that the City Council did them. I said that the City Council had issued notices to tenancy owners under the Public Health Act,

and Mr. James A. Tudor, the Hon. Minister's father was one of the heads of the delegation which Mr. Mottley invited down to the City Council in his typical style, and he made his speech. That is a fact and more roads were done as a result of this. There is no doubt about that. I am sorry that the hon. member is not here. I am not telling you that all were done, but some were done. The question arose when the tenantry owners said: "If we do this, we will have to increase the rent." At any rate, the basic point which I am making is this: that there is machinery in existence to see to it that in respect of those roads which came under the Tenancies Act after 1946, the owners of them should be called upon to do them.

When you came to my area in particular, there is a tenantry road in St. Lawrence by Chapman's Swamp. This has been a tenantry for many years before 1946. I was trying to trace it the other day. It is an important area; there is bad drainage and everything; that wants fixing. That is one set of roads. Lodge Road is in the same situation; that has been a tenantry since there was a Christ Church. The Hon. Minister has an advantage in that he has a Parliamentary Secretary who used to be Chairman of the Road Committee in the Southern District. (*Asides*) He was never Chairman? Well, probably, that is why they did so many roads. (*Asides*). If he was not Chairman, he was a member of the Road Committee. They have experience and the Councils had laid down a long-term programme for tackling this matter, but we cannot get any action taken. That is a serious matter. In addition to this, Rendezvous illustrates the other problem. There were roads which were originally good; but now - this was after 1946 and there can be no doubt about it that they complied with the provisions of the existing law - with the passage of time, the roads have deteriorated; but the area is sufficiently built up with the taxation in the area making a significant contribution both to Local Government tax on the houses as well as the number of cars in the area. Dover was one of them, but Dover has just got theirs. I do not understand how Dover got theirs before Rendezvous, because there was a scheme in Rendezvous where the two main roads, one in the centre of Rendezvous and the other at Amity Lodge, would have been repaired first and then all the side roads were to be done. That is a fact. I can tell you about this. Well, these two main roads have been done, but all the City roads have not been done. (*ASIDES*) You see, Mr. Chairman, when we come in here and argue this point, they say that we want all of the roads done. I would not be so unconscionable as to come in here and expect that all the expenditure under this vote should be undertaken in Christ Church; that is wrong. What I am saying is this: that before the Central Government was fully in control, the Local Government used to do a certain amount of roads in the parish financed from the revenue from the number of vehicles taxed in the area. In addition to that, the Central Government used to give them a grant for the other roads.

5.25 p.m.

The Hon Minister does not seem to know. Anyway, I am going to reply when he finishes. He has got a lot of misunderstanding in his head of what the Coun-

cils used to do. The Councils used to build new roads. They used to repair; they used to resurface and they used to do all those things. They used to get a special grant from the Government to build roads. They used to repair, resurface and reconstruct roads out of the revenue which they collected, and it was a self-balancing vote. This Government spends more than what they formerly spent and what they had in revenue. I want the revenue that is derived from Christ Church, from the vehicle taxes and so on to be spent in Christ Church in addition to the amount which the Southern District Council used to get from the Central Government. I am sure that we will get more roads done. We are not getting as many done now in Christ Church as we have been getting in the past. Well, of course, it cannot be spent better now, there being so much spending now that you cannot tell the difference.

Mr J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, Sir, Communications and Works is not my subject and although the fact is that all of us represent constituencies, I really rise with some diffidence after the very brilliant speeches which have been made by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, the hon. junior member for St. Peter, the hon. senior member for St. James who made some revelations, Mr. Chairman, which I think we would all do well to take note of, and the hon. senior member for Christ Church. Yet, there are a number of items to which I must draw the Minister's attention.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, Item No.94. I would draw his attention to that item and I would also draw his attention in that connection to Question No. 42 on the Order Paper of this Honourable House. Now, Mr. Chairman, there is an impression, unfortunate it may be, but nevertheless it has gone abroad, that the Minister is inclined to view with less favour applications for light in the parish of St. Thomas upon the basis of which part of the parish those applications come from, on the basis of how they voted at the general election of 1966. I have had it from employees of the Ministry of Communications, I have had it from people in other parts of St. Thomas, and I dare say that I must also draw my own conclusions from the fact that the Minister has kept 100 residents in his own constituency and mine waiting nearly a year for a Parliamentary reply as to whether they are going to get street lighting at Porey Spring, Dr. Moore's Woods, Spring Farm, Barker's Corner, Content Tenantry, Dunscombe Tenantry and Fortress Hill.

Now, the Minister met with his friends in Welchman Hall and said that all those below who vote for Tom Adams let them go and ask him for light; let him give them a light. When the Minister meets with people whom he thinks are his friends, they come and tell me what he says. He cannot blame me and others if we say that he was deliberately spiting the people of Porey Spring. There is one householder in Porey Spring from whom the Minister can expect votes although I do not know how much longer it is going on, and the Minister is as well aware of that as I am. The Minister naturally feels aggrieved that after he sent the Barber Green machine down to Spring Farm and then sent it in the Shop Hill direction during Election

week - and it was in Spring Farm the week before polling day - he still only came out of those districts with no more than would wrap around the inside the emptiness of his head. (Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I am still here.) Well, the Minister thinks it is important that he is still here: so I think that, from his point of view, I agree with him.

I remember that during the election campaign, the Minister walked about saying that Mr. Mapp was walking through Bridgetown selling pins and needles. At least Mr. Mapp was not walking through Bridgetown in a false beard representing himself as an itinerant preacher. Mr. Mapp was not cursing a policeman's mother in Dayrells Road.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think that has absolutely nothing to do with the Head which we are dealing with.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry. (ASIDE)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would not expect the hon. junior member for St. Thomas to be talking across the floor of the House from that side.

Mr. J.M.G.M. ADAMS: On an earlier occasion, a Minister made a very statesmanlike speech. He was a Minister for Barbados, but he was not a Minister for St. Thomas. "The people in St. Thomas had to wait for light; the people of St. Thomas must wait; learn that Bridgetown has to be lighted first. Most of the tourists go through Bridgetown and they must have light", and so on. Mr. Chairman, that point of view was respected, but that was six to eight months ago. We had appropriations for lights in Bridgetown; plans for the light in Bridgetown have been settled. Why can't the Minister reply to the petition signed by more than 100 voters calling for street lights at Porey Spring?

Porey Spring Corner is very highly populated. People have to gather there under shop lights when the evening comes. Barker's Corner is a corner where people have to wait for buses and there are a lot of dark big trees from the woods. There is no light or shelter from anywhere there. Fortress Hill is a hair-pin bend. No lighting is there. At the top of the hill there is another severe bend and there is no lighting there either. That is the main highway to Hillaby. You will think that the Minister of Agriculture would make some representation to his colleague that the road be improved. They may not be able to get to Hillaby if nothing is done about that road.

Anybody who has seen the Porey Spring road will know that this is a road which has been neglected so much that you can say it is deliberately neglected. The Minister did not even know that we have the Porey Spring Act of 1862 - or 1864 - when the Waterworks had the responsibility of draining that part of Porey Spring road and keeping the reservoir works and the dam works in order.

Well, Mr. Chairman, we cannot have this indiscrimination against a part of Barbados. If the Minister wants to dig his own political grave, I, Mr. Chairman,

am the last to quarrel. I am not going to quarrel if the Minister has decided that if Porey Spring is spiting him, he is going to spite Porey Spring. I will sit down and laugh: but the people of Porey Spring deserve better than what they are getting in respect of this matter of street lighting.

This is not the only part of St. Thomas that needs street lights. The Minister must tell us what he is going to do about street lighting in the country. I do not believe that you can find many corners, Mr. Chairman, which cry out more for a street light than Spring Farm corner in St. Thomas. There cannot be many places that need lights more than there. All the people from Spring Farm have to come out by the one narrow road. There is little occupation in that part of the country, and when the evening comes and the few hundred people who live down there come out, they have to stand in semi-darkness on the road which does not have paved guttering nor proper shoulders. Two buses can scarcely pass in Porey Spring road, although there is land available for widening and improving the road. There has been an accident in Porey Spring in the self - same buses which has resulted in suits in the Law Courts because the road was so narrow that a school child was thrown off a bus right there. 5.35 p.m.

All this has happened, and the Minister apparently has decided that since people voted for Tom Adams, Tom Adams can repair the road for them. I would be glad to, but it does not lie with Porey Spring alone to give us that power; and I suggest that under Item 94 the Minister owes an explanation to the House, not only to me as the asker of the Question as to how nearly a year can pass before he could say whether or not he is aware that a petition has been submitted to his Ministry.

The Hon. Leader of the House said that the aim of the Government is to answer Questions within fourteen days. It looks as though 14 months is going to go before the Minister is prepared to take on this Question.

On Item 96, Mr. Chairman, I would also like to draw the Minister's attention to Question No. 85 asked on the 18th July, 1967, eight months ago. Now in 1964 the Government on the 7th January took over the old public highways which has been formerly the responsibility of the Northern District Council in St. Thomas. I have searched the list very thoroughly, Mr. Chairman, and I cannot find anywhere that the Government is willing to repair or reconstruct the road adverted to in Question 85 and mentioned in the Schedule to Legal Notice No. 2 of 1964. I cannot find that the Government is willing to do any of the reconstructions - and there are not a large number that are required - to put all the public highways in St. Thomas into a reasonable state of repair. With the notes that I have, Fire Hill in Rock Hall should be repaired. The road of which I specifically asked is the road that goes from Shop Hill to White Hall Tenantry, and the road that is described as Reeves in the Schedule. I did not know it was called Reeves, but it must be the appropriate road, 733 yards of road at Cane Garden. These two roads

are in a very bad condition, but I will return to those later. There is a little road underneath District "D" Station which has 18 or 20 houses along it; it is only 250 yards at Rock Hall. There are two small roads in Bridge Field, one 100 yards and the other 60 yards long, and there is some work to be done at Sharon old road. They are the only roads that I have been able to find, apart from one which I have questioned the Minister about, and one other which I will mention now.

On this business of reconstruction and extraordinary maintenance, it is time, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister gives serious consideration to straightening out the problems which have been under negotiation for many years connecting up the Endeavour and the Lewis Village roads with Lion Castle tenantry road. There is an area of about two square miles in the centre of St. Thomas, and incidentally in the centre of Barbados, almost the exact geographical centre of Barbados, which is very badly placed for services and supplies generally. It is, roughly speaking, bounded by Highway 2B, the Vacluse Road, Fortress Hill, Hopewell Road and Hangmans Hill. If the Minister can envisage it, he will realise that that encloses an area of about two square miles, and inside that area water services are not good. Water was connected by Mr. Mapp when he was Minister of Communications into Hopewell, and a stand-pipe was put there, but that was the only water that Hopewell got.

There is no electricity inside that area except at Dukes House, Holy Innocents Vicarage, Vacluse Factory and one or two houses concerned with Vacluse Factory - the sub-Managers' houses and so on - only five or six houses, all of which are actually on the border of the area. There is no electricity at all in that part of St. Thomas. Lion Castle Tenantry, Dukes Tenantry, Hopewell - all these areas inside there are without electricity.

Mr. Chairman, there is a central road in that area, the same Endeavour Road which I am going to talk about now. It is understood that due to what the Government might perhaps call obstruction, but what the person concerned might call stinginess, the Government has never taken steps to acquire the last few yards that would enable them to build up the road system to bring it right up to Lion Castle tenantry. I think it very possible that if there were a road to connect Lion Castle Tenantry road to, it might very well be surfaced and handed over to the Government. I do not know this a fact; I have never discussed it with any of the relevant people; but the only road in the whole of Lion Castle that I know that is not made-up to a reasonable standard is the Lion Castle tenantry road itself. All the roads at Highland are well made-up roads, and all the roads in the upper parts of Welchman Hall that belong to Lion Castle are well made-up roads; but nothing has really been in fact done about the Lion Castle Tenantry road, because there is nowhere for it to go to.

If the Government would take the initiative with roads it owns in Endeavour and Lewis Village, you might in fact be able to get a connecting road to enable you to drive down through Lion Castle Tenantry road,

down through Endeavour to Hangmans Hill. This is something which I would ask the Minister to give serious consideration to at the earliest opportunity. The other road which undoubtedly for its length is the worst public road in St. Thomas, Mr. Chairman, is the road that goes from Shop Hill ultimately to Cane Garden through Ham Pond and White Hall Village. I drove up this road the other day - "up" in the ascending sense - and it was as much as my car could do to go up, and I had a visitor to the Island in the car with me. He had previously been praising Barbados' roads and saying what a good network we had, and I said I would show him another example, and asked him if he could believe that that was a public road.

I believe that a part of the road that is called Reeves was done some years ago. In fact, I think it was done by the Vestry even before the Councils, and if you drive from Cane Garden towards White Hall Village, you really see that there is some attempt to have done the road, but it stops very abruptly at one point where the hill comes in, and thereafter it is grass and gravel. There is a lot of the grass and very little of the gravel. Since 19th July I have been trying to get the Minister's attention drawn to the site, and the Minister cannot do me and, through me, his and my constituents the courtesy of replying to the question. He cannot be in any doubt that it is a public road. It is in the Act. He cannot be in any doubt that people want something done because I believe that people visit him and talk about it. This is a public road that starts with high grass in the Shop Hill main road and you drive along over rocks, scarcely even gravel, you go down the hill and there is more grass, some bush and then further down the hill deep ruts and deep pits. This is a road which the government must reconstruct. The rest of these St. Thomas roads were not handed over in a bad state to the Government. The Government has not had to do, as far as I can see from looking at the list, any other reconstruction, but these 667 yards of road plus another 733 yards which are partially reconstructed, partially surfaced at the moment should be done at an early opportunity.

Communications are difficult, anyhow. If you are in Shop Hill and want to go to Cane Garden, Bridge Field or that part of St. Thomas, you have to drive right down the hill and go through the cut-off. That road going right down the hill does not service anybody's houses, but all of Vacluse tenantry has all these roads I am talking about now. Again, Mr. Chairman, I have reason to believe that the Minister has little confidence as to his support in Vacluse Tenantry. The Minister does not really believe that he gets many votes down in Ham Pond and White Hall Village, and therefore I can only assume that the Minister is saying: "Let me make it harder for them to get to the polls next time!" Last time, I am happy to say, they were quite ready to walk to the top of the hill and get in the Minister's own cars and drive to the polls and vote against him; but he may have found that out too. I know he had the misfortune in Redman's Village where he paid a member of the Barbados Labour Party to drive for him on Election day and then guaranteed a loan for him to go to Canada, and now that the boy would not pay him back, he went into Red-

man's Village and cursed the boy's mother a Sunday afternoon; but this is something that happens to many politicians.
5.45 p.m.

I call on the Minister, Mr. Chairman, to pay some attention to the problems of these roads in St. Thomas, as well as the other districts to which hon. members on this side have adverted.

Now, Mr. Chairman, Item 103 - Bus Stops. This brings us back to Porey Spring. A lot of people catch the bus at Porey Spring. Where they have to wait for it, the road is slippery; the road is narrow; there is a tenantry road running up a hill down which water runs whenever there is a heavy rainfall; it is the same road which is probably the northern boundary of Dr. Moore's woods; it is this same road where an electric pole nearly fell down on a woman's house. The woman - I would not go into that now, Mr. Chairman, and I would not embarrass the Minister any further.

So far as the bus stops in Porey Spring are concerned, I see this amount for \$3.750 is for continuation of a programme of construction of bus stops, lay-by. At Barker's Corner - this is another very wet place, wet under foot and slippery. When it is raining, the leaves are washed out of the woods and they come down into the road. A lot of people catch the bus there. Rock Hall is the second largest district in St. Thomas, and a very large number of people come from Rock Hall to Barker's Corner to catch the bus to go to Bridgetown, depending on what time of day it is. They come up rather than go down towards Reeves Hill, but it is necessary for them to have better facilities at these two points for catching the buses.

The place where the bus stops, where Reeves Hill meets the main road, should have a shelter. To see people standing there in the hot sun in the middle of the day, Mr. Chairman, is to feel for them. The Minister, upon opening some bus shelter in Rockley, said that he hoped the next bus shelter would be in Welchman Hall. I know the Minister has some fond but misguided belief that Welchman Hall is his stronghold, and a place where he will derive some support in any future contest. As I have had to remind him several times, Mr. Mapp beat him at Holy Innocent's and at Blunts where the main part of Welchman Hall votes, not to think of how he ran compared with the senior member of the constituency. Nevertheless, the Minister talks about Welchman Hall. Welchman Hall needs a bus shelter; I am not saying otherwise; but do not let the Minister ignore other parts of St. Thomas. The greatest need of all is for a bus shelter - if he is going to ask the Lions to build one and make the facilities of his Ministry no doubt available to them in connection with selecting a site and so on, - the greatest need for one is that corner at the top of Reeves Hill, and the next greatest is Barker's Corner. When the rain falls at Barker's Corner you will get wet twice; there are so many trees there that they can keep up their own rainfall for two hours, if the rain fell for half an hour.

Mr. Chairman, Items 112 and 113. These deal with the Hometown Police Station, Post Office and Beach Facility, St. James. Anyone who is familiar with the Bahamas and what the Bahamas has made of their old military relics, and anyone, indeed, who goes to the Hilton and sees what has been done with what they are now calling Fort Charles - the old Rifle Range - will, I think, appreciate the need to clean up the old Fort near which a large sandbox tree grows at Hometown.

The Police Station wall has cut off, so to speak, the hinterland of the old Fort, and at the moment it is very bushy, surrounded by bushes and used as a dump, apparently, on one side, and of course the sandbox tree grows out of a lot of the part where the soldiers used to be. Nevertheless, I would suggest to the Government that when they are cleaning up the Station Compound, the Post Office Compound, and improving the access to the Beach Facility, that they clean up the back to the Station by the Fort. Plant some nice grass; put two guns there; put a bench round the sandbox tree, get Mrs. Bannochie or somebody to label the sandbox tree nicely for them, and they may be able to call the Beach Facility a nature preserve. Clean it up and make it nice, and you will improve the general facilities in that part of Hometown.

I would also like to ask the Government to remember that when they are talking about the Hometown River and facilitating Discovery Bay, if they want to rehabilitate Hometown itself - and I think there is an item for that in some part of the Estimates - Apart from this, if they want to rehabilitate Hometown itself, they will have to drain the second River which the Government own - the River which runs next to the Monument behind the Sergeant's house and comes to an end in some swamp and bush. That River is very foul. There is some land inside Hometown - it may be that some of this land was once the property of the gentleman whose name I have had to call very often, Mr. Mapp, and for that reason Mr. Mapp himself when he was a Minister did not deem it right to drain a River which butted and bounded his own property. But we have a different Minister now, and indeed the land is no longer, as far as I know, Mr. Mapp's and, therefore, those considerations do not apply. That little bit of river should also be drained.

Now that all of Trents swamp land is gone and Discovery Bay Inn has been built, and a new Hometown Bridge is being built, and the river is being improved somewhat, the Government should go into Hometown itself and improve that other river. It is certainly a fast developing part of Barbados. The Government have not done much to make it so. The private developers have certainly taken over as far south as Sunset Crest, not to speak of Sandy Lane. The private developers have done all this. Government owe it - in some degree, I would submit, Mr. Chairman, to the private developers to improve the facilities of the town. The town is attracting little shops. Miss Browne's house and the English Shop. It has a little compound where you can say, Mr. Chairman, that you can get as good items in the way of luxury foods and luxury drinks as almost anywhere in the world in that little compound

in Holetown. You can have Caviar flown in, if your taste runs in that direction. Now private developers are doing this as a facility to attract rich tourists. The Government should also clean up that part of Holetown immediately north of the Police Station River and south of the Holetown Road - south of Silver Beach Casino.

Mr. Chairman, Item 119 - Former Brittons Hill Police Station. I do not know if this has been mentioned yet, but I would be glad if the Minister could say for what purpose the building is being repaired, renovated, why electric lighting is being renewed, and why the water supply is being repaired. What does the Government have in mind for the former Brittons Hill Police Station? What do they intend to do with it?

Item 122, Mr. Chairman. I would just put in a plea here in connection with the re-surfacing of the road leading to District "C" Police Station. In the silence of the hon. junior and senior members for St. Philip, Mr. Chairman, I have to take up the cudgels - especially the hon. junior member. That road is not only in need of re-surfacing; it is a dangerous traffic hazard, because it can only take one car at a time, generally speaking, and when you come round the corner and something else is coming down a very nasty accident can happen.

Dr. Tappin's Gap is there, and I expect that some day the doctor will be coming out, and somebody will be going up, and there will be a very nasty accident. I would appeal to the Government when it is re-surfacing that road to consider also doing a little improvement to it. District "C" is a good site for a Police Station, of course, and I do not think anybody will gain - say that. There is a marvellous view from District "C", and it may not be known to the Ministry of Communications and Works that taxi drivers do very often include in their tours of the Island the view from District "C". You can see right around the whole flat coastline; it is a centre for watching for cane fires, and you also have to get there by that one little road.

I do not think that \$400 will go very far in the direction which I have indicated, but I would like to ask the Government to look seriously at that little road, and do something to improve its condition. 5.55 p.m.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I really have no intention of treating hon. members on the other side with the scant respect of replying. I did not intend to reply; that is the truth. They do not need a reply, but I will start off by saying in my reply that despite people like Edith, Olga, Roberta and Tom, certain families in this community still manage to keep a bit of respectability. In fact, we have heard all sorts of accusations about who is working on whom, who steals, who got locked up, who was this place, and who was the other place and who got numbers on their backs. You heard a lot of vituperations and villifications on this Item, but I find it extremely strange that

when we were dealing with Home Affairs we did not hear any discussion at all on Head 28 - "Prison;" but that is the price which you must pay for democracy, especially when people come into this Chamber and make statements in here. Unlike me, any statement I make in here, I am prepared to go outside and make it, and I defy anybody to do anything about it other than quarrel. You have heard all sorts of accusations; and the way in which the things were put, you would believe that this Minister of Communications and Works is nothing short of a villain. He would not give people street lights, he would not do roads; he would not do this and he would not do the next. According to the last speaker who has just sat down, according to his reckoning, I will have to have another recount, because so many people voted for him that I do not see how I got into the House of Assembly at all. It may be that I am a stowaway in here because all the people voted for him, even those whom I paid, whose mother I cursed and all the rest of it. I may have cursed anybody's mother that is unknown to me, but one thing I do know is that I will never let it be said that I have been found in any compromising position in any couch with "Slims".

Now, Sir, in reply to the various accusations which have been made, the villifications and the vituperations and so on, the senior member for St. Thomas knows whom he is dealing with, and, as I have always said, the Leader of the Opposition has his fancy that when he is referring to me, he always says that I am somewhat like an animal. Yes, that is true, because I have always said that I am a pachyderm. A pachyderm is a thick-skinned animal. It is very difficult for anything to get under my skin; but we will now get under other people's skins which are so light, as that of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas and the hon. senior member for St. James. You will hear the difference now.

Mr. J. M. G. ADAMS: On a point of order. If the Hon. Minister said anything so lying as the senior member for St. Thomas, I would really have to object to that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I understood the hon. member to say anything so light.

Mr. J. M. G. ADAMS: Well, he is an authority on heaviness.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Do you see what I said, Mr. Chairman? I sat down here and I have not interrupted anybody. I allowed them to do as they liked. Well, now I have to do as I like and I am sure that water is going to run out of somebody else's eyes, not mine. We will play our politics hard. When I use the word "honourable", I somehow get my jaw twisted; it always tries to dislocate my jaw whenever I use the word "honourable" towards some members in this Chamber. The senior member for St. Thomas said that I cannot go in to Porey Spring; he said something about my not answering some question which he asked about 100 people having made some recommendation. As far as I know I have been all

over the world and I have never been apprehended as a thief, a vagabond, a liar or anything like that. I did not see that if I go into other people's country how anybody can stop me from going in my country and in the parish which I represent. But we know the senior member for St. Thomas. We know that it is extremely difficult for that particular member to say anything, even if he is quoting anything out of the Bible, without twisting it and putting the type of slant which he is so capable of doing.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I object to the words "It is impossible for the senior member for St. Thomas to say anything even if he is quoting anything out of the Bible, without putting the type of slander". I object to the words at the point, because he is accusing me of slander. (MEMBERS: Slant).

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Do you see, Mr. Chairman what I have just said? (Mr. J. M. G. ADAMS: Did he say "slant?")

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I understood the hon. member to say "slant", not "slander."

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, he is going to be like a "yo-yo." He will be jumping up and down before I am finished with him. If the hon. member thinks that he can interrupt in order to take me off my stride I will be more in my stride. You will see who can talk badly about each other. One thing I can say is that I have never had the opportunity to have any grandfather or father who, because of a few bags of yams, got his child or grandchild educated at the expense of the masses of the country, and who, because of other nefarious actions, saw fit to run things to suit themselves when they were in power. You will remember that some time ago when I was speaking in this Chamber, I said that power corrupts but the loss of power corrupts absolutely. It annoyed certain people; I knew it would annoy them because I said it in order that it would annoy them. But from the way in which you hear some people come into this Chamber, and not only in this Chamber but in the island, and get on, you would be left to believe that those people's father came down here as Captain of the "Olive Blossom" and that his mother was the Chief Mate.
6.05 p.m.

You would not believe that all of us came from the same source in Africa, but that it is only that some of us more conniving and more of the 'Uncle Tom' type than others. That is how some of us got a little degree in Law, some got something in Medicine, some got in procuring, some got in extortion and so on. But I always say; do not rock the boat because we are all no different from one another and, as you know, Mr. Chairman, I am always accused of being Minister of slang.

The senior member for St. Thomas, who has his mouth, always makes accusations, unfounded and otherwise, of people whom he thinks are beneath his

social status. That is what he thinks. But I also know, that where there is a sprat there is a herring, but the fisherman knew different because he was caught in a sprat net.

He was talking about roads in St. Thomas and he went on to say that the road in Porey Spring, at least the road in Spring Farm was done because of the elections. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Mr. J. M. G. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of explanation. I never said that the road in Spring Farm was done because of the elections. I said it was done two weeks before the elections. I never said that it was because of the elections.

Hon. N.W. BOXILL: There is such a word as I have quoted before, in the dictionary as "congenial" and then you get 'congenital liar' meaning from birth: but you have other people who are not congenital liars; they are embryonic liars. That is from the day that conception took place. They cannot tell the truth even by exception. The senior member for St. Thomas said that the Barber Green machine was in Spring Farm the day before the elections. When the Barber Green machine finishes a job, it goes back to the Department or goes to another job. But he went on to talk about roads in Lewis' Tenantry.

I have the whole history of the road; but the way how you heard the senior member for St. Thomas talking, Mr. Chairman, you would believe that Barbados was discovered yesterday or since the Democratic Labour Party came into power. You would not believe that Ronald Mapp, the man who suffers from laxitene - he is the only man whom I know to suffer from laxitene, that is, a shortness of skin - you would not believe that Ronald Mapp was a Minister and represented St. Thomas. That parish had two Ministers - the Premier and the Minister of Communications and Works.

Mr. HINDS: Is this Ronald Mapp referred to a member of the Other Place, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am saying that the parish of St. Thomas had two Ministers - the Premier and the Minister of Communications and Works. The same Minister told the people in Porey Spring that they would never live long enough to see lights in Porey Spring. It was after the Democratic Labour Party came into office that the people in Porey Spring happened to get lights in their homes, as well as the people in Airy Cot and the people in Hillaby. As a matter of fact, it is since the Democratic Labour Party came into office that not only in St. Thomas but all over the country districts, you get this wide electrification that you see today. What did they do but pat themselves? Now he has got the temerity to come in here and talk of lights.

He asked me a question. (ASIDES)

You see what I told you. I sat down and listened to everything. I am sure you cannot talk loud enough to stop me. I am sure you will have to read a news-

paper, and if you do not read the newspapers, you will have to read the Official Gazette.

As regards the road which he talked of in Lewis' Tenantry, there was an old lady who owned some land at the top of Lewis' Tenantry, or the bottom. But the old lady was very adamant about anybody using her land. That is what I came and found. I spoke to the old lady on more than one occasion, but the old lady does not want to move. The land is not so important. Many people do not pass there and I did not think it was fair to go and discommode the old lady in her old age and make her die without getting a little peace. It is all right to leave the old lady in her place.

The senior member for St. Thomas tried to mislead the House. He really did not point out that the area is really a tenantry. It belongs to the estate; so he is expecting me to go into the estate's land and put in roads for the estate. That is the kind of dishonesty that we have in this community.

He went on to talk about the road running from Arch Hall and about how many votes I got. I do not know how I got in here, according to him. He won over me by 72 votes or something like that; so I do not know how he got all those votes. That road as far as I know, Mr. Chairman, was to be done: but on a closer examination, we discovered that it was not Government's land; it belongs to the estate. This is the kind of dishonesty that you must pay the price for when you say that you are a democrat.

Now, the senior member for St. James said that I am building a house; apparently, that is worrying him very much. I cannot understand why. I must be a crab, and even a crab builds a house. That is not the first house that I am building. He says that I am building a house and I am using workmen from my Department. What I would say, Mr. Chairman, is that I am building my house out of the amount of Judgment Summonses that he got.
6.15 p.m.

To make the accusation that I have workmen from the Department working on my house is stupid, because first, to begin with, I cannot build a house. A contractor is building a house for me. But the joke about it, Mr. Chairman, is that every Barbadian who really thinks anything of himself tries to get a house. The hon. senior member for Christ Church has a house; the hon. senior member for St. Joseph has a house; the hon. junior member for St. Peter has a house; the hon. junior member for St. Michael has a house; you have a house, Mr. Chairman. A house is nothing to me because I bought my first house in 1952 but it is evidently strange that a man who claims to be the best Insurance Agent in the Island does not even own a pigeon coop. Furthermore on the 26th of January this year his car was set up for sale in the Provost Marshal's office for the payment of debt. Yet that is the kind of person to come in here and try to villify honest people. I want everybody to know that I pay my debts; so do not interfere with me if you do not want me to interfere with you.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, is the Hon. Minister aware that three members in the House on his side have within the last six months also got judgment summonses?

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

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Oh Lord! Deliver us from this sort of ignorance! When the hon. senior member for St. Thomas gets up and asks me if I know that three members from my side got judgment summonses, I will tell you something now about him.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us get on. Would the hon. junior member for St. Thomas get on with the Head!

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I am trying to get on with the Head, Mr. Chairman, but with all due respect to you, you sat down there and allowed my character to be viscerated on the political altar, and now I am going to reply. Let the hon. senior member for St. Thomas deny that he took \$20 from a woman to appear in Court for her, and up to this day he has not appeared nor has he given back the woman her money. This is a habit with him. Let him deny it, and if he denies it you can go and look in the book and see the name of the woman.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am denying whatever the hon. junior member for St. Thomas said. I do not know what the relevance is.

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

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am denying what he has said.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: The hon. member cannot get up and interrupt me. He is only going to tell you another lie, as he is accustomed.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: He asked me to deny it.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: It is a fact. Don't forget I have the name of the person. You seem to think you are the only person who lives in Barbados, but don't forget what happened in Welchman Hall on the night of the elections. It is your car that almost got turned over, not mine; so let us get the record straight. Do not walk around fooling people that you are this greatly loved fellow, because you are hated by everybody, including your family.

The hon. senior member for St. James, Mr. Chairman, in reference to a member on this side used the word "bloke". In the dictionary the word "bloke" means some person whose name you do not know, and I do not see how all of us in here could not know somebody else's name; but you know how it is with us. I forget to tell you that he said, because he is trying to impress hon. members, that he is a Combermere boy; but the only thing is that nobody knows he went to Combermere. I went to St. Matthias and everybody knows that, people like Bennett Niles and others; but nobody seems to know that the hon. senior member for St. James went to Combermere.

School. Apparently he went when the school was on vacation. That is the kind of thing you get in this community with people walking around with their chest up and trying to fool the community.

Now the hon. junior member for St. Peter raised a point to which I would like hon. members to revert. It is Item 43, and the note to that Item needs a slight correction. The word "Increase" is to be substituted by the word "Decrease". Now the hon. member generalised so much that it would be difficult for me to speak on everything he mentioned. He however mentioned Tom Bend road, and the hon. senior member for St. Thomas - as usual an authority on every subject including how to suck an egg, but does not know that a lawyer does not plead guilty to murder and then say it is self-defence - got up to explain about Tom Bend road. Now Tom Bend road, Mr. Chairman, was owned by an old man, whom I considered to be a scamp, by the name of Turpin. This matter dates back to the time when I was a small boy, and everybody who was involved in this matter, apart most likely from Turpin, his wife and the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, has gone to the Great Beyond. Turpin who was one of those stubborn people who could not read or write had been to Panama, and when this land was to be sold, he bought a portion of it, and every year when the crop was about to start, people would encourage him to start litigation. The proceedings would start, he never got a decision and his money was spent; so Turpin's wife would lead him to this part of the road and he would dig it up. This has been going on every year even when the Barbados Labour Party was in power. As a matter of fact, it was only after I became Minister that we used the Land Acquisition Act to stop Turpin from digging up the road; so the hon. member must not come in here and misrepresent things.

Mr. Chairman, I am not the kind of Minister who sits down at his desk all the time; so the hon. member cannot call any part of the Island that I do not know. This is similar to some time ago when they referred to a woman in Major Walk, Mrs. Rochester, when the whole evidence came out and we saw who was the villain. In the case of Turpin, Mr. Chairman, this has been going on from somewhere in the Twenties, and it is after I became a Minister that I used the Land Acquisition Act to restrain Turpin from digging up the road. My predecessor knows all about this because when I was Parliamentary Secretary, I went there with the Minister of Health who was then Minister of Communications.

Now the hon. member also asked about the telephone at Chance Hall. The Government never stops people from using the telephone, and he knows that as well as I do. Recently a question was asked in here about the telephone at St. Andrew. The truth about this situation is that you yourself, Mr. Chairman, or the hon. member gives people telephone messages, but I am sure he is not going to allow people to go on his telephone every day with frivolous talk about "If you love, me, I love you; I will see you tonight" and that kind of nonsense. This is a business phone which be-

longs to the Government, and nobody is going to deny a person getting a telephone message to tell somebody something worthwhile. I need not therefore instruct people to give a person a telephone message. We are all Barbadians, although it is true that you find some Barbadians who are difficult. If the hon. member can bring evidence to me that the caretaker bluntly refuses to give anybody a telephone message, I would speak to him about it, but there is no need at this moment for that. He can rest assured that he too can get telephone messages.

6.25 p.m.

Now, the senior member for St. Joseph raised a few points. The first question he asked was about Item 54 - Compensation. This Item is for minor compensation. When it is anything extraordinary, it comes out of a Head controlled by the Prime Minister's Office. This deals with unforeseen minor matters. He went on to ask about the life-saving apparatus: boats and so on that are provided on the beach to rescue those who venture too far out to sea. But there is one thing he mentioned and which I must take strong - I do not want to say "objection", because it may be misinterpreted that I am taking strong objection to what he has said - measures with. I refer to the road to the shed at Graves End Beach.

When we were building the Hilton, Mr. Chairman, the Government decided to construct buildings for those who could afford to pay to go and undress and dress, and then, as an afterthought, the Government took the view that some people might not want to pay 10¢ to undress and dress, and decided to construct a shed so that those people could take a shower after coming out of the sea. What is most pathetic, Mr. Chairman, is that we are all Barbadians and anything we do here we are doing it for Barbados.

I am not one of those people who talk about repairing roads because the tourists have to travel on it. I think of the people here first, because when the tourists are gone the people will still be here with us. It is rather shocking to find that, after the Government went to the expense of putting in these facilities free of cost, you will get vandals who would go there and destroy these facilities. I received a report that somebody had messed in one of them. That is rather shocking. We must ask ourselves where our country is going. What I would like the members on the other side and my side to do is to stop fooling around. Do not, for the sake of a vote, let anybody drag you through the mud because, eventually, that person may not give you a vote. You can be firm without being dictatorial. When you encourage vandalism in this country you are not letting down Neville Boxill or the Democratic Labour Party, but you are letting down your own country. You are also letting down yourselves.

As I have always said in here, there is a man by the name of Cardinal Bowen who is a wrecker of houses. I have been watching him for some time operating, and he has never taken down a house while he is inside. He always remains in the lorry, ties a rope around the house, and then he drives off. If you

bring down this country, you will bring it down on yourselves. It is all right to get in here and use epithets about me. When I leave here, I forget what you have said about me; but when we are dealing with the image we want to make of Barbados, it is a different matter. We have to think of our country. When we are dealing with our country and the image we want to give the people outside and what we want for our children, we have to be very firm. (ASIDES) He says I disgraced Barbados.

Mr. Chairman, I must have been charged with procuring. In ordinary Barbadian parlance, procuring means pimping, Sir. I do not know what he is talking about. You will always get this sort of thing from pimps; that is part of their make up.

The same member for St. Joseph asked about Item 69 - Inspectors. He said that these people have to work very hard and so on. If he were to look back he will see that there are now 6 officers, whereas a couple of years ago there were only two. I agree with him that they are working hard, and can be called out at any time at night. They have a Duty Roster; so one will be on duty tonight, and one tomorrow night, and so on.

Now, the big question, Mr. Chairman, was street lighting. I heard the junior member for St. Peter say that you have street lights from Seawell Airport to Oistin. Maybe he takes a different route from the one I take or the people who come from Oistin take. What has set us back somewhat was the devaluation of the pound. Last year I told this Chamber that we were getting a new type of light, and I pointed out that street lighting is somewhat reminiscent of aeroplanes. Every year a new factory comes out with a new type of aeroplane. Street lighting is the same thing. Every year somebody is coming out with something new. Since we wanted the best for the money which we have to spend, we were examining the lights running along Hincks Street. Down came the devaluation of the pound - the lights were from Canada - and upset our plans.

I am well aware that some members on the other side do not read anything bigger than what goes on a penny stamp. If they had looked in the newspapers, they would have noticed that there was an advertisement by the Government asking for tenders for street lights, which most likely will be dealt with shortly. An hon. member on the other side asked about the policy of street lighting. The policy is that Government will improve the City area first, and then we will go to the environs or suburbs. We will take it stage by stage.

The senior member for Christ Church mentioned something about tenantry roads. He said that no tenantry roads have been built during the financial year. (Mr. St. JOHN: I never said that.) He said no new roads in Christ Church have been built during this financial year. His brother was Chairman of the Council and also Chairman of the Highways Committee, and he knows as well as I do that, before

the Southern District Council repaired the roads that they had already built, they would go and build a new road and then have a series of bad roads.

6.35 p.m.

Let him deny that we fixed the road in Montrose. (Mr. St. JOHN: Silver Hill and Dover.) We fixed the road in Dover there by Mr. Marcus Jordan. We fixed some of the roads in Rendezvous. What the hon. member fails to understand is that I am the Minister. When an hon. member makes a statement in the House that no new roads have been built, it might be true in Christ Church, but we have repaired roads in Christ Church which were never repaired and were not passable, and it is not really fair to make these accusations. There is nothing so dangerous as a lie intermingled with the truth, and the senior member for Christ Church would know what I am talking about.

The senior member for St. Joseph made a statement which I would really like to take him up on. We were talking about car parks and bus stands. He said that he went into a car park, he was going to the Bank to do business, he did not stay long and when he came out a man called to him for 15 cents. I do not think that the hon. member should really worry about that. I believe he went to New York. (A MEMBER: No, no.) That is not my fault. There is something very strange about my people. When you go to New York or to any of those big cities, you want to go from Manhattan over to Brooklyn, you get a taxi and you are sitting in the back: and the fellow who is driving, as soon as he comes to the toll gate, he looks at you and asks you if you have 25 cents. You had better pay that 25 cents if you want to get over to the other side, or if you do not pay that 25 cents, he is not paying it. After all, Barbadians leave here and go to New York and they pay something which is nothing to do with the taxi fare. This is something by itself, and if you meet 15 toll gates, you have to pay 15 twenty-five cent pieces. Barbadians will go to these places and pay this money and they do not say a word, but when they come back to their own country where they are getting free secondary education, free school meals and they are almost getting free water for the amount of money they are paying - this is a big free-ness; and, here it is, you are getting somebody questioning that he had to pay, I think it is 15 cents and a man, a parasite will come up to you and ask you: "Have you got anything there, Skipper?" And you will give him 25 cents, sometimes a \$1.00, and God knows how many people he has asked if they have anything in their pockets that morning. You give this man willingly, and furthermore if you were to ask this same man to help you with a parcel, he would start limping worse than the people who were along the streets in the days of Christ. Nobody wants anything in the line of taxation imposed on him if he can avoid it. This is our country and if you have to pay a cent more for an item in order to keep it in the country, I think we should pay it gladly, because when you go outside to the big countries, you have to pay for everything including getting your hair combed. Mr. Chairman, I think I have tried to answer every pertinent point which has been raised, and if I have omitted

to answer any question which was raised, I shall be only too glad to do so.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the Minister says that he will take me up on this matter of the car park. I have only asked the Minister to consider that, after all, we are taxpayers in this country. We are contributing to this car-parking system and to everything by way of paying taxes, buying gasoline, parts and everything. I have told the Minister that the Banks are very near to this car park, and if customers are going into the Bank to do business, at least a grace period should be given to these particular customers who are doing business in the Bank. The car park attendant has a book and he would know how to use his commonsense. A man is going into the Bank to do business and then the car park attendant is hunting him down for 15 cents! That is not fair. I do not know about any New York; the Minister knows about these big places. I do not know about them; I know about these little places. Imagine the Prime Minister of this country just pulling up there in that car park; he slips into the Bank, it might be, to have a cheque cashed, and the car park attendant is hunting him down for 15 cents, although the Prime Minister will go into the Bank and remain in there for three years and the car park attendant is not going to ask him for one cent. I do not see that you should be paying for parking at all. It is the Government's duty to find parking places for the public. You may as well charge me for parking in the Public Buildings yard then. If I pull up in front of Martin Doorly and stop there for five minutes, why do you not charge me for that? That is parking on the highway, too. I am not against anybody parking for two, three or four hours or for a day for that matter because I pass there on mornings around six o'clock, and three, four or five drivers are there already trying to get the coolest places for parking; yet you charge them, although you have no right charging them. Any customer, who is going to do business anywhere in Bridgetown, should not be charged, but the car park attendant is hunting you down for 15 cents!

6.45 p.m.

Now, I asked the Minister to consider it and the Minister meant to consider it. He did say that he would take the matter up with the Cabinet to see if something could be done. But he is not in favour of it, and because he is not in favour of it, he has not given it any consideration. That is No. 1.

Sir, with respect to the Inspectors at the Highways and Transport Department, he gave me a reply saying that you have more Inspectors. Suppose you had one thousand more Inspectors. I want you to consider that it is unfair to these Inspectors having to be on duty from morning until evening daily and then they are called upon any hour in the night, on Sundays, bank-holidays, at all times when the other Government servants are having a spree. These officers cannot have a spree because they have to be three to attend these calls.

Other Government servants are allowed, and receive, overtime allowance. These officers should be getting overtime allowance because they are working night and day. Is that the example that you are going

to set for other employers to follow by expecting these employees to work all hours in the day and all hours in the night too? All the reply that you can give me is that some Inspectors have been added. How many more? Consider what they have to do up there now, and especially at the peak of inspection time! These men have to be bending up and going under these vehicles, looking for faults and working hard. They are a hardy lot of people. Yet with all that work that they do in the day, they are called out at night.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, on a point of explanation. If the hon. member would give way. I have just been told that these Inspectors work a shift system. All cannot be called out one night. If you are on tonight, then you are off tomorrow night and the next night. Then somebody else is off, all the way down the line. This is part of their service too.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, you say that they are working a shift system. It could be a shift or a chemise; it is that they are called out at night. They are working every day and are being called out at night. If you are working a shift system, it would mean that this particular man who is working today will not be working tonight. But all of them are out on duty during the day. It might be a shift all right, but what kind? It might be a torn up one.

I am saying that whenever a day's work ends at four o'clock or five o'clock, wherever it may be, and an officer is called out at the night to go on duty, that is something different. I am sure one morning I was going up to my little pool about half past five o'clock and I saw one of the Inspectors there called to an accident out of his bed. No sooner than you call him out of his bed, he should get overtime allowance. Every Government servant that is doing overtime work gets overtime allowance. It seems to me that the Minister does not want to consider these things.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order, Sir. I cannot understand the hon. member saying that I do not want to look into this thing. I have just indicated to the hon. member that I would look into the matter. Immediately as I said this, he said that it looks as if I do not want to look into it. I would look into the matter for him.

Mr. SMITH: This is the first time that I heard him say that he would look into the matter.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I indicated while I was sitting to the hon. member. He was looking in my direction and I said that I would look into it for him. I thought he had seen me.

Mr. SMITH: All right; you are now cooking with gas; but I am still keeping my eyes on it because I am still going to enquire so as to know if they have got the overtime allowance, because it is not fair to deny them that.

The question that the sum of \$4,983,244 under Head 34 - Ministry of Communications and Works stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 35 - WATERWORKS

Head 35 - Waterworks - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$1,928,549 be appropriated under Head 35.

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

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

Mr. SMITH: Just give me one minute; otherwise it would have to be re-committed.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the Minister if he can explain for me Item 31 - Springs - \$1,018. It has a note to it which says: "Sum of \$960 represents rent and the remainder for Minor Expenditure." Item 40 says that the amount of \$66,200 is for reinstatement of Highways and roadways broken for repairs to mains and hydrants.

I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister is very well aware of the difficulties which members of the public suffer through this breaking of the highways at times, but what we say on that matter is that nobody can be against a highway being broken at any particular point.

The thing is that immediately in some cases as the Waterworks Department breaks the highways and it is resurfaced, soon after that the Barbados Light and Power Company Ltd. comes and breaks the highways at some other point and there is a perpetual suffering by the travelling public. In many cases, the surface of the road is broken, and it is not repaired immediately afterwards. In the meantime, persons using vehicles and pedestrians suffer some inconvenience.

We have been hoping for a long time that all these Departments that have got to be concerned with breaking, repairing and re-surfacing of the highways would get together and arrange their programme wherever it is possible. It is not every programme from an individual Department that can mesh into the programme of another Department at the same time; but wherever possible, some effort should be made to see that the Departments concerned with the breaking, repairing and resurfacing of the highways act in consort to see if they can reduce the amount of suffering caused from time to time to the travelling public.
6.55 p.m.

Under Item 43, Mr. Chairman, there is an amount of \$20,000 for purchase and maintenance of meters, and the note reads: "For purchase and maintenance of meters for gardens and industry." I wonder how many meters can be purchased for this \$20,000.

Under Item 45 - Delivery of Water by Lorry - we know how anxious the Minister is to have water flowing into every home and into every district; but let us hope that this is the last year in which we will have to make provision for supplying water by motor lorry, because we know when water is supplied by lorry what inconvenience it causes. Where you have an

intermittent supply, it means that you create a waste, because people will store as much water as they can get when the supply is limited, and immediately that fresh water is brought to the area, they are going to throw away the water which has become stale and try to replenish, and this creates the waste. We hope that the Minister will have his programme so pushed forward that we would not have to supply water to any part of Barbados by motor lorry.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, there is only a single point which I would like to draw to the Minister's attention under Item 38 - Chlorination. On behalf of the younger citizens many of whom keep tropical fish in aquaria, I was wondering if it would be possible for the Minister to issue a warning when there was going to be a heavy impregnation of chlorine in the water which destroys aquaria, immediately killing all the fish.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, this is another slight question under Item 34 - Mains, Hydrants and Standpipes. The explanatory note reads: "Upkeep and repairs to main hydrants and standpipes. Increase due to additional services and standposts." I am drawing to the Minister's attention - and he can make a note of this - that for over five or six years the residents in Horse Hill, Pond Well and Turville, all in St. Joseph, made application for the installation of mains so that they would be able to get the service, and up to now nothing has been done. There are people there on the newly bought land who are willing to build and cannot do anything until they get the service; so I would ask the Minister to make a note of it and direct the people who are responsible to pay a visit and see what can be done in that area, because the distance is not very long.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, speaking on general policy, no one regrets more than I do that I have to rise under this Head to ask a question on the general policy of the Department, especially as it relates to my colleague, the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, who is the Minister responsible for this Head. I have had a very distressing report, Mr. Chairman, to the effect that one day recently the Minister and Parliamentary Secretary saw some lady washing her feet under a pipe and chided her and made a report to the Police as a result of which she was prosecuted and subsequently, I understand, acquitted. If this is untrue, I would be glad if the Minister would explain exactly what happened; but before he does that, I would just say, Mr. Chairman, that I want the Minister to understand that this particular thing is no cursing match, because I am not saying these things for the purpose of denigrating the Minister. The Minister has been in one or two scrapes with persons with whom he should not be involved. I refer to the incident at the Garrison, the incident at the Treasury Building and now this incident. I am not going into them, but I call on the Minister as a matter of policy to consider whether it enhances the dignity of a Cabinet Minister of Barbados to be scrambling behind people washing their feet, and people cutting grass by the side of the road at the Garrison and so on. I say this quite seriously. The Minister may not know, but

there are complaints in the Department that he involves himself in too many small and petty things that should be better left to other people. I have purposely not mentioned the Minister going up to the St. Thomas Post Office to investigate something. It is not relevant to this Head and it has been gone over in the House often; but the Minister should not be down at the roadside. He has a position to keep up and it would distress me, no matter which Minister it was; but some Ministers you would expect it from more than the others. I heard the hon. senior member for Bridgetown dealing with the Hon. Minister of Communications once when he said that sometimes even when you wash your mangy dog, it still stays mangy, but I am not in that. This applies to all Ministers. They should not be getting down to the roadside. His predecessor in Office was not down there, and he was able to build a lot more roads and do a lot more in his year and a half as Minister of Communications than the present Minister has been able to do. His predecessor, Mr. Mapp, was not scratching in the gutters, either minding foot-washing, cantonnierring, "Beacons" and so on.

I ask the Minister to give us an account of this foot-washing incident so that we on this side can be sure that the Minister was not acting in a way in respect of his Waterworks' responsibility that we in this House can say was undignified.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, under Item 40 - Reinstatement of Roadways, I just want to draw to the attention of the Minister that it must have been an oversight, but at the corner by the Post Office opposite the Infirmary in Christ Church, there was an excavation there for the purpose of renewing a piece of pipe, and it is now about three or four months that they have no re-instated it. It is a small area, but it is dangerous because it is on a wide corner. The main opposite the District Council going to Scarborough was enlarged, and they seem to have forgotten that, too.

7.05 p.m.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member who has just sat down, the senior member for Christ Church, mentioned something about two breaks in the road. We pay Supervisors to look after those things. The Supervisors are paid for travelling, but where they do this travelling is beyond me. Apparently they do not see these things. It looks as though I have to do the travelling for them. Sometimes even in the City, we can see some big holes in the road, and unless I make a noise about these things, nobody seems to do anything about them.

The hon. senior member for St. Thomas raised a stupid point, and said that he wants me to give him some assurance. I warned him already, Mr. Chairman, that this is not the Magistrate's Court with any female Magistrate in it. Who is he? He must know his place when he is talking to me. He cannot come in here telling me that I must give him an account of my stewardship. He cannot come here and ask me any nonsense.

Last Wednesday, when we were in this Chamber, the senior member for St. James said - (ASIDE: He cannot make any noise at his home.) I cannot go home and make noise, neither do I have a husband-in-law, Mr. Chairman, I was saying that the hon. senior member for St. James said that some man told him that a man called me up about five o'clock in the morning because he could not get water, and I told him to get two buckets and get water. That is not true, but even if a man had the impertinence to call me at that time in the morning he would be lucky.

Mr. Chairman, we have a Chief Engineer at the Waterworks. Of course, the Chief Engineer is a white man and he would not call him. I do not work at the Waterworks, Mr. Chairman. Since this Government, of which I have the honour to be a member, came into office, we have installed 13,000 connections in 6 years' time. But imagine somebody calling me - this is not true; a man did not call me, as far as I know - at five o'clock in the morning to tell me that he cannot get water. I am not a thief! Do you see how people take advantage of the situation?

Mr. Chairman, one night, about eleven o'clock, a man missed the bus. He called my home and said that he missed a bus and wanted to know what I was going to do about it. Fortunately, I was not at home. If I were at home, I would have told him to wait at the bus stop and I would come for him. I would put my neck on a block that if the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was holding my portfolio, he would not have called and told him that he had missed the bus. Now, if the Prime Minister held my portfolio, he would not have called him and told him that he missed the bus. If the man were in England and he missed a bus, would he have called Harold Wilson and told him that he missed a bus? This is the kind of community in which we live. The hon. junior member for St. Michael told me a man phoned him at two o'clock, and told him that he missed the bus. It really goes to show how people can take advantage of the situation. We must tell our supporters that they must use their discretion.

In any case, Mr. Chairman, even if I wanted to give this man water, and I left my home in Dayrells Road to go to St. James to give him water, by the time I got there it would be no use. By that time he would have been able to go to the pipe and get a bucket of water. I am not trying to use any epithets now. This is a natural happening in this country, and it happens in all countries: the United States and United Kingdom have them too.

Several years ago, long before the senior member for St. James was born, buckets used to come into this country by the thousands, because it was fashionable to be seen at the pipe with a certain type of bucket for carrying water. The standard of living has gone up. You do not see so many people at the pipes with buckets. Quite a number of people have installed water pipes in their homes. A lot of lawyers, I know, will have to work for a chicken and a pint of peas, because standpipes have now gone through the eddoes.

We have built a reservoir in the St. Thomas area to hold 25,000 gallons of water. In those days it was adequate, because the standpipes used to be few and far between. Today everybody has a pipe, but the reservoir is no bigger. When people pay to have a pipe installed, they also attach a hose to it. Everybody has a little garden plot, and everybody wants to water the garden. More water is being used, but the reservoir is no bigger. Wherever possible, we are sinking wells to see if we can get water. We have one in Alleyne Dale, St. Lucy, which we hope to bring in shortly; we have one at Applewhaite, which we hope to bring in shortly, and we have one at Molyneux, which we hope to bring in shortly that will alleviate the suffering of the people in St. James and other areas. It is unfair for anybody to say that we are operating in order to spite certain people. We do not spite anybody.

This year we have had it fairly dry. When it gets like this, we have to warn people about the usage of water. Now, in the last War, Mr. Chairman, I was in the Navy. There was a Canadian Chief Mate on the ship who used to take a delight at six o'clock in the evening, no matter what he was doing, to come down with enough chain to secure a herd of cows and lock the pipe. From six in the night until six in the morning we could not get water on that ship. The men on the deck would consider it a picnic as compared with the men who had to work in the engine room. I am always aware of this water problem, and this is nothing new with me.

The Minister of Trade can tell you that any time I visit his home, and I do so quite often, and I see a pipe running I will turn it off. *(Laughter)* It is all right for us to laugh now, but I read an article last week to the effect that it is not only Barbados that is faced with a water shortage. The entire world is faced with a water shortage. There is a population of over three billion people in the world. Just imagine three billion people using water! The people in Barbados do not know what they have.

I am always trying to impress on people the importance of saving water, because the water you save today may be the water you will have to use tomorrow. I lived in Curacao for 11 years, Mr. Chairman, and anybody who was in Curacao will tell you that you have to pay 25¢ for five gallons of water and sometimes you cannot use it. It is all right to get here and think that this is a joke.

The hon. senior member for St. Thomas asked me about some nonsense with a woman. I do not have to answer that. This is why people have always been misled in this community. You get the so-called responsible people in this community who encourage nothing but vandalism. Some say: "Waste the water and put the Democratic Labour Party in trouble." You cannot put the Democratic Labour Party in trouble by doing that. The morning we get up and there is no water, neither the Prime Minister nor - maybe some of the members on the opposite side do not

bathe, but I bathe often. Mr. Chairman, as you can see for yourself, some of them may not cook at home; so they would not know the difference of saving water. As soon as we go into recess, you will see what is going to happen.

7.15 p.m.

But I would like them to impress upon the community the importance of saving water. We put on these new pressure cocks where you have to keep your hand on the stand pipe in order to get the water out, and if you have seen the stand for the pipe you can see evidence - the other day, for instance, I went into Scarborough and I had to run a little fellow from under a pipe. He had a stone scotched against the pipe to break it off so that he could bathe under the pipe. That is not fair; and the quicker that we, as leaders in the community, explain these things to the people in the community and stop encouraging them in this vandalism which is taking place in the community, the better it will be for all of us. I think I have answered all the questions which need to be answered.

The question that the sum of \$1,928,549 under Head 35 - Waterworks - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 36 - LIGHTHOUSES

Head 36 - Lighthouses - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$25,170 under Head 36 - Lighthouses - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 37 - ELECTRICAL INSPECTION

Head 37 - Electrical Inspection - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that the sum of \$39,130 under Head 37 - Electrical Inspection - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I will not be long. I would like, in connection with Item 8 "Temporary Staff" for which the sum of \$9,383 is required for casual assistance which is required by the large and increasing volume of departmental duties in accordance with the Electricity Act, 1936 - Mr. Chairman, I think it is time for the Minister to give this matter a little more thought. I would like to see the staff of the Electrical Inspection Office strengthened. I do not know what is the actual policy of the Electrical Inspection Department, but you only have to take a walk through Bridgetown, through Swan Street in particular, and you will see some very good-looking buildings from the front, but when you go into them you can see some wires hanging which you can only consider to be nothing but a fire hazard. It would be

the most amazing thing to go upstairs Messrs. A. S. Bryden's office where Mr. Trevor Talma formerly carried on his Dental Office, and look across the building in No. 47 Swan Street. I think it is owned by some man named Harewood. I do not know why this man should even have this building at all. All the electric wires you can see hanging. You find that the tenants have a piece of cloth taping them up, and this seems to be the practice of people who own quite a few of these buildings in Bridgetown. They have the front of the buildings looking all right just to bring in customers to get some money; but when you go inside you see that there is nothing but a fire hazard. It is only when something seriously happens - thank God for our very efficient Fire Service - that we are going to realise the danger of these fire hazards. I wonder if the Minister will take into consideration employing more Inspectors, or if they have Inspectors, let them carry out a complete survey of these buildings, the buildings in Swan Street in particular. That is all I would like to draw to the Minister's attention.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, before the Hon. Minister replies, I would like to refer to Item 14 "Traffic Lights". The note states: "Maintenance of traffic lights including the cost of energy. Increase due to the provision of maintenance costs for additional traffic lights."

As to these additional traffic lights, I do not know where it is the intention of the Government to put these additional traffic lights, but believe me, Sir, you can do with a traffic light at Jemmotts Lane Corner by the old Hospital site. During the peak hours especially, and you were to be on that by-road and the traffic is flowing from Bridgetown going up to the Garrison, do you know that you can be there waiting for half an hour before you can get across? On the other hand, there is the corner of Martindale Road going up to Belmont Road. Those are the only things which I would like to draw to the hon. member's attention.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, hearing the last speaker, one is likely to believe that somebody is handing out pointers, because we intend to improve the Martindales Road - Constitution junction and the other junction. We intend to improve the whole area - widening the corners and so on. That will be taken care of. As to the other junction which the hon. member mentioned at Jemmotts Lane - I find it very strange that he has come up with this, but that has been earmarked. In reply to the hon. senior member for St. James, what he has said is true, but he will remember that this point was raised by me the other day in relation to the Fire Brigade when I said that if you did not have the place re-wired, you would get some fire in the wires. The Electrical Engineer has the authority to call on these people to have their places completely re-wired, but, as I have pointed out, we do not want to impose these things upon people. However, in a case like that which the hon. member has mentioned, I will draw it to the attention of the Electrical Engineer.

The hon. member asked why we do not adopt the policy of getting more Inspectors. That is the problem with us. If you were to check with the Electrical Inspector's Office, you will discover that we have quite a lot of applications which we cannot take care of because the Inspectors are few and far between. I think that they have four or five Inspectors. It is difficult to get people trained in this field, and those who are qualified enough to become Inspectors can make more money outside most likely, than coming into the Government Department, so that they do not worry to come in; but we are training Inspectors wherever possible and practicable.
7.25 p.m.

The question that the sum of \$39,130 under Head 37 - Electrical Inspection - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 31 - MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, LABOUR & NATIONAL INSURANCE

Head 31 - Ministry of Agriculture, Labour & National Insurance - was called.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to move that the sum of \$1,096,892 be appropriated under Head 31.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman,.....

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

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

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

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to lay a Resolution which should have been laid this morning.

There being no objection, leave was granted the Hon. member.

Mr. SMITH: The Resolution reads as follows:-

BE IT RESOLVED that this House approve of the Report of the Select Committee (appointed on the 22nd March, 1967) on what provisions, if any, should be made for the payment of pensions to Members of Parliament and Ministers of the Crown, past and present, the Report having been presented to the House of Assembly on the 15th August, 1967.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Government be asked to implement the recommendations of the same Report, so that the said Pension Scheme shall become effective as from the 1st April, 1968.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I would just like to say in respect of the notice which the hon. member has given, that when the House comes to debate it, it would be a free vote. In other words, hon. members may speak their mind and vote as they place. The Whips are withdrawn.

SUSPENSION

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the sitting of this House be now suspended until nine o'clock.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER suspended the House accordingly.
7.30 p.m.

On Resumption;

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the suspension, the House was in Committee of Supply.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the suspension of the Sitting, Head 31 was being considered. I think the hon. junior member for St. Peter was about to speak.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, under Item 31A, there is an amount of \$51,758, the note reads as follows: "Provision made to meet wages of gardeners previously paid as follows: Governor General - 1 Head Gardener, 4 gardeners; Culloden Farm - 1 Head gardener, 1 gardener; Ministry of Communications and Works - 1 Head gardener, 22 gardeners."

Now the note makes reference to how these gardeners were paid previously, how they were deployed and shows that there is an increase.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. member would like me to explain this for him. I think I understand what he is trying to get at. The position is that in the past, the various Ministries under which these fell, had their own gardeners. For instance, Culloden Farm employed gardeners who were paid from the Ministry of Communications and Works. Most of the gardeners were paid by the Ministry of Communications and Works' vote or from the vote of the particular Department as in the case of the Hospital; but we were not satisfied that the gardens were kept as well as they ought to be, and we felt that since we have horticulturists and experts in all forms of agriculture in the Ministry, we should be responsible for all Government gardens, and this is why they were taken from these other Ministries and centralised in the Ministry of Agriculture where there will be proper supervision of the gardens. Now gardens do not only include lawns; they include the trees on the premises, and sometimes you have certain diseases on the trees which can be dealt with

more efficiently by the Ministry of Agriculture. This is the only reason for the change.

Mr. HINDS: I thank the Hon. Minister. Now there is Item 47 - Contingencies - \$10,000, the note to which is very lengthy, and I am sure that the Minister will be as willing to offer his explanation at this stage as he did in the other Item so that it might help us to get on a little faster.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, the Ministry of Agriculture is a big Ministry and there are always certain things which were not foreseen which do crop up in the Ministry. In most of the contingency votes, the money is spent with the approval of the Cabinet, but the reason why we have such a big contingency vote is that instead of having to come to the Legislature for every \$6 or \$10 we have to spend, all we have to do is to get the approval of Cabinet for the amount which is to be spent under this Item and save time. It is for major breakdowns or replacements of all vehicles of the Ministry transport system, tractors and equipment used at the Government Laboratory and the Central Livestock Station and other sections of the Ministry for other unforeseen expenditure required for the maintenance of the efficiency of the Ministry.

The question that the sum of \$1,096,892 under Head 31 - Ministry of Agriculture, Labour and National Insurance - stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 32 - LABOUR

Head 32 - Labour - was called.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$860,812 under Head 32 - Labour - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 33 - NATIONAL INSURANCE

Head 33 - National Insurance - was called.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$25,282 under Head 33 - National Insurance - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 31 - MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, LABOUR & NATIONAL INSURANCE - RECOMMITTED

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 31 be recommitted.

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

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, on page 84 there is an amendment to be made to the note. The note to Item 104 should read: "Provides for transfer of buildings from present site to new sites. Includes provision for re-installation of water and electricity and resiting of storeroom and lavatories etc."

Insert note to Item 105 as follows: "To provide one (1) table and six (6) chairs for staff room at Cheapside Market."

What has happened is that the note to Item 105 was placed beside Item 104.

I beg to move that the sum of \$1,096,892 under Head 31 - Ministry of Agriculture, Labour & National Insurance - as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am asking you to give a pause between the moving and the passing of the Head. I would just like to ask what is a hedge trimmer.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: If I can explain to the hon. member, when the Estimates were being done, I noticed that there was a lot of duplication in the requests from the Ministries. For instance, Government House asked for a hedge trimmer, the Ministry of Communications and Works asked for something similar which has been eliminated, and there were also requests for larger lawn-boys and so on; so in moving these things now to the Ministry of Agriculture, we said this should be pruned and the Ministry decided that Government House could have the hedge trimmer today and somebody else have it tomorrow. A hedge trimmer is an electric shear which allows you to walk along and trim the hedges and save a lot of man hours. This will be used in all the Departments.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I thank the hon. member, but with my limited knowledge of English, is this the correct terminology? Do you want me really to accept that "trimmer" is not the person?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: We do not have anything on the Establishment called a hedge trimmer, because we expect a man who is trimming hedges to do forking of the garden beds, fertilising and everything else; so he cannot say he is like a gabling packer and that this is his job and he is not doing anything else. C. F. Harrison & Co. advertise them as hedge trimmers.

The question that the sum of \$1,096,892 under Head 31 - Ministry of Agriculture, Labour & National Insurance - as amended, stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

9.10 p.m.

HEAD 38(1) - MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$2,086,797 under Head 38(1) - Ministry of Education - stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I want to make a point on Item 23 - Cleaners. I do not know who is responsible for this Head, because there is no Minister here, but I am throwing it out to the introducer. I want the Hon. Minister to take what I am now going to say very seriously. It has been drawn to my attention that there are certain paymasters who have to pay these Cleaners, and they make the Cleaners sign for the money, but they do not see the amount.

Now, this is a very serious matter, and I hope that the Minister will see to it that the amount should be filled in by the same person who is drawing the money. They make the poor people sign, but they do not put in the amount and the people do not know how much they are signing for. They cannot make a noise because, poor people, they will be sent through the eddoes.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I will certainly look into this matter. The hon. member must realise that Government would not countenance that at all.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister to throw some light on Item 33 - Teacher Training - \$49,612. The note states:

"Provision for Local courses and exhibitions and expenses of training overseas."

Mr. Chairman, there is considerable experience in having Teachers trained, and then they leave the Service. I am wondering what is Government's policy, and what Government intends to do, wherever possible, to retain the services of these Teachers after they have been trained. I understand that some consideration was being given to the fact that those who were trained overseas would be requested to sign some form of contract to return, and that the Government would be doing something to see that they live up to the terms of any contract they sign.

In view of the Teacher shortage - we cannot say that it is other than acute. The fact that even those that are trained at Erdiston quite recently - the Minister, no doubt, will agree that quite a number of those who have been trained at Erdiston have, apparently, found greener fields in Canada. The exodus of Teachers from this country can do the Service as a whole no good. It certainly falls on the Minister, at this time, to say what really can be done, if the services of these people must be made available to the country after the taxpayers' money has been spent on training them.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I think it is a most appropriate time for me to say this, Sir. A few days ago when the Government answered the question about the number of students in Government Secondary Schools and Government Aided Schools, it revealed some shocking information. The information which it revealed seems to have people thinking and wondering.

While there is no Minister of Education here, it is a very good thing that the ex-Minister is here and the

Prime Minister is here. I can only express to them what is being said in the country, and this is the most appropriate Item on which to express it. It is said that students are neglected in the schools primarily, or principally, because a lot of Teachers who should give more time to training children are themselves studying in the schools for their degrees, because there is an incentive to get more money.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: This is just to suggest that Head 38(5) would be a better Head under which to discuss this.

Mr. MOTTLEY: There is an incentive for greater monetary consideration, and therefore the students are neglected. This, as the facts came out, is the talk which you can hear among parents who have children attending Private Secondary Schools aided by Government and Government Secondary Schools. There must be something in it, and I would like to urge the Ministry to look into this matter.

After you have spent money on training people, quite a number of them go to College in the evenings and work in the day; they sit in the Schools doing their own work and neglect the students. I am wondering what steps, if any, the Government will have to take in this matter. These three subjects, and two subjects, and one subject, and so on will not fit children for anything. I wonder whether there will not be the necessity for revamping the whole system, and having some sort of vocational training.

While it is true that a parent would like to see a boy or a girl in uniform going to school, you are not fitting the children for anything when they come out with a Certificate for one subject. They feel that they have a smattering of secondary education; they look for a job for which they are not suited and, therefore, they become disgruntled. You are breeding a set of dissatisfied young people. I am wondering whether the Government will go into this entire matter. As I said, what has been revealed to us, as a result of questions asked, was very alarming. These facts really point to the fact that somewhere along the line the children are neglected.

I remember once, when I served on the Governing Body of Harrison College, an entire Form failed the examination. I asked Mr. Hammond if he thought that there was something wrong with every boy in the Form who had failed in every subject. He had to admit, as an experienced schoolmaster, that something would have to be wrong with the Teachers and not necessarily all of the boys. The next Term he changed around the Teachers and the boys got through.

I am making a plea that the Ministry of Education should go very carefully into this matter. It is either going to be vocational training, or some Domestic Science training attached, and more attention should be paid to that at the schools. A lot of these children just waste time at these schools. In my opinion, something must be wrong where the Teachers are concerned. If they are just sitting in school and doing the work they have to do to be able to qualify

themselves and neglecting the children, this will always be the case. I would like to hear the Minister on this matter.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: First, let me deal with the question raised by the hon. junior member for St. Peter. The Teacher Training Vote includes the cost of Overseas Training Courses, the Scholarships in Geography, the Diploma in Education, the expenses of the the Local Art Classes, the Vocational Courses, the Induction Courses, and so on.
9.20 p.m.

It goes to meet the cost of Teachers' manuals, practice material, students' text books, film strips, tapes and tape recorders. In respect of the problems raised by the hon. senior member for the City, I think he will remember that some four or five weeks ago, the Hon. Minister of Education addressed himself to this problem and mentioned certain steps which the Ministry was embarking upon to deal precisely with the problems which he mentioned. The hon. member will note that among other things the Minister explained and outlined his plans for the starting of the Trade School in September, as well as with the start of the Community College to take into account not only the people who, at a certain age, do not show themselves particularly bent towards academic subjects, but also to take account of those persons who, in addition to showing academic capabilities still wish to branch out into technical and other subjects. The Trade School and the Community College are particularly geared to take care of these problems and they are both to be launched in September.

One last point with respect to the inducements to retain people in the Teaching service. The Minister also announced, some weeks ago, the new steps which he was taking not merely to induce people to stay, but also to make it easy for Teachers to be appointed without, at the same time, lowering the educational standards. He announced that, as from September, he would insist not on five "O" level subjects for appointment, but on four, provided that one of them was English Language, one was a foreign language and one was Mathematics or a science subject. He also said that henceforth, after a certain date, the Ministry would insist on certain guarantees being given by persons who were awarded Government Scholarships, Bursaries and Exhibitions, that they would give at least three years' service to the Government before they disappeared, if they wish to disappear. I think that this problem will sort itself out not only by the inducements given to enter the service, but by the inducements given to remain, many of which, of course, are common knowledge among us.

The question that the sum of \$2,086,797 under Head 38 - Ministry of Education (1) General Administration - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 38 - MINISTRY OF EDUCATION (2) ERDISTON COLLEGE

Ministry - Ministry of Education (2) Erdiston College - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$50,044 under Head 38 - Ministry of Education (2) Erdiston College - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 38 - MINISTRY OF EDUCATION (3) TECHNICAL INSTITUTE

Head 38 - Ministry of Education (3) Technical Institute - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$111,946 under Head 38 - Ministry of Education (3) Technical Institute - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 38 - MINISTRY OF EDUCATION (4) HOUSECRAFT CENTRE

Head 38 - Ministry of Education (4) Housecraft Centre - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that the sum of \$15,470 under Head 38 - Ministry of Education (4) Housecraft Centre - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 38 - MINISTRY OF EDUCATION (5) SCHOOLS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, in respect of this Head there is an amendment which we have to make. On page 117 we have to delete the note to Item 11 "Maintenance of Buildings," the reason being that there is a change this year from the former policy. Formerly this vote was controlled by the Ministry of Communications and Works, but is now being brought under the control of the Ministry of Education. Therefore, we are deleting the note which makes reference to the former control of this vote by the Ministry of Communications and Works.

Then we have to amend the note to Item 15 "School Meals Service" by the substitution of the words "of expansion in the parishes of " for the words "in expanding " which occur in the last line. With those amendments, Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$5,246, 376 under Head 38 - Ministry of Education (5) Schools - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 38 - MINISTRY OF EDUCATION (6) INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS

Head 38 - Ministry of Education (6) Industrial Schools - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$70,195 under Head 38 - Ministry of Education (6) Industrial Schools - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 38 - MINISTRY OF EDUCATION (7) PUBLIC LIBRARY

Head 38 - Ministry of Education (7) Public Library - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that the sum of \$85,072 under Head 38 - Ministry of Education (7) Public Library - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 38 - MINISTRY OF EDUCATION (8) PUBLIC RELATIONS

Head 38 - Ministry of Education (8) Public Relations - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$19,940 under Head 38 - Ministry of Education (8) Public Relations - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, while this is not appropriate to this particular Head, I had a note on Head 38(5) Schools and I am sure that the Hon. Minister would not mind recommitting it. What I wanted to get at is the question of the number of children who are taking the examination for entrance into the Secondary Schools.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If the hon. member would not mind finishing what we are doing here and then go back to that if we need.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: Yes, but I will talk on it here; it does not matter.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: All right, make your remark then.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The Hon. Minister should be able to tell us how many - I see from the Press report that there are some 10,000 children who are

taking this examination, and the Minister should be able to tell us actually how many places they have in the Government schools annually.
9.30 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that it is necessary to go back. There are ten thousand children who took the examination for places in the Secondary Schools. Will the Minister tell us how many places you have in Government-aided Secondary Schools and how many places you have in Private-aided Secondary Schools?

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, before the Minister rises, I would just like to ask, is it that the last hon. member who just sat down was speaking under Head 38 (5)?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Head 38(5) has not been recommended. He asked a question, really.

Mr. HINDS: All right, Sir. What I want to enquire of the Minister is what is being done about the Industrial Art Teachers in the various Secondary Schools? The situation there is that these Teachers are so placed that when general promotion is offered, they are not included. Having been employed in such specialised position, they find that there are no promotions for them, so to speak; so I just want to know what is the position with these Industrial Art Teachers employed at the various Secondary Schools. Is there any opportunity for them to be included in the regular promotion stream or if it is that they will be given Specialist pay so that they will be a satisfied body of people?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister would make a note? What does it cost you to send a child to the Combermere School, Harrison's College, Queen's College or such a Government-aided school and what does it cost you to send them to Private-aided schools? The whole position is this. I want to know, if you only have five hundred or four hundred places out of ten thousand places, what are you doing about it because there are quite a number of children who want to get into these schools.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: We are doing everything possible. Next September there will be 700 places in the Grammar Schools. We are of course, maintaining the policy of the 1,500 exhibitions in the Independent Schools. Of course, some of these 1,500 children will be new pupils going into the first Forms, maybe 200 or 300. I do not know.

There will be a considerable number of places available in the Grammar streams of the Comprehensive schools for children for whom places are not available in the approved Independent Schools or in the Grammar schools. I imagine that that policy still maintains; I do not believe that the policy has changed. I think it was in 1966 that we found places for secondary education for every child that satisfied Part one, and over 2,500 children were distributed between the Grammar schools and the Independent schools and the Grammar stream of the approved schools.

It would appear in answer to the hon. junior member for St. Peter that the Industrial Art Teachers do not necessarily suffer because of their speciality. The Ministry has recently increased the number of posts for Senior Assistants which gives qualified Teachers opportunity to gain promotion.

The hon. senior member for the City asked about the cost of maintaining pupils at Harrison's College, Queen's College, Combermere school and such places.

I have no up-to-date figures. When I was in the Ministry of Education sometime in 1962 or 1963, we calculated that it would have been something like \$500 or more per pupil.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister if he would be kind enough to give us the breakdown which he had promised me privately relative to the distribution of the subsidised teachers to Independent Schools. I wonder if he would be able to give the information.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, this is the last word I have to say on it because I do not want you to think that I am keeping it back. There is something that is worrying me and is worrying the general public. Will the Minister give me the assurance that the Government will desist in removing qualified teachers as soon as they are trained and qualified to teach, carrying them into the Ministry and all over the Government service? Will the Minister give us some assurance about that because it is humbugging the whole situation, and that is what people are annoyed about. We take a person and we train him to be qualified as a Teacher: and the next thing that you know is that you have them in the Agricultural Department and some other Department, and they are doing everything else but teaching.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The Government as a government is entirely anxious over this practice. There is no policy on the part of the Government which says that we must arbitrarily delude the schools of their best qualified people; but what is happening is this. In the general administration there have been more openings, obviously, for promotion than in the schools, and from the time that a career was opened in the general administration in the last ten years, there has been this movement from the schools.

I do not know if the Minister or the Government can do anything except by arbitrarily deciding that nobody should be recruited into the General Service from the schools. Mind you, it is not only the Ministry of Education in which teachers are recruited from the class room into the general administration that you can train them now as first class teachers and in three months time they can go into the Ministry of Agriculture. They can go overseas; they can go into the Labour Department; they can go anywhere.

Not only this: but other Ministries outside of Education complain also that their own Specialists are taken away from them. The Minister himself is in

great embarrassment because every year or two one of his Senior Specialists is moved away from him to the University to the post of Lecturer, or Senior Lecturer - still in teaching, but away from specialised technical important jobs within the Ministry. That is nothing which we can control.

While I am on my feet, I have no information arithmetically with respect to the amount of money which has been disbursed within the schools, but I can say that the Independent Schools are given one qualified Teacher to every 200 pupils.
9.40 p.m.

The scheme started in 1965, and it was proposed that it would be reviewed after a five year period. This matter will be given consideration. I may also add in this respect that it is my understanding that we started out with sixteen Approved Schools, and the Minister has just given his approval to a seventeenth - the Unique High School. I do not know if this satisfies the hon. junior member for Bridgetown, but this is the information I have available at the moment.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, I would like through you to thank the Hon. Minister, but at the same time I would like to point out that in accepting his figures of \$500 for a place like Harrison College to educate one pupil there, and that the pupils that are sent to the Approved Independent Schools will cost the Ministry \$75 a year, that is a saving of \$425; and if there are 1,500 pupils at present distributed, that represents a saving of \$637,500. Surely the Minister would consider passing on to his colleague the idea some of those 9,900 children who cannot be accommodated in Government schools should be sent to the Approved Secondary Schools which are Independent. We know that there are 10,600 applicants for Part I, and we have just been told that there are liable to be 700 admissions; therefore 9,900 children will be told that they have failed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If the hon. member would give way, we must not put it quite this way. I would like to remind the hon. member that in 1966 - this is the year that I last remember for admissions - we found a place for every possible successful Part I student, in that they were accommodated either by places in the Grammar Schools or by exhibitions in the Independent Schools or by being sent to the grammar wings of the Comprehensive schools, so that nobody was left out. So it is not quite right to talk about 700 people getting this and 9,900 not getting it, because within the 9,000 that take the Part I any year, there will be a lot of pupils who will do it the second year; so that once you have taken care of your 11 + in any particular year, your 10 + do not come to any harm because they have a second chance. I think I should just remind him of this. The other point, of course, about impressing upon my colleague the necessity of creating more exhibitions is very well taken and I will certainly put this over.

Mr. MOTTLEY: There is only one thing I would like to say to the Minister when he says that the Government has no policy as such. If you train a Teacher

as a Specialist, the only thing to prevent him from leaving the Teaching Service if he likes teaching is to pay him properly. That is the only thing I see you can do. If he is trained as a Teacher and it is more remunerative to go into another branch of the Service, and if you are really interested in having him teach children or having the children taught, you will have him remunerated properly.

With respect to the question which my colleague raised, as I understand it, you have to be of a certain age to take the examination; and if 7,000 pupils took the examination in September and you only found places for 2,000, then I am suggesting that at least 5,000 failed. If 5,000 did not fail, then you should find places for them in the Approved Secondary Schools, because it saves you a tremendous lot of money when compared with the \$500 paid in Government schools. It is the duty of the Government to provide education, and everyone knows what is happening in this country today. Whether it is the agricultural labourer or the water-front worker, everybody is clamouring for some sort of higher education for his children, and therefore if you can save something like \$425 per pupil and get results from Approved Secondary Schools, I think it is your duty to see that they get into Approved Secondary Schools.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, another point I would like to raise with the Minister is as to refund of fees to those pupils who have passed the G.C.E. annually. I have drawn this to his attention previously, and I would like to do so again. For some reason those pupils who are eligible for a refund are asked to come for this money at the Education Department when in truth and in fact many of these pupils' fees have been paid by the Independent schools which entered them. The Minister's colleague can inform him of the truth of this statement. The pupil who passes the examination in certain subjects draws the money because he has already left school and is outside the jurisdiction of the school, and he walks off with the refund. The Minister can correct this if he cares to, but I am sure that this could be substantiated by the Hon. Minister of National Insurance if he were in the House. (A VOICE: He is no longer a schoolmaster.) He would still know whereof I speak although he may not be a schoolmaster now.

Mr. Chairman, the Government has agreed to pay private schools for one teacher for every 200 children. Now we are required to provide one teacher for every 40 children. Surely at this time it must be seen that the work we are trying to do would be greatly helped by Government if we can have one or two other Teachers paid for, that is to say, even one for every 150 children rather than one for 200 children, which is not very liberal treatment. For instance, I have some 56 teachers, and Government is good enough to assist with the salaries of seven of them. How much better staff could we have, Mr. Chairman, if for every 150 children we could be given assistance with the payment of one teacher! When aid to Independent schools was first envisaged, I do not think anybody foresaw the day when you would have 10,600 pupils sitting the entrance examination. If

those pupils do not gain entrance to Government-aided Secondary Schools or the Independent schools, they must go through life feeling disgruntled. You must understand, Mr. Chairman, that when a child at the age of 11 - realises that he is sitting an examination on the result of which 700 pupils will gain admission to Secondary Schools out of 10,600, and that 9,900 cannot therefore gain admission, discounting those who would have another chance - the number would be unknown to both myself and the Minister, but it must run into several thousands - it must be disconcerting, and we must think of some way in which these children can be accommodated. It is nonsense telling them about free secondary education when in point of fact it is only the few who are on the top bracket who can gain admission to Secondary Schools.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order, the hon. member knows how much sympathy I have with him in his point of view, but I must ask him not to talk about free secondary education for the top bracket. If he means by "few" few in numbers compared with those who might like to have it, I would say "yes, this is an argument"; but if the hon. member is trying to infer that he means the rich when he says "the few", which I hope he does not mean, I would have to draw swords with him.

Mr. LYNCH: I am thinking of the rich in intellect, Mr. Chairman, and you would recognise immediately what I mean. I would be the first to concede that much has been done for our education in this Island in recent years. That does not mean, Mr. Chairman, that I cannot see that a great deal more can be done with a little thought and patience. The Hon. Minister himself has assisted me greatly in the past as has the Minister who succeeded him. I am very grateful for what they have both done for me by their own efforts when they were good enough to assist me in teaching in my own school, and they must both be aware of the problems of the Independent schools, having laboured in them. The Hon. Minister himself started the teaching of Economics in my own school, and there is one boy whom he taught who has since gained a degree in that subject and is now employed in the teaching service of this Island. So I have very much to be grateful to the Minister for, and he likewise must be aware of the problems of which I speak in the Independent schools.

9.50 p.m.

I hope that he will remember his sojourn in these schools, and will be reminded to pass on our request to the Minister of Education who is not here with us.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to enquire from the Hon. Leader of the House what contribution our Comprehensive Schools are making to the educational life of the community? In asking that, I would like to know how he classifies, say, the St. Leonard's Boys' School and the St. Leonard's Girls' School? Are they Comprehensive Schools, or Independent Secondary Schools?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: They are Government Comprehensive Schools and certainly not Independent

Schools, because they are not Proprietary Schools in the sense of which the Federal High School, or the Ursuline Convent are Proprietary Schools. It would take me the better part of the day to make out a case for the Comprehensive Secondary Schools. They are Secondary Schools for many reasons; the easiest that springs to the mind is that they provide post-primary training for pupils of the 11 plus age range.

The hon. member should also know that in St. Leonard's very good work is done. A case in point is that some two years ago a pupil of St. Leonard's Boys' School gained 6 subjects at the first sitting of the London G.C.E. and was accepted for a 4-year Bachelor of Arts Course at the College of Arts. There are a number of other pupils from the Grammar Schools and Comprehensive Schools who have done good work. I cannot give him the full evaluation of that now, but he can rest assured that the Ministry keeps them in continual review, and the policy is designed to give the pupils the best kind of advantage which can arise from it.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, very much play has been made recently of the answers to certain questions posed about the results in various schools in the G.C.E. First of all, I would like to say that the sample taken was a very unscientific one of two particular years. Any educational sample would be given at least five years or ten years. Two years are not a scientific sample for any results to be considered. Then, again, there are certain points which may be unknown to certain members, such as in Government Aided Schools the students are entered and their entries paid for by the taxpayers' money, but in the Independent Schools it is not so. The pupils take advantage of what is called "The Island's Charter", the new G.C.E., in which you can get a number of subjects in one year and add to that number in subsequent years. The pupils who come to us take full advantage of this "Island's Charter", and take three subjects in the first year and, perhaps, four subjects in the second year.

Mr. Chairman, you will find pupils leaving Independent Schools with 9 or 10 subjects at "O" level, but they have got them over the course of three years for the reasons, to wit, (1) the parents cannot afford to pay for more than a few subjects in one year, while their counterparts in the Government Secondary Schools have their entries paid for by the taxpayers willynilly. I know that the Minister, who has just returned to his place, can substantiate the fact that very often the proprietor of the school has to pay the examination fees for his bright pupils, hoping to get it back if the pupils pass. This work has been much destroyed recently, for the Minister is insisting that the pupils themselves call at the Department of Education for the refund rather than sending it to the school.

I do not know if there is any suspicion that the Heads of Schools might hold on to the returned fees rather than passing them on to the pupils for whom they are intended. Perhaps the Hon. Minister would be good enough to explain it. There are other stupi-

titles of the Department of Education which come into view at this time - for instance, the acceptance of an L.C.C. pass in Mathematics for entrance to the Civil Service instead of a G.C.E. pass. Any intelligent child must know that there is a world of difference between passing the L.C.C. and passing the G.C.E. in the subject of Mathematics; yet the Civil Service in this Island continues to accept such a pass as being equivalent to the G.C.E. in Mathematics. Now we who teach know very well that many L.C.C. passes with distinctions would have no chance in passing Mathematics at "O" level either at Oxford and Cambridge, or at London. As long as these stupidities are perpetuated, Mr. Chairman, you will find people taking letters in the L.C.C. and sitting that examination, because it is accepted by their Government, rather than taking the examination for which the school is geared, notably, the Oxford and Cambridge examination at "O" level, or that of the London University.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to enquire of the Hon. Prime Minister - (Hon. E. W. BARROW: "You can ask any Minister in the House.") Mr. Prime Minister, I am sorry. Sir, chatting with a few friends of mine who are supposed to be in the Teaching Service, they have for some time expressed some bit of anxiety over this proposed Community College.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If the hon. member will give way. The Minister of Education proposes, as soon as the Advisory Committee which he has appointed has reported to him and he has studied the Report, to prepare a White Paper which, with the Cabinet's permission, will be laid before this House. He would have me at a disadvantage now speaking about it. Does that satisfy you?

Mr. CRAIG: Yes.

The question that the sum of \$19,940 under Head 38 (8) - Public Relations - stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 38 - MINISTRY OF EDUCATION (9) ARCHIVES

Head 38 (9) - Archives - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$6,529 under Head 38 (9) - Archives - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

10.00 p.m.

HEAD 39 - ECCLESIASTICAL

Head 39 - Ecclesiastical - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$3,960 under Head 39 - Ecclesiastical - stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister is in a position to tell us at this stage exactly what is the situation obtaining between the Anglican Church and the Government at this particular moment. There has been some anxiety on the part of the members of the Synod, as I have learnt. They were looking forward to the opportunity of discussing what is called an Enabling Bill or the draft of it, and I would like to hear from the Minister what he has to say on it at this stage.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Quite briefly, I can tell the hon. member that the Cabinet has communicated both the outline and the details of the settlement to the Lord Bishop and the Synod, and their comments have just come back to us. They are being studied and the legislation in draft is now being prepared. It should come before the House when we come back from the recess, but there is no problem outstanding. For me to go into the details now would, of course, take a long time, but there is no problem between the two sides now. I give the hon. member that assurance, and he will see all the details, when the legislation is settled, come before this House.

The question that the sum of \$3,960 under Head 39 - Ecclesiastical - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 40 - MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Head 40 - Ministry of Health and Community Development - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman in moving the passing of this Head, there are certain amendments which I would like to insert and have dealt with at this stage. They are as follows:- On page 136 and at Item 139, "Upkeep of Motor Vehicle," I would like to amend the note by deleting the words: "Includes wages for Driver at Key Scale rate." On page 139 and at Item 166, "Furniture and Equipment" substitute the sum of \$6,795 for \$3,544. On page 150, amend the note to Item 102 "provisions" by deleting the words: "Increased as a result of increased prices, greater bed use, more staff and more students." On the same page, amend the note to Item 103 "Medical Supplies" adding: "Includes provision for X-ray maintenance and films. Increase due to greater demand for surgical instruments following increase in the number of medical staff." On the same page, amend the note to Item 104 "Furniture and Equipment" by substituting "Includes upkeep of domestic equipment, crockery, cutlery, office and all other furniture. Increase due to higher costs of maintenance and need to service additional furniture at new staff quarters for the following: "Includes provision for X-ray maintenance and films. Increase due to greater demand for surgical instruments following increase in number of medical staff." Delete the note to Item 105. "Linen clothing and Uniforms." And on page 152 amend the note to Item 128 "Mortuary and Laboratory Equipment" by deleting the word "Olympus" in the last line.

With those amendments I beg to move that the sum of \$957,596 under Head 40 - Ministry of Health and Community Development - stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, before I deal with a few of these items, I wish to make a few overall remarks on the entire Head under "Other Expenditure" I know, Mr. Chairman, that the Ministry of Health and Community Development is a very important Ministry because it deals with the sick, many of the unfortunates, and it deals with housing and with the youth of this country. Therefore, when the Minister from what little contact I have had with him - I will give him credit for all that he has done during the tenure of his office.
10.10 p.m.

That however, Sir, will not stop me from making a few comments. As I have before, I am going to make a few comments on the overall expenditure of the Local Government. The whole Local Government system, since it has been taken over by the Central Government, is a complete farce. Nothing has been done even to encourage Government to think of re-introducing Local Government. I heard from many political speeches made by members on both sides of this House - and I always held the firm view, and I still hold that view - that Local Government is a training ground for the young people who at some future date would have to guide the destinies of this country. But worst of all, Mr. Chairman.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Would you just let me know directly what you are speaking on? You said that you were dealing with the whole Head; but that is Head 40 which we are dealing with: Local Government is Head 42.

Mr. CRAIG: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for your guidance. I am awfully sorry. Thanks very much for the advice of the Clerk. A good Chairman always seeks the advice of the Clerk. So said the Speaker of the House of Commons.

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

Mr. CRAIG: I am still on my feet, Mr. Chairman. Under Item 22, Head 40, it says: "Allowance in lieu of fees" and the sum required is \$15,024. I would like the Hon. Minister to make a note of that. Nothing is set out; there is no Addendum here telling us any thing at all about these fees for \$15,024. The Minister, of course, will make a note of that, and, in his reply, he can just tell me what it is all about.

I just wish to make a little comment on Item 75 - Specialist Coach. A Specialist Coach in what, Sir? Cricket, football, lawn tennis, golf or what? I have no idea.

I wish the Minister also to let me know something about this. Quite recently a Resolution came down to this House to the effect that the Government was

asking for money to appoint a Specialist Coach. To the best of my knowledge, I am told that this Specialist Coach is in cricket. They do not say in what, but I sincerely hope that we do not look around for the Martindales and many of those resigned old buggies to come and give them a job as a Cricket Specialist Coach because I know what is the present position with one of the coaches in Barbados now.

You see, history is going to record that the Prime Minister sacked Wes Hall because if we had a specialist here, if we did not chase out Mr. Waite from Barbados, if this Government did not chase out Mr. Waite who is a specialist in his field as a masseur, Wes Hall would still have been playing for the West Indies Cricket Team. I believe that it is my Prime Minister who is responsible for Wes Hall getting dropped.

(ASIDES)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am yet listening to the hon. member.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I hope, when they come to appoint this Specialist Coach that Government would not only appoint this Specialist Coach who, I am told, is going to be in cricket, but they will appoint a man who is worthy of this post. I have been hearing one or two little things about some Martindale getting this job as Cricket Specialist Coach. I sincerely hope that Government would not be that silly to appoint such a man who is a broken-down, resigned cricketer because no youngsters today have ever heard of Martindale, and they are not prepared to accept advice from this type of people. Do not let politics get into this. They would be spending some \$6,840 on this particular vote.

Now, Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the Minister, I turn to page 132, Item 86 - Travelling. This is not really clear enough. The note says "Increase to meet travelling expenses of the Handicraft Development Officer and the Assistant Handicraft Development Officer." I hope the Minister in his reply would also set out clearly what this sum of \$22,230 is for. As a matter of fact, it is increased by \$1,440.

Item 100, Mr. Chairman, you are asking for \$7,000 - an increase of \$5,800 over last year's vote. It says: "Increased provision of spectacles to cataract cases, Dental and Visual treatment of School Children and treatment of deafness in Children, including cost of Hearing Aids. Increased to pay for optical sessions formerly done by the Senior Specialist Ophthalmic Surgeon of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital."
10.20 p.m.

Now I am told, Mr. Chairman, that children over the age of 16 years do not qualify for this treatment, and this worries me a bit. If this says it is for school children, I take it that a child at the age of 18 years attending one of the Secondary Schools is entitled to this treatment. I feel that as long as a boy or girl has not reached school-leaving age, he should be entitled to this. I imagine the Minister is in a position

to correct me if it is true that this care is only provided for children under the age of 16 years.

Under Item 119 - Control of Infectious Diseases - there is an amount of \$33,000, and the note reads: "Provision for Field Equipment, Disinfectants and insecticides, Rat Extermination, Vaccines, fees to Public Vaccinators and doctors notifying infectious diseases, continuation of B.C.G. programme, removal of dead animals and any other work recommended by the Public Health Inspection Department."

Mr. Chairman, either this morning or yesterday morning I read in the newspapers of a very serious threat to the economy and also to the health of this country, because it would appear from what I read that certain precautions are not carried out well enough around the Wharf and at the Deep Water Harbour. You are asking for \$33,000 under this Item which includes extermination of rats. I know that rats pose a big problem to the economy of a country because they destroy foodstuffs and they carry diseases; but you really could not spend that amount of money unless you get a big rat like "Prophet" and I could not support this vote to exterminate such a rat. However, I am quite sure that the Minister will let us know what is the position on this.

Under Item 134 - Tennis Courts - some time ago the Government took over the Tennis Courts at the Garrison Savannah, and when I pass and see the condition of these courts now, I am shocked. They are not even in use by the children for whom the Government took them over. When these courts were being taken over, it was argued that the former Government of Barbados did not drive off the Savannah Club, and this Government took over the Courts so as to give the children of Barbados and the poorer classes, in particular, an opportunity to use them. I do not see any children there using the courts, because we have not got anybody to coach them. Since you have taken the courts over and have not put them to use because you have nobody to coach these children in tennis, you might as well give them back to the Savannah Club because they serve no useful purpose and are in very bad shape.

On Item 137 - Sports Centre, for which \$2,000 are to be provided for the upkeep of Blenheim Pavilion and grounds, I would like the Minister to tell me what they have decided to do with "Blenheim". Not a cricket match, football match or anything else has been started there yet, although speaking under correction, the pavilion and grounds at Blenheim were made available to the public almost a year ago. Why are they not used?

On Item 138A - Special Events, the note reads: "Includes provision from which grants may be made to Sports Organisations requesting assistance in financing tours; such assistance may not exceed 50% of the total cost of any such project and is subject to prior Cabinet approval."

I must confess that the \$15,000 which the Government is voting to help these clubs with overseas tours is not enough. Athletes can project and raise

your country's image, and you must support anything wherever there is sport and, more so, these overseas tours. This is always very dear to me because at times it hurts me very much when I look in the papers and see that Trinidad sends a team of thirty or forty athletes to games, Guyana sends 50 and the Barbados contingent is made up of three or four included in which you have a Coach and a Manager. If we are going to spend this kind of money, we must also provide the necessary playing fields and coaches to have these people well trained for the purpose of taking part in overseas meetings. I feel that this sum should be increased, or as my colleague would say, you could put a bigger plum there. You could, for instance, take \$3,000 from the Barbados Arts Council and improve the Special Events vote.

Under Item 159 - Bessie Yearwood Home, the sum of \$200 is required to assist with the running expenses of the Bessie Yearwood Home for children. I would like the Minister to tell me if this is a Home where you have coloured children and white children, because for many years I have only seen a few white faces there, and I would like to know if there is any segregation there, because I would not support this vote, small as it is, where a white child would have the opportunity of going to have care and a coloured child would not have such an opportunity. I am not saying that it is so; I am asking the Minister for the necessary information.

Under Item 162A - Barbados Boxing Board of Control, I would say that this vote is also inadequate, because it is to provide equipment for the promotion of amateur boxing. What can \$300 really buy if you are going to do this on a national scale?
10.30 p.m.

A set of boxing gloves, I believe, will cost about \$50. Then you have to get skipping ropes, set up a ring and so on. \$300 really is not good enough; you would be only wasting this money. You must provide more money, and encourage boxing in schools and so on. I think that would be a better idea, instead of putting in \$300 to fool someone. I feel that this vote is inadequate.

With regard to Item 170 - Equipment, the note states:

"Equipment required for continuation of the Sports Development Programme in Country Districts. Includes the cost of a boxing ring for amateur boxing and a push mower."

On that, too, Mr. Chairman, I hope the Hon. Minister will give me some explanation. I do not see any Sports Development going on in the country districts at all. I asked about a playing Field for Orange Hill some time ago, and I was told that on a population basis it is the only way of getting one there. Orange Hill is one of the most densely populated agricultural areas in Barbados. I do not see how \$1,300 can do anything tangible in this matter.

I see a lot of little boys playing in the streets, or on somebody's pasture. When they are chased off the

pasture, they have hardly anything to play with. It states here:

"for continuation of the Sports Development Programme in Country Districts."

What does this mean? I would like the Minister to tell us what programme he has going on. That ends my questions on this Head, and I would be very grateful if the Minister would give a few replies to the questions which I asked him.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, Head 40 - Ministry of Health. What we on this side want to get, once and for all, is a clear and definite statement from the Government. What is their policy in relation to the Hospital? They have passed legislation in this House, taken up a lot of our time in relation to the Hospital Board. It appears that I am a little premature, Sir, but under this Head we can deal with Health Centres and District Hospitals.

Only a couple of days ago I was in St. Andrew, and I saw a place which appeared to me to have been half-repaired. It was closed, and I understood that the Government had decided to adopt the policy introduced by my colleague when he was Minister of Health. He reduced the District Hospital Service, and Oistin's was the first, and they were going to introduce that all over the Island. In St. Andrew I have been going to that area for a number of months now, and all I have seen is an area closed up. Perhaps the hon. Minister will tell us why it is that the District Hospital in St. Andrew, which, I understand, my colleague's Ministry repaired, has not yet been opened to the public up to now.

Now St. Andrew is a parish represented by one Minister and the "King of the City Bar". It is an area which is cut off because of the topography of the area. It is an area where it is difficult to get in and out, because every time you have rain, the roads break. If there is one area where one should have to adopt the principle that the services should be carried to the area, it is in St. Andrew. The light never shines too brightly down there, and it is an area which because of physical conditions, is relatively cut off.

I would have thought that the Ministry would have understood that it is far too difficult for the people down there to get to town, or anywhere else in Barbados. I know that they have tried, but it is time that they make a statement as to why the St. Andrew District Hospital is not open. We are waiting on this side to hear that statement.

Now, Sir, Community Development and Social Welfare. I have been asking since I have been in here and I believe that the hon. Minister has himself, and he has represented the constituency which I represent for a very long period of time. If there is one thing that is lacking in this country of Barbados, if you compare it with any other country like Trinidad and Grenada - I was over there a few days ago, and I understand the hon. Minister was down there, too,

but we were on different missions - it is Community Centres. In Trinidad and Grenada every where they have a Community Centre. It is remarkable that there is such a lack of Community Centres in this country.

Take the big parish of Christ Church where you have a little "nay-nay" thing, as my colleague the hon. senior member for St. Joseph would say, built under the Vestry system in Sargeant's Village, and nothing in the big areas in Oistin and Silver Sands! There is no Playing Field, and there is nothing in St. Lawrence and St. David's - one area, one Playing Field. As far as the people in the western part of Christ Church are concerned, one can say that they can utilise the Garrison.

In Christ Church we have the former room that used to be used by the Vestry and the League as their Council Meeting Hall, and I hope that directions will be given immediately by the hon. Minister to the Local Government Commission to the effect that clubs and associations - I do not mean political parties for Group meetings - should be permitted to hold meetings there. In that area the D. L.P. dare not hold a Group meeting there. The former Vestry Room can be used as a centre for cultural activities. We have nothing like that in Oistins or Silver Sands. We have to go up the hill to Aberdeen's Emporium, or Aberdeen's Dance Hall as they call it to get any place where you can meet. That is definitely not right.

If you look at the Electoral Register, you will find that that area comprises two constituencies with as many votes as any other parish - much more than St. Andrew, St. Lucy, St. Thomas, and more than that part of St. George where Ellerton is, and the idea that the Development Community Centres must be tied to those areas that hitherto got their money under the Rural Amenities Fund is nonsense.

10.40 p.m.

Either the Government has a policy for Community Development or it does not have a policy for Community Development. In that area you need centres where young people can go to. It is true that the Prime Minister told the young people to rebel, but even in that, they have to be trained. It would be a good thing and it would definitely prevent the juvenile delinquency, the discouragement, the gambling; I would even say that it would not discourage the national sport or the national pastime. I believe that the useful activity and the useful organisation of young people's leisure time would go a long way towards the reduction of the birth rate in this country. It would also help the Family Planning which is to be found in this Ministry. I want to hear the Minister of Health on this, and I believe that I can get a response from him because, not only is he the Minister of Health, but he is representing the very area that I am talking about. He must give us a response in this matter.

I leave Sports to the sportsmen. I do not care to trouble that except this; that in Dover the Hon. Minister will remember that Dover was promised a pavilion a long time ago. And I would go further; at the Southern District Headquarters, the intention was to

create there not only Administrative Offices and Hospital Services, but also a Recreational Centre. Up to now the young ladies in that area cannot even play netball; they have sufficient available space up there in Oistin's Town, but they are lacking in the poles and things of that kind. They are lucky in that respect because there is so much which can be done with a little expenditure, if there was intelligent administration going along with the intelligent use of the resources which are devoted to community development of this country. The facilities are there and the physical abilities are there. The Hon. Minister told me not so long ago that I would soon see tractors operating up by Silver Sands, and that the Housing Board's area of land up there would be levelled. We have not seen it yet.

I am speaking generally in relation to Health now. I am talking about scavenging in particular. This is health. Could anybody suggest that the problem of scavenging is not relevant? We want to know what is the Ministry's policy about a central system of garbage disposal in this country, and it is a most important point. Not so long ago my colleague, the hon. senior member for St. James, put some questions on the floor of this House. I see nothing in the Estimates about this matter at all. Perhaps the Hon. Minister will tell us - they have had tours abroad about this matter - what is the policy of this Government. Do they or do they not agree with the use of an incinerator as opposed to the compository system of garbage disposal, or have they not made up their minds even now, at this late stage, after they have had the opportunity of investigating both systems of garbage disposal? Mr. Chairman, these are the Sub. Heads that interest me under Head 40. There are other hon. members who, no doubt, will make their contribution under this Head, but we await the Ministerial replies to the various questions which have been raised in this respect.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder what the Minister would tell us on Item 117 about this provision of \$450 in respect of the expenses relative to the sampling of milk. Now, Sir, it is only \$450, and we are to wonder how often samples of milk will be taken and particularly if samples of milk from the Pine Hill Dairy will be taken; because, despite the fact that the milk coming from that dairy bears the label of having been produced in Belgium, there are still complaints as to its quality, and it is time that the Government decides what is going to be the policy regarding this Item. Since we see that provision is being made for the sampling of milk, we want to know if samples of milk are taken not only from the local milk vendors or producers, but from the Pine Hill Dairy which happens to be the largest supplier at this time. As you know, Sir, this matter has provoked widespread discontent and uneasiness, and we want to hear from the Minister what he has to say on this matter.

With respect to Item 118 "Environmental Sanitation", this, in itself, is a very big problem. It entails the life of each and every one of us, not only the health of the poor and destitute, because we find that

in the event of there being an outbreak of epidemic proportions, there is nothing which can be effected. 10.50 p.m.

We see the amount of \$15,000 is provided for the improvement of toilet facilities for poor and destitute persons. The Note tells us that the increase of \$6,300 is on account of the large number of applications on the waiting list.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this matter of Environmental Sanitation should not be approached in a piecemeal manner. We are attracting tourists here by the thousands, in very much larger numbers than in the past. We are spending a considerable sum on tourism. We have got to try and keep the health of the country up to a standard not only because we have to depend on the tourists who come in to trade with us, bringing the dollars that we need, but we have got to bear in mind at the same time that the health of the community comes first.

As I said, it is time that this matter be looked into, and what we might hear from the Minister is how much longer people who have had their names on the waiting list to be supplied with these facilities have to wait. We know these facilities are so necessary in these people's homes. Now, Sir, what makes it such a difficult case is that it is one which we find in having to deal with people who cannot help themselves; you will find in cases where people make applications to be assisted in this respect they find the time lag to be a considerable degree, and it can develop in many people themselves an air or attitude of indifference.

Remember, Sir, that air or attitude of indifference is an indifference to their own lives and to the health of their neighbours or immediate neighbours, in the first place. Therefore, this matter should be tackled in an able manner because we cannot be exposing the health of our young children, more so because their resistance to disease is not as sturdy as in the case of the older people. It is for that reason that we should ask that the matter be attended to as speedy as possible so as to liquidate this waiting list that we find here with this large number of applicants.

We would certainly like to hear from the Minister how many applications have been made in the compiling of this list, and what is the length of time the applicants have to wait before they can be attended to.

Now, Sir, Item 106 for which there is provision made for Monthly Vehicle Upkeep Allowances for Public Inspectors. I take it to mean Public Health Inspectors. That is in the Note on page 133. I think it is intended to be Public Health Inspectors - I hardly think that it is a case where we have Public Inspectors and Private Inspectors. It is just the omission of the word "health".

Now, the Inspector who is using a car gets \$15.00 a month, a motor cycle \$10.00, a motor scooter \$8.50, an auto-cycle \$7.50 and a bicycle \$3.00. What we are concerned with is that it is about time that Public Health Inspectors be assisted in a greater measure

because it is not as in the past where we could feel that when a Public Health Inspector visited a home in any particular area, so long as he came and made a note in his diary that he visited premises once in a month, that that was sufficient.

I hardly consider that that can be considered satisfactory in an enlightened day such as this, and we are to wonder if something can be done; instead of there being Travelling Allowances, if loans can be made to some of these officers who now use a bicycle, if we do not offer it to anybody other than those who use bicycles. They should be motorised, so to speak, at this time: and instead of the officer riding a bicycle where he would just receive \$3.00, you grant him a loan to get a motor cycle, unless it is a case where an officer is old and in such a case when an officer is reaching retirement age, you usually find something for him to do easier by giving him a district nearer his home where he would not have to exert himself to any considerable extent.

If there are any Public Health Inspectors who are using bicycles, I think that Government should do something to see that they can be raised at least to the auto-cycle bracket. I am sure that you will consider that the officer is better equipped to render better service to the community when he is fitted with an auto-cycle than with a bicycle; he is in a better position to get around and carry out his inspections than the one who is on a bicycle.

As you know, Sir, there are cases when these officers find it necessary to make return visits to some of the homes; so we would be doing ourselves a great deal more benefit if we try to assist these officers in this particular respect.

Now, Sir, there are some Training Sanitary Personnel at Item 97. There is an amount of just \$75. That \$75 includes cost of administrative matters, apparatus, specimens and similar equipment.
11.00 p.m.

Now unless the Minister is in a position to enlighten us further than we can be given to understand at the present moment, one must come to the conclusion that there is either (a) not much training, or (b) the equipment, materials, apparatus do not cost very much, because we cannot see how in a day such as this the training of sanitary personnel, materials and so on to be used in any demonstration can cost us a mere \$75 for a whole year. It is something that the Minister should find it necessary to explain.

On this question of Health Centres, there is a Health Centre in Speightstown, and it would appear that there is not enough use being made of this Centre. The Minister should be in a position to show us that the number of attendances there has increased, and unless he can go further, we are apt to come to the conclusion that the increased number of visits to the Health Centre might only have been paid by persons intending to travel abroad and have gone there to get vaccinations. You might find that the numbers at the Health Centres have increased, but is it a case

in every instance where that increase has come about as a result of people seeking the medical services which the Centre is supposed to be offering? I should just like to hear what the Minister has to say on this question.

Now on District Hospitals, it is time that we be told what Government intends doing about a District Hospital for St. Peter. We have seen that the children who are housed at the St. Peter's Infirmary have been removed - I hope to say something on that further under another Head - and with the removal of the children, the population of the Institution was considerably reduced. It has long been hinted that Government intended establishing a District Hospital at St. Peter, and we feel the time has come that the Government could tell us what are Government's plans in this respect, and how far they have got in bringing about such a necessary convenience for the people of the parish, because as the situation stands at the present moment, doctors in the area are still complaining of the difficulties encountered in having to transport the sick from the farthest point north at St. Lucy to Speightstown, and then for despatch to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. There are cases where, had a District Hospital been established at Speightstown, the risk involved in worsening the patient's condition through having to undergo so much travelling very often in conditions that are not at all conducive to their betterment - very often in the back or some portion of a seat of a motorcar - would not be there. The ambulance services are not always readily available to doctors in the northern parishes, and you have got to try and despatch the patient to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital in the best way you can at the particular moment.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that a case has been made out, no doubt, for the very necessary measure of setting up a District Hospital in St. Peter. I am almost sure that it would not be the case as is presently obtaining in St. Andrew where all preparations have been made, renovations carried out and the building is still kept securely locked as if it is a showpiece - and for how long we do not know. While that is closed, the sick in the nearby parishes are still suffering, and we would not like to see such a situation obtaining in the parish of St. Peter.

Under Item 127 - Provisions - the sum of \$16,000 is needed for provisions for daily feeding of patients. It seems to me that this sum is for the buying of provisions for the feeding of the patients in the District Hospitals which includes the Oistins District Hospital, and I am to wonder if careful consideration has been given to the prices of such commodities since we know for ourselves that quite recently there have been increases in prices, and we would not like to know that we voted a sum that is not enough to cover the buying of provisions for a place like a District Hospital, because the poor patients there cannot make demands; they have to wait until something is offered them.

11.10 p.m.

At some of these Institutions if a patient should express his true feeling, he must be told, as happens

quite often, not that he is rude, but that something else is wrong with him. I am just asking the Minister to give us a little enlightenment on the points we have raised.

(PAUSE)

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I will get up and talk for the whole night, if you attempt to do that foolishness.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, many questions have been asked, and I will attempt to answer as many as possible. The member who has just sat down asked questions on Item 117 - Sampling of Milk. In the Ministry there is a qualified Public Health Inspector who has been specially trained for making samples of milk, for testing the milk, and this is done regularly, as far as the Pine Dairy is concerned.

So far as Item 118 - Environmental Sanitation - is concerned, this Scheme has been going on for some time and we provide funds under the Labour Welfare Fund. We have pre-cast concrete slabs, and we see after the construction of these toilets on a large scale. I cannot tell you exactly how many are in arrears.

In so far as the District Hospital for St. Peter is concerned, which I know the hon. member would like to hear something on, the policy is to reduce the number of infirmaries and, in reducing the number as we have been doing, St. Peter will be no exception to the rule. We will be setting up a District Hospital and an Out-patients Clinic there in due course; so that the hon. member has no fear in that the policy is to reduce the number of infirmaries and to establish District Hospitals and Out-patients Clinics. Over and above that, the parish of St. Peter has a very up-to-date Hospital - the Roman Catholic Hospital - and certain investigations are being made to see whether some arrangements could be worked out with them; but the general policy is to set up Out-patients Clinics and District Hospitals wherever we reduce the number of infirmaries.

The hon. senior member for Christ Church raised the question of the St. Andrew District Hospital not being utilised. First of all, provision has been made in these Estimates for setting up, for staffing, and commencing and opening up the District Hospital. I think you will find it in Items 49 -60 where provision is made for staffing the St. Andrew District Hospital. At present the roof is being repaired. The provision of an incinerator as well as a water storage tank is required before the Maternity Section goes into operation.

The Public Health Clinic is already functioning; so that with the provision which is being made in Items 49-60 under this Head, we will have the necessary funds available to get this Hospital started. In fact, as far as the staffing arrangements go, advertisements have already gone out, and the processing and selecting of staff is being conducted.

The hon. member asked about a Central Playing Field, and the hon. senior member for Christ Church asked for a Community Centre and a Playing Field. I agree with the hon. member. I have been trying for some time myself, but I can tell him that negotiations are now almost complete for a Playing Field and Community Centre at Gall Hill at the back of the Housing Area.

I realise that the Community Centre at Sargeant's Village is a mere apology - especially having regard to the size of the parish - and it will serve no useful purpose, and this very little purpose is not particularly utilised either. It is out of the way. For that reason, we have entered negotiations for the purchase of land at Gall Hill for a Community Centre and a Playing Field. It will serve as a central Playing Field.

So far as the Silver Sands area is concerned, there are an existing 4 1/2 acres to 5 acres of land at Silver Sands which are utilised already as a Playing Field, but the land needs levelling and cleaning up, and I am trying to have these things done. These things take time. It is not something done by a private individual, or a private concern. The Sports Department has a tractor which is very heavily committed, but you can rest assured that the Playing Fields to which the hon. member referred will be looked into.

As far as Dover is concerned, I have made a note of the remarks, and I will see that something is done for the young girls in that area.

Now, there are in the Silver Sands area, as the hon. member knows, about 15 1/2 acres of beach land which have been acquired about two or three years ago, and it was recently decided by the Cabinet that the construction of the beach facilities at Silver Sands would go to tender; so that tenders will be put out for the construction of the beach facilities at Silver Sands. I think the Tender Notice is ready, and the Ministry of Communications and Works will soon be issuing that notice for tenders.

In so far as the Vestry Room at Oistins is concerned, the hon. member will remember that only on Monday the inmates from St. George were transferred to Christ Church Infirmary, implementing the policy of the reduction of the number of infirmaries, and the six Nurses who have been transferred from St. George to the Christ Church Infirmary will have to be given accommodation; so it is intended to convert the Vestry Room into Nurses' Quarters. 11.20 p.m.

In the meanwhile, the policy of the Government is to assist with their transportation to some extent 50% so that the ones who have to do travelling will be assisted in their transportation expenses until such time as the old Vestry Room will be converted into Nurses' Quarters.

There was a question asked about scavenging. I believe that scavenging is not quite as up-to-date as it should be. I think we need more refuse lorries and further extension of the facilities for the collecting

of garbage and of refuse collection and for the use of a traxcavator. That is planned for this financial year. There is a study which is at present being conducted on the question of garbage disposal, and a Committee has been appointed and its report has just come to hand. It is expected that the service will be improved by the setting up of a Sanitary Board. That is now being planned. I think that those are the main questions which were asked by the hon. senior member for Christ Church.

In answer to the hon. senior member for St. James, we have Item 22 "Allowance in lieu of fees." This provision relates to the 20% allowance in lieu of fees payable to the Chief Medical Officer, the Senior Medical Officers of Health and the four Medical Officers of Health and one Assistant Medical Officer of Health who possess the Diploma in Public Health. The Officers are not allowed private practice, and the allowance is given in lieu of fees which they might otherwise have been able to earn. The hon. member asked several questions and I will try and give him some more replies. With respect to Item 75 "Specialist Coach" the hon. member had quite a lot to say on that, but the answer is simply that the Sports Department is now being established. In other words, there are certain posts which are now being established and put on a permanent basis. You will see that the salary is \$6,840 at present. The holder of this post is Mr. Wedderburn. It is a question of making his post established; that is all. The Sports Department is being re-organised, and certain experts who have been there on a temporary basis are now being put on a permanent basis. This post, which is Mr. Wedderburn's post, has already been filled and there is no question of any vacancy. He will be appointed permanently.

As to the Bessie Yearwood Home, that includes both white and coloured people. It is not like twenty years before.

Relative to the Boxing Board, I admit that the money is small, but boxing is business; there is promotion and there is money to be made out of boxing contests, and it is for that reason that the amount may not be quite as liberal as the hon. member may want it to be. Relative to the Item 138 A, "Special Events", the sum of \$15,000 is provided. The hon. member will remember that from time to time whenever these sporting events, whether they be Olympic Games or whatever they are, are coming up, we make application for a grant, and the Government usually gives a grant on a dollar-for-dollar basis. That is done in order to expedite matters. We have a block vote of \$15,000 so that when these applications come in, even although they come in late sometimes, we will still be able to accommodate them from this vote. I think I intimated that to the hon. member some time ago. As far as "Blenheim" is concerned, "Blenheim" is being levelled by the Ministry of Communications and Works. We are getting the mould from the Airport and also from Waterford, and we are levelling it to put it on the proper footing. "Blenheim" is not quite ready yet. It is taking a little longer than we expected, but it will be in use, we hope, some time this year.

Relative Item 97 "Training of Sanitary Personnel", this vote has not been used for the past few years. It was utilised when there was a periodic course for the Public Health Inspectors which used to be held in Barbados, but that course is now provided in Jamaica. It is proposed to start a course for unqualified Inspectors this year. Through the Pan American Health Organisation, we have been assisted in training our personnel, and a course for Public Health Inspectors is being organised shortly, and it will be conducted by the Pan American Health experts who are here and who are doing a great deal to assist us in training our untrained personnel. I think that those are the main points which were raised.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, after hearing the Hon. Minister giving us a comprehensive report of great expectations, I feel that I will be failing in my duty if I did not suggest to the Government the need for a National Sports Council. On the coming in of a National Sports Stadium, it is time to start getting our personnel together; otherwise you will find that the same thing which is happening with Blenheim, is going to happen again. It is always the policy of the Government to start before they are ready. You can rest assured that if there is one whom any member on this side can call in the darkest hour of the night and ask for any co-operation, it is the Minister. He is always quite willing and happy to render it. However, I am not going to sit here and throw any shots at the Minister. It is the policy of the Government on the whole. I heard quite a bit about Christ Church. I heard something about St. Peter, but I have not heard one single thing about the tons of garbage that there are in St. James. I invited the Minister to come with me into the Thorpes Housing Area and see the rats running out of the garbage and going into the homes of the people in the same area. He has only to drive through Dates, Baywoods, Springhead, Taitts and Rock Dundo and, worst of all, along Highway No. 1. I am not concerned with how they buy a truck or two. The same money which they took to pay Sir Lionel Luckoo, let them put down an incinerator in Barbados in some central position whereby it would serve the island overall. That is the problem; and then you can talk about the trucks! Some time ago the Southern District Council sent out some delegation - I think it was to Miami - looking into the business of an incinerator installation for a part of this country, if not the entire country, and the Government refused to purchase that incinerator which would cost \$ 1 million at that time and today, with devaluation of the pound, it will cost approximately \$2 million. But if you can find money to put in Sir Lionel Luckoo's pocket you can find money to serve the people who serve you. That is what they have to do. Since you can find \$60,000 to put in Sir Lionel Luckoo's pockets, you can find money to pay for an incinerator in Barbados for the purpose of disposing the garbage. If this Island is supposed to be a paradise, if this is supposed to be an island of our own, if this is a place where you are supposed to build up the tourist industry, in this country - I am speaking on Head 40, on Health, Mr. Chairman, so you do not have to look in the Estimates; I can help you in a hurry. Since the Government can boast of doing all of these fancy things and they boast first of protecting

the health of the people of this country, you only have to take a drive along Highway No. 1. where you are promoting tourism, where you have about eight or nine hotels all along that Highway - not including the small guest houses - and you will find tons of garbage. Sometimes people do not see the garbage trucks in the outlying districts of St. James for some two weeks. I remember that Mr. Ronald Tree called me one morning and asked me if I could get in touch with Mr. Foster and ask him to come and remove the garbage, not from around his own house but from around the poor people's homes - the poor people who must go and dump their garbage in front of their homes. 11.30 p.m.

Then, I am going to hear something about Christ Church. Let me know something about St. James and, on the whole, about Barbados; I am not only confining my arguments to St. James. It is time that we make sure that priority in Barbados be given to an incinerator. That is how I feel.

As far as the Sports Section is concerned, the whole Department, as the Minister said, needs completely pulling down; it is nothing but shackles and then made to look properly. It is a bare joke in the Sports Department. They have a lot of Coaches who do not drive one stroke when the day comes. I know that for sure. Of course, it is not their fault, anyhow. You must first provide the playing fields and then the sports equipment, such as a lawn mower. You also want a caretaker to take care of the things there. That will keep many of the young people, as my colleague, the hon. senior member for Christ Church said, from around television watching "The Fugitive". Have a better way of life! Have a cultural way of life! A healthy mind breathes a healthy atmosphere!

We should support this country and promote it; particularly when people come here, let them see not only a healthy city, but let them see on the whole a healthy people. That can only happen by improving their own lives. Have proper Community Centres. You do not need centres like what you have in St. Joseph today where people go in just to do tailor's work. This idea of taking these Community Halls and renting them out for the purpose of dance halls, I think, Sir, should not be done at all. They were not meant to be used for that purpose; they were meant for the purpose of having some dramatic play where some young boys and girls could sit down and discuss the D.L.P., discuss Mr. Waite, decide whether Mr. Waite should remain here and Cally should go or that Cally should remain and Mr. Waite should go. Those are the things that I think should be taking place in a Community Hall when you go into them. They are not built for the purpose that when you go into them you find one man in a corner playing dice and all that sort of thing. Nothing so.

This is how I feel about the whole shuffling about of the Sports Department. It needs a complete overhaul. Set up a National Sports Council now with somebody who is qualified in such a field as its Director so that when your National Stadium is ready, you will

also have the people to move in. Do not wait until your National Stadium is ready and after that, you find that you have to look about and ask the so-called hangers-on that support the Government's Party for their help. Of course, it is their democratic right, anyhow. They do it just for the sake of getting jobs in this particular department.

I am going to watch that like a hawk. I am going to keep an eagle's eye on that. I wish, however, to thank the Hon. Minister for the information which he gave; so we can rest assured. Members from this side of the House can approach him and ask him to assist us on any matter coming within his portfolio and he will, as far as he can. 11.40 p.m.

Some time ago I asked the Minister about having some toilets and baths put down at Fitts Village, and I am sure that he is ready; but to get the Minister of Communications and Works to move, you will have to get a bull pistol and wake him up. There is a lot of petty foolish spite. Boys and girls walk up and down the beach and can find nowhere to undress in order to take a swim. Tourists can go to the hotels; but this project for the inhabitants is being stalled by the Ministry of Communications and Works. Anywhere they did not get a seat, you get the clutch and brake on. As the Prime Minister said some time ago, let the youth of tomorrow pay for the debts which we incur now.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Minister of Health and Community Development for his support. It is regrettable that he is so pleasant a man at times. I do not know if his pleasant approach is due to his nature or if it is an approach to dodge blows; but I know he is a very able politician and a gentleman for whom I have the greatest respect. It would serve the Minister of Communications and Works to go to him every morning for some lessons in culture which, I think, would help this august Assembly a great deal.

The question that the sum of \$957,596 under Head 40 - Ministry of Health and Community Development - as amended stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 41 - LAZARETTO

Head 41 - Lazaretto - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$21,681 under Head 41 - Lazaretto - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 42 - LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Head 42 - Local Government - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$3,217 under Head 42 - Local Government - stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I have been searching up, down and across to find where provision is made for the Farris Children's Home at St. Peter, and I understand from the Minister that I would have to raise anything on that particular Item under this Head. I am somewhat at a loss even at this stage to tell you under what Item I am speaking if I am asked, except probably to say Item 10 - Local Government Service Commissioner, because he is charged with the responsibility for Farris Children's Home. I want to say that we are glad to see the Government instituting a scheme whereby children are removed from the Almshouses or Infirmarys, if I may use a better term, and from among the old people whose condition is such that it does not lend itself to the health and upbringing in any respect of the children generally. As far as I can speak for the Farris Children's Home at St. Peter, my view is that it is not a Home in any respect. It does not offer to the children anything approximating home life, and the best that one can describe it as is an Almshouse away from the sea. In other words, the children have now been removed from the St. Peter's Infirmary which is on the sea, and taken further inland to another infirmary.

At Farris or at any Children's Home for that matter, what must be of chief concern, apart from the health of the children, is that it should be so equipped as to make ample provision for the Matron and Staff; it should be so equipped that the nurses can be so housed as to offer to the children that home life feeling and atmosphere which is so necessary. But what do you find at Farris? You find a condition which is nowhere near what a home should be. Members of Staff have to make out with less accommodation than was afforded a similar number of persons employed at the St. Peter's Infirmary. With such a condition obtaining at Farris, Staff members have first got to try and see for themselves. In a Children's Home the Matron or Nurse is expected in some degree to perform the functions of a teacher as well until the children reach an age where they can play their part or take their places in the schools provided at Primary School level; but on examination of the situation at Farris Children's Home, you will be very dissatisfied in going among the people there. I want to say that the Matron and Staff there are to be complimented on the bold attempt they are making to make life worthwhile for the children. They are doing a wonderful job. But even the provision for the Matron is badly sited. One would feel that at such an institution the Matron should be housed in a cottage which commands a view of the entire Institution and not tucked away in some back premises. That is not good enough. In other words, when these children are taken from the main building to the Matron's quarters, the quarters should portray an atmosphere which offers to these little children something they will remember through the rest of their lives.

11.50 p.m.

In other words, the Head of the Institution should be so housed in such surroundings - she should be so housed that her cottage should have around it nice

flowering plants where the children should find an opportunity to mingle amongst; they could be taught; they should see something. We have to bear in mind that they are poor, destitute children that are accommodated at Farris Children's Home. It is not merely to give them a full belly, or a meal - something that they would have got if they had been left with their destitute parents.

We are glad to see that some care has been taken of them, but the building at Farris - while one may say an attempt has been made and something has been done, there is nothing at Farris to lend itself to being called a Children's Home. It is our view that the Government itself is not sufficiently familiar with what home life should mean.

I do not want to cause the Prime Minister to be denied of one minute of his rest. One would be tempted to take the example that any Minister might offer of home life. At Farris Children's Home there is absolutely nothing to which one can point, except to say, as I have said earlier, that the children are no longer at an Institution where the old, aged, decrepit and infirm persons - the incurables - live. We are glad that the children have been removed from that atmosphere; but just to put a coat of paint on Farris and attach to it the name of "Children's Home", I feel, honestly, would be prostituting the name of a Children's Home. I feel that if we attach the name to Farris, it has absolutely nothing to lend itself to being associated with that name.

Mr. Chairman, if one is to take these Estimates as a guide, it must be clearly seen that Government in itself thinks so much of Farris Children's Home that - unless I have not done a careful enough search - I will be very glad if the Hon. Minister can show to me on what page provision is made for the children at Farris in St. Peter. I do not believe that it could have been such an omission on the part of the Government. I could hardly understand it; but I understand, as I said earlier, that the Interim Commissioner for Local Government is charged with the responsibility for this Home, and as such one would be expected to find it under Head 42 - Local Government.

I have tried even to enlist the support of the Hon. Minister and all I find that he can tell me is that it has to be raised under Head 42. However, whether an omission has been made here or not, it can be corrected at some stage or some place. I am just inviting the Minister to give some consideration and to do something even now to house the staff under such conditions that the children, when they are invited, or taken - they must at some time go, in their running around, or whilst at play - where the Matron lives, or where many of the other staff members are housed, I say that what is to be seen in those places is not at all good by any standard.

The Minister will be well advised - I do not want it to be thought that I am trying to throw cold water on any effort which has been made so far, but I still feel that Government has fallen so far short in projecting home-life to these children that to call Farris a Children's Home is a misnomer.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw to the attention of the hon. member the fact that Government has not taken over the various Districts, and that legislation must be enacted before that can be done. These Children's Homes are still being supervised by the various Districts, and therefore they are responsible for the Estimates.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I would like to confirm what the hon. member has said. So far as Farris Children's Home is concerned, it is under the Local Government Estimates and based on Local Government Revenue. There are a few points which the hon. junior member for St. Peter raised. The hon. member seems to be very familiar with Farris Children's Home.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I represent that constituency of St. Peter, and Farris Children's Home is in St. Peter.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate the hon. member in that he knows the building so well. There are quarters for the Matron, as the hon. member has stated; but how they are sited he does not like. At the extremity on one side there is a driveway, and it is very cool and commodious as far as I know.

12 midnight.

Quarters have been specially provided for the Matron and the Nurses and Assistants, and they are cool and commodious as far as I know. I will see what can be done to enhance the accommodation and improve it. Accommodation for children today is very much better than it was when they were in the Infirmarys, and new furniture and equipment is being installed for children. The Staff has been trained by the Child Care Committee which is run by the Social Welfare Department with Miss Gittens who is an expert in that work. There is a Kindergarten being established, and the children's diet is superior to what it was in the Infirmarys.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Chairman, speaking under Head 42, I do not think that there is any country in the world outside of some of the African States - even in Russia and Cuba, a Local Government system still exists. The rights of the people, one can safely say, were taken away when the Government abolished Local Government. Only a few days ago, I read in one of the daily newspapers that the Government had to pay some \$20,000.00 or more to a firm for taking pictures and also for organising the registration system of Central Government. Since the Central Government have taken over Local Government, no one can safely say up to this day that it is a success. If one looks into the Manifesto of the present Government, he will observe - I think Mr. Jackson in his Report made certain recommendations to the Government of this country - and to abolish Local Government is a wicked act on the part of the Government of this country. It is safely stifling the democratic rights of the people of this country. I challenge any member to call another country where there is no Local Government. You cannot go into a parish and ask any person to go to a representative outside of any of us who is sitting around

this table, and ask him to help the people with their problems. All of that is due to the abolition of Local Government and it has gone through the eddies. I am making an appeal to the Government under Head 42.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am of the opinion that the hon. member is not now dealing with Head 42.

Mr. CRAIG: I am dealing with Head 42 - Local Government - and Item 10 - Local Government Service Commissioner.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is, in my opinion, making a second reading speech on the abolition of Local Government.
12.10 a.m.

Mr. CRAIG: I am only making an observation.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are not making an observation; you are making a second reading speech. I would like to know on what item of Local Government you are speaking.

Mr. CRAIG: Item 10.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Proceed to deal with Head 42.

Mr. CRAIG: The expenditure on Local Government Service Commissioner is to be \$1,000. I am saying, Mr. Chairman, that the \$1,000 under this Head is not worthy of coming under the Estimates because Local Government in Barbados today is gone with the wind, and I am appealing to the Government to make haste that such an Act is repealed.

It is unfair to this country; it is unfair to the citizens of Barbados. If you come to Barbados, there is not even a Mayor to greet you and give you the freedom of the City. It is my humble belief that when the senior member for St. George made his speech in here some time ago, he made one salient point when he said that it was not Local Government that was wrong; nothing was wrong with Local Government; what was wrong was the people whom they had in Local Government.

It is the training ground for young men and women to serve their country. You pass from Local Government to Central Government, and when one can come here and ask for a vote of \$1,000 under Item 10, Head 42, Local Government Service Commissioner, I cannot sit here and feel comfortable about it. I feel deep down within myself - and I speak for my Party; I have heard their arguments on this - that unless you have Local Government in this country, you are always going to have problems as regards garbage disposal, problems of Community Development, and you are going to have the problem of people hounding you down and asking you questions, to support them and grant them a favour, things that members of Local Government would have been asked.

I got up, Sir, to make this appeal only on the Local Government system which they now have in Barbados. I had the very sad experience to hear

the groundsman of Trents Social Centre, who formerly worked with the Northern District Council of Local Government which controlled his duties, make it very clear to them now that he is a Civil Servant, and no one of the Northern District Council can tell him how to keep the grounds at Trents Social Centre. He feel that it is no longer in the hands of Mr. Foster; therefore he can do as he feels. That is something one experiences all the time now. That is something other countries throughout the entire world do not experience, and in our community we have this bad state of affairs in our Local Government.

I am saying, Sir, that the Government felt within itself after the 1956 elections, when things were looking so close to them, that if they held the Local Government elections in either the month of January or February when it should have been held that they would have lost hold of the Local Government Councils, presently controlled by members of the D.L.P. They immediately abolished Local Government. It is not a good feature that when one comes to Barbados, he has to go up at Government House to meet the Governor-General when he could have met the Mayor of the City. I believe that you cannot go to any other part of the British Commonwealth, even to the U.S.A. and find that there is no Local Government body operating. For some strange reason or the other, we are asked to vote \$1,000 under Item 10 - Local Government Service Commissioner, although I feel personally that no Local Government exists in the country.

The question that the sum of \$3,217 under Head 42 - Local Government - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 43 - QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

Head 43 - Queen Elizabeth Hospital - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$3,035,078 be appropriate under Head 43.

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

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

HEAD 44 - MENTAL HOSPITAL

Head 44 - Mental Hospital - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$559,165 be appropriated under Head 44.

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

(ASIDES)

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

HEAD 45 - HOUSING

Head 45 - Housing - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to move that the sum of \$75,000 be appropriated under Head 45.

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

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

HEAD 46 - OLD AGE PENSIONS

Head 46 - Old Age Pensions - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$1,793,240 be appropriated under Head 46.

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

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

HEAD 44 - MENTAL HOSPITAL - RECOMMITTED

Head 44 - Mental Hospital was re-committed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, there are a few amendments to this Head.

Page 154. Delete notes to items 37, 38 and 39.

Page 155. Insert note to item 40 as follows:
"Resolution No. 86/1965".

Insert note to item 41 as follows:
"Payable to present holder of post of Tutor in lieu of quarter."

I beg to move that the sum of \$559,165 under Head 44 - Mental Hospital - as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 47 - PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

Head 47 - Public Assistance - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$4,842 be appropriated under Head 47.

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

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

HEAD 48 - MINISTRY OF TRADE, TOURISM, CO-OPERATIVES AND FISHERIES

Head 48 - Ministry of Trade, Tourism Co-operatives and Fisheries - was called.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$956,623 be appropriated under Head 48.

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

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

HEAD I - ANNEXED ESTIMATES - POST OFFICE

Head 1 - Annexed Estimates - Post Office - was called.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I beg to move that the sum of \$766,049 be appropriated under Head I - Annexed Estimates - Post Office.

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

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

12.20 a.m.

PART II - CAPITAL

HEAD 101 - AGRICULTURE

Head 101 - Agriculture - was called.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, there are amendments to this Head. They are as follows:-

Delete "\$50" appearing under Revised Estimated Expenditure 1967-68 against, "Small Holder's Irrigation".

Amend the note to item 3, Markets Improvements and Construction by substituting the words, "for new markets and", for the words, "at existing markets" in the first line.

Amend the note to Item 5 - "Animal Nutrition Unit", by substituting "\$26,560" for "\$36,945" in the last line.

I beg to move that the sum of \$1,238,685 under Head 101 - Agriculture - as amended stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I see that under Item 3 there is a revote of \$156,850.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr Chairman, I think I can anticipate the hon. member. He is going to raise the point about the Market at Speightstown. The plans are now being prepared, they have got to go before the Planning Committee, and I hope to get the Market off the ground within another two or three weeks' time.

The question that the sum of \$1,238,685 under Head 101 - Agriculture - as amended stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 102 - COMMUNICATIONS AND WORKS

Head 102 - Communications and Works - was called.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$2,133,159 under Head 102 - Communications and Work - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 103 - HEALTH AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Head 103 - Health and Community Development was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$1,101,200 under Head 103 - Health and Community Development - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 104 - EDUCATION

Head 104 - Education - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, there are amendments to this Head. They are as follows:-

Amend the note to item 4 - New Secondary Comprehensive Schools, by the substitution of the following:-

"4. New Comprehensive School (38,517). To complete Ellerslie and to start New School at St. George. A token provision of \$5,000 is included."

Amend item 5 - Extensions to Secondary Comprehensive Schools, by substituting the amount of "\$120,000" for the amount of "\$112,000" appearing under the column, Estimates 1968-69.

Amend note by the addition of the words "Increase to meet increased costs".

Amend the note to "item 7 - Technical Institute" by substituting the following words, "new technical institution" for "New Technical Institute on site to be selected".

I beg to move that the sum of \$1,493,891 under Head 104 - Education - stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I see that the Government's plans here for new comprehensive schools are that they are going to complete Ellerslie and start a new school at Codrington. I am to wonder if the Minister has any plans whatever for providing a comprehensive school for one of the northern parishes, preferably St. Peter.

Hon J. C. TUDOR: Mr Chairman, some time ago the Northern District Council by a Resolution passed

at one of its meetings decided to negotiate with Government or to hand over by negotiations Barrows House for the provision of a comprehensive school for the northern parishes. The Northern District Council preferably wanted the school in St. Lucy, but whether in St. Lucy or St. Peter, it will serve the northern parishes as soon as the Minister has developed his plans for it.

The question that the sum of \$1,493,891 under Head 104 - Education - as amended, stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 105 - HOME AFFAIRS

Head 105 - Home Affairs - was called.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$1,139,268 under Head 105 - Home Affairs - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 106 - OFFICE OF THE PRIME MINISTER

(1) DEVELOPMENT AND INDUSTRY

Head 106 - Office of the Prime Minister (i) Development and Industry - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, on page 190, insert new "item 3 - Hilton Hotel", and provide an amount of \$1,130,700, with the note, "To carry out necessary works, and make final payments."

Amend "Total Development and Industry" by substituting "1,876,200" for "745,500" appearing under column Estimates 1968-69.

I beg to move that the sum of \$1,876,200 under Head 106 - Office of the Prime Minister (i) Development and Industry - as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister can tell us at this stage what is the final cost of the Hilton Hotel. Now, Sir, it is known that all did not go well in the construction. It is known that materials ordered for the construction of the hotel - and I make reference to things like iron works and steel works - came to the Island, remained at the Port for a considerable time, had to be bonded here and there, and eventually were sold out at auction.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: That is not correct. the only thing which was sold out at auction was a billiard table, because the Hilton Development Committee which ran the office did not receive notification that the billiard table was being transferred from the transit shed to the Queen's warehouse. We ordered an investigation into the matter, and the person who purchased the billiard table at the Government auction

offered to give it back to the Hilton Development Committee, but by that time a new billiard table had been ordered. I have a complete Police report, and the only item coming to the Island which was sold out at auction was a billiard table, and that was actually published in the Official Gazette. Nobody apparently noticed it, and the consignment of the billiard table to the Barbados Development Board was in the advertisement.

I have now given instructions that these auctions should not be conducted by the Government Auctioneer, and that there is a duty on the Customs Officer if anything is consigned to a Government Department to send a letter to the Government Department notifying them that the goods are being moved from the transit shed to the Queen's warehouse or to any other place. 12.30 a.m.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I am repeating that iron works imported for the Hilton Hotel were sold by the Government Auctioneer. It is true that a billiard table was sold, but there were three billiard tables, and not one. One billiard table was sold at auction, but three billiard tables came here for the Hilton Hotel.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, there were three crates: two of them were delivered on the side, and the other one was kept in the Transit Shed. We have never got any satisfactory explanation why the third crate did not leave the Harbour with the other two crates. That particular crate was kept; it was a fairly large crate, too; it was not the sort of thing that could be hidden behind a bag of flour. That crate was kept down there for some considerable time - I cannot remember the period; it could have been three months or longer. It was moved to the Queen's Warehouse, and after it had been there long after the Hotel was opened - 6, 8, 9 months after the hotel was opened - and after the Hotel Management and Development Board had written all round and made enquiries, gone down and searched and that kind of thing and nobody could find it, lo! and behold, one morning we read that it would be sold out at auction by the Government Auctioneer.

When the hon. member says three billiard tables, that is not correct. It was one billiard table in three crates. In other words, it came broken down. I think the top is what was actually sold by the Government Auctioneer, and the legs and frame were delivered at the Hotel.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, a billiard table was sold by auction, and it was bought by a Swan Street businessman. After he had complete his purchase with the Government Auctioneer, then the Manager of the Development Board went to his premises in a manner as if he wanted to demand the billiard table for the Hilton Hotel. That is what happened. So you will see that I believe the Prime Minister, for once, that he has Police Reports on this matter. I believe him, but he would know why. What was he using his Police Force to do on that occasion? He is accustomed to using it. He would know why he was using it.

Mr. Chairman, if an item is set up for sale by auction; it is advertised; it is not anything, as the Prime Minister tells you, that could be hidden behind a bag of flour; if a customer makes his bid and his bid is accepted by the Government Auctioneer, where then does the Police come in? Why? I am confident, Mr. Chairman, that the Prime Minister is going to use the Police on himself before long.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to tell the hon. member that I do not have any Police Force. The Police Force belongs to the people of Barbados, and if there is a property which belongs to the people of Barbados which finds itself in the hands of the Government Auctioneer, which should not be in the hands of the Government Auctioneer - I have had a personal experience about that at the Customs; a very personal experience, too. Property with my name written big over it was sold out at auction, and it cost me \$3,000. That was some eight or nine years ago. It was consigned to me by a client of mine in Curacao for safe keeping. One shipment had arrived at the bond, and the late Mr. A. E. Taylor, who was another client of mine, in order to save the day paid for the items and allowed me to buy them back at cost price. He made a bid for the items and allowed me to buy them back at cost.

I find it difficult to understand how the Customs Officers or the Government Auctioneer, when a Government Department or a person who is well known in the Island and has not gone away on long vacation, or anything like that, cannot before they publish things for sale - it is true that there is no legal obligation - cannot write the person a letter and say: "You may have forgotten that there are things here in the Government Bond."

In that particular instance, I had given instructions for the items to be bonded in a Bonded Warehouse. Because it was late a Saturday afternoon, they put the things in the Queen's Warehouse instead of the Bonded Warehouse, and they remained in the Queen's Warehouse instead of in the Bonded Warehouse, where I would have paid the normal rent. Now this is not the first time this has happened to people in Barbados. If you pick up the Official Gazette - people do not normally read these things to see about three cases of dried saltfish; so many rolls of toilet paper, and so on for sale. Nobody except the people who are going around speculating normally would read that; but even if you read it, as they do not state whom it was consigned to, and only recently they have been doing that, you would not know that your property was being sold. I think it was since I protested to the Customs in my case.

The question that the sum of \$1,876,200 under Head 106 (i) - Development and Industry - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 106 - (ii) SEAWELL AIRPORT

Head 106 (ii) - Seawell Airport - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move the following amendments:

"Page 191 - Amend "item 5, Taxiway" by substituting "\$120,000" for "\$101,000" and inserting "\$135,828" in column, Provision in Supplementary Estimates for 1967-68, and substituting "\$697,650" for "\$713,450" in column, Revised Estimated Expenditure 1967-68.

Amend Total Seawell Airport by substituting "\$316,124 for "\$297,124", "\$259,451" for "\$123,623 and "\$1,793,794" for "\$1,096,144."

Amend note to "item 5" by adding "\$118,000" after "Revote".

I beg to move that Head 106(ii) - Seawell Airport - as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question that Head 106 (ii) - Seawell Airport, as amended, stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 106 - (iii) - REGIMENT

Head 106 (iii) - Regiment - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$6,000 under Head 106 (iii) - Regiment - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 107 - MINISTRY OF TRADE

Head 107 - Ministry of Trade - was called.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$36,511, under Head 107 - Ministry of Trade, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Schedule to the Bill, as amended, stand part.

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

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

12.40 a.m.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called. It read as follows:-

2. The Accountant General may on the warrant of the Minister or some person authorised by the

Minister in writing, issue out of the Consolidated Fund and apply towards making good the supply granted for the service of the year ending on 31st March, 1969 a sum not exceeding in the aggregate forty-two million five hundred and sixty-two thousand, one hundred and seventy-eight dollars.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, in respect of this Clause, the figures on the first page of the right corner are to be changed to \$42,565,429, and over the second page, the words "forty-two million, five hundred and sixty-five thousand, four hundred and twenty-nine" substituted for the original. With that amendment, I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

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

The question that Clause 2 as amended stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 3 to 6 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill with amendments in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE ESTIMATES OF PORT DEPARTMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister:- To move the passing of the following Resolution:-

A Resolution to approve under Section 10 of the Barbados Harbours Act 1960, the Annual Estimates of the Port Department for the year 1968-69.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution giving approval to the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure of the Port Department in respect of the financial year 1968-69, shows a total revenue of \$2,895,698, and there is a total expenditure of the same amount after the operating expenditure of \$1,161,154 has been taken care of. The capital charges in respect of the construction of the Port which is the amortization of the capital and interest charges, and so on, amount to \$1,529,436. The maintenance of Static Facilities amount to \$49,698 and after that, there are contributions to the Renewals fund for Wasting Assets which amount to \$32,398, Water Craft Replacement, \$50,092 and the Betterment Fund \$72,920. The notes are self explanatory. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

EXPIRING LAWS BILL

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 8 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister:- To move the second reading of a Bill to make permanent certain enactments formerly continued in force from year to year by annual Expiring Laws Continuance Acts.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, this is an exercise which we go through every year and hon. members are well acquainted with the need for an Expiring Laws Validity Act in order to give Parliament the opportunity to say whether these Acts should be continued or not. The enactments themselves provide for limited duration, and the oldest one is the Vagrancy Act, 1897 and it comes down to the Volunteer Amendment Act of 1946. We are looking at the whole question of an Expiring Laws Validity Act because there are some of these Acts which we feel should be of a permanent nature, and others which are being examined in the light of amendment form maybe made into permanent Acts and some of them may, of course, be rescinded altogether or allowed to lapse.
12.50 a.m.

Unless Parliament, therefore, acquiesce to their continuance, they no longer have the force of law. The list is already reduced considerably on the advice of the Law Commissioner who is doing a revision of the Statute Laws of Barbados and there are only, I think, ten laws which will come under the Expiring Laws Validity Act.

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

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

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

On motions of Hon. E. W. BARROW, seconded by Hon. J. C. TUDOR, the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

The Preamble was postponed.

Clauses 1, 2, 3, and 4 were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

The Preamble was called and passed.

On motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER, resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: This concludes Government Business.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now stand adjourn until Tuesday next, 19th March, 1968, at 12 o'clock (noon).

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

Mr. St. JOHN: I do not know whether the Government has urgent business; I do not know whether they have fixed the Order Paper as is customary at this time. I say so because there is a large amount of Private Members' Business which I understand hon. members on this side are anxious to have done.

The question that this House do now stand adjourned until Tuesday next, 19th March, 1968, at 12 o'clock (noon) was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. Speaker adjourned the House accordingly.