

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 19th March, 1968

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

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, O.C., F.Z.S., (Speaker); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; 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. P. ST. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. P. LOWE; Hon. N. W. BOXILL, (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. J. B. YEAPWOOD, (Chairman of Committees); Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; His Honour C. E. SAFGEANT, (Deputy Speaker) and Mr. L. S. CRAIG.

Prayers were read.

Mr. MOTTLEY entered the House and took his seat.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: There are, I regret to say, no Minutes available for confirmation.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

The Second Annual Report and Statement of Accounts of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation for the period January - December 1965.

The Third Annual Report and Statement of Accounts of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation for the period January - December 1966.

On behalf of the Hon Minister of Agriculture, Labour and National Insurance, I am commanded to lay the Financial Statements of the Barbados General Agricultural Society for the year ended 31st January, 1967.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, Minister of Fin-

ance and Minister of External Affairs, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of \$6,240 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1967-68 Part 1 Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1967-68 No. 68 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, it is also my intention to ask the leave of the House to deal with this Money Resolution in all of its stages today. Copies of this Resolution are available for circulation, and hon. members will see the reason for the urgency.

Also, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Labour and National Insurance, I beg to give notice of a Bill to provide for the regulation and control of the production and distribution of milk and milk products in the Island, to establish a Milk Advisory Board and for matters connected therewith and incidental thereto.

Also, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Health and Community Development, I beg to give notice that the Oral Replies to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 118 and 127, asked by the hon. junior member for St. John, are ready.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 89, asked by the hon. junior member for St. Peter, is ready.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S NOTICE

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Peter: his notice re a Commission of Enquiry.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:-

WHEREAS one of the prime reasons of constructing a Deep Water Harbour at Bridgetown was to give effect to reducing the high cost of living to the community in general;

AND WHEREAS the cost of living has continued on an upward trend since the Harbour was declared open in 1961 and there is no evidence forthcoming of its fulfilling the purpose of relieving or reducing the cost of living to the consuming public;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House urge upon Government the necessity of appointing a Commission of Enquiry into the complete working of the Deep Water Harbour having as its main object the means of reducing the cost of living in this Island, and including amongst its terms of reference the following: -

- (a) Productivity;
- (b) conditions of work, conduct and other matters not normally part of Trade Union activities giving rise to labour unrest and uneasiness;
- (c) job security;
- (d) Kick-backs, pilferage, loan-sharking;
- (e) threats of violence especially with regards to the Port Workers' Provident Fund;
- (f) the management of such Fund and the total amount thereof;
- (g) employment practices not part of or dealt with in collective bargaining;
- (h) checking of cargo in Port Sheds;
- (i) methods of documentation and
- (j) discipline and maintenance of reasonable standards of conduct.

QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Peter. His question re the Mental Hospital.

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

1. Is the Minister aware of the fact that on Monday 11th March, 1968, a member of the Royal Barbados Police Force entered on the premises of the Mental Hospital and administered a beating to his wife who is a member of the Nursing Staff of the said Hospital in the presence of other Staff and of mentally sick patients at the said Hospital?
2. What action does the Minister propose taking in this matter?
3. Can the Minister say what effect such an act by a member of the Royal Barbados Police Force has had on the staff of the said Institution as to their feelings of security and protection from such acts in the future?
4. What effect has this incident had on patients and what assurance can the Minister give that there will be no recurrence?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member, his query also *apropos* of the Mental Hospital and Children.

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

1. In view of the growing numbers of children of school age now becoming patients at the Mental Hospital, would Government treat as a priority securing of one or more psychiatrists to be attached to the Ministries of Health and Education, and/or a number of psychiatric social workers whose prime duty it will be to assist the entire school population through working in collaboration with Head-teachers of the several schools in this island?

2. What steps have been taken, if any, to provide a ward at the Mental Hospital for housing mental patients, some being of as tender an age as eight years of age, so that they be removed from the chronic cases housed at the said Institution?

Mr. SPEAKER: Again, the same hon. member. His query relative to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

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

Since the opening of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital have all the Wards of this Institution been put to use for providing accommodation for the sick?

2. If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, when was the last Ward made available?

3. If the answer is in the negative, will the Minister state why all of the Wards of this Institution are not in use?

4. Would Government consider the necessity for providing a sick-bay at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital to be used exclusively for the Nursing staff attached to the said Hospital.

Hon A. DaC. EDWARDS entered the House and took his seat.

Mr. SPEAKER: That, so far as my information goes, concludes notices of questions.

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to provide for the regulation and control of the production and distribution of milk and milk products in the Island, to establish a Milk Advisory Board and for matters connected therewith and incidental thereto, be now read a first time.

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that you do now leave the Chair, and the House go into Committee of Supply, and that it be an instruction of the House, while in Committee of Supply, to deal with the Resolution for \$6,240 of which notice was given earlier in today's sitting.

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

The question was put and carried nem. con.

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

12.25 p.m.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS entered the House and took his seat.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1967-68 No.65
HEAD 25 - POLICE

Head 25 - Police - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, Head 25 requires supplementary provision of \$864 for a new item, allowance in lieu of quarters. This is required to meet the payment to the Commissioner of Police for a housing allowance in lieu of quarters for the entire financial year at the rate of \$72 per month. Hon. members would note that provision was not included in this year's Estimates.

I beg to move that Head 25 stand part.

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

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

HEAD 28A - METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE

Head 28A - Meteorological Service - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Head 28A, Meteorological Service, Item 66, Item 12 and Item 12A require supplementary provision. The largest one is, of course, provision under Item 12 for Caribbean Meteorological Service. I think hon. members are aware that in this matter the Government of Barbados is required to make contributions to the Caribbean Meteorological Institute's recurrent costs for 1968. As a result of sterling devaluation there has been an inevitable increase in our contributions. The balance of the contributions, as the explanatory note says, will be met from an amount of over \$23,000 which now stands to the credit of the Caribbean Meteorological Service in a Suspense Account.

I beg to move that Head 28A stand part.

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

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

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, the Resolution for \$23,406 was passed.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1967-68, No. 66

HEAD 41 - MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Sir, it is not the intention of the Ministry of Education to proceed with this Resolution. I am sorry. I have to warn the Committee about this Resolution. We would not be proceeding with this. I am going to ask leave when we get back in the House for it to be removed from the Order Paper. I ought to have informed the House earlier.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Did you say that you are not proceeding with it at all?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Have you withdrawn it?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes; but I cannot withdraw it in Committee.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What a pity!

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1967-68 No.68

RESOLUTION FOR \$6,240

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Hon. members would recall..

Mr. MOTTLEY: Is that the Resolution which you asked leave to deal with when we were in the House? I am submitting to the Hon. Leader of the House that I am not objecting; but I am regularising the procedure.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes. This was the result of an instruction given to the Committee when we were in the House. Is this necessary now?

Mr. MOTTLEY: That does not necessarily mean that you have leave to deal with it in Committee. You asked the House for leave to deal with it. This Resolution has just been circulated on the Table. I am submitting to the Hon. Leader of the House that I am not objecting, but I am just regularising the procedure. I know that I am right. You asked that it be an instruction of the House when in Committee. But then, you have to ask for leave to deal with it. How can we give you leave?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I am somewhat definite here. I did, of course, indicate that I would ask for leave to deal with it in all its stages when I was moving the motion for the Speaker to leave the Chair. I did ask

that it be an instruction to the House when in Committee to deal with it in all its stages. That is the motion which was carried.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not want to catch at small things like this, but you gave notice to do it today and you said that it was your intention to ask leave to deal with it. When did you ask leave? You said, when the House was assembled, when the Speaker was in the Chair that it be an instruction to the Committee. Now that you come back in here, did you ask leave to deal with it? That is how I have seen it done all the time.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The Committee may rightfully assume that the House having given the instructions, leave to be granted to proceed is given. Well, Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to proceed with this Resolution in accordance with the instructions which I gave.

There being no objection, leave was granted the Hon. Minister.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, hon. members will recall that earlier in this financial year, amendments were made to the appropriate legislation which fixes the rates of copyists in the Registration Department for copying and recording documents. Hon. members will also recall the amounts by which the emoluments were increased.
12.35 p.m.

This amount is therefore required to supplement the original vote between now and the end of the financial year. It is also to be remembered that this is a sort of self-balancing account, and that the amount expended is always recoverable under Head 13 (1) as part of the Registrar's Fees of Office.

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.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I had intimated to the Committee that I was not proceeding with the Resolution for \$106,658, and consequently that was not done. I am not asking leave to have this withdrawn from the Order Paper.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave of the House to withdraw from the Order Paper a Resolution in respect of \$106,658, and unless there is any objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted to the Hon. Leader of the House to withdraw from the Order Paper the Resolution of which he has spoken.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 4 be the next Order of the Day.

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

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

THE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1967

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 4 stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Labour and National Insurance, and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1964.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, it is noted that Part IV of the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1964 which deals with industrial diseases has not been brought into force because of certain difficulties raised by insurance companies, and these difficulties centred around the question of a recognised Specialist as is provided in the Act. We are now therefore seeking to amend Part IV by removing the requirement for a recognised Specialist in diseases of the lungs as contained in section 20 (3) and (4) thereof and by providing in place thereof the requirement for a Specialist in tuberculosis and that Part I (10) and Part II (2) and (3) of the First Schedule be deleted. This matter was held up for a long time, representation has had to be made to the Secretary of State, we have had the opinion of the Attorney General, we have had to be consulting the Chief Medical Officer, the University of the West Indies and so on.

Now as it stood before, the insurance companies raised the point that they could not insure people under Part IV of the Act for industrial diseases since there were no recognised Specialists in lung diseases. The position is that there are no recognised Specialists as such here in diseases of the lung, and in Jamaica where we have made representation to have them placed on the panel of doctors to go into these diseases, it was pointed out that a qualified Physician Specialist is generally accepted as a person competent to deal with diseases of the lung. All that has happened here is that we have amended that Part of the Act which makes provision for recognised Specialists in lung diseases and substituting therefor the Senior Physician Specialist and the Physician Specialist in Clause 2 of the Bill.

You will note that in this amending Bill which we have here, it is stated that section 20 of the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1963, is hereby amended by deleting the words "containing at least two persons who are recognised specialists in diseases of the lung" occurring in the second, third and fourth lines of subsection (3) thereof and substituting therefor the words "of whom two shall be the persons for the time being holding the offices of Chief Physician Specialist and Senior Physician Specialist on the staff of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital."
12.45 p.m.

It is to be remembered that the post of Chief Physician Specialist at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital was a special post created to meet certain contingencies to avoid having to pay compensation to a certain officer at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital when we abolished the post of Medical Superintendent. The post of Chief Physician Specialist was created at the salary of the Medical Superintendent, so that the Government would have been in a position to offer this post to the then holder of the post of Medical Superintendent at that salary so as to avoid having to pay out compensation for the abolition of the post.

It was pointed out then that this post would only be there as long as the present holder of the post held it, because it was \$20 a month or so more; but now the present holder of that post no longer holds it, it is not the intention of the Government to fill the post of Chief Physician Specialist again, but to go on as usual with the Senior Physician Specialist and Physician Specialist. Therefore, we are seeking to amend the amended Clause 2 of the Bill which we are now dealing with instead of providing for the Chief Physician Specialist and the Senior Physician Specialist to be the recognised specialist to deal with these diseases for industrial insurance purposes. We are substituting the Chief Physician Specialist and the Senior Physician Specialist by a Senior Physician Specialist and a Physician Specialist.

We are also amending (d) in the same Bill which reads:

"by deleting the words "one of which shall be a recognised specialist in diseases of the lungs" occurring in the third and fourth lines of subsection (4) thereof and substituting therefor the words "one of whom shall be" and instead of its reading "the holder for the time being of the office of Chief Physician as aforesaid", we are substituting "the person for the time being holding or acting in the office of Senior Physician Specialist or Physician Specialist as aforesaid."

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

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

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, this amendment to the Workmen's Compensation Act is not controversial. I do not propose to speak on this amendment, but to seek information from the Minister. Some time ago he gave this House the assurance that they were thinking of bringing the Workmen's Compensation under National Insurance, and I am.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I did not hear what the hon. member said, and I would like him to repeat it.

Mr. CRAIG: Some time ago, Mr. Speaker, the Minister gave this House the assurance that they were going to bring the Workmen's compensation under National Insurance. I am wondering if he can throw any light on when they envisage amending the

Act to bring the Workmen's Compensation under the National Insurance, as it was once stated by the said Minister.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to find out one or two things. There is no opposition, I believe, over here to this amendment, but I want it to be made clear lest any one should think that I am in opposition to any industries coming here, for they would have another thought coming, because I am a member of the Party who was in the forefront for fighting for industries coming to this country for many years. I want the Minister to note this very carefully.

With regard to the International Scientific Limited, what you have amended here today is the correct thing; but a person in my position cannot help hearing something that the Minister might not hear. We grant concessions and the like to the people establishing industries in this country, but it is also our duty to protect our labour force. The thing to which I object most strongly is the fact that I see the New York Times advertising the question of cheap labour. It is about time the Ambassador in Washington see to it that this is stopped. I do not know who is responsible for it. In Puerto Rico you do not talk about cheap labour.

The Hon. Minister spoke about lung diseases and so on. I am not saying this dogmatically, but it is still my duty to draw to the Government's attention what I have heard, not by way of any grapevine, but by way of a person who is qualified to speak on this matter. The International Scientific Limited, I understand, have girls who work there mostly throughout the day for hours, looking through a particular type of glass in order to do their work. I understand also that in other countries they are only good for a period of ten years. I am not saying this dogmatically. I am not saying that I know it is so, but because a person in a position to speak on this matter knows of it, and having raised it not only with me, but with other persons, I would like the Minister to look into it and see if this is so and give some protection to these girls who are employed there. I notice every month, or every week, in the newspaper that you have "The Girl Of The Week", or The Girl Of The Month". That is all well and good, but everyone knows when one's eyes go bad what will happen. I do not know, as I have said, that it is so.

However, I support the Bill and the amendment, and I certainly would like the Hon. Minister in charge, without delay, to go into this matter carefully and do not simply ask the Manager if this is so or not. There are men trained, not as industrial experts, but as Ophthalmic Surgeons, and people who understand what it is to use your eyes under a strain and a light for over a long period.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that two hon. members are on their feet.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am not afraid of that at all, Sir. I am sure the Minister in charge will give this matter his immediate attention, and find out if there is any

truth in it and, if so, give some sort of insurance coverage to people working in this industry.

I understand also in the industry of welding - it does not matter if the people are Barbadians or not - people use glasses in welding, and they should be specially insured. It is the duty of the State to see that these people get protection. While it is the duty of the State to see about labour clauses and what should be paid to the worker, it is also the duty of the State to protect everybody. I know that some peculiar things are happening in this respect. I think it is the duty of the State to look into this matter and see that some clause is inserted to protect the worker when these people who are setting up industries here are granted priorities. The International Scientific Limited near the Seawall Airport is what I am talking about. This is an important matter and one which I think the Minister should, and I am confident he would, investigate. 12.55 p.m.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to amplify in some small measure the remarks made by the hon. member who has just sat down. Many people feel that the first Schedule to the Workmen's Compensation Act is somewhat limited in the range of diseases which it describes in effect as occupational hazards in certain industries. It seems to me that this is taken from one of the early Workmen's Compensation Acts of England, and that it makes little allowance for such industries as the one which the hon. senior member for the City has just described - industries which may place a strain on the eyes. It makes little allowance, for example - it makes no allowance at all for damage from radio activities of a modern sort, although it does say something about pathological manifestations due to radium or other radioactive substances; and the Minister might well find that some of the Questions which are now being asked by hon. members might be answered by inviting the Medical Assessors to advise the Government on extending the list of occupational diseases. There is a question on the Order Paper, if I can locate it, asked by the hon. junior member for St. Peter on this very point, whether a disease described as myosis has arisen as a result of operations of International Scientific Limited. I would suggest to the Minister that that is a point which he might very well examine with a view to amendment of the first Schedule of the Act.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the points raised by the two hon. members are well taken. As a matter of fact, I think the first Schedule to the Act, as the hon. senior member for St. Thomas has mentioned, makes provision for people affected by radiation, and if he looks at Section 20 of the Act, he will see there that the Minister has authority to appoint a Medical Board with a Chairman, and so on, to look into matters of industrial diseases. It is true that at the time of the amendment to this Act in 1963 or early 1964, we might not have been envisaging the situation which, it is reported, we have in this country today. I will promise hon. members to draw this matter to the attention of the Crown Law Officers for their advice on it and to see whether the Act, as it stands now, goes far enough to deal with those people who may be

affected in this manner, or whether there should be an amendment to the Schedule of the Act. The whole purpose of amending this Act is to give protection to workers far and wide. It is noted that currently there are a lot of people who are employed, but who are not covered by Workmen's Compensation.

In reply to the hon. senior member for St. James who raised the question as to when Workmen's Compensation will be brought into National Insurance, I give him the assurance that this will happen during the year. This Act having been amended, makes it easier for us to implement it. I expect that we will have the Adviser from the I.L.O. down here in a couple of months' time to look into the question of bringing Workmen's Compensation into National Insurance and to make provision for self-employed persons under the National Insurance Scheme. I suppose that that reply satisfies hon. members and they can rest assured that I will take up this matter. I started off by saying that the Minister has the authority to appoint a Medical Board to go into these things. Section 20 of the Act provides for the appointment of a Medical Board.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I appreciate the Minister's point of view, but I am only asking him to say if he intends to go into this matter and see if there is anything in it. I would be happy to know if there is anything in it.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order, but when the House goes into Committee.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am just saying this to the Minister. (Asides) All right, Sir. I am just asking the Minister if he can give us an assurance that he will go into this matter.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is well aware that a Question has been asked in this House on this very matter. (Mr. HINDS: All of this time?) It is taking all of this time because when you have to make an investigation like this, you cannot just send to the Head of the Establishment and ask if it is true. You have to carry out investigations and it takes time to have these investigations carried out, and that is the reason why the reply has taken so long. I would like to assure the hon. members that I am prepared to do anything which is in the interest of the workers of this country.

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair, and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: In the temporary absence of Mr. Chairman, it is entirely open to hon. members to appoint a Chairman *pro tem*.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to move that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph be appointed Chairman, *pro tem*.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: No, No, I beg to move that the junior member for St. Andrew be appointed Chairman for the time being. He will make a fine Chairman, both in manner and otherwise.

Mr. SMITH: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Two hon. members have been proposed to the Chairmanship, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph and the hon. senior member for St. Andrew.

(ASIDES)

Am I to understand from the hon. senior member for St. Joseph's remarks *sotto voce* that he has declined the Chairmanship?

Mr. SMITH: Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER: There remains then only the name of the hon. junior member for St. Andrew. Hon. members who are in favour of the hon. junior member for St. Andrew acting as Chairman *pro tem* will please say "Aye" and hon. members who are of the contrary opinion will please say "No".

I think the "Ayes" have it.

(Order! Order!)

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, the reason why I cannot accept that is because I have forgotten my reading glasses at home.

Mr. SPEAKER: In view of the fact that the hon. member has been appointed.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move that the hon. senior member for St. Philip be appointed Chairman temporarily.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that the hon. junior member has explained that it is physically impossible for him to act as Chairman of Committees in view of the conditions of his eyes, and I hope the House would accept that as a good reason.

The hon. senior member for St. Philip has been duly proposed and seconded for the honour of the post of Chairman of Committees. Hon. members in favour will please say "Aye" and hon. members of a contrary opinion will please say "No". Methinks the "Ayes" have it.

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

Clause 1 was called. It reads as follows.

"This Act may be cited as the Workmen's Compensation (Amendment) Act, 1967."

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, Sir, in moving that Clause 1 stand part of this Bill, I should like to make the amendment that the figures "1967" at the end of Clause 1 be substituted by the figures "1968".

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 1, as amended, stand part.

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

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

Clause 2 was called. It reads as follows:-

Section 20 of the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1963, is hereby amended -

- (a) by deleting the words "containing at least two persons who are recognised specialists in diseases of the lung" occurring in the second, third and fourth lines of subsection (3) thereof and substituting therefor the words "of whom two shall be the persons for the time being holding the offices of Chief Physician Specialist and Senior Physician Specialist on the staff of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital"; and
- (b) by deleting the words "one of which shall be a recognised specialist in diseases of the lung" occurring in the third and fourth lines of subsection (4) thereof and substituting therefor the words "one of whom shall be the holder for the time being of the office of Chief Physician Specialist as aforesaid."

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to make an amendment to Clause 2. In the fourth line from the end of Clause 2(a) which reads, "holding the office of Chief Physician Specialist and Senior Physician Specialist" should be substituted by "holding or acting in the offices of Senior Physician Specialist and Physician Specialist," and at the end of Clause 2(b) "holding for the time being of the office of Chief Physician Specialist as aforesaid" be substituted by "the person for the time being holding or acting in the office of Senior Physician Specialist as aforesaid."

I beg to move that Clause 2 as amended stand part.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Clause 2 as amended has been explained. We all remember when Clause 2 of the original Act was amended to retain the services of the Physician Specialist as the Minister quite rightly said. I agreed with it when it was done. Now we are amending it because you want to make sure that you do not pay out money in compensation.

What I would like to know is this. There are not all of us who are fortunate enough to be able to leave this country and travel for illness. However we might feel about a man, you must respect his qualifications. I would like to know whether or not it is a fact that this officer for whom we are amending this section - and we are dealing particularly with an individual - whether or not this officer for whom we are amending the Act so as to give him a bigger salary as Chief Physician Specialist, whether or not it is true that he is not allowed at present to attend to anybody. I want to say this. All of us are not fortunate to be able to go abroad for medical treatment. It does not matter how you feel about a man individually, his qualifications and ability must be respected.

1.15 p.m.

I understand, sir - and the Minister should be able to tell us if it is a fact - that this officer has been promoted to Lecturer at the University of the West Indies, and that he is debarred from using hospital facilities for certain of his patients who would not be able to pay outside for medicine. I am not talking about patients who can afford to pay. People are worthless who can afford to pay and want free things. This is a very serious matter and one which is engaging the attention of people in this country who feel that experience with internal medicine as comes from a Physician Specialist is something that must count; and therefore since you are amending the Act, and since he has been promoted, so to speak, to train our physicians, could the Minister tell me if it is true that some hospital administration has debarred his patients from getting free medicine - certain patients whom he would attend as Consultant - not paying patients as it were in the expensive way. If this is so, I would like to know further whether the Minister realises that experience is something which we should appreciate, and in this case I think you should give the opportunity to such patients as might have to go to him the right to get free medicine. I understand that he is looked upon by the other doctors at the Hospital with some sort of contempt. I support the idea of the amendment as I supported the idea when you had to bring it in to make him Chief Physician Specialist, but I want to know what is happening presently.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, the particular officer to whom the hon. senior member for Bridgetown referred was the former Chief Physician Specialist at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. He is still performing certain functions in that connection at present. He is lecturer at the University of the West Indies by virtue of his high qualifications and experience, and he still enjoys certain facilities there in that we need specialists of that calibre; so that his old patients are still under his control, and the Government has not done anything to interrupt or interfere with the patients whom he saw during his tenure of office as Chief Physician Specialist. To suggest therefore that certain embarrassment is being meted out to him is not quite correct.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the hon. member said "to suggest". I asked

the hon. member if he knows of this. Nobody is suggesting it is so.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I am merely giving the assurance that in so far as his old patients are concerned, he still enjoys the facilities of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and the patients under his control are still getting treatments and assistance. We fully appreciate that to be a Chief Physician Specialist you do not only have the highest qualifications possible - and all this is being looked into very carefully at present by the Government - but you also need a certain number of years' experience. It is just like a Queen's Counsel. No matter how brilliant you are - you could be a double First at the Finals - you cannot come out straight and be a Queen's Counsel. You must put in a certain number of years of successful practice at the Bar to be thought of as a Queen's Counsel. The services of the officer in question are still available, and he is performing a very useful work in training young doctors from the University of the West Indies, and he has the full co-operation of the Hospital Director, the Chief of the Medical Staff Committee and all of the Committee connected with the running of the Hospital and the Government.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The Minister has assured us that he is still allowed to practise in a consultative capacity and his patients are attended to. Is the Minister saying that his prescriptions are not turned down when he gives them to his patients at the Hospital, or he does not know?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out that I made specific emphasis on the words "old patients". I said that about two or three times. In so far as prescriptions go, the policy on that has been changed recently; it does not only affect that particular doctor; it affects all. It is nothing personal as far as prescriptions are concerned.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If he is called in by the general practitioners of the Hospital staff in a consultative capacity and he changes or gives a prescription, why should it be turned down? I am not talking about somebody outside. If he is called in by the doctors at the Hospital and gives a prescription which is different from the one they gave, why should they turn them down? This is what I am asking.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The policy in so far as prescriptions are concerned is that the one who can pay should pay a certain amount, and the ones who cannot pay or find it impossible, are given their prescriptions free. Those who can pay do not pay the full amount, but pay a certain proportion. That is the policy in so far as that Specialist and his patients are concerned. In so far as the Specialist is concerned, he has certain beds allocated to him still. Why doesn't the hon. member say that? He still has certain beds in the Hospital under his control just as other Specialists have; so what he helps with as far as general attendance goes by way of consultation, he is amply rewarded for by virtue of the facilities he enjoys at the Hospital which costs thousands of dollars to put there.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not think the hon. member understood me well enough. I am not arguing about people who are referred to this Chief Physician Specialist in a paying ward. I think that if you can go in the Hospital, it should follow the pattern of what is done in England and America where you have to pay for every tablet; but this is not the point I am making at all. I am talking about people in the general wards. There is some subtlety in not filling prescriptions, and the patients do not get the best. I know it and I am drawing it to the Minister's attention.

The question that Clause 2 as amended stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. Acting CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill with amendment in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

1.25 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 3 be the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Accordingly, the next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. member for Christ Church, the Minister of Community Development, and it is to move the passing of 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.

AMENDMENT TO NOTE TO ITEM 42 OF HEAD 43 - MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, as the Addendum sets out, this is simply a proposed change in the Note so as to bring about a change to Item 42 of Head 43, Ministry of Health and Community Development of the Approved Estimates for 1967-68. Provision is made for seven Car Drivers and five posts of Driver/Supervisor, but, owing to the change and progress we have made at the Speightstown Health Centre and Enmore Health Centre, we need more Car Drivers than Driver/Supervisors: so the object of this is just to reduce the number of Driver/Supervisors by two and to tack that on to the posts of Car Drivers and to amend the note accordingly.

It should be noted that the number of General Workers, Category II, was reduced from forty-four (44) to forty-three (43) when an additional post of Laboratory Attendant was established at Enmore Health Centre under the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1967, of 19th January, 1967

However, it is erroneously stated in the Note to Item 42 that the number of posts is 44. It is therefore proposed that the Note should be further amended to correct the error.

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.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1968

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is Order No. 5. It stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, and it is to move the passing of the Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1968.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, this Order.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member asking for the leave of the House?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes, of course.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution covers staff increases and staff re-adjustments in several Departments and Ministries of the Government: the Registration Office, Fire Service, the Sports Section of the Ministry of Health and Community Development, the Probation Office and Accountant General's Department. In the Registration Office it is proposed to increase the Establishment by one Senior Clerk and one Deputy Marshal, and to reduce in the same Department one post of Clerical Officer in that grade;

In the Fire Service, to increase the Establishment by one Sub-Officer, 2 Leading Firemen and 12 Firemen;

In the Sports Section the replacement of the non-establishment contract post of Specialist Coach by a permanent pensionable post of Coach in the appropriate salary scale, the creation of 2 posts of Assistant Coach, and the upgrading of 2 posts as Sports Assistant from G.11-9 to G. 7-6. This is a question of establishing these posts;

In the Probation Office, an increase in staff by the following:

3. Probation Officers

1 Typist.

It has been explained in the note before why this is necessary, and in the Accountant-General's Department the opening of the new Treasury Building requires a Telephone Operator for the switchboard which serves all the offices occupying the building, and lastly, there is an error to be corrected under Head 25 (2) - Health Centres - by a substitution of the figures 11 for the figures 10 under Item 10 - Staff Nurse.

If there are any questions on the respective Departments and Ministries, the answers will be given, of course, so far as we can. 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: I beg to move that Item No. 2 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.

PROPOSED LOAN TO CARIBBEAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1967-68 No. 66

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 2 is the instant Order of the Day, and it stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister and it is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the loan by Government to the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation of the sum of \$2,100,000 to be borrowed from 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.

1.35 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the Addendum to this Resolution sets out that it is proposed to revise the financial structure of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation, and that the loan will be used to liquidate all existing loans to the Corporation and thus consolidate its borrowing and to provide working capital. The Government will be required to repay the Bank of Nova Scotia within ten years by quarterly instalments beginning on the 31st March, 1970, and the rate of interest will be the prime lending rate existing from time to time, and the identical terms will be applicable to the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation's liability to the Government. There are two or three different ways in which a Government Corporation can be financed in contradistinction to a public liability company which, at the outset, decides

on the capital requirements of the company in order to establish, with due deference to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, plant machinery, and also to provide working capital. I do not think that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph really understands my allusion to his concern about plant. (Mr. SMITH: I cannot hear.) I am speaking with the aid of equipment. I am not trying to communicate to you directly; I am doing so with the assistance of the public address system. I can hear my own voice and I do not see any reason why you cannot hear. I am not accustomed to shouting. The trouble is that the hon. member is not always listening and you can only hear if you listen. You can listen and not hear, but you cannot hear unless you listen.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I was listening very carefully to everything which has come out of the mouth of the Prime Minister, but I have actually heard very little of it. If the public address system has too much bass on it and too little treble or whatever the case may be, I am not blaming the Prime Minister for it; but, in fact, we are finding it very difficult to hear what he is saying. I have heard the joke on the remark about the senior member for St. Joseph made twice without hearing what the Prime Minister said.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I cannot hear, and it is of no use the Prime Minister speaking if we cannot hear him.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understood, yes. Let the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister proceed.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I was saying that a lot of people seem to feel that you are only indulging in politics when you scream at midnight at the top of your voice on public platforms. That is not my concept. I was not brought up to get on in the way in which I see some people behaving. You do not make your point more effectively by shouting, and I am not only certain that the hon. members on the Opposite side heard what I said, even if they were not listening, but they were actually taking notes of what I said. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph turned around and asked the hon. senior member for St. Thomas what it was and he replied to him. The difficulty is that I did not say anything derogatory because they would have been on their feet, asking me to withdraw. The hon. member will probably say that he did not hear that.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. I am trying to take notes of what the Prime Minister has said, and the only note I have down is on what are the present liabilities of the C.B.C. That is all I have written; that is what I am waiting to hear. The Prime Minister has said that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph asked me what he, the Prime Minister said, and I replied that I did not hear. I still have not heard what the Prime Minister has said. I am listening carefully and trying to take notes, but I cannot hear.

Mr. SPEAKER: Anyhow, I think the hearing is better now, and I suggest that we proceed with the subject matter of the Resolution.

Mr. SMITH: We want to get along with the subject matter of the Resolution, but I want to hear.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think you are hearing better now.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, you know the Prime Minister as well as I do. The Prime Minister is not talking out. If the Prime Minister wants to lash us, you can hear him, but he is keeping his voice down. I cannot make him talk out.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point of inaudibility has been duly made and understood. Let the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister proceed just with the subject of the Resolution.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I think that the hon. member should appeal to the gentleman who is in charge of the amplification system, and not to me. Anyhow, I will continue and I have no intention of shouting because I am satisfied that hon. members can hear me. I was saying at the time when I was interrupted that a public or private limited liability company has various ways of raising its finance at its inception, and the principal manner in which that is done is for the company to issue shares to cover their capital cost of plant and machinery, and it was at this stage that I said with due deference to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph because he raised the point about plant and machinery during a debate a few days ago. I am using the word now with apologies to him, asking his permission to use the expression in this context, "plant and machinery". That is all. If I had said anything derogatory about the hon. member, the hon. senior member for St. Thomas would have been the first person to tell him to get up and object, even if I said it in a most *sotto voce* tone and in the manner in which I was speaking. We know this from experience. But it is only that he did not have anything malicious to tell the hon. member that he pretended that he did not hear. But let us continue. (Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,) You see, Sir, he can hear me now.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, has not the Prime Minister ascribed to me the speaking of malicious things? I object to his use of the word "malicious".

Mr. SPEAKER: I understood the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister to say that the senior member for St. Thomas did not have anything malicious to say, but I wish that we could get on with this debate and forget personalities and forget each other.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I expect to be heard without interruption from either side. (laughter) As I was saying, as the hon. member would know, being one of the more or one of the most successful business men on that side - I do not think that we have any successful or unsuccessful ones over here. If you have to raise money - let us take our local Brewery, for instance. They would estimate the capital cost, or they should have estimated the capital cost, and this is not really an indictment against the

Brewery; this is a simple fact of company formation. You would estimate the cost of your plant and machinery, and then you would estimate what it will take you for working capital, that is, to buy consumables such as your ingredients, your components, and so on, for manufacturing or whatever it may be, to pay salaries and wages during your period of infancy or your first one or two years of operation. The company then issues a prospectus and goes to the public and invites subscriptions for a certain number of shares which with any well-founded company, can cover their capital completely, their capital cost and their operating capital for the first year or two years as the Directors may think fit. With a Government Corporation, it is entirely different; but let me come back to the private or public liability company registered under the Companies Act.
1.45 p.m.

Having invited shares from the public, they set out a prospectus. They then have a certain amount of money which they use for the construction of their plant and machinery, their buildings, and so on. These are capital fixed costs. If the company does not make any money within the first or two years of its operation, the shareholders do not receive any dividends, but at the same time the company is not under any obligation debenture wise, that is, having to borrow money to pay out money and get itself in more debt. The company therefore has a breathing space from their shareholders' contributions to get the company established.

But in the case of Government statutory corporations, the case is somewhat different because neither the Barbados Marketing Corporation, to give an example, or the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation issued shares to the general public nor is either one of these organisations presented with a gift to defray their cost to plant or machinery or to provide working capital. In other words, the way that the C.B.C. was established, it starts out with a tremendous burden of debt because they borrowed money for capital as well as for working capital with the approval of the Legislature, of course, from the commercial banks in Bridgetown. This, of course, has cast an unfavourable aspect on the finances of the Corporation from the time it was established about three and one-half to four years ago.

Now, there are instances in which public limited liability companies, that is, companies with more than 50 shareholders, invite subscriptions from the public if they underestimated their capital requirements and they have either to go back to the public before commencing business for a further invitation for subscriptions as shareholders to the company or, alternatively, the directors not wanting to dilute the share capital and not wanting to be out-voted by issuing shares to all and sundry, decide not to do so, but to restrict their share capital and to use their existing capital assets, such as, partially constructed buildings and the land which they own, and so on, as a security or collateral to borrow money to complete their capital structure and in order to provide a certain quantum of working capital.

All this to the uninitiated may sound somewhat strange, but I can quote a case without giving out a secret because it is a public company, and this happened in the case of Bank Breweries. I do not have the precise figures, but my recollection is that they underestimated their capital requirements by some 30 per cent so that when they were ready to go into production they were indebted to the commercial banks to the tune of one million dollars. So it means that when the company starts operation, the first charge on its revenue has got to be the repayment of the interest on the loan, if it was a direct loan from the bank, or a debenture which they made for the issue from debenture holders who are not entitled to any voting rights in a company.

Now, I have known of other companies in which the directors themselves rather than issue more shares for providing capital required - and to be quite frank with hon. members, that is what has happened with the Barbados Dairy Industry - the directors themselves instead of consulting their other shareholders and issuing more shares to the general public, they themselves arranged to provide the institution with building finances, so that becomes the first charge. There is nothing illegal about that, but what happens is that people do not want to dilute the shareholders so that they lose an effective control over the management of the company. This is what companies which find themselves in need of additional capital do in their day-to-day business life. It is nothing strange. It is not a method that I particularly would go in for myself; I would sooner, if I were a company director, issue more shares and then de-amortize the institution even although it may mean a smaller yield to the institution's original investors and shareholders.

That is a public company and I quoted two restrictions - one, which we were not concerned with at all - Bank Breweries - in which they found themselves in this same position, and the other one - the Barbados Dairy Industry - in which they did not have enough capital and they merely issued debentures to the directors or one of the firm's directors to provide the finances so that they did not have to go to the banks. The alternative would be to issue more shares or go to the banks and borrow the money.

Now, the effect of this on the company's finances, or the corporation's, is that before you do anything, you have to pay the interest and the agreed capital repayments to the banks or other institutions or debenture holders from whom you borrowed the money; so the company starts off with a deficit in the sense that all of its revenue is not available for the payment solely of wages, salaries and working expenses. The first charge on the company has got to be payment of its interest.

To cut a long story short, I am just giving a general picture. When the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation was established, certain projections were made as to the potential revenue, and so on, and the accountants and other persons and the managing agents who made the projections did not envisage that

it would be necessary for any direct subsidy or grant to come from the Government or from any other source in order to establish the Corporation because it was felt that after the second year there would be sufficient surplus of revenue over expenditure to amortize any bank loans over the period of time, and also for the purpose of paying the interest charges which would be due on those loans. But they knew right at the outset that they would have to face as a first charge on the Corporation the payments of interest and the amortization of the capital which did not come from the Government - but only by Government guarantee - which came from the commercial banks. That is right from the outset.

Although these things have happened, the Corporation expanded its activities much more rapidly than originally envisaged. The Corporation started off with radio and shortly afterwards within twelve months, as far as I can remember, from 1st December, 1964, the Corporation went into the much more expensive exercise of television broadcasting. This of course entailed further involvement in the raising of loans for the broadcasting on which I can give the figures here. The total capital cost of the radio and television, including retaining expenses, was \$1,261,432.69. Those are the fixed capital assets. 1.55 p.m.

The figure, I repeat, is \$1,261,432.69. These are the fixed capital assets of the Corporation after deducting the minimal amount of pre-trading expenses, promotion and so on; so let us say approximately \$1.2 million. That is something which is there which is tangible, and that amount is included of course in the Resolution which the Corporation is now seeking. The picture then was that the Corporation started off on capital account with a bill of \$1.2 million. I would like to make it clear, sir, that any requirement which the Caribbean Broadcasting has is not in any way due to anything other than a shortage of revenue, and the capital which was necessary to establish the Company. The figures will be given later because it is getting close to the statutory hour. The figures of revenue and expenditure are all available, I think complete up to the year 1966. There is a statement by the Auditors here which I am sure the Hon. Leader of the House will be prepared to give excerpts of, and he has my permission to give hon. members any part of the statement by the auditors, Messrs. Fitzpatrick Graham & Co. dated 26th July, 1966.

We had Thompson Television coming down here and making four recommendations, three of which we could not accept, and this is a result of the modification of the fourth proposal which they made for restructuring and refinancing the company. I am not going into detail now because as you know, I am due to improve the communication systems in the area within a matter of an hour and a quarter in another place. There is just one final point before I sit down and it is that this Resolution will now be divided into two parts: a Resolution for making the loan, and then the appropriation which will go to the House in Committee.

I therefore beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting is now automatically suspended by virtue of the appropriate Standing Order.

On Resumption:

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I observe that there is no quorum and ask that you direct the Clerk to ring the Bell.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank the hon. member. Let the Bell be rung.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time. I am advised that the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 89, standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter, has been laid.

QUESTION 12 FUNCTIONS OF WATERWORKS AND PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENTS

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

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. Is integration of the functions of the departments of Public Works and Water Works having the desired effect?

2. Is one such effect the reduction of employment of certain categories of workers?

3. If the answer to No. 2 is in the negative, will Government state if a number of plumbers transferred from Public Works to Water Works have been offered employment every other week since 19th June, 1967?

4. Is Government aware that the plumbers referred to are men who have been employed by Public Works every working day for periods of 4, 5, 6, 7 and 10 years?

5. Does Government consider it fair and just that these plumbers or workers, or however else same may be styled, should be treated as mentioned at No. 3?

6. Is the standard of plumbing employed and practised at Water Works Department the same or equivalent to that formerly practised at Public Works?

7. How many plumbers trained at the Barbados Evening Institute are amongst those transferred from Public Works to Water Works and now offered

this unsatisfactory deal of unemployment every other week, (having the effect of reducing a man's pay by 50%)?

8. Are Barbados Evening Institute standards, that is, certificate of City & Guilds (Finals) which are acceptable to Public Works Department, equally acceptable to Water Works Department?

9. When will Water Works Department employ the "stick and solder" technique as taught by the Evening Institute, and abandon the "pot and ladle" method which the Evening Institute does not consider acceptable to present-day standards?

10. If the Public Works Plumbers transferred to Water Works are not being discriminated against in employment, how many of the Water Works plumbers have been placed on this every-other-week basis?

11. What steps Government propose taking to relieve the problem of transporting workmen to the various work sites in this Department?

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

1. Yes, Sir. It should, however, be pointed out that only the plumbing services of the two Departments have been integrated.

2. Yes, Sir.

3. Does not arise.

4. Does not arise.

5. Does not arise.

6. Yes, Sir.

7. Nine, of whom only four completed their training. There is no unsatisfactory deal.

8. Yes, Sir.

9. Both techniques are employed, but they have their different applications.

10. None, Sir. The plumbers of the Water Works Department are all permanent and whole-time employees (Unestablished Staff) and could not therefore be employed on a rotational basis.

11. Steps have been taken to improve the Department's Transport facilities.

DISPOSAL OF GARBAGE IN ST. JOHN'S

Mr. SPEAKER: No. 118 standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. John.

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

1. Is the Minister aware that the disposal of, garbage in certain areas in the parish of St. John leaves much to be desired?

2. Will the Minister consider, among other means of improving the present system of garbage disposal:

- (a) the construction of concret dumps at central points in each village in the said parish;
- (b) the extension of the service of collecting refuse by trucks from two visits per week to one visit per day in the said parish?

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

- 1. Yes, Sir.
- 2. (a) The proposals for the improvement of the service include the provision in the Interim Commissioner's estimate for 1968-69, of an additional refuse collector for the area and upgrading of the level of supervision in order to secure maximum efficiency.
- (b) Experience has shown that erection of additional concrete bins is not advisable due to the difficulty of maintaining satisfactory standards of sanitation at these units. It is proposed, therefore, to provide additional refuse containers at selected places in the parish for the convenience of householders.

PENSIONS OF MESSRS PADMORE AND SHEPHERD

Mr. SPEAKER: No. 127 standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. John.

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

1. Is the Minister aware that two road workers formerly employed by the Vestry of St. John and subsequently by the Southern District Council - namely James Alfred Padmore and Javan Shepherd - have retired from the service of the Southern District Council (one in December, 1965 and the other in February, 1965) and to date have received neither pension nor gratuity, although entitled to receive same?

2. Will the Minister investigate the cases mentioned without delay?

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

- 1. Yes, Sir.

2. The collection of necessary information for computation of benefits due to these workers has taken a considerable amount of time owing to the difficulty in obtaining affidavits in support of their periods of service and the fact that some 50 employees were affected by the take-over of the roads to Central Government from the Southern District Council. The computations will shortly be completed and it is expected therefore that payment can be made soon.

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: I am advised that there are no other replies which have been laid. Accordingly, there is no other matter to be dealt with during Question Time. The House will, therefore, proceed to Private Members' Business, and the first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the hon. senior member for Bridgetown. The hon. senior member for Bridgetown is not only in his place, but when the debate was adjourned the hon. senior member for St. Andrew on the 5th December of last year was speaking on this matter. He may now resume.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am asking the leave of the House to proceed with Order No. 15 standing in my name under Private Members' Business as the first Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Joseph is asking leave of the House to proceed with Item No. 15.

Mr. MOTTLEY: And I will remain No. 2.

Mr. SPEAKER: If 15 becomes 1, then I will become 2.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I have seen so many queer things in here.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am aware that the hon. member has sat under divers Speakers. If it is the will of the House, No. 15 will be No. 1 and the Order remains as it was. If there is no objection, No. 15 will become the instant Order of the Day. Hearing no objection, No. 15 is the instant Order of the Day, and it stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph and it is to move the passing of a Resolution relating to the Report of the Select Committee 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. Let the hon. member proceed, if he still so desires.

PENSIONS TO MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT AND MINISTERS

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, Be it resolved, that this House approves 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 recommendation of the same Report so that the said Pension Scheme shall become effective as from the 1st April, 1968.

Mr. Speaker, as you are well aware, this Report was handed in; it was discussed and everything; there were quite a few meetings held on it, and everything had been agreed on by the Committee. I do not think that I would take up the time of the House any longer by making any speech on this matter, because it is fixed, in other words, fixed right. I now respectfully beg to move that this Resolution do now pass. 2.45 p.m.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to second the motion for the passing of this Resolution. Barring yourself, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is the senior member in point of service in this Hon. Chamber, and I am the junior member of the Hon. House. I should like to add my support to what has been said by the senior member for St. Joseph. The senior member, of course, will be the one in respect of whom substantial rights under the proposed scheme will already have accrued. I, myself, may be one in whom such rights may never accrue, who knows, but along with the hon. senior member for St. James, the hon. senior member for Christ Church and the hon. senior member for St. Michael, whom, I should say, I approached in this matter inviting his support on an earlier occasion, and I really regret that I do not see him here today, is the junior member who takes his seat on the opposite side of the House. I can say that, speaking for a number of new-comers, the hon. junior member for St. Philip and the hon. junior member for St. George, I am sure I can say that we all welcome the idea of a Pension Scheme.

Mr. Speaker, it will be observed that certain aspects of the Committee's Report were not unanimous, and I must go on record as saying that my opinion would lie with the minority of the Select Committee who said that the Pension Scheme should not apply to the non-elected Ministers. I stress that my opinion lies with the minority because I am moving to adopt the Report on the democratic principle that the majority of the Committee has taken a certain view, and unless the majority of the House was going to show itself willing to reject that - we have found no evidence of this - I do not think it would proper for us to vote against the Report just on that ground; but my opinion certainly is that Ministers of the Crown who have never faced the electorate should not get a pension. I want that to be made perfectly clear. I do not subscribe to the idea of further gilding the golden boys who are afraid to face the polls, who run away from the hustings and who will be chosen purely on favouritism, not chosen on the basis of their service to their constituents - I do not think it right that

they should enjoy the same pensions as such hon. members as the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, the hon. senior member for St. Andrew, the hon. junior member for Christ Church, who has faced so many elections, and the hon. junior member for St. Lucy who has fought elections through thick and thin, (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Especially thick.) and the hon. senior member for St. John, all of those members of whom I have spoken, well, the first I have named have not yet had the experience of defeat, but the other hon. members have all had experience of defeat at the polls. They have, in their political careers suffered the ups and down of political fortune. I do not think it right for Ministers who are chosen to sit in the Senate and on no other basis should enjoy pensions on the same scale as hon. members who have suffered and who had to pay for their positions, because every member has to look for his election expenses - the hon. junior member for Christ Church over seven elections and the hon. senior member for St. Lucy over, I think, five elections, and other such Ministers. I do not think it right that Ministers who may never face the polls and who now sit in the Upper House should be entitled on the same basis as all other members. Nevertheless, I must assume that this is the Government's view; certainly apart from the question of Government, this being a free vote, it proved to be the majority view, and if hon. members wish to prove me wrong, I, for one, would only be too happy to support any amendment to delete that part of the Report; but, as it is, Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the motion.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I, of course, was a member of this Select Committee and shared in all the deliberations and all the decisions reached and except for (e) on page 2 of the Report which says that a majority of the Committee was of the opinion that the Pensions Scheme should apply to all Ministers of the Crown and Parliamentary Secretaries - except for that, the Committee, I think, was unanimous in everything else. Now I should just like to deal with that point; but before I deal with that, I should like to make some general remarks setting out my views on this matter and they are quite simple. (Mr. MOTLEY: Do you agree to the Pension Scheme?) I agree to the Pension Scheme. The whole basis for a Pension Scheme must lie in the fact that, some time ago, by a decision of the Legislature, it was possible for remuneration to be paid to members of the General Assembly, and that was in keeping with the democratic trend of the age. After all, if the representatives of the people were coming at long last from among the people themselves, it stood to reason that these representatives were most likely to be people not of wealth, whether inherited or acquired, but ordinary people earning their living in various capacities. Consequently, logically, if you decide to remunerate members of the General Assembly, and we were doing this since 1949, some time or other, it would be a logical step to provide a Pension Scheme for hon. members. The Committee took all of this into consideration, and made what I think was a good, generous and most fair decision with respect to those former members of the House who are not now members of the House, but who, if they had been members

of the House, would certainly have qualified on the basis of the recommendations, and decided that anybody who had a minimum of eight years service, between 1948 and 1966, whatever it was, should qualify for a gratuity worked out on a certain basis. This is eminently fair and just, and provision has also been made for a person, who does not qualify by the contributory scheme, but who, nevertheless, is entitled to a gratuity if he should return to the General Assembly in a subsequent General Election, to decide whether he wishes to turn back in the gratuity he received into the Pension Scheme and have the computation made on that basis, or he might decide, if the Government thinks it fit, to start his contribution from the beginning.

2.55 p.m.

One other point and one of the reasons why it is well that there should be a free vote on this, Mr. Speaker, is that certain hon. members on both sides of the House have quite cogently argued with well-directed arguments against the basis of contributions. They feel that it should not be a contributory scheme.

I dissent, Sir, from that view on two grounds. I think that, in the first place, since the Committee has recommended that in the case of persons who have started to contribute but for various reasons might never reach the qualifying period - since provision has been made for them to be refunded their total contributions bearing interest at four per cent, in that case, they have not lost anything; and, secondly, I think the principle of contribution is a good one because it is no more or less than that which we have imposed for the National Insurance Scheme.

We are supposed here in this House to be working for the people and drawing our salaries out of the Treasury as servants of the people for a certain period. It is true that we have no fixed tenure of employment and no security of tenure in that respect, but we are, nevertheless, employees of the public and it does us no harm in my view to make a contribution of a reasonable portion of our salaries, so to speak, when we have the guarantee if for any reason we do not prove to be eligible as laid down in the terms of the recommendations, we can be refunded the total contributions with added interest. I think that is as much security that you can require.

The third point which I want to make is this, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that any of us should ever fail, or need to fail, about arguing quite strongly in favour of a Pension Scheme. In the first place, we are doing no more for ourselves and future members of Parliament than we, all of us, are endeavouring to do for the people of this Island, and that is to give them security.

You know, Mr. Speaker, no matter what we may say about one another, whether in debate across the floor of this House, or outside on public platforms, or anywhere else, there is something that I am going to say now which I am sure must meet with the accord of other hon. members, no matter how senior or how junior they are in this House. It is a fallacy, Mr.

Speaker, to suppose that it takes less skill, less confidence, less judgment and less everything to gain a seat in this Assembly than to earn one's living outside. The man who, in whichever country it may be, can persuade his equals, and his peers, as the hon. member reminds me, in whatever circumstances it may be, to give him their confidence by returning him to an elected Chamber has more judgement, more confidence, more skill than is ordinarily needed to follow a vocation outside because it is easier to do most things than to persuade people like yourself to vote for you and to retain that confidence when once you have acquired it. Therefore, I do not subscribe, and I resent the implication, that you need less character, less tenacity, less knowhow and less judgment to be elected than you need to be an engineer or a doctor, or a carpenter, or a mason or a shopkeeper, or anything of that sort.

Therefore, anybody who has been elected freely and fairly to membership in a deliberative assembly, in a Parliament, can more than hold his own in the competitive world outside of Parliament. This I firmly believe: and if an hon. member does not believe this, well, he is doing less than justice to himself as an elected member. That is why I say, Mr. Speaker, that we need not be shy on raising the argument because not only do we deserve this consideration at the hands of the people, but we never shrink no matter how we disagree in our approaches, from providing security for the people because it is a logic of the representative of the people by the people.

One point in parenthesis I may refer to. Hon. members might well have taken the point which has been raised by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas about excluding non-elected members from this scheme. I dissent from that and I tell you why. A Minister of the Crown is a Minister of the Crown. The Constitution of the country makes provisions for Ministers to be members of either House. Secondly, the same personal sacrifices which a Minister in this House is expected to make if he gives wholehearted and conscientious attention to his duties are the same sacrifices which are required by members of the Other Place.

What the hon. member was arguing was that Ministers from the Other Place did not get elected. That is true, but the Constitution allows that they need not be elected. You cannot explain the possibility that a Minister in the Other Place may either have been elected before, or may be elected in the future, and you certainly cannot say that because I have been elected and am therefore a Minister or because any of my colleagues have been elected and therefore Ministers, we have necessarily because of election to this House to pay more attention to duty and therefore make greater sacrifices than Ministers in the Other Place.

It is true that Ministers of the Government in the House of Assembly, because they have to get elected, are required to make financial sacrifices of expenditure and other things on their campaigns and other things. That is true; but it is what applies also to

anybody else whether in this House or out of the House who seeks to come into the House. So the sacrifices which we have to make, even in relation to our trying to get into this House are not in relation to our trying to be Ministers of Government because you do not know, or cannot know, who can be a Minister unless you are certain which side has the majority.

In the Other Place at the moment we have a Minister of the Crown who was already a member of this House and may conceivably be again. That is what happens from time to time. Therefore, I do not think we need argue that too closely because it turns out just to be a projection rather than a principle which we are trying to establish.

3.05 p.m.

I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that it is completely right and proper, as the Select Committee has recommended, that special provision should be made for those who have held the distinguished office of Speaker of this House, and certainly that special provision should be made for any person, and obviously in this case it has to be a member of this House, who has been Prime Minister, and the Committee has quite rightly recommended that the only qualification for the enjoyment of a separate pension for the Prime Minister is that that person shall have been Prime Minister. So whether you have been Prime Minister for one hour, one day or twenty years, difference of time does not invalidate one's right to a pension.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, there are many recommendations which hon. members could wish to make, and the course of this debate will indicate how hon. members feel. The matters are in the hands of the entire House, and as I indicated last week, there is to be free discussion and a free vote so that the House may reach any conclusion it wishes to reach on it; but as for myself I support, by seconding, the recommendations of the Select Committee which have been before the House for quite some time, and I have pleasure in seconding the Resolution moved by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, I rise to give this Resolution my support. In doing so, I would like the public to know that the members of this House have to contribute to this Scheme. Some people are of the opinion that it will be something which will be given to us, but I think it is approximately 6 per cent of our salaries which must be contributed in order to get a pension. As you know, Sir, the qualification has been divided into years of service, and people who have put in the greatest number of years will be remunerated on a better basis than newcomers. In contributing, this becomes similar to the Widows and Orphans Fund, and therefore nobody should be displeased about it. Only ex-members of this Ancient and Honourable House will be given a gratuity. I must state these things because the public has the wrong impression. They feel we may be giving ourselves pensions, but I must remind them that we have to contribute before we are entitled to this pension, and we must serve a number of years before we are eligible for it.

With those few remarks, I am indeed grateful for this Scheme and I give it my wholehearted support.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, as one who has served in this Assembly for almost 21 years and a total of thirty years in the political arena, and having served on the Committee which sat on this particular scheme, I want to make my position perfectly clear in two or three respects. You sir, were Chairman of the Committee and we signed a majority Report. Now I do not want to leave this to chance, because for the interpretation of this Scheme one will probably look at the people who sat on this Committee in order to find out what was their intention at the time when this Scheme came into operation.

In so far as past members are concerned, they will be entitled to a gratuity. With respect to members who are serving at present, they will contribute to the Scheme when it commences presumably from 1st April this year; but the ones who have been serving for five, six, eight, ten or fifteen years will contribute and will be entitled under the Scheme for all the benefits and the full pension rights, and not be refunded if they lose their seats after another three or four years. In the case of a member who gets a seat at the next election, or one who got a seat in the last election and only serves for five years, he will be refunded whatever he contributes, provided he does not attain the full age or term of service of 8 years and upwards. I want to make that clear because there are lots of loose holes and gaps in these things.

Mr. Speaker, I sat as a member of the Committee and it is my duty to make these things clear. In the case of members serving at present who put in five or six years, or like some of the hon. members who have served seven years, they will be entitled if they only contribute for another three or four years under the Scheme. The members who come in and put in six years and contribute to the Scheme for four years, would be entitled to full pension if they lost their seats at the next election. Those who come in and only serve four or five years and contribute but fail to regain their seats, will get a gratuity and will be entitled to be refunded what they put into the Scheme at 4 per cent, but provided they continue and put in 8 years they would be entitled to a full pension like anybody else. I have said that three or four times because it is not something that could be glossed over. You do not gloss over important things like that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I too subscribe to the policy as enunciated by the Hon. Leader of the House which is really the policy that I think we all subscribe to, that all Ministers of the Crown without exception should be entitled to the full benefits of this pension scheme. I say this because a Minister's job is a full-time job; he is cut apart from his private practice if he happens to be a lawyer, doctor, solicitor, carpenter or has some profession or calling, or carries on a business, whether small or large. He has given up everything and whether he serves for a year or three, five, eight or ten years, he has lost all contact with his business, and to expect him not to be entitled to a pension like everybody else is wrong. What is

more, a Minister should have a Private Secretary, because the secretaries in the office are one thing, but the other work is an entirely different thing. He should also have an allowance because there are so many straitened cases all over the place in which he has to help. When you start to talk about a Minister in the Other Place not being entitled to a pension, I do not agree with that at all. I think that we have to protect them and see that all Ministers, all Parliamentary Secretaries and all members of the House of Assembly who have to face the tape are given some measure of protection, because when you enter the political arena, you make thousands of enemies all around, and some of them are only waiting for the day when you fail to secure a seat in here to try to get even with you. The State should protect you then. 3.15 p.m.

You cannot expose yourself when you are young in trying to represent people and when you get older some of the same people may not think of supporting you but of supporting the younger blood, and then you are fully exposed to your detractors. The State should then come and protect you and see that you get some sort of protection and security in your old age, and everybody connected with you. The people at Christ Church will like to see me get as much when I retire as I am getting now. I have no axe to grind. I am one of the members who can talk on this matter and talk freely.

We hope that the Scheme will come into force on the 1st April, and I am very happy to see that provisions have been made to give some sort of consideration for those who are no longer here with us, many of whom are very able and constructive politicians and have given so much in the past. They will receive a gratuity. I hope that the Scheme will not be long delayed and that the gratuities will get in their pockets before any of them are called to the Great Beyond.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL and Mr. MOTTLEY rose.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Thomas caught my eye before the hon. senior member for Bridgetown caught my ear.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Only short people catch your eye, Sir.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I am taking a somewhat different view from other hon. members who have spoken on this matter today. I want it made explicitly clear that I am for a pension, but I am not for a pension in this half-hearted way that members on both sides of the Chamber seem to be putting it up. I am going to speak my mind, and that is why we have a free vote.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as the last speaker who has just sat down has said, when you venture into politics it is somewhat like walking a tight rope; you are in a circus. A lot of people who attend a circus do not attend to see the performances; they attend a circus hoping in their subconscious mind that one of the

actors, rope-climbers, or acrobats, would fall and they would be able to say that they were there.

A lot of people whom we have the honour to represent will clap us on our backs now. All of us in this Chamber have thousands more acquaintances now than we had before we came into this Chamber, but let us fall tomorrow, like the acrobat, and you will see what will happen. I do not see why I, as a representative of people, who have to work 25 hours a day - whether I am home on Sundays or during the day or night the telephone is going to ring and somebody will want some sort of assistance. As a Minister and as a representative of the people in Barbados, not only me, but all of us get no spare time for ourselves. Even if you are going out with your wife, somebody wants to stop you, because people feel that their business is more important than yours. (An Hon. Member: "Which one?")

Mr. SPEAKER: Monogamy is still the order of the day in this country.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: No matter how much of a hurry you may be in, you have to stop and listen to somebody with a problem which, most likely, you cannot solve. Today some idiot wrote that the majority of people in the House of Assembly, if they were thrown on the open market, or had to get a job in Broad Street, could not get a job at \$300 a month; therefore, he considers that the people in the House of Assembly are well paid.

It may be true that a lot of people in the House of Assembly could not get a job in Broad Street for \$300 a month, but it is also true that some of the "poor whites" in Broad Street could not get a job in the open market. They got jobs because of the colour of their skin and not because of ability. When people are throwing such aspersions at us it is only a matter of grudge.

Mr. Speaker, I am not putting up any case for myself, because I am yet young. It is extremely unfair, in my opinion, to ask people to give of their best to a country, and at the end of their tenure of office they are being villified, ostracized, victimized, and so because they have been representing the people and because somebody asked them for a job they did not have. We are legislators; we come into this Chamber and we pass money every day for the Governor-General, the Prisoners, the Police, and so on, and when we come to pass money for ourselves hon. members are worried about what the people are going to say. I am saying here now, and I hope the papers will print it and it comes over the radio. I have nothing to hide. If you want me to do a job, you have to pay me for doing it, if you want me to do it honestly. If you are not going to pay me, then you are looking for something else.

Here it is, Mr. Speaker, a cantonnier, as the majority of us know, feels that if he does an honest day's work at some time he is doing somebody a favour. After the end of six years on a job, if he has reached the age of 60, he is entitled not only to a pen-

sion, but a gratuity as well. All over the Island people who work with the Government are entitled to a pension and gratuity, if they put in 10 years, and if they put in 5 years they are entitled to a gratuity.

We are legislators who are constantly giving away everything we work for. We have to pay more taxes than other people outside, because everything is taken out from our salaries before we get them. I want this to be expressly known. Politicians must pay taxes, and some of us cannot afford to pay the taxes we have to pay, but it is taken out from our salaries and we cannot quarrel. Along with that we have to pay for our car, our property, and anything else we may acquire. We get nothing free.

Mr. Speaker, today some members have come in here in this half-hearted fashion as if they are afraid. I am not afraid to tell the population: "If you want me to do a job, I must be paid." The Bank Manager is being paid well; the Permanent Secretary is also paid well; the people in business are also paid well. In the Government, we do not get any production bonus. We do not get anything at the end of our time. After holding office in here and you lose your seat, you would believe that you are Public Enemy No. 1, for the amount of sneers and the things that are said about you after you leave this Chamber.

That is why I have said that although I want to support the idea of members of the House of Assembly getting a pension, I cannot see why I should be asked to contribute 6% of my salary, and the other members should contribute 6% of their salary to a Pension Scheme.

3.25 p.m.

It is not fair. Furthermore, whether we like it or not, all of us who are here today and who have been here before and who will be here after, our names have gone down in the Roster of the House of Assembly. We have been members of this House, we are M.P.'s, Members of Parliament, and no matter what anybody might say, there is absolutely no need - the hon. senior member for St. Joseph a few meetings ago, raised a very pertinent point when he mentioned about members of the Legislature, after dying, being treated in such a shabby manner. Personally, I do not care if they ever bury me. I want to be with my friends all the time, so if I die you can leave me up here. I know that I would be offensive all the time. I am not looking for any special funeral; I have always told my family that if I die they can get some old lumber from up at the Department, nail it together drop me on a cart and drop me down at the Cemetery. I have not got this lot of preference and I do not want any pretty funeral. You can throw me anywhere. I do not worry about that. If I die, I have died and that is the end of me, but I do not see that it is fair that after members have served in this Chamber - and the member of whom the hon. senior member for St. Joseph was speaking at the time, gave of his best whatever that might have been, and it was very unfortunate that we were afraid to give this former member a proper burial. I want this made explicitly

clear. I do not want any fancy burial. (Mr. MOTTLEY: What has that got to do with it?) I am talking about members of the Legislature and how shabbily they are treated, and I am raising the point that I do not contribute to the idea that we, the members of this Assembly, should be paying to get a pittance at the end of our journey. I want this made explicitly clear and I will repeat it. I want it for the record that I am opposed to the idea of members of the House of Assembly contributing to get a pension at the end of the eight-year period, or whatever it is. I feel that members should be given a pension after the allotted time without having to contribute to the Scheme.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have listened very carefully to the last speaker in his reference about his being a man, but if you take everything by height and so on, he will still be considered as a boy. I believe that it is in the Hansard of this House that I have been the villain of the piece who caused this question to be brought up during a debate when I suggested it, and it looks to me as if it is coming to fruition. I believe I had the courage to do it then because most people felt that I would get back my seat, and most people felt that I have been fairly successful during my lifetime; therefore I can afford to say it in here. There is one thing about the recommendations which I do not understand, quite frankly. I am not worried about it either in one way or in the other; but I am only thinking of people. You, Mr. Speaker, have already strayed from the happy band of bachelors; however, there are still some bachelors among us in here and the recommendations provide that where a member dies in the House, his widow or children or whoever it is, gets the pension. Where there is no widow or children there is no such recommendation. None of us has any lien on his life or of his better half, so to speak, but it is my considered opinion, and I hope the Minister in charge of affairs will listen to this, that in the Bill it is being provided that some recommendations should be made that where a person who dies a bachelor and who was a member of the House, his estate should be able to draw some sort of gratuity. On the other hand, I am worried and there are members of this House who, I believe, are also worried about it, that if a member becomes incapacitated for one reason or another, though he may not have lost his seat but he is in here for a five-year period and during the period before the five-year period comes to an end he becomes incapacitated, whether or not he should be given a gratuity. I mention it and I subscribe very strongly to it that persons who have been in here and who have given service to this country - I instance the ex-member for St. Michael who was a Minister. I did not see eye to eye with him; I believe I gave him as much France as anybody could give a man, to remove him from his seat; but I believe he did a good job and my experience, having spoken with Secretaries and Permanent Secretaries that he worked conscientiously and hard. I recommended consistently that they should be given some sort of gratuity because in England, and we have always followed the usages, customs and habits of England, a Minister after serving for one period is usually given a pension. Not in ten years, the rea-

son being that he should not be exposed to temptation and exposing the Government's policy and secrets and so on. If he loses his seat for one period, he is given a pension.

I therefore feel that the Minister in charge of this House should know the feelings of members of the House. There is a peculiar rule that I believe few hon. members are aware of, that if a member had to leave this Chamber because of illness, or if you had Party politics to the extent that people became so malicious that you could suspend a man for any time up to the entire session, what would be his position? I have already dealt with a Minister. I believe that some form of gratuity should be given to him. Just as you are working it out for ex-Ministers and ex-members who have not contributed and this would only apply to people who came into the House, the service would only apply from 1948 when hon. members began to get paid. Just as you worked out a gratuity for them, I feel that if a Minister serves for one period, we should be following the customs and the habits and the usages of England and give him a pension. There are reasons for that and we can quite understand them. On the other hand, as to a member who was ill and could not attend the House - suppose he had a stroke, he could not come to the House - I am not making any plea for myself at all, but I think that he should be given a gratuity. You may have in the next Session quite a number of bachelors. There are still bachelors in here.

3.35 p.m.

What is the position if this Bill came into operation on the 1st April, and a man was divorced, let us say, and he had no children? Obviously, I am saying to the Minister to make a note. You are giving ex-Ministers and ex-members a pension but he has no children; he has no wife as this Bill talks about. What would be the position? I still say that there should be a form of gratuity.

I agree with the junior member for St. Thomas; I cannot see your making a difference. A member should be entitled to the same privileges as a Civil Servant and allow him to have a gratuity or pension, whatever he elects to have, because these things can happen. I ask the Hon. Leader of the House to make a note of this. Do not say a pension only. It should be also a gratuity for other people who prefer it that way.

I have never been a Minister, I am only following what is the practice in England and I believe if a man was a Minister for five years and he got kicked out - it happens - it is my considered opinion that he should get a pension. I have no apologies to make as far as I am concerned. I have faced eight elections in this country. I have had to do so and therefore I support the Bill subject to the suggestions which I made.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the report of the Select Committee in connection with pensions for members of this Hon. House. My reason for supporting it is because I know the torture that an hon. member of this House has to meet before he be-

comes a member. I can assure Your Honour that there are people in foreign countries who fail to represent their people in their legislative assemblies because of the dangers that lie ahead of them.

There are many men whose homes have been burnt down because they elected to represent their people. Some have lost their lives, some have been assassinated. President Kennedy and all those big men have been assassinated. For what do you think they were assassinated? They were assassinated because of the position in which they were in representing their people. There is a margin fixed between the poor and the rich, and someone has to meet between that particular place. That is the place where men fail to get because you can be easily pushed out or can be destroyed or something like that.

I remember, Sir, that some former years, when I look back at history, I saw that the people went to the big fig tree and the big fig tree refused to represent them. They went to the sycamore tree; they went to the grape vine and the grape vine said, "must we leave our good grapes to rule over you?" They then went to the brambles who said that: "it is not true that you want us to rule over you; but as you have elected us, we will represent you" and they went to the bramble.

Now, Sir, do you know who rules the world in many parts of the world? The brambles. Apart from the brambles you would not get anybody at all because the merchants and the millionaires and all the big men today fail to take the responsibility which we are taking today. They have sufficient money, they have sufficient worth that they can pay for bodyguards and all the protection they need. They can eat minced ham, and beans, chicken, beet, pumpkin, and all of that crushed yam, corned beef and whatever they want they can get.

We have to represent the poor people as well as we have to represent the very high people too. We have to provide a pension and gratuity for the people of Barbados, and I feel sure that members of this House have done enough to be promoted for a pension and/or gratuity and I do not see any reason, according to the junior member for St. Thomas, why any member of this House should have to pay six or four per cent out of his salary as a contribution.

When a member has served ten, twelve, fifteen years in this House, he should rightly receive two-thirds of his salary as pension and those who have served for five years should receive a gratuity if they have not been elected for the next five years. That is how I see it. Any member of this House or any person from any part of the world that has been elected by the people of their country to represent them must have the skin of a rhinoceros. You must have a backbone of steel to bear the jeering, the criticisms, the slander, which we have to bear.

All these things we have to bear; so when it comes to us receiving a pension, I do not see why we should be denied of it. There are certain members

who have to spend every cent they have to be a member of this House and then after five years they are kicked out and then have to walk the streets as a beggar. That should not happen in any part of the world. We should be in a position to receive a pension or gratuity for as long as we live without subscribing one cent to a Scheme for the work which we have performed in this House of Assembly in representing all the people of this Island.

I do not see any reason why we should have to subscribe anything at all because we are doing a very valuable work, regardless of who we are. This job which we are doing today is uneviable. Look at the millionaires sitting around the beaches in the arm-chairs and going abroad having excursions from one island to another. We have to bear the responsibility of every man. We are here to see that justice is given to them and their affairs: so I do not see why we should not have some recompense for this great job which we are performing today.

Regardless of whom he or she may be, go to them and ask them to come forward as a representative of the people - go to the estate owner, go to the millionaire and he would say: "Man, I do not want that; that is not good enough for me." Why? Sir. When you get on a platform, wherever you go, you will hear your pedigree read out; you will know where you come from and where are you going. Your parents are cursed. All manner of things are spoken against a representative of any parish of this Island and he has to bear all of that and then at the end of time, he still has to give justice, though the heavens may fall.

3.45 p.m.

I think it is hypocrisy for anyone in this Island to criticise any member of this House for getting a gratuity or pension. We serve them night and day, sunshine or rainfall, through dew, and all hours of the day they come to Riverside Drive where I live. They want roads, water, light and education. All these things we try to provide for them, and must we fight for nothing?

I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that when a man has served ten, fifteen or twenty years in this House, it should be possible, apart from the gratuity or pension which he receives, for him to go abroad on a vacation and see the world and come back and rest for the balance of his days. We are doing a very honourable job and I hope we will continue with this good work as long as the people send us here. I must repeat that millionaires, merchants, estate owners - none of them is willing to come forward today to represent the people. We have to go in the scrap heap, and later on they are going to bring some of lesser ability because people are afraid. They lose their lives, they are threatened, and their homes are burned. All that happens today throughout the world; but Barbados is a very fortunate little place, because I am certain I walk up and down the street night or day and nobody has tried to assassinate me; but if anyone wants me, I am ready to go; I am well prepared. I count it a privilege and a pleasure to support the Report which the Select Committee has brought in for a gratuity and

pension for the members of this House. Sir, I have pleasure in supporting these recommendations.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, when one assumes the role of representing his country, there are lots of sacrifices he has to make. He has got to face scandals, his character is attacked unjustifiably in many instances, and there are many ill-fates that befall him during the time he has undertaken to represent the people. There are lots of people in this country - and in other countries, for that matter - who may have more ability academically and otherwise than the few of us who come forward to represent our people; so you will see that the task of being a politician is not an easy one. It calls for more than ability; it calls for guts; it calls for sacrifice; it calls for tact and skill. Not everyone possesses such qualities. I therefore submit that people who have undertaken to look after the destinies of their fellowmen should be satisfactorily and commensurately compensated for it.

In agreeing with and supporting the Resolution moved by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, I should like to make further recommendations and observations on this scheme, and also to move an amendment to the Resolution. Now the Report states that one who has served 8 years in the Legislature should be entitled to one-quarter of his salary as a pension, after 13 years to one-half and after twenty years to two-thirds. This may be all right for a person who has served as an ordinary member of the Legislature, but I do not see how it could apply to a person who has served as a Minister of Government. My reason for saying this is this: when one assumes the office of a Minister of Government, he has got to set behind him, perhaps, a flourishing business or a fairly remunerative job and accept that post and take an oath that he would not indulge in any business other than the office which he then holds. It means that any Minister, whether he is a member of the Barbados Labour Party, the Barbados National Party or the Democratic Labour Party, has got to make that sacrifice if he wants to be a Minister of Government. The minute he does that, he has given up the prospects of a good life, not knowing what the future would be for him in politics in representing the people of his country, and he does that at great sacrifice to himself. I am speaking from experience.

Mr. Speaker, I can speak *ex cathedra* on this matter because I have had the experience. I have had a flourishing business; it is not flourishing any more, but I had undertaken, as many of us have, to serve the people of this country. If and when the time comes that the Party which I represent no longer holds the Government, I have got to go back and start a new life if I want to survive. I want to be brutally frank in this respect. I agree with the hon. junior member for Bridgetown that any Minister, whether he be a member from the other side, whether he was a Minister in the last Government or a Minister now or will be in a future Government either here or in the Senate, whether it is the hon. junior member for St. Peter 10 or 15 years from now or the hon. senior member for St. James 20 or 25 years from now, after serving

for a session which is five years in our Parliament - he should be entitled to a pension because he has to set behind him all that he had worked for in his private business in earlier years. He may have taken 25 years to establish a business. If the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is called upon tomorrow to be a Minister, he has got to set aside "Fix-it-Right." Although he will be coming here to 'fix-it-right,' he still has to set aside "Fix-it-Right"; therefore instead of 'fixing-it-right' up there, he would be 'fixing-it-wrong' up there to come here and 'fix-it-right'! Is it fair to tell him after making sacrifices in representing his people and making contributions to the advancement of this society that he should not be entitled to compensation if and when the time comes that he cannot sit in such an office any longer? 3.55 p.m.

In other words, must he be asked, after serving in public life as a Minister of the Government, to enjoy a lower standard of living, far below that which he was accustomed to enjoy even before he was appointed a Minister?

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, one of the amendments that I am going to move to this Resolution is that after five years' service a Minister should be entitled to a pension of 1/4 of his salary; after eight years' service he should be entitled to a pension of 1/2 of his substantive salary; and after 13 years' service he should be entitled to a pension equivalent to 2/3 of his salary. That is one of the amendments I desire to make to this Resolution.

I have sat and listened to hon. members talking about contributions. I do not agree that any member of the legislature should be making a contribution to a Pension Scheme. We are already making contributions. We make contributions to income tax and to the Department of Inland Revenue, whereas in many countries no Minister pays income tax. I am not advocating that we should not pay income tax, but in many other countries Ministers do not pay. In other countries Ministers are given a housing allowance, but in Barbados we are not; in some countries Ministers are given a car allowance, but in Barbados we are not. We are not saying that we should have a house allowance or a car allowance, but I feel that it is *infra dig* to ask a member of the Legislature to contribute to a Pension Scheme. He has already contributed; he has contributed in the night dew campaigning; he is disturbed all hours of the night; he cannot take a good night's rest. Somebody cannot get water at three o'clock in the morning; the telephone rings and I am told that a man cannot get water in St. Andrew and what can I do about it. A Minister cannot get a Sunday for himself.

This morning before I got out of bed, I had six people waiting on me - not even my constituents. Is not this enough contribution? That is the case of all members of the Legislature, not only the members on this side, but the members on the other side as well. Although a person is elected in a particular constituency, there is no one in here who can say that he does not have to advise or do something for people

from all parts of the Island who are not his constituents.

Furthermore, before you receive your salary, it is gone. The contributions you have to make! Mr. Speaker, I am sure you have to contribute three or four bats a year as well as pads. Every time somebody's child is ill, and even when the child is not ill, you have to contribute to pay the doctor's fees. There are always sad stories coming to you. What nonsense are you talking about contributing to a Pension Scheme for members of the Legislature? You cannot get a full night's rest; you cannot eat your breakfast properly on Sunday mornings; you cannot get your Sunday lunch; you have to go and look after the welfare of your constituents, and eat corned beef and biscuits for lunch. (Mr. HINDS: I eat with my constituents.) Some of us may be fortunate to eat with our constituents, as the hon. junior member for St. Peter has said. I am not so fortunate as to eat with my constituents, and I have to go and enable some of my constituents to eat. Sometimes they owe the Court money and they come to borrow it from you. If you do not have it, you have to find some means of assisting them. You have to stand responsibility for some of them at the Bank, and very often you have to pay back the loan. Let us be realistic. We are already contributing. When we get our salary it is not ours.

Now, do the Civil Servants contribute to a Pension Scheme? I am speaking as a Minister. Look at the salary paid to a Permanent Secretary who is next in command to the Minister in his office! Is there not a big difference between the Permanent Secretary's salary and the Minister's? He is not asked to contribute to a Pension Scheme. He gets long leave, and the Minister gets none. He has security in office, and the Minister has none. I was sick three or four weeks ago, and I had to get out of my sick bed on two occasions to go and attend a Cabinet Meeting. No Permanent Secretary is going to do that. When we had the problem here with the Sugar Producers and the Union, I had to get out of my sick bed on two occasions and attend a Cabinet Meeting. Fortunately for me, I am not called to the Great Beyond. Your work is piling up, and when you come out, you have to do your work. Can anyone want a greater contribution than that? You sacrifice your health, you sacrifice your family, and you make a sacrifice financially.

Mr. Speaker, I am not one who will vote for the payment of any contributions to this Scheme, or any contributory Scheme for members of the Legislature. I feel that since the destiny of the country lies in the hands of the members of the Legislature, they should be satisfactorily remunerated for it. I feel that we must pay respect to the Governor-General as the Queen's representative. We in Parliament are the Queen's representatives also. I am a Minister of the Crown, one of Her Majesty's representatives, and we represent, on behalf of Her Majesty, the people of this country. The people cannot come in here and speak for themselves; so they have chosen us, according to parliamentary democracy, to speak for them. Otherwise, we would be calling the 250,000

people in Barbados when we want a standpipe and ask them: "Do you think we want a standpipe at Trafalgar Square?" You would then get confusion, because one section would say "Yes", another section would say "No", another section would say: "I prefer it at Rockfield" and so on. The reason we are here is that the 250,000 people in this country cannot assemble in the market place and say what they want.

Mr. Speaker, if we are the chosen few, if we have been elected - not by any machine, but by the handwriting of the people that we have the honour to represent - to come here and represent them, I am confident that our constituents would have no objection to supporting a Scheme like this. In the same way that a Civil Servant does not have to contribute directly to a Pension Scheme, I see no reason why a member to the Legislature, who has made the sacrifices I have aforementioned, should have any reason to contribute to the Scheme.

4.05 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I have proposed certain amendments to this Resolution to the Clerk at the Table, which I would like to read back to this Hon. House, and these amendments embody the points which I have raised. It is allright to think that we are in the Legislature and we should not look after ourselves, but if we are not well looked after, how are the people to be well looked after? The position is that the people of this country have confidence in the twenty-four of us in this Legislature that we would look after their interests, and we have confidence in them that they will see to it that we are to be compensated for the sacrifices which we have to make on their behalf.

Mr. Speaker, if the recommendations which have been made, as I understand it, are not embodied in the Resolution passed in this House, neither the Cabinet nor nobody else has the authority to change the Report of the Select Committee. I am not making any fun about this. I have made out a case for my recommendations and I do not think that any hon. member of this Chamber could justifiably get up and oppose the recommendations I have made for amendments to this Resolution. I have dealt with the stark, bald facts, All of us at some time or other have had the experience which I have mentioned here today. Do you know what happens sometimes, Mr. Speaker? Some of us even find it difficult to go to our constituents because we do not have that finance in our pockets to assist some of our suffering constituents. That is a fact. Sometimes on Sunday mornings, you have to go to your constituency, but you know that somebody in your constituency will be suffering and if you were to tell him that you do not have anything, he will not believe you. Let me tell you something. I went to the Races on Saturday and I got broke, and on Sunday when I was going to my constituency, I had to borrow \$50.00 to put in my pocket. Before I left down there, I saw some of my constituents who were not working, perhaps, and sometimes you find people who have no books or lunch for their children going to school. Are you going to tell me that you are going to see one of your constituents who has not got anything to give his child for lunch or to pay the doctor's bill, and you are not

going to assist him? Mr. Speaker, you need no lecture on this. You have had your experience - thirty-odd years of it. You have even found that you had to pay peoples' fines in Court and that sort of thing, and where is it to come from? What little reserve the members of the Legislature might have been able to put aside goes; therefore I think that my attitude in this respect is justified. I therefore beg to move an amendment to the Resolution; I should like to read the whole Resolution as distinct from the Resolution which was moved. Mr. Speaker, the amended Resolution will read as follows:-

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House *note* 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 *with the modifications set out in the Schedule hereto*, so that the said Pension Scheme shall become effective as from the 1st April, 1968."

These are the amendments:-

SCHEDULE

Amendment No. 1

Recommendation (g) to be modified as follows:-

In the case of a Minister, the minimum qualifying period to be the period of five years' service as a Minister as from 1948."

Mr. Speaker, I am of the considered opinion that a Parliamentary Secretary should be entitled to the same preference or consideration as a Minister because he is a full-time officer. (Mr. MOTTLEY: You cannot make a Parliamentary Secretary the same as a Minister). I am saying what I feel.

4.15 p.m.

"The minimum qualifying period being a period of five years' service as a Minister as from 1948.

Recommendation (h) to be modified as follows:-

The annual rate of pension payable to a Minister to be as follows:

After five years' service, one-quarter basic salary,

After eight years' service, one-half basic salary,

After fifteen years' service, two-thirds basic salary.

Amendment No. 1 The entire pension Scheme should be non-contributory,

I therefore beg to move that these amendments be embodied in the Resolution.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, the Minister spent so much time on this matter that one would take it that he was defending his Ministry from attack by the Opposition, but we are not attacking him. I made a few notes here. Sir, when one enters politics, he must make sacrifices. Public life is one of sacrifices.

I just want to make an amendment, and in so doing I wish to draw to the Minister's attention that in all Pension Schemes throughout the entire world - may be not in Government but in private enterprise - you must make a contribution. In this one, the Select Committee is asking Parliamentarians to contribute six per cent of their salaries; but of that six per cent, if one is no longer in Parliament, he gets back the six per cent that he has contributed plus four per cent. That is how I see it. It is only a savings which he is making; so I do not see there is any reason for that.

But what I propose, Mr. Speaker, as you will see here by way of my amendment - No. 3 - we should either have a full pension or a gratuity and reduced pension. That is what I wish to propose. In so doing, I wish to make this motion:-

BE IT RESOLVED that this House note 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 said Report with the modifications set out in the Schedule hereto so that the said Pension Scheme shall become effective as from the 1st day of April, 1968.

This is Amendment No. 3, Sir. It reads as follows:-

"Option to be given to present and future members as to whether to receive benefits by way of either (a) gratuity and reduced pension, or (b) full pension."

Sir, I beg to move that this be Amendment No. 3.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that modification by the hon. senior member for St. James.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, I wish to speak on this amendment. I am sorry that it is so late, and I am also sorry that I have only heard the debate at a distance. But, Mr. Speaker, I must say that it is very difficult for me to support Amendment No. 2 and Amendment No. 1. I really think that the amendments are ill drawn because if alternatives are going to be made to Recommendations (g) and (h), Mr. Speaker, I think they can be done without differentiating between Ministers and members of the House.

The amount that is involved in reducing the qualifying period for pension to ordinary members is so slight that I would suggest that if what is desired in

Amendment No. 1 is desired by the House, it can be achieved not by making a difference between Ministers and ordinary members, but perhaps by reducing the thirteen years' service to ten for all members and the twenty years service to fifteen for all members. That would cost us little in the case of ordinary members. Really and truly, in my submission, it would be negligible.

The other submission which I would make is that instead of the proviso to (h) "and in the case of a Member who was a Minister at any time, it should be based on his salary as a Minister" and instead of talking about percentage of his salary at the date of his retirement, all that you should say is "based on a percentage of the highest salary earned by that Member in any capacity while a Member" and by so doing, you would cover the Prime Minister, Ministers Leader of the Opposition, Parliamentary Secretaries and Chairman of Committees. If you say the highest salary earned by a member at any time during his service in any capacity, you cover everybody without having to go into the involved details.

Well, I ask to put this in the form of an amendment, appearing as Amendment No. 4, Mr. Speaker. I must say that I do think Parliamentary Secretaries were being a little ill-done by only drawing a pension as a member, but should he be unfortunate as to lose his seat when a floor member, by not having their service recognised as subsidiary Minister. All along I thought that; but if he wants that amended, I would suggest what I think.

Mr. Speaker, to be truthful, I cannot support five years for a Minister. I cannot really support that. I think that eight years' service or two sessions ought to be the irreducible minimum. But, anyhow, if it is going to be for a Minister, it should be for everybody; and if you reduce the figures in (h) to five years, eight and fifteen - that is eight years to five, thirteen to eight, and twenty to fifteen - and you delete the proviso from "and in the case of a Member" to the end, and instead of "it should be based on a percentage of his salary at the date of his retirement", you say "it should be based on a percentage of the highest salary or remuneration" - whichever phrase is found appropriate - "the highest remuneration ever earned by a member in any capacity while a member" that is the sense of the amendment, Mr. Speaker. If that was thought desirable, I would really need a little longer time than to half-past four to work out the best form of words. Or perhaps the Government would give the undertaking to get the correct form of words to be used before the Bill is introduced into the House. However, I think that Members and Ministers should not be differentiated, and you would cover everybody by this amendment. The highest salary is covered, and everybody, in my submission.

Mr. SPEAKER: Now, this is a Resolution in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph and there are certain amendments proposed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, would the other side agree to an extension to Private Members' Busi-

ness, say, for twenty minutes or half an hour - say, until five o'clock to get this matter straight?

Mr. MOTTLEY: If you extend, I am going to do my Bill.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Order No. 18 be suspended until 5 o'clock.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the hon. member to extend the time until 5.30 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: That is accepted.

The question that Standing Order No. 18 be now suspended until 5.30 p.m., was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to throw out this to the other side as a suggestion. Would it be worthwhile then going into Committee so that we can get the amendments properly thrashed out? Is it feasible to go into Committee on these amendments so that we can hear what has been moved and the proper form in which the amendments ought to be done, say, for half an hour?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Hon. Leader of the House that we should go into Committee on this Resolution.

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: 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, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, before we begin, I would like to say that in fairness to the hon. senior member for Bridgetown we ought not to stay in Committee longer than 20 or 25 minutes, because the purpose of the extension to 5.30 p.m. was to enable him, as I understand it, to do his Bill.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, what I have in mind, and will involve in fact a little criticism of the Report as it is is this. When you look at the Report, on page 3 you have that "a pension may become payable in respect of service as a Member of the House of Assembly in respect of which the minimum qualifying period shall be two complete terms of the Legislature or Parliament amounting to a period of not less than 8 years in the aggregate commencing from 1948 - years of service need not be consecutive." Now to begin with, this has certain difficulties because certaining in one case - and I could as well be a little personal - in the case of the Leader of the

Opposition, I think you will find that he does not, despite a very long service in Parliament, have 8 years in two complete terms and would not have unless he serves this term out; so the expression "two complete terms" I would suggest is dangerous, because if someone dies in the middle of a term having served 9 years and is in the middle of the second term, this expression "two complete terms".....

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but the term of eight years need not be consecutive because it could be three years now and five years after another ten years; so the case which the hon. member is making does not hold ground. If you serve as a Minister in 1954, 1955 and 1956 and again after three or four years and you serve again to make it eight years, you will see that the term will not be consecutive.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Now, Mr. Chairman, the member really has not taken the point. If he looks at the text, he will understand what I mean. "A pension may become payable..... the minimum qualifying period shall be two complete terms of Legislature"; so if a man serves five years in one term and four years and 364 days of another and dies the day before prorogation, he will not in terms of (g) be liable for a pension because he will not have served two complete terms of the Legislature.

Mr. Chairman, hon. members perhaps have not had the recent experience of construing Acts of Parliament, but some other hon. members may have had. Paragraph (g) says "shall be two complete terms of the Legislature". The eight years is only a qualification; it is only put in there because 1948 to 1951 was a three year session. It is not 8 years as such; it is two complete terms of the Legislature. I keep hearing interruptions from people who do not understand. The eight years is a redundant qualification inserted in the Committee's Report intended apparently to take care of the fact that 1948 to 1951 was only a three-year session. All you had to say was two complete terms of the Legislature if that is what you meant. If you meant eight years, you should say eight years, but what is said here is "two complete terms of the Legislature". That is the first point which I will suggest the Minister consider.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The hon. member means then, I take it, that two complete terms of the Legislature amounting to not more than eight years is a contradiction in terms? I am just asking because all along I was reading it to mean that you could interpret "two complete terms" to be eight years which need not be consecutive. I do not know if he sees what I mean. I did not think that one excluded the other.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I can well see what the Hon. Minister means, but let us just read it again: "shall be two complete terms in the Legislature", that is what it says and "amounting to a period of not less than 8 years in the aggregate" is in fact redundant, because it does not add or take away anything from the eight years. I must just speak a little longer, because the Minister is perhaps anxious to interrupt without trying to understand what I am saying.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The specific point on which the hon. member is speaking is what we have carefully considered. The intention of the Committee that sat was that you should serve for two terms, not complete terms or not consecutive terms, but two terms as such, but that the period should amount to eight years in the aggregate. In other words, if you serve for one term and missed another term, and then you served again, as long as it amounts to eight years in the aggregate, you are entitled. Another point is that a Legislative term seldom lasts for the whole five years; it usually goes 4 1/2 years or 4 years and 9 months and so on. What we had in mind was that so long as you complete two complete legislative sessions as such or 8 years of two terms, you would be entitled. The wording here is inaccurate and incorrect and misrepresents what the Committee had in mind. In other words, you have to take out the word "complete".

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: That is exactly what I meant. The Minister did take a very sound point there because it is not every session that goes five years, but I think that "complete" there is dangerous. That is the first point. You can then fix "eight years" as the true minimum period of qualification.

Now in paragraph (h), I would respectfully suggest, Mr. Chairman, that Ministers already have a slight advantage. In fact it could be a powerful advantage in the matter of their pensions in so far as that if a man is a Minister for one single week, he is going to get a pension at the Ministerial rate and not at the "member's" rate. This is a great advantage to Ministers. A man could be a Minister for a very short time in twenty years in Parliament, but he will get a Ministerial pension. That in fact is the system that prevails in France. People are genuinely Ministers in France for one week and then entitled to a Ministerial pension for the rest of their lives and be addressed as Ministers - it goes like a title there - and it is a source of some fun in France; but I do not anticipate that French political conditions are likely to be reproduced in Barbados. I would suggest that if it is thought that a quarter is too little after eight years' service, the same is true of members, and the amount in the case of members is slight; so let us reduce all the qualifications to, say, one-quarter after eight years or after five years in two terms; one-half after ten years and two-thirds after fifteen years if necessary. This will allow for the position of a man who goes out in a by-election in one term. I am just suggesting how this can be done. I would certainly support a reduction in the qualification period, but I would prefer to hear from those who are pressing loudest for the reduction what periods they have in mind overall. It seems to me that five years is a bit small.

4.35 p.m.

I would not feel that I had worked for a pension, if I lost my seat at the next election. That is the truth, Mr. Chairman. I feel that we should get the confidence of the people twice. At one election you may prove to be such a bad member that it would be disgraceful if you got a pension. I would prefer to hear now, for

example, from the hon. senior member for St. Andrew as to what suggestions he would make.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am sorry that the hon. senior member for Christ Church was not here when I was speaking on this point. I was speaking in relation to 5 years' service as a Minister. It means that the person may be in the Legislature before he was made a Minister, say, for a year or two and then he becomes a Minister. If, at the end of 5 years, he has put in service as a Minister, I think he is entitled to consideration in that he has given up - I think hon. members know and are aware of the fact that to be a Minister one has to take certain oaths and one has to abide with certain conditions. One cannot participate in or be, say, a Director of a business; one has to give up even one's own personal business and in many cases one has to do it with due regard to inefficiency. One's business may have been operating satisfactorily when one was in charge of it, and having to leave it to other people to operate inefficiently, as a Minister.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Is it his understanding that you have to be a Minister for 8 years before you can qualify? It is not so.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: No. The hon. senior member for St. Thomas said that he felt 5 years was too short a period. This may be so for an ordinary member of the Legislature who can be an ordinary member and still engage in another form of profitable employment. A Minister may have had a thriving business, and there are lots of us who have had a thriving business and who have accepted the office of Minister at smaller salaries than we were receiving in our former businesses, but the fact that we have left our businesses has resulted in the turnover not being as it ought to be. If we were to return to our businesses we would have to live on a lower standard than we were living before we were made Ministers and since we were Ministers. This is the point that I have been making, and I hope the hon. member for St. Thomas sees my point.

The position is that an ordinary member of the House can still look after his business, but as a Minister he cannot do that; therefore, he has made a financial sacrifice. If at the end of 5 years he has lost his seat - he may regard his seat, but the Party he represents may not be the Government - he would have to start from scratch in his business when he was accustomed to a certain standard of living. That is the point I was making.

Now, in the case of an ordinary member he is looking after his business or his job. He may have a large store; he may have a Super Market; he may have a Dairy Farm, or something that he can look after; but the Minister has to depend on other people to carry on his business, or he will have to close it. I am not against bringing all members within the ambit of my amendment. I am in favour of bringing them in, but as the hon. member feels that 5 years is too short, he should bear this in mind in relation with the office of a Minister and a Parliamentary Secretary.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, my difficulty is this: We went into Committee in order to make definitive suggestions to one another which would be embodied in a Report to the House and consequently would leave us with a Resolution which would contain clear drafting instructions to the draftsman. If we continue like this we will go out of Committee without being able to advise the House what it is the Committee has recommended. I would suggest, therefore, that we take the proposals one by one and see how much consensus there is on them, so that when we report we will know on what we are reporting. The hon. senior member for St. Thomas can help us with his suggestions in black and white. This would also be an advantage.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, it is still a difficulty, because there is a principle to work on as well as the mechanics. If you say 1/4 after 5 years; 1/2 after 8 years; 2/3 after 13 years, then you have still the two complete terms of the Legislature that is going to be a difficulty. It means, in effect, that you are pensioning a man who has been elected once. I cannot agree with that.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Could not we say "for a period of not less than 8 years during two Sessions"? Would this help?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, all sorts of possibilities enter your mind. A Parliament ran in England from October 1935 to May 1945. I think that Members who, perhaps, made the qualifying 8 years in that Session would have felt very sore if they were told that it was only one Parliament and they could not be pensioned.

Nevertheless, that would be dealt with in any extension of Parliament. If we say: "Shall be during two terms of the Legislature making it a period of not less than 8 years" in (g), you will have to bring that down to 5, because he will still have to be elected twice. Even though he may have had more than 5, he would still have to be elected twice. I think that would probably meet my objections and the objections of the Hon. Leader of the House. Once you say it should be during two terms, but not less than 5 years that would allow a man.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: He will still have to be elected twice. I would be prepared to accept that, if it is the general view of hon. members that 5 years is a long enough period. The Civil Service is 10 years; do not let us forget that. I would accept that, Mr. Chairman, once (g) was suitably corrected so that it would read: "Shall be service during two terms of the Legislature or Parliament amounting to a period of (Asides) I would move that you delete the words "two complete" in paragraph (g) in line 3, and substitute therefor (b) "service during two." It will read: "service during two terms in the Legislature or Parliament." Then in line 5, delete "8" and substitute "5".

4.45 p.m.

So that recommendation (g) would then read:-

"A pension may become payable in respect of service as a Member of the House of Assembly in respect of which the minimum qualifying period shall be service during two terms of the Legislature or Parliament amounting to a period of not less than five years in the aggregate commencing from 1948 - years of service need not be consecutive."

In respect of recommendation (h) I would delete "his salary at the date of his retirement" occurring in line 2 and substituting "the highest salary which he receives in any capacity during his service in the Legislature or Parliament." That would allow for a Minister who ceases to be a member of Parliament, but becomes a Minister in the Upper House. You should take that into consideration, if necessary, and alter the figures. Instead of (8), (5); instead of (13), (8); and instead of (20), (15), and delete from "and" to the end of the sentence.

Mind you, Mr. Chairman, I am not suggesting that these are words which would stand the scrutiny of Parliamentary Counsel. These are words thought out in the course of a Committee debate, but I think that they would probably express the sense of the House as I have heard it mentioned and what I myself feel.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I should just like to ask hon. members, and perhaps the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, to tell me whether the two amendments which he has just suggested take care of the points raised in Amendment No. 1 (g) and (h) of the hon. senior member for St. Andrew.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I think I can say that the hon. senior member for St. Andrew agrees with them. As far as Amendments Nos. 2 and 3 are concerned, I do not agree with (2) but I would support (3). This is something personal, which is different.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, about Amendment No. 2 which says that the entire Pension Scheme is to be non-contributory, I really cannot support this, because, as I said in my speech, I think it politically sensible that members should impose on themselves a contributory scheme and, secondly, I think that once it is sufficiently clearly understood that we do not lose by contributing, the objections of the hon. member should be covered. It is a matter for hon. members, but I really could not support a non-contributory scheme. (Asides) Would hon. members feel then that 5% as a contribution would be reasonable?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If the Hon. Minister would give way for one moment, I would welcome an assurance that, as is usual with all contributory Pension Schemes, the amounts contributed are deductible from income tax in the ordinary way that they would be deductible, but in the absence of something specific, it is just barely possible that the Commissioner of Inland Revenue might ask for legislation on the point. Any contributory Pension Scheme is normally tax free.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I believe that that assurance could be given, but the House, in order to make assurance doubly sure, could put this in as a recommendation that the legislation should include that safeguard. I think it is a good thing for the House to do.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, if this is taken from the income tax, I have no objection to it, but if you have to pay income tax on this and that sort of thing, I cannot agree with.. (*Asides*) This is a free vote of the House. I am a member of the House and not of the Opposition now. (*Laughter*) If this amount is deducted from your income tax, I say "yes"; but already heavy contributions have got to be made by the members of this House, and I cannot agree with it unless it is deductible from your income tax.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I just want to clear up a little misunderstanding apparently. The deduction will be 5% of your salary, but that will not be taken from your income tax. It will be deducted from your salary and it would be an allowance as such for income tax purposes.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, any contributory scheme as such is an allowance on income tax. It is the same thing as an insurance and therefore what is the point of raising that matter?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I take it then that we will recommend a contributory scheme. The deduction will be 5 % of salary and the amount is to be treated as an allowance for income tax purposes. There is a proposed amendment by the hon. senior member for James that an option should be given to present and future members as to whether to receive benefit by way of gratuity and reduced pension or whether by full pension.
4.55 p.m.

Well, I think this option ought to be given. It means that a member can choose either to have his full pension when the time comes, or a gratuity and a reduced pension.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Since we have improved the position of present Ministers, should we not also improve the position of past Ministers? We have improved the position of present Ministers who for five years would be getting a quarter and for eight years would be getting a half. We have still left paragraph (1) alone which deals with former Ministers like Mr. Mapp, Mr. Cox, Mr. Garner. They were all ministers for seven years. I do not believe Mr. Thorne is going to get anything at all because he served in this House for only one session.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, you also have to consider the position that there are a lot of former members who, I think, could be reconsidered. Mr. E. K. Walcott used to get a salary as Attorney General but, as I see it, he would be only liable to get a comparatively small pension as a member. Well, that may be fair because he gets his pension as Attorney General anyhow. Mr. E. K. Walcott is in a slightly different position because he was a Civil Servant and he is draw-

ing a pension based on his Civil Servant's salary which was based on his service in the House because of his years as Attorney General in this House. I understand that was taken into consideration for computing his Civil Service's salary. I believe that is correct.

But as regards these former members, they were not Ministers for eight years; they were only Ministers for seven years. Now that you have reduced the qualifying period for Ministers, I think that you should increase the amount of gratuity that they are getting. The present position is that a member who was a Minister for eight years will get a year's salary at his Ministerial rate, and if he was a member for thirteen years he would get a year and a half salary. As soon as you have improved the position of present Ministers, I feel that you can make that one and a half years and two years. I do not think that is unreasonable.

It would just read, instead of one year's basic salary, "one and a half years at the date of the member ceasing to be a member," and instead of one and a half years, it would read "two years" for somebody who have served fifteen years. Our highest qualification period, Mr. Chairman, was 20 years formerly. We have now reduced it to 13 years, and I am submitting that you should reduce it for those former members and give them two years' salary. Those who render only eight years, give them 1 1/2 years, if we are improving the position all round.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Of course, one cannot make laws, Mr. Chairman, for individuals, but there are some very hard cases among the ex-members. I was thinking of the former Minister of Education. I do not know how we are going to get around that. Can there be a proviso for anybody who has been a Minister for not less than three years and not more than five years?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: What you can do now is this. We can bring in the five years' service at one year's salary; eight years' at 1 1/2 years' salary; and 13 years' at two years' salary. That is what we can do and that would certainly provide for the position of the hon. member whose case the Leader of the House has just been directing our attention to in a desire to help the hon. member.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I will tell you what I would do. Would you accept my assurance that I would draw the attention of the Cabinet and the appropriate people to that particular difficulty and bring in a proposal to cover it? You can leave it with me; I would certainly do it.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: In that case, I would move that the figures in paragraph (1) of one year be altered to 1 1/2 years and the figures of 1 1/2 years be altered to two years.
5.05 p.m.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, in paragraph (n) there will also have to be an alteration so that it will be five years instead of eight years.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, could we ask the Clerk to read out all the amendments?

Mr. CLERK:

1. Recommendation (f) to be modified as follows:-

Contribution to be at the rate of 5% per annum and to be deductible allowances for purposes of income tax;

2. Recommendation (g) to be modified as follows:-

The minimum qualifying period to be service during two terms of the Legislature or Parliament amounting to a period of not less than five years in the aggregate commencing from 1948, and to be computed on following basis:

After 5 years' service - 1/4 basic salary
After 8 years' service - 1/2 basic salary
After 13 years' service - 2/3 basic salary

The above to apply to Ministers, Parliamentary Secretaries and Members equally.

3. Recommendation (h) to be modified as follows:-

Pension to be payable on a percentage of the highest salary received by a member in any capacity during his service in the Legislature or Parliament.

4. Recommendation (i) to be modified as follows:-

Former Members to be eligible for gratuity on the following basis:

After 5 years' service - the equivalent of 1 year's salary.

After 8 years' service - the equivalent of 1 1/2 years' salary.

After 13 years' service - the equivalent of 2 years' salary.

5. Option to be given to present and future Members as to whether to receive benefit by way of either (a) gratuity and reduced pension; or (b) full pension.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Resolution as amended do now pass.

Mr. SMITH: I beg to second that.

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

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution with amendments in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Resolution as amended was read a first and second time and agreed to.

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.

SPEAKER'S RULING

Mr. SPEAKER: I promised to give a ruling at a very recent meeting of the House and I now propose to give it. It is as follows:-

At the meeting of the House on 8th March, 1968, I promised the honourable and learned Leader of the Opposition that I would consider - and rule - whether the Notice then (as now) under 'Private Members' Business': "to move the passing of a Resolution re "behaviour of the Leader of the House in forwarding "a letter to the President of the Senate re use of the "ante-room of the Senate." constituted a matter of Privilege. Facts, as ascertained, are that on 16th February, 1968, the honourable and learned Leader of the Opposition handed to the Clerk-at-the-Table notice of a Resolution, as mentioned above. Regrettably, this Notice was mislaid in the Office of Mr. Clerk.. On 27th February, 1968, Notice of this Resolution was given in the House by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, and copies thereof were circulated (stencilled) to hon. members on 6th March, 1968.

Standing Order 68 of this Assembly governs Privilege stating:

"1. A motion directly concerning the privileges of the House shall take precedence of all other public business.

2. If during the sitting of the House a matter suddenly arises which appears to involve the privileges of the House and which calls for the immediate intervention of the House, the proceedings may be interrupted, save during the progress of a division, by a motion based on such matter."

and, it is to be noted, covers only "a matter" which "during the sitting of the House..... suddenly arises"

Sir Erskin May's (17th Edition. pp. 375-379), at page 377, states:-

"SPEAKER'S DISCRETION IN PERMITTING MATTER TO BE RAISED. - As a motion taken

at the time for matters of privilege is thereby given precedence over the pre-arranged programme of public business, the Speaker requires to be satisfied, both that there is a *prima facie* case that a breach of privilege has been committed: and also that the matter is being raised at the earliest opportunity. If he is not so satisfied when the circumstances are first brought to his attention privately, he may inform the Member that he is not entitled to raise the matter as a question of privilege, or he may allow him to make a statement with a view to ascertaining whether or not a *prima facie* case can be made out. This latter course is also taken when for some reason a preliminary explanation has not been given to the Speaker."

Further, on the same page, appears the following:-

" It has often been laid down that the Speaker's function in ruling on a claim of breach of privilege is limited to deciding the formal question whether the case conforms with the conditions which alone entitle it to take precedence of the notices of motions and Orders of the Day standing on the Order Paper of Public Business; and does not extend to deciding the question of substance, whether a breach of privilege has in fact been committed - a question which can only be decided by the House itself. The conditions with which a claim of privilege must comply, in order to be accorded precedence, are those mentioned above, viz., (1) a *prima facie* case of breach of privilege must be made out, and (2) the matter must be raised at the earliest opportunity."

On page 378 appears the following:-

" The matter must be raised at the earliest opportunity - A matter of privilege which claims precedence over other public business should be a subject which has recently arisen.

The older rulings applied a further condition, that a matter to secure precedence must be one of urgency. But this condition seems to have been waived, and later Speakers have satisfied themselves with insisting that a matter should be raised at the earliest opportunity.

A matter which occurred during the recess was refused precedence as a matter of privilege because it was not raised at the commencement of the session.

Similarly a matter containing an article in a newspaper published on 6 May was refused precedence, because it was not raised till the 14th, and a speech reported on a Saturday because it was not raised until the following Tuesday. On the other hand, when special circumstances justified it, the Speaker has permitted a Member to raise a matter on the day following the date of issue

of the newspaper containing the article complained of.

A matter which is postponed to suit the convenience of the House or to secure the attendance of a Member implicated, or to give the Speaker an opportunity to consider it fully, does not forfeit priority when eventually raised; and in recent years it has become the regular practice for the Speaker to defer to the next sitting day a Ruling on whether a *prima facie* case has been made out."

This matter was not submitted for my decision during a sitting of the House (which would have had to be on 16th February, 1968, - the date when reports appeared in two sections of the local Press purporting to be reports of proceedings of a meeting of the Other Place of 15th February, 1968, which stated that a letter had been received by the President of the Senate purporting to have been sent to him by the Honourable Leader of the House, *apropos* of the use of the Senate ante - room -) as to whether a *prima facie* breach of Privilege had been established, nor was this raised at the earliest possible opportunity, which could only have been sometime on 16th February, 1968. Mere delivery of notice of a Resolution to a Clerk-at-the-Table does not fulfil the required conditions as to breach of Privilege.

2. On the question of Privilege (which, it is laid down, "shall take precedence of all other public business"), it may not be irrelevant to state here, that it is clear on examination of Standing Order No. 68 in conjunction with Standing Order 5 (9) that precedence is not intended to apply to a meeting summoned in conformity with the latter Standing Order which *inter alia* provides that "the business set down for that day shall be appointed by the Government". Thereby - in my view - is excluded all other than business appointed by the Government (even matters of privilege - other than any which may arise during such special meeting itself - which would normally appear on the Order Paper as the first business of the next adjourned meeting). To rule *aliunde* might well be to negative the purpose of a Special Meeting, by precluding the transaction of business appointed by the Government for such meeting.

In summary, it is my view that, by not raising the matter at the earliest possible opportunity, and by omitting to submit for Mr. Speaker's determination the question of whether a *prima facie* case has been made out, the prerequisites of a Motion of Privilege have not been complied with by the honourable and learned introducer, and I rule that the Resolution in question is correctly listed as of Private Members' Business on the Order Paper of the House.
5.15 p.m.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

WITHDRAWAL OF ORDER No. 2

Mr. SPEAKER: Government Business shall now be resumed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I think, just before the Hon. Prime Minister wound up his speech he hinted, that we would ask leave of the House to withdraw the Resolution which is on the Order Paper, and substitute therefor two separate Resolutions which would cover both aspects of the problem. The House, when it approves a loan, still has to appropriate the amount in the Capital Estimates. I am asking leave to withdraw the Resolution at Item No. 2 and substitute (ASIDES) First stage first, Mr. Speaker. It has to be done in two parts: The House has to go into Committee of Supply; there is a Money Resolution as well as an abstract Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave of the House to withdraw the Resolution, namely, No. 2, which stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister. If there is no objection, leave will be granted. There being no objection, leave is granted to the Hon. Leader of the House to withdraw the Resolution.
5.25 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to give notice of two Resolutions in substitution of the one Resolution which has just been withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to give notice now of two Resolutions consequent upon the withdrawal of that one Resolution for which leave has just been given.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I should just like to enquire from the Hon. Leader of the House what is the position with regard to the Addendum as to those two Resolutions? The Resolution which has just been withdrawn has an Addendum at the back. In withdrawing that Resolution and substituting these two Resolutions are you withdrawing the Addendum also?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No, no. The Addendum at the back of the Resolution will be the Addendum for the Resolution which has to be dealt with in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to give notice of these two Resolutions, and unless there is any objection, leave will be granted. There being no objection, leave is granted. Let the Hon. Leader of the House proceed to give notice of the Resolutions.

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

WHEREAS it is provided under Section 3 of the Special Loans Act, 1968, that any money borrowed under the authority of the said Act shall be appropriated and applied to such purposes as Parliament may approve by Resolution;

AND WHEREAS it is deemed expedient that a sum of Two Million One Hundred Thousand dollars to be borrowed from the Bank of Nova Scotia should be loaned to the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation for the purpose of revising the financial structure of the Corporation;

RESOLVED that this House approve the loan by Government to the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation of the sum of Two Million One hundred Thousand Dollars to be borrowed from the Bank of Nova Scotia for the purpose of revising the financial structure of the Corporation and that the Senate be invited to concur herein and if concurred in,

RESOLVED that His Excellency the Governor-General be asked to assent and take the necessary steps to give effect to this Resolution.

Also, I should like to give notice of the following Resolution:-

RESOLVED that the sum of Two Million One Hundred Thousand Dollars be granted from the Consolidated Fund and placed at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1967-68 Part II - Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, 1967-68, No. 67, which forms the Schedule to this Resolution, and that the Senate be invited to concur therein, and if concurred in,

RESOLVED that His Excellency the Governor-General be asked to assent and take the necessary steps to give effect to this Resolution.

I should also like to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply later in today's sitting in order to deal with this Money Resolution of which notice has just been given.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I must register my objection to dealing with this Resolution in this manner. It is only today a little after we came into the House - and it has happened for the second time within the last month - that we received.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member speaking on a point of order?

Mr. MOTTLEY: i am, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not hear that phrase precede the hon. member's remarks.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member is asking leave to deal with this.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member said that and I asked if there was any objection. There was no objection raised, and leave has been granted.

Mr. MOTTLEY: How Sir? Before you put anything at all, I was on my feet to object and I gave my reasons for my objection. That is what I said. I got up to say that I was objecting and I gave my reasons why I was objecting. I do not want any tricks pulled on me in this matter at all. I got to my feet definitely and I said that I was objecting, and I was proceeding to give my reasons why I was objecting.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry that I cannot hear the Clerk of the House whom I have called in consultation.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is not a matter for me. I am objecting. I am on my feet, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it a matter for me that an hon. member.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I want you to get this straight now.

Mr. SPEAKER rose.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is your power and your position. I will sit down, but I will rise again. *(After a pause)* The Hon. Leader of the House, as soon as he said that it was his intention to ask for leave, before anything was put at all, I said that I am rising to register my objection. That was clear. *(Asides)* I understand you to say that leave was granted, and then you would put the question and there was no objection. *(Asides)* I see what has happened. I am not going to argue with you, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am awaiting the transcript of the official record. By that I am bound.

Mr. MOTTLEY: No question was put.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am awaiting the transcript from the Clerks of the Table of the record they have of what has transpired. I thought I said so audibly. They are not writing in shorthand.
5.35 p.m.

I await the record of the Clerks of the Table. There are two Clerks.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Anybody would understand that. Yes, I understand that. I would await Your Honour's pleasure.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am indeed grateful to the hon. member. I read from the Official Record:-

"Hon. J. C. Tudor asked leave of the House to withdraw the Resolution re C.B.C.

Leave was granted.

Hon. J. C. Tudor asked leave of the House to give notice of two Resolutions in lieu thereof."

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is the truth.

"Leave was granted."

Mr. MOTTLEY: No.

Mr. SPEAKER: "Hon. J. C. Tudor gave notice of (a) a Resolution for \$2,100,000 to be passed in Committee of Supply, and of his intention to ask leave to move the House into Committee of Supply later in the day to deal with this Resolution.

At this stage, Mr. Mottley spoke."

Mr. MOTTLEY: What happened. You stopped me, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I was asking the hon. member if he had risen on a point of order. Is there anything before the House?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Your Honour said I should not try to open a wound - that is all right, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The present situation is that the Hon. Leader of the House has given notice of two Resolutions and the hon. senior member for Bridgetown has risen on a point of order. Is that correct?

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member has given notice of a Resolution and he went on to say, Sir, "of his intention".

Mr. SPEAKER: To ask leave of the House to move the House into Committee of Supply later in the day to deal with one of these two Resolutions.

Mr. MOTTLEY: But he has not asked leave yet. Are you saying that?

Mr. SPEAKER: He has given notice of his intention.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If this is a true transcript! His intention was to ask leave.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, any comments which can properly be made from this side on this first Resolution have already been made by the hon. Minister of Finance and I do not propose to add to them, although of course, I will reply to any question raised by hon. members.

Mr. HINDS: Am I to understand that the Leader of the House is proceeding with the Resolution, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: There are two Resolutions. The hon. member gave notice of a Resolution to approve a loan by the Government of \$2,100,000 to Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation and he gave notice of a Resolution for the same amount to be passed in Committee of Supply. He gave notice of his intention to ask leave to move the House into Committee of Supply later in the day to deal with the Resolution.

Mr. HINDS: Well, may I ask, which of the two Resolutions is he dealing with at this stage?

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that he is dealing with the Resolution to approve the loan by Government. Am I correct?

Mr. HINDS: Is that the same Resolution, Sir? Is that the abstract Resolution? Is that the Resolution which the Leader of the House said he would be asking leave to deal with?

Mr. SPEAKER: Well, the hon. member asked leave to give notice of two Resolutions, and leave was granted him to give notice of two Resolutions. Having been granted leave to give notice of two Resolutions he proceeded to give notice of the said two Resolutions, and he also gave notice of his intention

to ask leave to move the House into Committee of Supply later in the day to deal with the Resolution which is to be passed in Committee.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Well, I understand now, Sir. It is clear.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: It is not \$4,200,000. It is the same amount, but it has to be properly done this way. So I would say in respect of this one, not the one that requires Committee of Supply, but the abstract one, which was passed in the House when the Speaker was in the Chair that I do not need to add to the comments already made by the Hon. Minister of Finance on the Resolution. I therefore beg to move that this Resolution do now pass. I would answer questions arising out of this.

Mr. MOTTLEY: No, the Speaker ruled on that. How can you move that this do now pass?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I was dealing with the abstract Resolution which was dealt with by the House when the Speaker was in the Chair. The other one is withdrawn.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am submitting that this cannot be done.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that there are two hon. members on their feet.
5.45 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am informed that I should properly ask for leave to deal with this one now and I now do so.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am objecting to leave being granted. I do not believe the hon. member meant to put anything on us with this; it may have been just a slip. However, I object to leave being granted for this purpose: if this abstract Resolution which says "AND WHEREAS it is deemed expedient that a sum of Two Million One Hundred Thousand Dollars to be borrowed from the Bank of Nova Scotia should be loaned to the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation" is passed, we are binding ourselves to this. I am not fooling. I have been in here long enough to know my way about. This Resolution is asking Government to back \$2.1 million for the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation, but today for the first time, while we were discussing other business, the Marshal delivered to us the second and third Reports of the Caribbean Broadcasting Station. I am not objecting on the grounds that the Government should not vote our money, but surely if the Company is running and you are asking to be allowed to back a note for them, we should know what their financial position is.

Mr. Speaker, you cannot rush an urgent \$2.1 million loan for a Company that has not sent to us a Balance Sheet and Statement of what they would have in hand. You cannot railroad a matter like this. I do not know how they feel about it, but I know how I feel. The House must approve of the loan to the

Caribbean Broadcasting Station of \$2.1 million by the Bank of Nova Scotia for the purpose of revising the financial structure of the Corporation, and I am submitting to any member on the other side that if somebody came to him and told him he wanted to revise the financial structure of something, the first thing the member would ask him was what was his financial position. Do you believe we could honestly do this? The people in Barbados must think we have gone mad. If you are borrowing money to revise the financial structure of the Corporation, this leads us to think. You are not borrowing money to start the Corporation, as had been done. You are borrowing money to revise the financial structure; so how could you do this and we have not got a Statement in front of us? We are not lunatics!

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If the hon. member would give way, I think the hon. member's contention is extremely reasonable. The Statements of Account were only laid today, and no hon. member, I agree, could be expected to digest them and peruse them when we have been doing other things. The sensible thing, I think, I would recommend is that we postpone further consideration of these two matters under Friday. I would have to ask hon. members to accommodate the Government by meeting on Friday, which would give three days to study the Report and Statement of Accounts. I think that would be a reasonable time.

Mr. MOTTLEY: There is only one thing I would like to say on this. This Resolution does not tell us what interest rate you are paying. You cannot bring a Resolution of this sort before us to borrow \$2 million to lend somebody to work; you are responsible for it; it is the taxpayers' money, and you are not telling us how they are going to have it and what interest they are going to pay. All this has to come before us. Is there some hurry for this? It is true the Hon. Leader of the House is not now Minister of Education, but I understand this comes under the portfolio of Education. Is there some hurry for this that you must meet on Friday? They must be in very bad waters if they could not wait four or five weeks for a loan. You have to tell me how you are borrowing this money. Prime interest rate is something I know a lot about, and with the Usury Act amended to leave the rate open to the Cabinet, we must know what they are borrowing at. I do not agree with the hon. member in coming back on Friday; not that it worries me! I have not been able to scan the 1965 Report, but where is the Auditor's Report for 1966?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. senior member for Bridgetown would give way for a moment, in the last few days, having looked at some of the things about Departments not reporting, the Ministry of Communications spending so much money that cannot be accounted for and now this, I really have to wonder what stage of financial arrangement we have reached, and it is not good enough for the Hon. Leader of the House to say that we can come on Friday. Let the Hon. Leader of the House look with me at the Third Annual Report which was laid today. It ends with the words on page 9 "Statement of Account of the Corporation at 31st December, 1966,

are presented herewith", and they are not laid before the House. So what use is it in coming on Friday? What is this nonsense about coming on Friday? It is signed by Mr. Hunte, but the accounts are not laid in the House. The last accounts we have here are 1965. I have studied them and I have just managed to understand the Balance Sheet which shows that C.B.C. managed to lose \$400,000 out of \$1.1 million in its first two years of operation - nearly half, and now they are coming for \$2.2 million; so what use is it to come on Friday?

As far as I am concerned, if the Government wants to bully it through today, we will talk, but coming here on Friday will not advance the situation. The accounts have not been laid. I do not know if it is that the accounts were so unpalatable to the Minister of Finance that he could not lay them. The only accounts here are the 1965 accounts, and Mr. Speaker, let the Minister consider this, because the Minister had experience of opposition, and he knew very well what he would have done in opposition with a situation like this. Section 18(1) of the Act says "The Corporation shall prepare annually a Statement of Account in a form satisfactory to the Minister of Finance being a form which shall conform with the best commercial standards". Even what has been laid, the Auditors have not signed the Accounts; they have only signed the Balance Sheet for 1965. As I see it, I could not believe that an Auditor would sign a Statement of Accounts that does not show what interest was paid on the then loans existing in 1965, that does not show how much money was paid to Thomson for operating these services. The Auditors have only signed the penultimate page of the Second Annual Report and the Balance Sheet showing in fact that \$1.129 million in capital was loaned and \$392,000 odd were lost, including depreciation. The Statement of Accounts for 1965 as such is not signed by the Auditors, and there is no Statement of Accounts for 1966; so how could this be dealt with? Either the Government will be flagrantly immoral, brazenly corrupt and go ahead with this Resolution by weight of numbers, or will postpone it until April or May when the Corporation can bring its accounts.

5.55 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I am Secretary to a political Party and the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is the Treasurer; we are not accountants, and we can still produce the year's accounts. We do not lose as much as C.B.C. We have already produced them, signed them, and they are in the hands of the Auditors now. Do you mean to say that a commercial business cannot do what two busy members in this House can do?

There are no accounts since 1965. What is this foolishness about lending \$2 million? If the Hon. Leader of the House wants to use his numbers and go ahead with it, he can do so. We are only a few on this side. Things will be no better by Friday. There are no accounts, and it cannot be done. I submit that it cannot be done honestly or in morality to appropriate a sum equal to one-fourth of the Capital Expenditure for last year. Do you want to appropriate more money now than the Minister of Communications and Works spent, or the Minister of Education spent in the Departments?

This is Capital Estimates. You are asking people to appropriate one-fourth of last year's Estimates without any accounts. Let the Hon. Leader of the House remember how the now Minister of Finance and himself queried the contract for the Deep Water Harbour. We have not even got the contract for Thomson. Thomson has three ways of making money out of C.B.C.: he has an Advertising Agency, a Television Sales Agency, and a straightforward cash business. None of that appears in the accounts, and is never revealed to the House. There is even a hidden subsidy in this that barely appears at the bottom of one of these Reports. The fact is that every year the Government gives C.B.C. a certain amount of money, and that in itself is a conceivable loss. But there will be a lot more to be said both by us and by them when the accounts are actually out. I do not see how it can honestly and in keeping with morality be done. I just cannot see it.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, although I can understand the indignation which hon. members on the other side would feel, I do not believe they are doing us justice. I was genuinely under the impression that, when I gave notice today that the accounts had been laid, and distributed copies of certain documents, what the hon. senior member for St. Thomas was now asking for had been circulated along with the Reports. The Clerk has now informed me that that is not so, and that the Balance Sheet has now to be printed. The Balance Sheet, for instance, which I have in my hands ending December 31, 1966, is signed by the Auditors, and the Auditors' Report is appended to it. This had not been seen by hon. members, because it will have to be printed. I did not know this, because I handed a bundle of documents, and I thought that within that bundle this was being circulated at the same time. That is a genuine error on my part.

Now, with respect to the 1966 - 1967 Accounts, these are not yet ready. We do not get accounts in until about the middle of the year. Neither the Corporation nor the Ministry would have the 1967 Statement of Accounts yet. I was, therefore, suggesting that, not knowing these documents were not yet in the hands of our members, perhaps, on Friday we could deal with it. (*Asides*) I now see that that is not now possible, because what should be printed and circulated to hon. members is not before the House. I would, therefore, suggest that this be left over for a week. If I were in their position, I would have wanted to see the documents. I formally withdraw my request for leave to proceed. Of course, notice has already been given.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, it is only fair to thank the Minister. It is so seldom that you get a frank expression and a frank view that we are right on this side. I thank the Minister for seeing our point of view.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I do not thank the Minister for one thing. He has a duty to perform to this side of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: On what are you speaking?

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, it is strange that the Leader of the House just told us that we do not get the figures until some months after the end of the financial year, but it so happens that we have today the Report and Statement of Accounts for 1965, but we got for the year ending 1966 just the Annual Report with no Statement of Accounts at all, and they had no intention whatsoever of giving them to us.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not now speaking on any point whatsoever.

Mr. HINDS: I am speaking about this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: To what is the hon. member objecting? The hon. member is asking leave not to proceed; he does not propose to proceed; he has also withdrawn his proposal to come back here on Friday.

Mr. HINDS: He is now talking about coming back here next Tuesday. It cannot be done like this. I am sure Your Honour would like to hear me on this point. We feel the Government should.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you objecting to leave being given to the hon. Leader of the House to withdraw his request to proceed with this matter?

Mr. HINDS: Yes, Sir. This is the way we feel. We are satisfied that the Government is trying to put something over not only the Opposition, but something over the Bank of Nova Scotia.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I must really protest about this. The hon. member has no warrant whatsoever for saying that.

Mr. HINDS: One of the leading Banks in Bridgetown, this morning, informed me that it was approached on this matter, and in view of the fact that it was not reasonable business, it could not be entertained. The Government was told that it was not a reasonable request to make to any Bank, and they are putting it over on Nova Scotia. We are doing our home work, and we come here prepared for them.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I must protest that, so far as I am aware, what the hon. member has said is not so.
6.05 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I am objecting to the Hon. Leader of the House saying that what I said is not so. He does not know.

Mr. SPEAKER: He is entitled to say what he thinks is so, just as the hon. member is entitled to say what he thinks is so, just as the hon. member is entitled to say what he thinks is so, so long as each side couches it in parliamentary terms. The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to withdraw his request to proceed with this Money Resolution at this meeting, and if there is no objection.....

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The Hon. Leader of the House is not.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member objecting.....

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am speaking on a point of order. The Hon. Leader of the House has not only asked leave to withdraw his request, but he has mentioned the question of dealing with this matter next week. It will be sought to appropriate this money to last year's Estimates.

Mr. SPEAKER: As to the question of dealing with it next week, that can be dealt with on a motion for the adjournment of the House. Do not let us confuse two issues.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: In passing, I would just like to say that I believe that somebody set out to mislead the Opposition and ended up only by misleading the Hon. Leader of the House, because it was never intended at all for us to get the accounts today. The very document which was circulated makes no mention of accounts. They set out to fool us, but they did not fool us. Unfortunately, they fooled the Minister.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Leader of the House proposes seeking leave to deal with this matter at any stage, I am just enquiring from Your Honour if we would be in a position to serve notice on the Hon. Leader of the House now that at any future date when he proposes to deal with this matter, we are expecting him to come here with the information as even to the documents which have been removed from the files of the Ministry of Education concerning the C.B.C.

Mr. SPEAKER: That cannot be.....

Mr. HINDS: I am only asking a question about these missing documents from the formation of the Company.

Mr. SPEAKER: That cannot possibly arise at this stage.

Mr. HINDS: I am only asking Your Honour.....

Mr. SPEAKER: And I am replying. Please let us keep within reasonable limits. All we are dealing with now is the request of the Hon. Leader of the House for leave to withdraw.....

Mr. HINDS: What is he withdrawing?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to withdraw his request to proceed with this Resolution at this meeting, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted. (After a pause) There being no objection, leave is granted.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, of course this only means that these two Resolutions will appear on the Order Paper for the next sitting. They are not being proceeded with now. That is the whole point of the withdrawal. I think I ought to say with respect to the remark which has just been made by the hon. junior member for St. Peter that it is certainly not within my knowledge that any documents or files have

been withdrawn from the Ministry of Education in respect of the C.B.C.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order. The hon. member knows that he is not speaking the truth.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: That is what I am saying, that it is not within my knowledge that any documents are missing or have been withdrawn with respect to the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation from the Ministry of Education.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (THIRD VALUATION LISTS) (POSTPONEMENT) BILL

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 6 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 stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to take charge, in the absence of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, of Order No. 6 which is the instant Order of the Day, and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to make provision for the postponement of the coming into force of the third valuation lists under section 147 (3) of the Local Government Act, 1958 in respect of the rating areas of the City of Bridgetown and the Southern District. Let the Hon. Leader of the House proceed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time. I think hon. members can understand why this postponement is necessary.

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

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

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

The two Clauses of the Bill were called and passed.

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the 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.
6.15 p.m.

THE ADJOURNMENT

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

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next 26th March, 1968, at 2.30 p.m.

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

Mr. SMITH: I cannot understand why the Leader of the House is adjourning now until next Tuesday at 2.30 o'clock. There is work to be done here, and the hon. senior member for the City has a Resolution here or something like that, but he is down there drawing up under the Leader of the House. He does not appear as if he wants his business done. Why 2.30 o'clock?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I object to the hon. member saying that I am drawing up under the Hon. Leader of the House.

Mr. SMITH: He is now sitting by the side of him, Sir.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What does he mean by that?

Mr. SMITH: There is work to be done, Sir, and so long as we have to come, let us come at 12 o'clock and get through with some of the work. It does not appear as if the hon. senior member for the City wants his Bill finished.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, on a point of order. I gave way specially for him today because he said that he wanted a Resolution to be passed which took up a lot of time. We did not expect that it would have taken so much time. He should not say so. I am always ready to do it.

Mr. SMITH: Yes, Sir. He gave way, but he could not be any closer to the Hon. Leader of the House when the Hon. Leader of the House was moving the adjournment of the House until 2.30 o'clock and he should have been on his legs to get up and say: "No, not 2.30 o'clock but 12 o'clock (noon)."

Now, Sir, am I in order to make my motion? I think that the Hon. Leader of the House will withdraw his motion and make it 12 o'clock noon. Let us get through with some work next Tuesday. Then, we can go on a spree and come in the next few weeks. All right, Sir, let it be 2.30 o'clock.

The question that the House do now stand adjourned until Tuesday 26th March, 1968, at 2.30 o'clock p.m., was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

6.20 p.m.