

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Friday, 8th March, 1968

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

PRESENT

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

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret to inform hon. members that there are no Minutes ready for confirmation.

BREACH OF PRIVILEGE

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I wish to draw to Your Honour's attention that on the printed Order Paper, no mention is made in the usual place of a Resolution surrounding a breach of privilege standing in my name. Before there should be any dissension about the beginning of the Orders of the Day, I just draw to Your Honour's attention that my motion was in accordance to the procedure laid down in May's "At the earliest possible moment" after the breach of privilege came to my notice, and I presume to the notice of the general public, I did what was necessary.

Your Honour would remember that on the 13th of last month, there was no quorum and then there was a statement made by the Clerk of the House that my Resolution was misplaced or mislaid and it was not until the 27th of last month that official notice was given of it.

It is down on the Order Paper as a Resolution and if Your Honour follows at least one precedent, May says:

"that the fact that it is on the Order Paper in the Orders of the Day does not preclude it from having priority over the Orders of the Day."

It is necessary to draw specifically to Your Honour's attention - if it were necessary to you - the procedure laid down in May's on these two things; the fact that the House was adjourned, and the fact that the Resolution for the motion of the breach of privilege was not on the Order Paper, does not preclude it from having precedence over the Orders of the Day. Your Honour would find that the only true criterion as to whether it is in order is laid down in May's - in my edition of May's - the 16th Edition. It is laid down on page 382:-

"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 in 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: (1) a *prima facie* case of breach of privilege must be made out; (2) the matter must be raised at the earliest opportunity."

I submit, Sir, that on the 27th last month because of the mishap in the House or of the Clerk, it was possible only then to give notice by reading it out. I had already given notice of it. I am sure that Your Honour needs not to be reminded of the statement in May's that the fact that it has found itself away down on the Order Paper does not preclude it from having precedence over the business of the House - of course either Government Business or Private Members' Business.

I should like a ruling from Your Honour as to whether what I have done had not complied with the conditions, that it is no fault because of the erasure of the motion of breach of privilege that it does not appear early on the Order Paper and it should not be taken first. The fact that it does not appear on the Order Paper in the usual place in which notice of breaches of privileges appear - as for instance, on

the 13th of last month there was on the Order Paper a notice of a motion of breach of privilege standing in my name.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not in a position now to give a ruling on this matter, but I shall undertake so to do later in the day. Mr. Clerk is preparing for me a memorandum of the events with respect to this document, but I can assure the hon. and learned Leader of the Opposition that that fact would have nothing to do with the matter that would affect it as a breach of privilege if it is my opinion a *prima facie* breach of privilege. The delay would not operate adversely because that was due to some error in the office of this House on the matter itself.

I will give my consideration to it and give my ruling later in the day.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I would like to draw Your Honour's attention to page 383 in May's 16th Edition in view of Your Honour's present Ruling.

"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."

Mr. SPEAKER: I never thought otherwise. I am grateful to the hon. and learned Leader of the Opposition for further fortifying my opinion.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Annual Report of the Director of Medical Services for the year 1964-65.
12.25 p.m.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:

A Resolution to place the sum of \$614 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1967-68 Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1967-68 No. 63 which form the Schedule to this Resolution.

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

A Bill to make permanent certain enactments formerly continued in force from year to year by annual Expiring Laws Continuance Acts.

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Replies to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 101 and 114, asked by the Hon. and Learned member for St. Thomas, are ready.

Also, Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 63 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Peter, is ready.

Also, Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 99, asked by the hon. junior member for St. John, is ready.

Also, Oral Replies to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 129 and 131, asked by the hon. junior member for St. James, are ready.

On my own behalf, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 30, asked by the Hon. and Learned member for St. Thomas, is ready.

Also, Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 46, asked by the hon. junior member for St. Peter, is ready.

Also, Oral Replies to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 76 and 90, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, are ready.

Also, Oral Replies to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 116 and 136, asked by the hon. senior member for St. James, are ready.

Also, Oral Replies, to Parliamentary Questions No. 124 and 140, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, are ready.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Replies to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 149 and 150, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, are ready.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to deal in all its stages with the money Resolution for \$614 of which notice has just been given.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to make permanent certain enactments formerly continued in force from year to year by annual Expiring Laws Continuance Acts, be now read a first time.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Order No. 14 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting. Hon. members will be aware of the fact that with the notice of Replies which we have just given to Questions - there are more than twenty-five, possibly 28, and the purpose of this suspension is to increase the time normally given under the Standing Order for Question Time.

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

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

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1967-68 No. 47

Head 36 - Waterworks - was called.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: At the last sitting of the House Head 36 was being considered when further consideration of the Resolution was postponed.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution calls for \$240,000 to be spent under Head 36. Today is March 8, and yet the Ministry presided over by the hon. junior member for St. Thomas is coming to the House and asking for \$200,000 to permit the installation of mains for private development. Now this is not a question of poor people wanting water in their houses as I read in the note; this is not a question of a tenantry being supplied by water, and water being turned on in the houses; this is a question of large-scale private developments needing water to be placed, no doubt, in expensive homes, and at this stage of the year with only three weeks to go, the Waterworks Department is asking for \$200,000. What kind of estimation is this, Mr. Chairman? What kind of budgeting is this that permits this Resolution, if it were even early, to have lingered through so many sessions of this Honourable House and falls to be considered only at this stage? Notice of this Resolution was originally given on 13th February, 1968, which is nearly a month ago. Since then Government have walked out of the House and have stayed out of the House when they could have dealt with this Resolution if they wanted the money urgently. The same applies, of course, to the next Resolution for \$362,000, which the Prime Minister told us was so urgent, but I am not going into that now. It had to be done because factories could not be completed. If the Government knew these Resolutions were so urgent, they could have stayed in the House and done the people's business.

12.35 p.m.

If the developers need this water supply so urgently, the Government should have passed the Resolution as a matter of urgency at an earlier stage.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not appealing to the Parliamentary Secretary; I do not see him in his seat at the moment, in any event, and I cannot appeal to the Minister; but I am appealing to the Minister of Finance, who knows perfectly well that the Waterworks Department cannot install \$200,000 in plumbing between now and the end of this month. It is madness to pass a Resolution calling for a sum of this size and saying that this is the present rate, or that this "will permit installation of mains for private developments, service connections and plumbing services to continue at the present rates."

Of course, the taxpayers' money is not being wasted if this Resolution is passed, because, naturally, the private developers are charged and, eventually, this money will be paid into the Treasury. What we are tackling is the estimating procedure and the accounting procedure involved in this matter. After all, in the middle of the year there are vast layoffs at the Public Works. As a matter of fact, at the Public Works and at the Ministry of Communications and Works you will find employees looking for work to do now.

What kind of Department is it that carries on its budget in such a way that it does not know that Sunset Crest, or whatever big development is coming off, will need water during the financial year 1967-68? It only needs to drive about the country and see where building is going on. You can look and see that there is more house building, and this has been so for over a year and a half.

Now, a great deal of expenditure, Mr. Chairman, is undoubtedly needed under this Head of Waterworks. To discuss that falls more properly within the "shadow portfolio" of my colleague the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, but I represent a constituency, namely, St. Thomas, where there are very serious water problems indeed. We would have preferred to see that the Department is making some effort to improve the water supply in Shop Hill, and is making some effort to see that the people in Welchman Hall do not suffer as they have been suffering for water for some years now.

There are areas, Mr. Chairman, such as Christie Village and Grand View where private building was discouraged. That has been my personal experience. An architect told me, within the last few months, that there is a waste of time to try to build at Grand View at the present time, because the water situation is so bad that you would find it very expensive to connect a proper water supply to any house built on The Ridge. There are one or two houses there, and I understand that things got so bad that the people had to use the water in the swimming pool for ordinary washing at certain times.

There is a pipe between Christie Village and Grand View, and at times it was the only pipe where the people could get water. They had to walk from Shop Hill to Vacluse tenantry down the hill to this pipe. It was so much used that it was broken, Mr.

Chairman, and at that stage, then you could safely say that the residents of Shop Hill were without a source of water during the daylight hours. Fortunately, I was able to get the Department to fix the pipe at an early stage. Mr. Chairman, this is not good enough. It is years and years that they have been promising that Lodge Hill Reservoir or some other Reservoir would improve the water situation in Shop Hill; but, at a time like this, when the crop season is on and Vaucluse Factory is using a great deal of water, the people in Shop Hill suffer for water as practically nowhere else in Barbados. I do not believe there is a worse water service in Barbados where there is supposed to be water, than you will find in Shop Hill, St. Thomas, at the present time. It is a very neglected area in many respects.

Mr. Chairman, there is a public road running from Shop Hill to Cane Garden, and it seems that, since it passes through a district which is not supposed to have supported the hon. junior member for St. Thomas at the last elections, he deprives the people of water, because it is within his portfolio to put water pipes in the White Hall Tenantry road and so on. Nothing at all has been done in this matter. It was four years ago, I believe, that the road in that area was taken over from the Local Government Council. The *Official Gazette* will reveal the length of road involved, but nothing has been done to improve the water supply in Shop Hill.

In Welchman Hall, Mr. Chairman, things have got worse and, therefore, perhaps the residents have grumbled even more. But in Welchman Hall there is a situation where an employee of the Waterworks Department is an active political canvasser for the junior member for St. Thomas. His name is Best. If he is a politician, he will have to take the penalty of a politician. I will call his name; he is an active canvasser for the Democratic Labour Party in Welchman Hall. He, I believe, misrepresents to the Minister, whose ears he has intimately, the water situation in Welchman Hall.

I suppose I should be glad, Mr. Chairman, that the Democratic Labour Party constituency branch in Welchman Hall has been destroyed by this very water problem, because the water situation between the same Mr. Best and the President of the branch has become such that the branch can no longer function, or even get together on any basis rather than open warfare. Mr. Best walks about at night spying to see whether the President of the branch is watering his lettuces. He walks along with the arrangement which is used for turning off the stopcock in his hands, and he walks about generally looking to see who is watering.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order. I am sure the hon. member must know how improper it is for him to be openly on the floor of the House attacking a member of the Public Service. If he has reason to believe that the gentleman whom he has been naming is acting in any way improperly, he should report him, or cause him to be reported to the Public Service Commission. It, certainly, cannot be in

order for him, even in the Minister's absence, to be saying this and, certainly, in the light of the fact that the person mentioned is not a member of this House and, therefore, cannot defend himself here and now. He will, certainly, see the impropriety of what he is doing.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On a point of order. Are we to add to the Standing Order, which says that you must not call the Queen's name, or the Governor-General's name, or the Judge's name, or members of the House of Assembly or the Other Place - are we to suppose that to that list should be added, "or an employee of the Waterworks?"

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is talking about impropriety. What about the impropriety of a public servant in his position, because he is not a person who connects pipes? He is a senior public servant in a responsible position. What about the impropriety of his taking an active part and being known as an active political canvasser? I would just ask: How does he know that he has not been reported to the Public Service Commission? I would mention one other thing. I believe that the gentleman in question is well able to defend himself at street corners in Welchman Hall. Without even being attacked, he has defended himself quite successfully for some time.

It pays sometimes to teach Civil Servants, Mr. Chairman, that no political activity means no political activity in either Party, and all the Horatio Cookes and the George Bests who are active political canvassers for the Democratic Labour Party, if they want to be protected, and if they want not to have their names called in this Honourable Chamber, let them learn to behave as all Civil Servants are expected to behave.

12.45 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, in Welchman Hall, there are a lot of vegetable gardens; it is an area which is at a high altitude and there is a peasant economy since Welchman Hall was sold out. The policy of diversification so often adverted to by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, was long ago adopted in the Welchman Hall district due to the activities of Mr. Best. I am praising him here. I think that many of the vegetable growers are well aware that they must not water their gardens after dark with house water, because many of them have heard that their nocturnal activities have been observed. There is a lot of installation of meters of irrigation water - this is my information - meters are being installed and people are endeavouring to comply with the law. That being so, I suggest that the Ministry could very well turn its attention to improving the supply. It is obvious that if Welchman Hall is 900 feet up and the water supply is by a gravity feed, Castle Grant is probably the only reservoir which can give satisfactory gravity feed to Welchman Hall. I am not a technical expert. I regret really that the Minister and the Parliamentary Secretary are not here. I hope perhaps that people who know more about this would suggest something because perhaps the Minister would be as glad to hear

it as I would be. I know that there are these technical problems of supplying water to this district, but, in many cases, the problems are of gravity feed where there is only a small fall. I imagine that these problems can be solved by creating a greater volume of water at the reservoir. These are the problems which the Ministry should be looking at. Just above Welchman Hall Gully where the altitude rises to 1,000 feet, the water situation there is obviously going to be bad because it is getting its water from only a scant 80 feet higher.

The Ministry should know this. We are not condemning the people of Vault Road, Welchman Hall or Chimborazo or Castle Grant; we should not condemn them to a weak water supply for that reason. I would have been much happier to think that instead of this ill-thought-out Supplementary Estimate being launched on us at the end of the year, there was some evidence that the Department was seriously thinking of improving the water supply in these high altitude areas in St. Thomas and St. Joseph.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the Hon. Minister is not here, because of late, there is a tendency of the Department, whether under the direction of the Minister himself or the attitude of one or two of the officers administering the Department, to indulge in acts of turning off the water at points which appear to many people to be childish and senseless. Not so long ago in an area in Christ Church which is just outside the fish market - there is a standpipe and some directive was given to turn off the water purely because when the fishermen come in on afternoons they use a little of the water to wash the salt off their bodies. That is categorised as wastage of water. I sincerely hope that these discretions, these powers which are granted to the authorities will be used in a little less senseless manner.

I should also like to draw to the attention of the Minister a situation at the corner of Oistins by the Public Library opposite the Almshouse in Christ Church. There was a breakage there a considerable period of time ago; it was repaired and, naturally, excavations had to take place; but for some peculiar reason, up to now, the road has not been re-surfaced; so that there is a dangerous junction there, a "Y" corner, and any person who is travelling along there with a motor vehicle or bicycle has to face a bump in the road. This problem of reinstatement is a serious problem. I understand that this is done by another branch of the same Ministry; but if one looks at a number of reinstatements done after, whether it is the Waterworks or the Natural Gas Corporation or any other Utility Company has operated, the reinstatements done by Highways and Transport - I am dealing now with the Waterworks reinstatements - one will see that the standard of reinstatement is definitely not to the same standard as that of doing the roads. This should not be. I should like to remind the Government that if they reinstate the roads improperly, they open themselves to liability for accidents which could be traced to that. I urge upon the Minister to see to it that his Department, and the

departmental officers in charge of reinstatements, get these reinstatements done as quickly as possible after the fixing of the roads and that they be done in accordance with a proper standard of work.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I cannot sit here and allow this Resolution to be passed without drawing to the attention of the Government that something is wrong with the water system in St. Joseph. It is either a question of the Government or the people. I am sure that it is not the people, and therefore there must be something wrong with the Government. Now, Sir, when one reads the explanatory note to this Resolution, one can clearly see that provision is being made for development projects this year, and it is anticipated that this trend will continue, and the provision of \$200,000 will permit the installation of mains for private developments. Sir, I believe that these private developments may only have taken place a few months ago, but it is in such areas as Horse Hill, Blackmans Tenantry and other areas up there, which are built-up areas, that for the last six or eight years the people were calling for assistance by way of mains being installed so that these people will be able to benefit from it, and there are other people who have already bought land for building purposes and they cannot start to build because there is no water. I am sure that applications were sent in to the Northern District Council many years ago asking for the supply of water in these particular areas, and nothing has been done about it; yet the sum of \$200,000 is being asked for now overnight and at a very late hour.

12.55 p.m.

It is my opinion that this money which is being asked for is to pay for work which has been done already. If it is so, how much money can be spent from this large sum within the next two weeks from now? How much of it can be spent that has not been spent already? It makes me to believe that this money is not needed so much for these improvements and these installations. The installations and the improvements might have been done already, but the Government is only asking us now to give them the green light to get the money for the work which has been done already.

Now, Sir, I cannot understand this. Here it is, the Estimates have been laid last Tuesday and it is expected that they will be discussed from next Tuesday and I dare suppose they will be passed if we are not on time because they will skip from Head No. 1 to Head No. 22 and fire off the gun as fast as possible, and when we come inside here the whole thing would be passed. However, I am preparing to say my prayers in here next Tuesday morning so that they would not be able to railroad it this time because if I have been tricked once, it is a very hard thing to get the same trick over me a second time.

Sir, this money is really worrying me. I cannot find out anything really and truly. I know the position of an auditor. An auditor can only audit what comes before him. I want to know if an auditor can put him-

self in a position to really find out if most of this money that is coming before us is to pay for a job which has been completed already.

I do not know who is responsible for that, but I feel this money has been spent because anyone, even the biggest monumental idiot, will know that you cannot spend this large sum of money within two weeks or three from now, and if it is so, the money is bound to lapse. Why waste valuable time by asking for money which you know you cannot spend and which you will have to give back? If you can keep it, well that is all right; ask for it and keep it; but by the 31st March, you will have to give it back; so why ask for it? I credit the present Government with much more sense than that. I do not think that they are the monumental idiots they say, to be asking for money when in truth and in fact they know that they cannot spend it.

Now, Sir, I am very sorry about this. I cannot expect much of an answer or reply today to this question because neither one of the members responsible for this Resolution is in his seat. The Minister who is responsible for it now is in the very happy position to tell me that he cannot give me the explanation now because the matter is not under his portfolio, but he is going to make sure that as soon as the Minister responsible returns, he will ask him. That is very easy, and I am sure he is going to give me that reply, and I would not be able to do anything about it because it does not concern him.

I think the Hon. Minister got away with murder in this case by having to go away and leave this matter behind because he would have had to tell me how far he has got with the development of the Horse Hill - Bonwell area, Turville and so on. I believe they took over the applications from the Northern District Council long ago so that it should be done. There are other areas, such as Vaughan's Road and Cul de Sac road in St. Elizabeth's Village where there are people waiting, asking and looking about the matter, but nothing has been done. Now, we are faced with private development.

While I expect that private development would bring in money, it is not all money that the Government has to look for. The Government has to look out for the people who are suffering. Some people are dying for want of this development of the supply of water. Who is responsible for this new development of water? I am sure that every one of them has water in his home; but there are other people who would love to live in homes too, and who would like to build a home on their own land which they bought long years ago. I do not think all the distance added together would exceed half-mile to carry the water main to these people. It would cost nothing in the vicinity of two million dollars; yet the taxpayers are suffering. If you are a taxpayer paying one thousand dollars per minute and I am paying one cent per minute, all of us are taxpayers. You do not pay it by the minute, by the hour or by the acre or by anything like that.

We, the taxpayers, are all contributing to the upkeep of the country; therefore encourage us by

letting us know that you are quite willing and ready to help the poorest out of the richest at some time, if not always. As I said, I do not know if either of the Ministers over there would be in a position to tell us about these roads. I do not even think that the Ministers know if there is a place in St. Joseph called Turville or Bonwell. I doubt very much if the Minister concerned, if he were present, would know of it either. I am almost sure he does not, but I know it, and the people there are asking me to see if it is possible to get this water supply in that area.

Up to last Monday a man went to my place to know whether the people in that area were going to get water. He said that his son had come over from America and he wants to build a home, but he could not build on the land because there was no water. He had to go back without doing so. You cannot expect him to buy land and then find that he cannot build on it. That land was sold at a very expensive price. Everybody knows who was the person that sold it. I would call the name of the area - Horse Hill - so that everybody would know how much money per acre agricultural land was sold for at that time when that land was being sold out, so that man had to pull up his sticks and go back to America until the water is installed.

Well, that is a hard one. I say that is a hard one because if the Minister was doing his duty, or in my opinion if the Waterworks Authority was doing its duty, I am sure that man would not have had to go out of the Island. He would have been able to start on it right away. There are two more persons like him. The other two have not left the Island yet. They are awaiting the supply of water.

1.05 p.m.

Now when it comes to the question of water in St. Joseph, I would almost say it is a bad word. I know that the Waterworks Department is trying its best, because minutely the Manager telephones me and asks if there is any improvement and how we are getting it. I can remember telling him on a particular morning that I had managed to get a little dripping from the pipe, and he said I was still a little better off than District "F" Station, because they were not getting any at all. I told him it is better to take District Station to the water than to get water to District "F".

For months now we in that area have been enjoying empty pipes, and yet the Waterworks Department's bill is still coming in. Is that fair to any of us? Is it fair to pay for a commodity that you cannot get. It is hard to pay for something you have already or something that you can see, far less to pay for something you cannot see or get. The water situation in St. Joseph is very bad. As I had to draw to the attention of the Government already, big men up there have turned back to children, because the saying is "once a man and twice a child". I can tell you that I turned back a child on many occasions for the last six months, because I find myself bathing in a basin, in a pan, sometimes a tot and an enamel cup. All of that we have to do up there so as not to be offensive

when passing the road. I am ashamed to say this now, but when I went home some time ago, my wife told me she had asked the servant to go for some water and she told her she had not come there for that and would not go. I told her she could not make the servant go because when she was taken on she was not told that she had to bring water; so she had not told her anything that was wrong. That will tell you what we have to endure in the country, and yet \$200,000 are now being asked for for new development. If it were for old development I would not say one word, because the new ones could wait while you fixed-it-right with the old ones. You should fix the old ones first.

I understand we want a bigger reservoir at Castle Grant. I do not know if this is so because I have not yet got a chance to peruse my Estimates. I want to know if the Government is now contemplating bringing money in the Estimates and not waiting for the Budget which will be a few months away, to tell us that it is going to start a new development at Castle Grant by way of building a larger reservoir. I hope it is in the Estimates and that you are not waiting until the Hon. Prime Minister brings down his Budgetary Proposals in June, July or August - I think on one occasion the Budgetary Proposals came down near to November - to tell us what you are going to do as far as water in St. Joseph is concerned. I believe that the Hon. Introducer of the Resolution should have seen the files, for no sooner had he known that he would be responsible for this Resolution, he should have asked for the files and perused them, because he knows that I would ask questions. I am not going to accept the suggestion to wait until the Minister returns to tell me something. What is going to be done should be on the files, as well as what has been done and everything else as far as St. Joseph is concerned. As a matter of fact, this should apply not only to St. Joseph, but to wherever there is a shortage of water in the Island. I am representing the Island, and not St. Joseph alone when it comes to water. I do not want to pinpoint St. Joseph. I am sorry I have to say this, but I have to do some thorough representation in St. John especially when it comes to Martin's Bay, but it is not that I am doing it for the Prime Minister or the Chairman of Committees; I am doing it for the people, and it is my duty as a representative of the people to do everything just as the Prime Minister or the Leader of the House or the Chairman of Committees would try to do something in St. Joseph although they are not representing that constituency. I will do something for St. Lucy and St. John although I am not representing those constituencies. It is true that each representative is responsible for his parish, but we represent the Island as a whole. I really do not like to hear hon. members getting up and only pinpointing their particular parish. It sounds to me a little narrow and cheap.

This question of water affects the whole Island, and I am appealing now to the Government because they have the money to remedy the situation. I do not think it is a question of a lack of money that is holding up these projects, nor do I think it is a question of labour. Up to yesterday a man told me he had been

laid off from the Public Works Department and another from Highways and Transport because there is no money left. It could be that the money voted for this year has been spent, and not that the Government does not have it. The way the Government is spending money on certain projects makes me feel that they have it. You have the money and you have the labour, though I do not know about the materials; but so long as you have the two hardest, you should speed up your programme and let St. Joseph and wherever there is a shortage of water get it as soon as possible.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, it was a good thing that the hon. member just before he was finishing made reference to the fact that the Minister handling this Resolution should have the files before him, because I had intended when he first spoke to say that I did not agree with his approach to the matter. Surely if a Minister is going to be out of the Island and there is no substitute Minister who knows all the facts, and he cannot know them except by reference to the Minister, the Resolution should not be brought before the House. What is the point? Well I can see the point, but it is not doing the right thing to other hon. members. Would there be - I do not want to use the word "honesty" but the House would know what I mean - in bringing a motion before the House, and then when asked a question bluntly say it is not your portfolio, the Minister is out and you will have to wait until he comes back? Why bring it unless you have all the answers to possible questions? It should not be before us at all for that reason if the Minister can really say he has not got all the answers, and only the appropriate Minister himself can give them.

On the other hand, I think the hon. member who has just sat down has not sufficiently stressed the fact that a child, a babe in arms can see from the circumstantial evidence of the Resolution that this is not money to be spent on something now to be done, but is money for work already done and expenses incurred. I am not going to hesitate to use the word "dishonest"; it is dishonest to come before the House as has happened more than once this Session and ask for money in a supplementary estimate, because money is not there, for something yet to be done, when we know that the vote is to pay somebody to whom you are in debt, because the vote for the lunch room is still fresh in everybody's memory. Everybody knows that the caterer went on providing us with lunch and the money was not there to pay him, and when they came here for a supplementary estimate to pay for catering for the rest of the financial year, that was a dishonest statement. It was to pay back debts. That is not the only incident. Any member of this House would hesitate for some time at any rate to say anything which might look like a reflection on the House or the people of Barbados in almost reverencing the memory of the late Sir Frank Worrell. 1.15 p.m.

But when you incur the expense of a Memorial Service in London without first coming to the House, you were doing what Barbados has, until this Government got into power, never done. Every Civil Servant in the British Empire and Commonwealth in the old

...days who came here from the other territories always said: "Why is it that you can spend no money unless it is first approved by the House, either in the Estimates or Supplementary Estimates, and that there is not in Barbados a sort of general fund out of which Civil Servants could spend in a particular department?" Over and over again I have heard people from outside - the African Colonies and the rest of the West Indies and other parts of the British Empire - say Barbados is unique in that. But we have always been able to say that you cannot play hanky-panky with the taxpayers' money, if you have the right to dip your hands into some reserve fund and the House of Assembly knows nothing about it.

It is dishonest to spend money and then come here and pretend that you can spend \$200,000 in turning in water in two weeks. Worse still to come here and get this passed because of your numbers, and then say when the financial year is out that \$180,000 has lapsed in the Treasury. It will have to lapse. Enough departures from the high opinion that outsiders had of the Barbados Government and the Barbados parliamentary system - too many departures have taken place, and, once you erode the Constitution because you have numbers, you will soon find that there is no point in worrying to look at the Constitution at all as you look at Standing Orders.

There is a minor thing, comparatively speaking; but this tendency on the part of the Government as evinced, at any rate, by the Leader of the House to do the wrong thing and then try to make an excuse for it has got to stop. On Wednesday I had to pay tribute to the foresight of the Leader of the House in providing a third lunch room: a lunch room in there; a lunch room in the ante-room of the Other Place, and a lunch room in the Members' Lobby. I was very glad to have the honour of being the first to dine in that new lunch room. I congratulate the Leader of the House on being, for the first time I am told, ready to show the way that you should dine in the proper lunch room.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I wonder if the hon. junior member for St. Joseph will stick to Standing Order 26 (2)? It states:

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

I rule that talking about the lunch room at this time is completely out of order.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: If a speaker on any subject under the sun cannot bring in other matter to illustrate his point, he could never make a speech. In a Church, in a House of Assembly, in the Other Place, at the street corner, he could never make a speech. It is not enough for Your Honour to read a Rule; you must understand it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I understand it. I am asking the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to discontinue talking about the lunch room.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Obviously, Your Honour feels keenly about that, and for that reason, inasmuch as the whole world knows now, I need not stress it any more. I have said it, and if the necessity arises I will say it again. We have too many misrulings from the Chair for us to put up with them.

I have just said that the reputation of Barbados was the highest in the West Indies as regards the conduct of this House - Speaker, Chairman of Committees, members of the Government and members of the Opposition - but it is nearly the lowest today. It is time we stop this silly Party take-sides, and acting as if your opponents on either side of the House were your mortal enemies - as if the Jews must not have any dealings with the Samaritans.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat it is wrong to ask for money which you know you cannot spend. I say even a child, or a babe in arms, must know that; therefore, one can only draw the conclusion that this is money to pay old debts. We should not go on with members of the Government coming here with Resolutions which they have for money after they have wrongfully incurred expenses without the House being told about it. You cannot look at a lump sum in a particular Department without seeing whether that lump sum is or is not allocated to specific items with an explanation in the right hand side of the Estimates. You cannot spend money like that, and the fact that Governments take advantage of the fact that they have numbers is not sufficient justification for anything other than a straightforward, honest approach to public life and public conduct.

I will stress this now, and I shall stress it whenever it appears. I ask the Hon. Leader of the House, in his reply, to tell us straightforwardly, without any beating about the bush, whether the Waterworks Department has convinced him, or the Minister, or any member of the Government, that this is money that it can really spend between now and the 31st March, and to say plainly that the accusations from the opposite side are wrong; that none of this money is to pay back debts. He owes it to the House; he owes it to his conscience to say that. If he cannot say it, he must say that he cannot honestly say it.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am appealing to the Hon. Leader of the House to tell me something about the points that I have raised in relation to St. Joseph parish. Are there any applications at all? Is it the intention of the Government to install water mains in the Horse Hill/ Bonwell area for those people? He should let me know; he has a file, and it is not a blacksmith's file; he has Government files, and he must read them. He must tell me something so that I will be able to explain things to my constituents when I am questioned by them. It is the Minister's duty to do that, and I do not think he should sit there and allow this to pass. He should not sit there and ignore me in this matter. I am one of the sufferers, because I had no water at my home this morning. The Minister should be in a position to tell me something about that.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, when this Resolution was introduced two or so days ago, I believe that the Minister, who was present in his place, offered the House some explanation for its introduction. The debate which followed was nothing like what we had today. One or two hon. members who spoke at that time raised certain points which had to do not so much with the policy of the Government in respect of the development of our water resources, but with alleged remarks made by the Minister to persons applying for water, or complaining about a shortage of water.

1.25 p.m.

There was no time, for reasons which hon. members will understand, for the Minister himself to deal with these allegations because the postponement of the consideration of the Resolution was moved. Two hon. members on the opposite side, despite their customary attacks on the Government - attacks which were made entirely without foundation - have raised points with which, I am certain, the Minister has already dealt, not last week, of course, or this week, but from time to time whenever he has been asked about the water question in the Island. He has already been asked, for instance, by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph about the troublesome question in that constituency, and he has explained that, in his Development Programme, or in this year's phase of it, he has been taking, and is taking some steps to develop the Reservoir or the pumping system in that part of the island designed to facilitate not only the existing consumers, but additional consumers whose applications have long been on the waiting list. He has explained all this already, and even if he were here, I do not think that he would have anything more to add. He has explained to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph the difficulties which he has had in acquiring supervisory and efficient technical staff - deficiencies which he has only recently made good and which have been reflected in the increased tempo of the development which is under hand. All of this is known. I put aside the outburst of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition because, if the truth were to be told, he is not very helpful to us in this House, I do not think that he realises that he is in Parliament, and therefore we have to put up with him and not be distracted when we are dealing with the serious business of the people. As a matter of fact, I understand that he is leaving us tomorrow and we are quite prepared, at no sacrifice on our part, to give him up for Lent. However, the hon. senior member for St. Thomas and the hon. senior member for St. Joseph are both to be assured and ought to be reminded that an accusation against this Government about its dragging its feet with respect to putting water in people's houses cannot possibly stand ground because ever since we have been in power, and certainly since 1963, there have been at least 2,500 installations. I am reminded by my colleague that there are 2,900 new installations, attended to every year - and not only in quantum but also in the way in which we have facilitated the people because, hitherto, under their regime, if you wanted a service installed, you had to pay for it, of course, as you have to pay for it now. But the difference between their policy and ours

is just this; that we now make it possible for people to get water installed in their homes on the instalment plan. They can pay, I think, 25% - I speak under correction here - of whatever the fee is, and they have 18 months or two years in some cases to complete the full payment. And it is this kind of facility which we have initiated which has made all the difference between more and more thousands of people applying for and having water in their homes and not having it.

I think that lest the Government's case should go by default, this has to be pointed out. It is all very well and good if you have a personal grievance against a particular Minister because he happens to be in a constituency where you have a political contest, or you know that a political contest is going to come at some time or other and you start your campaign here; but, at the same time, the Minister has to be given credit which is rightfully his due for doing the work which he has been appointed to do. Whatever you may think personally of my colleague as a Minister, nobody could contend that he would refuse to extend the water service of this island or that he would not do anything which lies in his power to do. Therefore, if the Minister has said that he needs this money which is, by the way, recoverable, and he has satisfied his colleagues that he is justified in asking for it, and I may say however, in parenthesis, that through no fault of the Minister, the request from the Department did not reach him early enough for him to make the request known to the House. But that is not the fault of the Minister; as soon as he was aware of it, he has brought it down to the House. You have to take his word that he knows that he can spend this money, and you do not even have to take his word on the other point, because everybody knows that in this sort of exercise where the Waterworks Department assists in promoting services for private individuals or for constructional development, the money is completely recoverable because it goes back into the Treasury when the people pay for it. If these facts are taken into account, there is no need for hon. members to contend that there is something wrong, because there is nothing wrong.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I had no intention whatsoever of entering the debate, but it is only after hearing the Hon. Leader of the House in his attempt at replying to the points raised by hon. members on this side of the House, that I find myself being drawn out, so to speak. What we, on this side of the House, are particularly concerned about is this: Is the \$200,000 which is being asked for money which has been already spent or is it money to be spent between today and the 31st March this year? That is all we are asking about? Is it money which has already been taken out of the Treasury? If that is the case, we are saying that it is illegal, it is dishonest on the part of some, it is immoral and worse. The Hon. Leader of the House in his reply had this to say, that the request did not reach the Minister on time or at an early enough date, so that he could have approached this House earlier for the money required. But, Sir, the information given in the note to Item 4 contradicts the Minister's statement in some respect,

because it tells us that the installation of mains has been rapid and it is expected that this trend will continue; hence the request for this money.

1.35 p.m.

My information, Mr. Chairman, is that these are employees at the Waterworks Department whose employment is so casual that between the months of June last year and today they have not been able to make one contribution to the National Insurance Scheme, and believe me, their employment is so casual that between June and today they have not been able to pay thirteen weeks' contribution to the National Insurance Scheme.

All of them who are casual employees are today on the sick list and they have not been able to pay six weeks' contribution immediately before they became ill; hence, they cannot qualify for sick benefits under the National Insurance Act. That is the same Waterworks Department where we are told that the installations for mains have been so rapid and they would continue at the present rate. The plumbing service would also be continued at the present rate. The operations are so rapid that it is anticipated that the trend will continue.

In my own constituency at the Mount, there still remain standpipes from which intended drawers of water cannot get any when they go and turn on the taps. There are two such taps at the Mount. There is a similar situation at Bend Hill.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, in the hill itself, there are homes from which applications have been made to the Department over a period of years, and those homes cannot or until the present hour have not been able to get the service for which the occupiers made application.

It would appear, Mr. Chairman, that there is some engineering feat involved, but it is so strange that at Pleasant Hall Plantation House which is at a point between the standpost on the hill top and the one at the middle of the hill, there is water supply and there is no complaint at any time whatsoever; but the poor people who live nearby - just may be 150 yards away from the Pleasant Hall Plantation House - cannot get their own water supply services. They have to go backward and forward. When they go to the top of the hill and they find that there are too many people there, they then go to the bottom.

This is a case which I feel that, despite the Leader of the House's words that the Minister concerned would do all that he can to develop the water services of the Island and what not, that it is the duty of us on this side of the House to bring it to the Minister's attention and let us see that not only the Minister's words must be taken, but that the Minister would do something to let us see something practical. We want the people to get water. That is what we want. In the Bend Hill area, it would not be an engineering feat of such magnitude. If brains, the time and energy and whatever it is, or the resources of the department were pooled together, they would be

able to overcome the situation. I have that confidence.

It might be that the parish of St. Peter has not shown itself into lending the Government the type of support that they expected most at a particular time, and I am sure that if an examination were made of the renewal of applications from time to time, it would be seen that the Government, the Minister and the Department have been given time enough to go into a matter of this sort to see what is the real problems of the matter of Bend Hill in St. Peter.

I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that the Leader of the House would like to tell us in no uncertain terms what we on this side of the House find it necessary to ask of him.

1.45 p.m.

If my memory serves me correctly, I think that I am right in saying, Sir, that the last words spoken by the Prime Minister when he was last in this House were to the effect that he sees to it that no money is spent before it is approved by the Legislature, and this was in reply to something said by the hon. senior member for Christ Church. If that is the case, there should be no hesitation on the part of the Leader of the House or the Hon. Prime Minister to get up and let us know if the money has already been spent. We appreciate and are well apprised of the fact that whatever sum is to be expended is recoverable and there is no loss involved; but what we must insist on knowing is whether we are being asked to vote it after it has already been spent. Incidentally, money can really go down the drain at the Waterworks Department, and that is why we want to know if between now and 31st March so many plumbers who have been unemployed for all these weeks and months will suddenly be called out in an effort to spend this sum of money, or the money has been spent already and you are just eye-washing by coming to the Legislature and making a mockery of the House at this time.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I have sat here and listened in amazement to the intemperate vapourings from the members on the other side spearheaded, of course, by someone of whom we should like to say: "How are the mighty fallen", if he were ever mighty. I am not going to get on with that kind of vituperation and nonsensical fulminations in which the hon. junior member for St. Joseph so frequently indulges. He does not appear to understand the nature and function of Parliament, neither does he appear to have had any dealings with financial matters during his tenure of office, nor has it been drawn to his attention that we have a device known as the Financial Administration and Audit Act and the Rules made thereunder in 1964 - not that any radical changes have been introduced in the Constitution of Barbados. We will forgive the hon. junior member for St. Peter because he thinks at a certain level, and he is comparatively recent to Parliament - much to the misfortune of this Island; but he is here and it is part of the occupational hazards of democracy that you have to listen to that kind of thing; but I want to draw certain things to the attention of hon. members.

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph first assumes that something has happened and then says if it has happened, it is dishonest and never has Barbados sunk so low and all that. What he is saying now in truth and in fact is that the Accountant General has paid out money from the Treasury which Parliament has not authorised. He has further implied, if he has not said so explicitly - I believe he actually did - that the Superintendent of the Waterworks Department, the Head of Department and his Accounting Officers incurred expenditure which Parliament had not authorised, and then he would have also to accuse the Minister of signing an R.I.E. - I do not know if he understands what that is; that is a requisition to increase expenditure - which Parliament has not authorised, and that we therefore, after all these things have been done, have now come to the House and asked the House to vote us money. He certainly reached the depth of Parliamentary bad manners when he referred to the Memorial Service of the late Sir Frank Worrell and said that we had no right incurring that expenditure without coming to the House.

Now let me tell the hon. member this: we have there in the Ministry of Finance bills amounting to over \$7,000 incurred by the hon. member in London and in Geneva which we can get no explanation for and which I as Minister of Finance would be glad to come to the House and ask for a supplementary estimate for, but we can find no authorisation. This is the only matter in the six years that I have been in Government that I have found to be money spent without the prior authorisation of Parliament, and I challenge the hon. member that he was written eight times and asked to explain this.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On a point of order, that last sentence is as untrue as any untrue statement that has ever been made in this world. I was elected a member of the Committee of Experts on the application of International Convention. My expenses are paid by that Organisation. Before Independence came to Barbados, all I knew was that a letter came from them saying they were meeting on such and such a date and asking when I could come. The Colonial Office works it out. No money came into your hand except that when you got there you were given money for your hotel expenses and so on, but the question of air fares and all that kind of thing was done between the Colonial Office, the Government of Barbados and the International Labour Office in Geneva. That continued until Independence. When after Independence as usual I went to B.W.I.A. and said I wanted to leave Barbados on such-and-such a date and return at such-and-such a time as usual. From 1949 this has happened until Independence. This Government chose to write to Geneva, as I was told afterwards, and asked if this is a true thing and whether they could really guarantee my passage. When the hon. member - I almost called him a gentleman - says that he had been writing to me, I am nothing to do with it. None of us has anything to do with it. We come from all ends of the world - eighteen or twenty of us - and it is done in that way through Governments; but until this Government came into power, nobody sent and asked if this is legitimate

expenditure that we can incur. Since then for the last two years, including this year, I have had to ask B.W.I.A. to send to the I.L.O. and they send the ticket now, or they authorise B.O.A.C. to send the ticket. It is absolutely, utterly, maliciously untrue that anything has ever been incurred.

Until this Government came into power, I used to be asked in Geneva what is wrong with the Colonial Office, and why don't they collect this money for us because the Colonial Office is responsible for it. The Colonial Office's accounts are kept with the Colonial Office. Antigua either owes money or money is due to it. All this is done through the Colonial Office. The Colonial Office acting on behalf of Barbados used to deal directly with I.L.O., and more than once I have been asked by the Treasurer of I.L.O. why is the Colonial Office not sending to us for the money which they really owe us, and then the Hon. Prime Minister of an independent country gets up and delivers a deliberate lie that the only thing he cannot find is my incurred expenditure and when written to I have not replied! Not a human being has ever written anything to me about it. I would not be in it. 1.55 p.m.

Why in the name of Heavens did the Barbados Government have to send to ask us whether it should be liable for my passage money? Any ordinary, self-respecting man, having deliberately made such a malicious, untrue, statement should withdraw it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I consider that point of order to have been fully made.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Why stop me? I was accused maliciously. A man calls me a liar, and I must defend myself.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, silence is a virtue. What the hon. member has just been telling me is something I did not know about, and I will have it investigated. The hon. member is saying that this Government, since I have been Minister of Finance in November or December, 1961, has never written to him about anything in connection with I.L.O. That is something new and different, which I will have to investigate.

The hon. member is going off to Geneva shortly - within a matter of days. This Government has never paid his passage or hotel expenses, neither has it ever been asked to advance any money for his passage or hotel expenses in connection with anything concerning I.L.O. He is now saying there is another amount, which we have to investigate.

Now, I am saying as a positive fact that the Ministry of Finance and the Cabinet Secretary wrote to the hon. member on several occasions about another matter altogether, because we can find no authorisation - we have searched back 15 years. I would never have mentioned this, because I did not want to embarrass the hon. member. But when he can get up here fulminating about the Government is dishonest to spend this money, I will now give you chapter and

verse. Perhaps the hon. member for St. Peter has given the clue to the whole situation.

On the 17th November, 1967, the Head of the Waterworks Department wrote to the Ministry, and he did not say anything about having spent money. But you will have to understand the background when you understand that in this year's Capital Estimates the Government has allocated for waterworks extension and improvement of water supplies a figure which, I daresay, is in excess of all the money spent in 17 years by the previous Government. I say that subject to correction. The figure is \$1,142,800 for additional mains and standposts; replacement of mains, and development of water resources \$734,000.

Now, Sir, that compares with \$571,000 spent in 1965 - 66, and \$86,000 spent in 1966-67. This is, of course, Sir, on Capital Account, not under Head 102 that we have here. We have two items on the recurrent side which are fully refundable. What the Head of the Waterworks Department, the Chief Engineer, wrote to say is that the supplementary provision of \$40,000 which he is seeking under Head 36, Item 34, is the minimum which is estimated to be needed to continue to provide the necessary maintenance and repairs service for the remainder of this financial year, pointing out that the volume of work had increased considerably although they had put in an extra \$31,000 in the Estimates.

Now under Item 35 in the same Head

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, is it not now two o'clock? Are you afraid to stop the Prime Minister?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am awaiting the chime of the Public Buildings' clock.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On a point of order. His Honour the Speaker has refused or neglected to say whether he goes by his own watch, the Clerk's time, or the Public Buildings'. I would like Your Honour to rule on that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: As Chairman of Committees, I always depend on the chime of the clock.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: This clock, or the Public Buildings' clock?

At this stage, Mr. CHAIRMAN left the Chair and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: In accordance with Standing Order No. 5, this sitting is now suspended until 2.30 p.m.

On resumption:

(Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair.)

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking that the bell be rung.

Mr. CLERK rung the bell and a quorum was obtained.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now Question time.

QUESTIONS

SICKNESS OF SCHOOL CHILDREN IN ST. THOMAS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Question No. 30. It stands in the name of the hon. and learned senior member for St. Thomas.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister:

In view of recent outbreaks of sickness among school children in the parish of St. Thomas after eating school meals provided by the Government, will the Minister state:

(i) on how many days did sickness occur, at what schools and how many school children were involved;

(ii) If it is true that the Minister expressed himself to be satisfied that those of the children's parents to whom he spoke were not unduly worried;

(iii) if the answer to (ii) is in the affirmative, to how many parents did he speak;

(iv) if it is true that he was not at once informed of the first outbreak of sickness on February 2, 1967;

(v) if the answer to (iv) is in the affirmative whether he agrees that so important a matter should have been made known to him at once, and whether he will forthwith make a departmental enquiry as to why he was not so informed;

(vi) on what day were samples of the food served to the children first taken to the Government Laboratory and Enmore Health Centre for Chemical and bacteriological analysis;

(vii) what are the results of the analyses carried out?
2.35 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before I reply, I should like to remind the hon. member that the Replies to Questions Nos. 38, 39 and 61 I believe, are also ready, and I think that we gave notice of this some time previously in connection with the same Question.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the House and the Minister will take the other Questions as asked, if that is what the Minister means.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No, no. I am just reminding the hon. member that although we may not have mentioned the other ones today, we are reminding him that we gave notice of the Replies about two or three meetings back and that they are also ready.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: What I was going to suggest, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is this; if it is possible to take them together in one subject, is that possible? (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes, alright.) So that we can supplement all of them if we have to do so.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, with respect to Question No. 30, the Reply is as follows:-

(i) Sickness occurred among pupils of schools in the parish of St. Thomas on two (2) days - 2nd and 9th February, 1967:

<u>Date</u>	<u>School</u>	<u>No. of Children</u>
2nd February, 1967	Southborough Senior	15
	Clifton Hill Junior	20
	Holy Innocent's Mixed	29
	Sharon Mixed	36
	St. Thomas Girls'	3
	Hillaby Mixed	8
	Turner's Hall Junior	12
	Westbury Junior	24
		<u>147</u>
9th February, 1967	Clifton Hill Junior	40
	Hillaby Mixed	14
	Holy Innocent's Mixed	32
	St. Thomas Boys'	40
	St. Thomas Girls'	46
	Sharon Mixed	36
	Southborough Senior	32
	Welches Mixed	98
	Turner's Hall Junior	31
	Westbury Infants	4
		<u>373</u>

(ii) Yes, Sir.

(iii) Six.

(iv) Yes, Sir.

(v) The Minister agrees that he should have been notified at once. Instructions have been issued to the effect that the Minister should be informed forthwith of any such outbreak of sickness. In the circumstances, a departmental inquiry is not considered necessary.

(vi) Samples of mayonnaise and sandwich spread were taken to -

(a) Government Laboratory for chemical analysis on February 9th;

(b) Queen Elizabeth Hospital for bacteriological analysis at Enmore on February 9th.

(vii) Results of analyses:

(a) The Government Analyst reported that he was unable to detect the presence of poisons in the material submitted.

(b) The Ministry of Health reported that samples of unminced ham and the mayonnaise used for the sandwich mix were negative on culture, but samples of sandwich mix consisting of minced ham and mayonnaise showed the presence of staphylococcus pyogenes.

With respect to Question No. 38, perhaps it would be better if the hon. member were to ask it.

PREVENTION OF RECURRENCE OF SICKNESS AMONG SCHOOL CHILDREN

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Question stands in the name of the same hon. member.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, to enquire of the Minister of Education:-

What steps, if any, were taken prior to February 26, 1967, to prevent a recurrence of outbreaks of sickness among school children attributable to the consumption of School Meals provided by the Government?

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

The following steps had been taken:-

(i) food handlers at the School Meals Centre and at the Schools are tested every term;

(ii) where infection is discovered the subjects are kept from work until treatment is complete;

(iii) Delivery routes are so arranged as to be as short as possible;

(iv) new sterilisation systems have been introduced;

(v) samples of each day's food are kept for a period of two days;

(vi) any outbreak of sickness is reported immediately to the Chief Medical Officer;

(vii) Health Inspectors inspect School Meals Centres every fortnight;

(viii) the supervisory staff of the Ministry of Education has been increased.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Question is Question No. 39, standing in the name of the same hon. member.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, to enquire of the Minister of Education:-

Since February 10, 1967, have there been any further outbreaks of sickness among school children

following consumption of school meals provided by the Government, and if so, when and at what schools?

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

1. Yes.
2. There was one further outbreak on the 28th February, 1967.

The following schools were affected: These are in St. George:-

St. Jude's
St. Augustine Boys'
St. Augustine Girls'

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Question is Question No. 61 also standing in the name of the same hon. member.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, to enquire of the Minister of Education:-

1. Is the Minister aware that questions addressed to him in connection with outbreaks of sickness among school children have been on the Order Paper of this Honourable House since March 14th, 1967?

2. Does the Minister intend to answer these and subsequent questions on the same subject in this parliamentary session and if so when?

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

1. Yes, Sir.
2. Answers to the questions have been given today. Subsequent questions will be answered as soon as practicable after they have been asked.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as a supplementary Question, in view of a suggestion made by the hon. junior member for St. Thomas last Sunday March 3, on a public platform in Welchman Hall, St. Thomas, that the hon. junior member for St. Peter and I were responsible for the outbreak of sickness amongst school children, will the Minister deny it?
2.45 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: No. 6 of Question 30. In view of the fact that the Minister in his answer said that no poison was detected, the Minister does not subscribe to the idea propounded by the hon. junior member for St. Thomas that the hon. senior member for St. Thomas and the hon. junior member for St. Peter were responsible for the sickness of the children? In view of what you found, you do not subscribe to the view expressed in public by the junior member for St. Thomas, that those two members were responsible for the sickness of the children in St. Thomas?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I will certainly answer that question in two parts. First of all, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I cannot be asked to deny what I have not asserted. Secondly, the facts as I know them are stated here, and I repeat that the Government Analyst reported that he was unable to detect the presence of poison in the materials submitted, and the Ministry of Health reported that samples of unminced ham and the mayonnaise used for the sandwich mix were negative on culture, but samples of sandwich mix consisting of minced ham and mayonnaise showed the presence of staphylococcus pyogenes.

The question of their being a human agency just does not arise.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I am not having an argument on it; I am entitled to ask a supplementary. I will put it this way. A statement was made that those two members of the House of Assembly were responsible for the poisoning of children in St. Thomas and they knew about it. They told the children not to go to school. I do not feel you would do anything like that.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I understand the Minister to say that there is a fortnightly inspection made by the staff. Are these trained people, Sir?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: This inspection is done by the officers of the Ministry - I mean the School Meals officers of the Ministry - in connection with the appropriate consulting advice and consulting specialists from the Ministry of Health.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Can we ask for an answer to the other supplementary question?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The answer to that is that I cannot be expected to deny what I have not asserted.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Do you approve of the Minister making that statement which was made in your presence? Do you approve of the statement made by the Minister who made it? I refer to the factual statement which was made here today. It is time that Ministers stop making these worthless, dirty, low, depraved statements. You do not have to answer now, I have got off what I had to say.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Would the Leader of the House admit that a statement by one Minister is a statement by the whole Cabinet?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, he said something different now. This is another supplementary. What steps were taken between the 2nd and the 9th February to prevent a recurrence of these outbreaks? There were 127 cases that suffered in that week. What steps were taken in that time to prevent it?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The hon. member is already aware, of course, that the time lag between the 2nd and the 9th is precisely seven days. Within this period, only investigations and the report of the outbreak could have been done. But before that, during

and since, the customary procedures which I have outlined have been carried out.

Obviously, I may say this in parenthesis; nobody regretted these outbreaks more than I do, but they just happened. They have not happened since.

Immediately after that took place, we discontinued for a certain period the sandwich lunch, and neither since it was re-introduced nor in the case of the cooked lunch has there been any outbreak of any kind similar to this. But I have really answered him both before and after, as well as during the normal routine of the things which I have outlined.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: This is another supplementary, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Would the Minister agree that he is a little injudicious to express that he is satisfied that the children's parents have not been unduly worried?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No; I do not agree because I was only speaking of something which I had seen for myself, after I had talked to the parents, after I had been to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital on that occasion. I would never have made that statement, but I have spoken to perhaps about eight or ten parents and have asked them what their reactions were and they said that they were not unduly worried.

Mr. HINDS: I wonder if the Minister can tell us, Sir, if he knew if those parents to whom he just referred were parents of the children at the school where the 98 children were affected?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Obviously, this I cannot say because there were an assortment of parents from various parts of St. Thomas in the casualty of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital on that occasion. They may have been or they may not. I do not know, but they were parents of children affected. That I know.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the Minister did not know at that time, since he knows now, or knew since, that 98 children at one school were affected, would he have made the statement that he made then?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: That question does not arise. I said that in respect of the people with whom I spoke. The hon. member's question would be well if either of the parents whom I had spoken to were parents of some of the 98, or had all been the parents of children of one school or some such contingency. I cannot say this; I can say that having spoken to them and having heard their replies, they told me that they were not unduly worried.

Mr. HINDS: As regards, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this outbreak of 98 children of one school, I wonder if the Minister can tell us what was the population of the school at that time?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I really cannot, because I do not have the school's attendance register here with me. This is a question of fact which can be verified. 2.55 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: Would the Minister tell us then why these questions took so long to be answered?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I really must apologise for this, and I expect an apology would be in order. I do not know why they took so long to be answered, but there was certainly no reluctance on my personal part to answer them. Hon. members, I think, are quite right to complain and to be upset at this inordinately long delay. I do not approve of it myself.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Did he or did he not know in March or April last year that these questions were even on the Order Paper? Let me help the Hon. Leader of the House by putting it in a simpler way. Are questions addressed to a Ministry drawn to the attention of the Minister by either the Clerk of the House, the Parliamentary Secretary or anybody connected with the Department?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I will answer this because I think it is an appropriate occasion to answer it. "Yes". There is a regular procedure which to the best of my knowledge is observed though perhaps not in every case as quickly and as efficiently as it should; but I wish to say on behalf of the Cabinet that repeatedly I have told the members of the Public Service, particularly the senior members responsible for the preparation of answers to Parliamentary Questions, that we should like draft replies sent to Cabinet within a week of the question being asked so that at least no more than fourteen days should elapse at the very most after the asking of a question before an answer is given. This is how we feel about it, and I wish to make it quite clear that there is no reluctance on our part to answer Parliamentary Questions.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: If there is no reluctance in the case of these questions, will the Hon. Leader of the House explain if specific orders are given that the matter should be over in fourteen days. There should be two or three meetings at the most elapsing. What has happened on this particular occasion for which he as Minister of Education at that time was responsible? At the end of a week and he got no prepared answers, what, if anything, did he do? If the Hon. Leader of the House has no answer to this, I will try an easier one. How was it possible for a whole year to elapse without anything being done, without presumably any enquiry being made of the subordinates in the Ministry about the answers they should have drafted about the sickness of school children? I will ask him a simpler question. Doesn't he consider that we on this side of the House look with profound contempt on any Minister who cannot answer a simple question and can only draw one conclusion that he cannot answer it because a truthful answer would show how incompetent he was in his office?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, will the Minister say if the fourteen-day rule also applies to the Minister of Communications and Works?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If the hon. member would repeat that; I am sorry I did not hear.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Will the Minister say if the fourteen-day rule also applies to the Minister of Communications and Works?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: It is impossible for the honour and the self-respect for the Leader of the House to let it go forth to the world that he has told us the routine is fourteen days and he cannot tell us why it took twelve months. If the routine is fourteen days, after another fourteen days, after another month after two months, after three months passed, did he as Minister of Education not haul the members of the Civil Service who were responsible for this delay over the coals? Did he report it to the Public Service Commission?

I am going to try until I get him to answer something; if not, he stands even more condemned than his Prime Minister condemned him when he kicked him out of the office. He had been utterly incompetent. Has the Minister any reply whatever - papers got lost, anything - things come to his head very quickly however truthful or untruthful - as to why twelve months could pass without answers being given?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member is asking me the wrong question. What he should ask me is if I took money from Dr. Hawkins and Mr. Skeete at Edgecombe to run as a nuisance candidate! That is what he should ask me.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: There are so many lies told from the other side, so many stupid defamatory statements. I challenge the hon. member down the steps of this Place to repeat what he has just said. Miserable cowards get in here and slander a man and defame him because they know you cannot put them in Court. Go outside if you are a man and repeat that. (A VOICE: He is not a man.) Of course he is not a man, but even these half-men sometimes can speak the truth.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wonder if the Minister can tell us if any deaths occurred amongst the school population resulting from the food poisoning.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No, Sir; none.

QUESTION re ROAD LEADING THROUGH ROCK HALL, ST. ANDREW

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Question No. 101 stands in the name of the hon. and learned member for St. Thomas.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Question reads as follows:

To enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works:-

1. Is the Minister aware that the road leading through Rock Hall, St. Andrew, has been impassable to traffic for over nine months, and that the inhabi-

tants of the district are having the greatest possible difficulty in travelling in and out of the said area?

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, by some oversight I do not seem to see that reply, but may I suggest that if we could call the numbers, hon. members might be guided so that they can take them in order. The next would be 46, then 63, then 71, 76, 90, 95, 99, - as I said I cannot find 101 - 107, 114, 116, 124, 131, 136, 140, 149 and 150.

QUESTION re SUCCESSES IN "O" LEVEL EXAMINATIONS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Question No. 46 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter.

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

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. How many pupils from Harrison College, Queen's College, Lodge School and Combermere School were successful in no fewer than five (5) subjects at the "O" level in the year (a) 1965, (b) 1966?

2. How many pupils from the remaining Government Secondary or other schools were successful in no fewer than five (5) subjects at "O" level in the year (a) 1965, (b) 1966?

3. How many pupils from Independent Secondary Schools were successful in no fewer than five (5) subjects at "O" level in the year (a) 1965, (b) 1966?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in answering this and for the benefit of the hon. member, I shall be calling the name of the school, then the years 1965 and 1966 and the appropriate numbers under each.

The numbers of pupils from the schools specified in paragraph 1 who were successful in no fewer than 5 subjects at 'O' level in 1965 and 1966 are as follows:-

Schools	1965	1966
Harrison College	20	35
Queen's College	29	30
Lodge	11	14
Combermere	8	10
	68	89

The numbers of pupils from the remaining government secondary schools who were successful in no fewer than 5 subjects at 'O' level in 1965 and 1966 are as follows:-

<u>School</u>	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>
Alleyne	3	2
Boys' Foundation	1	3
Coleridge & Parry	9	4
Alexandra	-	1
Girls' Foundation	5	4
St. Michael's Girls	6	-
West St. Joseph	-	-
	<u>24</u>	<u>13</u>

The number of pupils from Independent Secondary Schools who were successful in no fewer than 5 subjects at 'O' level in 1965 and 1966 are as follows:-

<u>School</u>	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>
Barbados Academy	-	2
Barbados S.D.A. Secondary	-	1
Codrington High	6	11
Community High	-	-
Federal High	-	-
Lynch's Secondary	-	1
Modern High	3	1
Presentation College	2	-
St. Gabriel's	0	5
St. Ursula's High	3	6
St. Winifred's	2	2
Villa Maria	-	-
Wakefield High	-	-
Washington	-	-
Christ Church High	-	-
Industry High	-	-
Mapps College	-	1
St. Leonard's Boys'	-	* 2
*(University of London)	<u>16</u>	<u>32</u>

3.05 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: We are going to vote for the Estimates very soon, and I wonder whether the Hon. Minister would agree to give members a copy of the document he has just read out? There is no harm in that.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If the Clerk can have some copies stencilled, we can pass on to other Questions.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Will we get them before March, 1969?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I take it that the hon. member wishes to defer the supplementaries, and therefore we can deal with another Question.

Mr. St. JOHN: I heard St. Leonard's Boys' called, but what about the St. Leonard's Girls'?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No mention was made of them.

EMPLOYEES AT CABLE AND WIRELESS (W.I.) LIMITED

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Question is No. 63. It stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter.

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

1. Is Government aware that relations between expatriate and local staff employed at Cable and Wireless (W.I.) Limited in Barbados are such as can cause serious disruption in the Island's communication with the outside world?

2. Is Government aware that an expatriate who once delighted in making reference to locals as "Black Barbadians" is returning to the Island shortly to act as Area Manager of Cable and Wireless (W.I.) Limited?

3. Will Government consider acting in the interest of local staff and Barbados' reputation as a whole, by denying the said expatriate a further opportunity to taunt locals?

4. What percentage of staff at Cable and Wireless (W.I.) Limited at Barbados are expatriates or non-nationals?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 63, as asked by the hon. junior member for St. Peter, is as follows:

1. No, Sir! The Government has no evidence to this effect.

2. No, Sir!

3. Does not apply.

4. Cable & Wireless (W.I.) Limited is a private concern and Government has no access to the Company's records. Government is advised however that approximately 17% of the Company's staff is non-nationals.

INSTALLATION OF COMMUNAL BATHS AND STREET LIGHTS IN ST. JAMES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Question No. 71 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. James.

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

Would the Minister favourably consider installing communal baths, and introducing street lighting in the districts of Greenwich, Durants' Village, Sea View and Olive Lodge Road in the parish of St. James?

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

The priorities for the current financial year have been all ready drawn up but consideration will be given to the construction of baths at these sites when the 1968-69 programme is being decided.

Funds are not available in the 1967-68 Estimates to carry out installation of street lights in the districts of Greenwich, Durants Village, Sea View and Olive Lodge in the parish of St. James. It is, therefore not possible to undertake this work during the current financial year, but consideration will be given to the matter when the programme for the 1968-69 financial year is being prepared.

Mr. St. JOHN: Will the Minister state how many street lights were installed in St. James last year, or this year?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would just like to draw to the attention of the hon. member that that does not fall under my portfolio to start with, and I am afraid I cannot answer him offhand. It falls under the Ministry of Communications and Works. There are two questions embodied in one: one portion deals with my Ministry, and the other portion deals with the Ministry of Communications and Works. I will try and get the information and supply him with it by Tuesday.
3.15 p.m.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should like to say how much the members on this side of the House - I hope that this will not either embarrass or cause him to get in hot water - how much we appreciate the willingness of the Hon. Minister, who has just sat down, to be helpful and co-operative to this side; but I should like to suggest to him that, if he is holding on for any other Minister, especially the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, he should get the information first, so that when a question is asked he will be able to look up the file and give the answer. I repeat, I hope that that does not sound like praise from this side, from members of the Opposition, with any object of dividing the ranks. *(Laughter)*

Mr. MOTTLEY: On this question, as a supplementary, I may remind the Minister that when the Premier took over, he said that there would be scientific street lighting and you will be able to drive on park lights. I wonder how many lights were installed in St. Michael since they took over, how many additional ones. (A MEMBER: Two.) I do not suppose that the Minister has it at his finger tips; I do not think he has it there. I know, you know. I am bound to know. All right, don't worry.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A SMALL INDUSTRIES BOARD

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Question is Question No. 76, standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph.

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

1. Will the Minister consider the advisability of establishing a small Industries Loan Board, for the purpose of assisting small manufacturers with small loans especially artisans, cabinet makers, upholsterers etc.?

2. If the answer is "Yes", can the Minister take immediate steps to implement the scheme?

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

1. The Honourable Member's attention is drawn to Part I section 4(a) of the Development Plan 1965-68 and section 6 (1) of the Barbados Development Bank Act, 1963.

2. The Development Bank Act which provides for assistance to small manufacturers with Loans has not yet been proclaimed. Implementation of the Loan Scheme will have to await proclamation.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as a supplementary Question. Can the Hon. Minister tell me about what time the proclamation will be made?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am afraid that I cannot assist the hon. member, but it is obvious that this is a matter which is still under active consideration. There must be good and sufficient reasons why the proclamation of that Act has not been given. Perhaps the hon. member would like me to go into this matter further on another occasion and if he would care, I would pass the answer on to him.

Mr. SMITH: Can the Minister state if any of these small manufacturers made applications for any loans to this Development Board? I mean, a manufacturer who would be considered as a small one.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, that would be a difficult question to answer because a large firm may wish to negotiate a small loan, and a small firm may wish to negotiate a large loan; however, business enterprises of all descriptions have been helped, as the hon. member knows, from the Development Board, and that is the policy which is still being continued.

Mr. SMITH: I would not ask the Minister if he could define "small loans;" I will define it for him. I mean small manufacturers applying for loans of about L500 and under. Has he had any applications of that sort made to the Board, and if so, how long?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should have to have notice given of that question because this is information which would have to be got from the Board. I can give it to the hon. member within the next few days, but I really could not give it to him now.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Can the Hon. Minister say anything of the number of persons who have received

loans, what proportion, if any, have gone without paying back? I do not want to say bankrupt because they may not necessarily be bankrupt.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No, I cannot answer that Question now. I must draw the hon. member's attention to this; I think that the Development Board publishes or should publish a report of its transactions in which full information can be found in respect of loans granted to defaulters, rate of repayment, percentage and so on.

TAXI OWNERS' ASSOCIATION CONCESSION TO HILTON HOTEL

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Question is Question No. 90, also standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister.

Is Government aware that the Barbados Taxi Owners' Association has to pay the considerable sum of \$9,000 per year to the Barbados Hilton Hotel for the concession held by the Association?

2. If the answer is "yes" does it appear to Government that the amount charged is exorbitant bearing in mind the high cost of maintenance of motor vehicles and that work for taximen at this Hotel is limited?

3. Can Government take any steps to have the amount of \$9,000 reduced?

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

(a) The existing arrangements between the Barbados Taxi Owners' Association and the Barbados Hilton Hotel were made by two private parties and have nothing whatever to do with the Government.

(b) Government is not in a position to decide whether the sum of \$9,000 is exorbitant and understands that other garages were willing to pay even more than the Taxi Owners' Association for this concession.

(c) Government cannot interfere with agreements made by two private parties. All taxi concessions are dealt with by Hilton according to their operation agreement.

Mr. SMITH: As a Supplementary Question. Is the Hilton Hotel the concern of the Government?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that the hon. member knows that the Hilton Hotel is vested in the Development Board and the operations are run by Hilton International. If that is what he means by the concern of the Government, I suppose the answer would be "yes". But more strictly the question before us has to do with an Agreement by the hotel management and a Taxi Association which ten-

dered for a concession in open competition with other such bodies.
3.25 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: Is the Minister really serious? The member has just said that the Government is having nothing to do with the agreement with these people. Is it a fact that the Government is having nothing to do with the agreement with these people? I want to know if a private concern can drive into the Government's property and make their own arrangements and the Government has nothing to do with it! That is what I want to know from the Government.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I know that it is a fact that he did say so; I just want to remind him. In all advertisements for contracts by Government or quasi-Government Departments a labour saving clause is always put in. Would not the Government or the hotel as vested in the Development Board say that such-and-such is not related to the Government as such? Would not the Government be in power to say, if you are advertising and you are a private concern, whether you can have a foreign taxi company or something of the sort working with you? Would they not be in power to say what is a reasonable charge to go into the hotel?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I will answer the hon. member. The Hilton Hotel does not consult Government about their contracts for the supply of food and so on. The rates they charge their guests or any contract they enter into with any caterers or suppliers or taxi owners or otherwise is a matter for them because in the agreement which was brought to this House they are really the lessees of the Hotel and the Development Board is the lessor. Two-thirds of the operating cost is paid to the Development Board instead of a fixed rent. Hilton International is free within the Government's general policy to write permits and other kinds of things, to enter into any kind of contract and so on. We do not infringe on the policy of work permits and so on. In the particular case to which we are referring, as the Minister explained, the Barbados Taxi Owners' Association was one of the tenderers and it was not the highest, but the Development Board made it known to the management of the Hilton Board in advance that they preferred, if there was not any substantial disparity in the rates payable, that they give the tender to the Taxi Owners' Association as that Association ought to be encouraged; but the privilege which is paid to the Taxi Owners' Association is a privilege which it tendered for and agreed with. It is a privilege which it negotiated for with the Hilton management. It was not the highest tender.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If they got the tender for \$9,000 and they were not the highest either, why don't they pay income tax on that? You must know what they work for?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I understand that it works out at an average - this is information which I got from the Taxi Company Owners themselves - of about \$35 which each participant pays per month.

They have reserve funds and so on. At one time they also had sight-seeing tours. However they pay \$35 to their Association in order to operate up there. They operate as a special section, and they pay \$35 per month for the contract.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I just want to ask the Minister this: is the Minister aware that the next largest hotel to the Hilton Hotel is the Marine Hotel owned by Goddard & Sons and all and sundry taxi owners can enter and go from there free? There is no concession which is granted anybody.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Yes, but the Marine Hotel did not cost \$11 million.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If it cost \$1 million, it is still a hotel just as the Hilton is in this country.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: That is now standard procedure. It is done at the Trinidad Hilton, and at all the hotels other than the old one that has been liquidated six years ago. All the leading hotels throughout the Caribbean which I know about have contracts, and airports have them too. We have the only Airport which does not charge taxi owners for the concession at the airport.

Mr. MOTTLEY: For the Minister's information, the Goddards took over the Marine Hotel, and they had a concession there and they put them out. Then the Goddards decided that any taxi owner is entitled to come in there free.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am very pleased to hear that. What I want to say is this: I am concerned about Government's property and it would be completely chaotic if they had a free-for-all at the Hilton; but the taxi owners agreed to pay up the concession. As a matter of fact, they had a certain amount of initial difficulty. The contract was for so many operators. The Taxi Company Association had the difficulty of getting a sufficient number of them to come forward and take the contract, but after those who had taken it had got in there, everybody said that they should have been there and they were willing to pay the \$35. But they had difficulty in mustering the twelve or sixteen operators that they needed to accept the concession.

Mr. SMITH: Does the Minister think that it is fair that other private hotels allow taxi owners to come into their places, and do you think it is fair that the Hilton Hotel which is built with Government money and to which these same taxi owners have to contribute should be taking a contribution from these people while the owners of private hotels allow them to come in and out free? At the Government hotel they are charged exorbitant prices for entering, but at the private hotels they are allowed to come in and out free.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Again I may remind the hon. member that the Taxi Owners' Association and the taxi owners who operate at that hotel did so on a voluntary basis. If they did not make money out of it,

they would not have taken the contract. That is what I would normally assume. They have a special cornered market, and it suits them to operate that concession. There are other hotels in the Island which have concessions, and they are paying for the same sort of thing at the place where they have the concessions. Therefore nobody is holding a gun to their heads and saying that they cannot come in there and carry out passengers. These taxi owners want to do it. If it did not suit them they would not do it. They can withdraw tomorrow, and they can have a free-for-all up there, but they would not like it. It would not be to the proper conduct of the hotel, anyhow. 3.35 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: Will the Minister then say that, since it is the free will of the Taxi Owners' Association to offer this price by coming together and to keep out others - does he think it is fair that they could get more money and would not get it? Since the Minister has just said that it is their own free will, that means they could put up more, but they are doing it to keep out other taxi owners. Well, give the other taxi owners a chance by putting on a fixed price.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I think I answered the hon. members' question already. The taxi owners who saw the possibility, the members of the Association, had great difficulty in persuading a requisite number of other members of the Association to join with them. They even had, I understand, to go outside and get some of the ones who were not even card carrying members of the Taxi Owners Association to come in so that they could have the full complement for the contract. Now that they see it is a good thing, everybody wants to get in; hence these questions. But when the thing was in its initial stages, nobody wanted to take the risk. That is all that happened, and this happens in business enterprise, as you know, everyday.

Mr. MOTTLEY: To put another supplementary, the hon. member said in his remarks that the Taxi Owners Association's was not the highest tender, and he also said that the hotel cost \$10 million and that it is a question of the lessor and the lessee between the Hilton Hotel people and the Development Board. Well, if you take \$10 million, the minimum from investment at 6 per cent would be \$600,000 a year or \$50,000 a month. I am only using this because you said it was not the highest tender. If you work this out in round figures, \$1,500 a day must be made in profit before the operation was made. Would the Government be satisfied that it did not accept the highest tender seeing that there is a big deficit in the Estimates now relative to the Hilton? I am not an economist.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The wheel has turned full circle, and instead of being accused of victimising the taxi owners we are now accused that we should not have given the taxi owners the job at all. You have got to make your mind up.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I have never said anything about victimising. It was not even my question. I am dealing purely with the economics of

it, I am not an economist, but I am only saying that \$600,000 is 6 per cent on \$10 million or \$50,000 a month. Even if you call it \$45,000, that would be \$1,500 a day, and seeing that there is a deficit, I am asking if he thinks it is in the interest of the Government. I am not talking about victimising; I am saying that you have invested our money here and you must make some money on it. You are bringing in tourists and doing well, but are you satisfied that you should not have accepted the highest tender?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: You know that when the Government or anybody advertises, it says that you are not bound by the highest tender or the lowest tender as the case may be, depending on what you are putting on the market. One of the main reasons for the construction of the hotel was not only to set the standard in tourism in this Island, but to attract people to the Island and primarily to provide jobs for the largest number of Barbadians possible. The reason why I assume the Development Board told the Hilton Hotel that co-operative associations like the Taxi Owners Association should be encouraged was specifically because it was a Government undertaking, and therefore we should encourage co-operative efforts instead of encouraging monopolistic positions in the taxi owners' business, which, as you know, at the Bridgetown Port and at Seawell International Airport, is something which the taxi owners are always crying out against. So here was an opportunity for Government to demonstrate that it was encouraging indirectly through the Development Board a co-operative movement, and so the Development Board indicated to the Hilton management that provided there was no great disparity, preference should be given to a co-operative movement. Now they are complaining. There is nothing wrong with that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What might seem wrong to you might not seem wrong to me, but I am only saying that the Hon. Minister said that as far as Government was concerned they had nothing to do with it. Now you are saying the Government has told the Development Board that they should do so-and-so.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I did not say the Government told the Development Board. I said the Government.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: Pardon me. The Hon. Prime Minister did not say so. The Minister who was answering the question said so.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The Development Board is appointed by the Government. They were aware of the policy directive. In the same way if the Hilton wants to bring in a catering manager here, they have to apply to the Government for him.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Are you aware of it or are you directing the policy?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: We do not direct the policy. They do not consult us on contracts. This was a special thing at the opening of the Hilton. In other words, before the hotel even opened, the Development Board indicated that any co-operative move-

ment, specifically the taxi owners, should be encouraged if possible. That is all it amounts to.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I thank the hon. member for the reply, but the time is coming when I will have a chance of dealing with the Development Board and its mal-practices. You can put that in capital letters all over the Island.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I see you are in a hurry, but is the Minister aware that up to now, since the Hilton was operating, there are certain taxi owners in the same association who have not got the chance to get a job up there, while there are others who are always getting?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: If the hon. member would give way, I explained to the hon. member that my understanding is that the Taxi Owners Association was awarded this contract. They then within themselves tried to get together, whether it was twelve or twenty who would guarantee, let us say, the \$35 a month or whatever it was. I am only giving a sort of hypothetical figure because I have not come in here after collecting information from any taxi owner; but no individual taxi owners were interested; some very large garages were interested. I do not have any paper which shows that they submitted a tender on a particular day and how much it was. I am speaking purely from my discussions I have had with the Development Board during this business, and with the Taxi Owners Association. The Taxi Owners Association, having been offered the award, then tried to get a sufficient number of themselves together who would take on the job, and they had great difficulty in getting the requisite number even of members of their own association, and my understanding is that they then had to go outside of the association and canvass one or two of the individual taxi owners to come along with them and form the group that undertook the contract. So if there are members of the Taxi Owners Association who did not get a pick, it was their own fault because they had an opportunity to get in on the ground floor, and there is no question of any more outside people coming in because it is a contract awarded to a group.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I understood the Prime Minister fully well from the beginning, but it appears he does not understand me. I am asking him if he is aware that present members, not outsiders, members who are still contributing and were in the association from its commencement, cannot get a berry. Certain owners are getting the berries.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: That is what I am trying to explain to the hon. member for St. Joseph. You may be a member of the association, but you are not in the group; you are not in the in-group. It was not a contract for everybody in the association. The association got the award, then they had to hold a meeting and say: "Look boys; we have this contract; who is coming in, who is willing to put up, say, \$35 a month?" About four fellows said: "O.K, I will put up \$35;" others said, "not me, I am not in that!" Then they went outside and got eight fellows and said. "We

are the group operating the contract." Therefore there will be members of the association who cannot go up there because they were not willing to go. That is all. I hope the hon. member understands that.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I did not understand it was a group. I was referring to the inner group. There are some of the inner group who cannot get a berry. In other words, they are being victimised.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: That would have to be their own fault, because I understand it is done in rotation, and if they are up there and are paying a contribution, they have a right to summon a meeting and ask what is going on, and say, "Let us get this thing straight." You cannot expect the Legislature to do something about that. They are members of a body just as you belong to a cricket club, and if you do not like the captain, you say you are not playing with him because he would not give you a turn at the bat. 3.45 p.m.

CONSTRUCTION OF THE NATIONAL STADIUM

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Question No. 95 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. James.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would rather have a written reply, because this has gone with the breeze long ago. I will withdraw it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. James has asked to withdraw Question No. 95, and he has been granted permission to do so.

WATER SUPPLY AT ST. JOHN

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Question No. 99 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. John.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On a point of order. Is it, or is it not, the practice that the Chairman of Committees does not take part in debates of the House? That is the practice in the House of Commons, and Mr. Speaker has ruled that, where our Standing Orders are silent, you follow the practice of the House of Commons.

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

Is the Minister aware that grave inconvenience is being suffered by the inhabitants of certain districts

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS rose.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. John is on his feet.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Apparently, to ask the simplest question, and to ask it with a view to getting things straightened out - I have been in this House long enough to know that there was a time when the Speaker used to go and sit in Committees and would

sometimes, very seldom, make a speech. All of that was stopped, because the House of Commons practice stopped that, too. The Chairman of Committees equally does not sit in the House and make a speech, or take part in its deliberations, like asking a question. I merely asked whether, in accordance with His Honour's ruling, where our Standing Orders are silent, you follow the practice of the House of Commons? Are you going to do that, or are we going to ignore that practice?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. Every time I come in here I hear new rules being improvised with the greatest authority and pontification. I would refer the hon. member to 1952 and then in 1955 when the Speaker himself, not in Committee stage, but in Second Reading Bills: one of the Bills was the Contributory Negligence Act, and the other was the Third Party Insurance (Risk) Act. That was round about 1952. On both occasions His Honour the Speaker, who was accustomed, when the Chairman of Committees took over, to come down here and sit down, took part in the debates.

I have never heard any rule; I have never seen it in May's and it certainly is not in Campion's Practice of the House of Commons, and it is not in our Standing Orders that the Chairman of Committees cannot ask a Parliamentary Question, or take part in debates. It certainly is not. If you can find anything, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the Standing Orders, or in any of the authorities, I would be very glad; but I would also like to remind you that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, when he was Chairman of Committees, frequently took part in the debates and he was the greatest question-asker that we had in the House at that time. You can check the records, because I made a study of the questions, and you will find that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph asked more questions than anybody else between 1950 and 1958.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On a point of order. I do not know why the hon. member chose to ignore what was said. It used to be done; I have seen it done over and over again, but I say that a recent ruling of His Honour the Speaker says that where the Standing Order is silent, you go by the practice of the House of Commons. This morning I looked it up in May. If the hon. member has not found it, let him look again. The Chairman of Committees does not take part in debates like an ordinary member. We used to do it. What the hon. member says is for once right as regards our doing it.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to accommodate him, but I would like to know when there was a ruling in the House of Commons that the Chairman of Committees cannot ask a Parliamentary Question, or take part in a debate. I would like to know, because I am always willing to be educated in these Parliamentary matters.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Other members will believe me, but the hon. member is not going to believe me. This morning I checked it in May. Find out the place.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: What I understood the hon. member to say that he checked was that where there is not a specific rule in Standing Orders that we follow the practice and procedure of the House of Commons. I did not understand him to say that May says that the Chairman does not take part.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Who else could say where there is no Standing Order you follow the House of Commons practice, except our Speaker? I said our Speaker, a year or so ago.

Mr. MOTTLEY: In view of the fact that they are two legal luminaries, I would like the Deputy Speaker to check this and tell us the position. As long as I have been in here, it has happened: I have seen the Chairman of Committees and the Speaker taking part in debates as long as I have been in here. You said you have read it this morning. You are a lawyer, and I would like the Deputy Speaker to rule on the matter. The Deputy Speaker is also a lawyer. If you get between two lawyers like this - we are laymen, and we are entitled to have the views of the Deputy Speaker who is also a lawyer. I have seen that done all the time that I have been in this House.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: It is as simple as simple. It has been done over and over again in here. I do not know how I managed this morning not to bring out His Honour the Speaker's ruling in here that where our Standing Orders are silent, we follow the practice of the House of Commons. That, effectively, puts an end to the practice which has taken place over and over again in here. I started out by saying that.

In the days of Sir Harold Austin, not infrequently he used to leave the Chair and go over there and take part and occasionally make a speech. Since then, as the hon. member pointed out, it has happened comparatively frequently. I do not know what happened when I was out of the House. I was not in the House during the intervening period. We had that practice, but the Speaker's ruling that silence in our Standing Orders means that we follow the practice of the House of Commons is all that I am saying. Therefore that practice ought to stop. I will read this for the benefit of the members of the House, and not for the Prime Minister. No matter what I say, he is ready to find something nasty by which to reply. When I told this House that I checked on this this morning he did not believe me, but the rest of you will. This is what is said in May's 16th edition at page 253: Under the heading of impartiality it deals with the duty of the Chairman of Ways and Means and says:

"Impartiality. - The Chairman of Ways and Means during his occupation of that office follows the same tradition of abstention from party controversy as the Speaker."

That is true here, too.

"He no longer exercises the rights of the ordinary Member to participate in debates and divisions of the House. His independence has not the same formal guarantees as that of the Speaker as he is appointed on a motion of a Minister of

the Crown from the supporters of the Government, and is unlikely to be re-elected on a change of Government."

That is true here, too. That is the authority, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

3.55 p.m.

And in the course of this Ruling he said that where our Standing Orders are silent, we follow the practice of the House of Commons; It is as simple as that. What is there to prevent the hon. junior member for St. John from handing his Questions to somebody else?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I know the hon. member well enough. I am never really concerned about what he is saying or what appears to be the occasion when he raises a question. He always has some ulterior motive, and I know what it is. I am not concerned about what a Speaker.....

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am telling you what the ulterior motive is.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, to accuse an hon. member of the House of saying or doing something from an ulterior motive could not be more offensive and unparliamentary, and I ask Your Honour to call on the hon. member to withdraw that remark.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I was trying to attract the attention of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. ^(Asides), I will not be dictated to by any one here. I am waiting to hear the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: The hon. member has accused me of saying something, even apart from making a general observation, of acting from an ulterior motive. That is a gross accusation on the conduct of hon. members of this House. It is not only offensive to me, but it is unparliamentary to accuse hon. members in their parliamentary duties of acting from ulterior motives. I ask Your Honour to call on the hon. member to withdraw that remark.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have the words complained of, and I quote: "I know the hon. member well; he always has some ulterior motive." I regard that as an offence under Standing Order 26 (7) and I ask the hon. senior member for St. John to withdraw the remark.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I withdraw the statement. May I get on now, Sir? What I was driving at just now, is that we have to look at the objectives. The occasion on which the hon. member makes a statement is one thing, but the reason for making it is another. What the hon. member is doing is this: He is saying that the Speaker has given a ruling that where our Standing Orders are silent - I am still on the same point of order - we should follow the practice and procedure of the House of Commons. Nowhere in "May's" the passage that he has just quoted - let

us accept for the sake of argument that the House of Assembly is bound by that, by the Speaker's dictum and by this pronouncement to be general policy in the House of Commons. The position is this; nowhere does it say that a Chairman of Committees does not ask a question or is not entitled to ask a question and get a reply, because the Chairman of Committees is a member of the House. In the same passage of "May's, it says that he has to contest a seat whereas the seat of the Speaker is usually uncontested in the House of Commons. The Speaker, therefore, being in a slightly different position. In this House, the Speaker of the former House who is now the senior member for St. Peter, frequently took part in divisions. What the hon. member is driving at now is this; he wants to carry it further and say that the Chairman of Committees, the Deputy Speaker and the Speaker cannot take part in divisions. Well, the Speaker never does. I want him to know that he is not getting away with it because we do not accept it. I am saying that to say that a person does not enter into Party controversy does not mean that he cannot ask one of his own Ministers as a member representing his constituency, particularly in a House of 24 members only, and where the other representative is a Minister who cannot ask questions. Does it mean that that member, just because he is Deputy Speaker, cannot ask a Parliamentary Question? If we are going by the late practice, if we go by the practice here, the people who asked the most questions during the past fifteen years in this Chamber prior to this Session were the two former Chairmen of Committees, one who is now unfortunately deceased and the other, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. We are now independent; we are free and we are going by our own customs now, not by anybody else's half-baked pronouncements. (Asides) You should be one.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. The Hon. Prime Minister says that I was one of the Chairmen of Committees who asked the most questions in here; yet, I cannot remember if it is he, but the majority of his Party said that when I was in here, I was a dumb man, that I was dead. (Laughter) Whom are we to believe now? Who is lying?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member used to ask written questions, but he did not have the supplementaries.
4.05 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If anybody wants the proceedings of this Chamber between the years 1961 and 1965, he will recall that most of the questions were asked by the then Chairman of Committees, the late Mr. Batson. His Honour the Speaker who was then Speaker of this Chamber never ruled against it and in agreement with page 275 of the 15th Edition of May's, I rule that it is in order for the Hon. Chairman to ask his question.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am not questioning Your Honour's ruling, but I am suggesting that you consult with His Honour the Speaker so that we know where we are, so that there can be no conflict. If there are answers to the Question, as suggested al-

ready to the hon. member, he can ask those Questions. He can go on by the simple expedient of putting them in somebody else's hands as we used to do.

CUTTING OFF OF WATER SUPPLY IN THE PARISH OF ST. JOHN

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

Is the Minister aware that grave inconvenience is being suffered by the inhabitants of certain districts of the Parish of Saint John by reason of the fact that the water supply from the Government Mains is cut off between the hours of 9.30 p.m. and 5.30 a.m. every day?

2. Will the Minister explain the reason therefor and instruct the appropriate Department to take immediate steps to rectify the situation complained of?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 99 asked by the hon. junior member for St. John, is as follows:-

"(a) Yes, Sir! It is the practice to shut off water at night during the low rainfall season in order to retain a reserve in the Golden Ridge Reservoir, which supplies the districts under reference.

(b) It is expected that the drilling work in progress in the Applewhaite well will result in an improved supply of water to certain districts in St. John."

TRANSFER OF INMATES OF THE ST. JOSEPH INFIRMARY

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Question is No. 107 and that stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph.

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

1. Is it a fact that it is the intention of this Government to transfer the inmates of the St. Joseph Infirmary to the St. Thomas and St. Lucy Infirmaries?

Well, Sir, now that I have got the question, I would have to make a pause here. The inmates have been transferred and everything; so I am not going to worry with this Question because the Government did what they like and have now come in here and given me the answer to this Question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is that the question?

Mr. SMITH: Only to get the reply and to get some sport or something, I will ask the question.

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. Is it a fact that it is the intention of this Government to transfer the inmates of the St. Joseph Infirmary to the St. Thomas and St. Lucy Infirmaries?

2. If the answer is "Yes", will the Government consider the inconvenience and embarrassment that will be caused to the said inmates and relatives due to the unnecessary removal of the said inmates to such an unreasonable distance from the parish of St. Joseph, and refrain from doing so?

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

1. The closure of St. Joseph Infirmary is in keeping with the Government's plan for the reduction and amalgamation of Infirmaries and for the improvement of the health and welfare services being provided for destitute, aged and infirm persons.

2. It is not expected that inconvenience or embarrassment will be caused to the inmates of St. Joseph Infirmary or their relatives by improved accommodation elsewhere.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this removal, is the Government effecting a saving, and if so, how much you are saving monthly?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The removal, Mr. Deputy Speaker, has not long taken place, and we are not in a position to say exactly what savings have been effected, but the object of the amalgamation and reduction of these infirmaries is to provide a better service and to effect savings. I would like also to mention that the Replies to these Questions were laid since 7th February and notice was given of the fact. This is the first opportunity I have had of giving replies.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Would the Minister agree that there is in fact some strain on the accommodation in the St. Thomas' Infirmary, and that a recent inspection by the Ministry has revealed that all is not well exactly as it should be? If he agrees, will he give an undertaking that this will be put right at the earliest opportunity?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I would like the hon. member to be more specific. He said that all is not well, but I do not quite understand what point the hon. member is driving at. I would give him this bit of information. The Chief Public Health Assistant Officer reported, on being interviewed on this matter, that the inmates of St. Joseph's Infirmary expressed their willingness to be accommodated elsewhere, and it has been stated also that of the 16 inmates housed at St. Joseph only two received regular visits from their sons who had no objection to the transfer; so that to suggest that the inmates are unwilling to go or to cause any embarrassment of that kind is not really the case.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Can the Minister state how many have gone and how much additional space has been added at the St. Thomas' Infirmary building?

Mr. SMITH: Will the Minister state if any of the St. Joseph's inmates have gone to the St. Lucy's Infirmary?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I am not aware of that, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. SMITH: Since the Minister does not know how many have gone down there, is the Minister aware now that the space at St. Thomas' Infirmary is limited, and the inmates are being bundled up down there on each other?
4.15 p.m.

Mr. St. JOHN: Will the Minister state whether any structural alterations were made to the building housing the St. Thomas' Infirmary, particularly whether any increased sanitary facilities were done?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Before the Minister answers that, this would have to be one. Is there a water borne system of sewerage at the St. Thomas' Infirmary for the use of inmates? If so, is there further accommodation provided due to the increased number of inmates? In simple Bajan parlance, is there a water closet, and if so, have you put in more bowls and seats for the increased number of inmates that you have there?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I know that a house is to be built for the Matron, and I would expect that the toilet and sanitary facilities would be extended in keeping with the facilities at St. Lucy's Infirmary where a similar thing was done. We take particular pains to see that the necessary sanitary arrangements are made and that toilet facilities and baths are available, and we have done that in all of our various infirmaries, and in the various transfers we have looked into that question. I am of the opinion that a similar thing has been done at St. Thomas. If it is not so, I will investigate it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not like to ask the hon. member too many questions, but is it the policy of the Government in view of the fact that these are aged infirm people to provide hot water for bathing? He can ask me anything, because they were provided at the St. Michael's infirmary.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: That is being done at the St. Lucy's Infirmary, and a bath tub too.

Mr. SMITH: In view of the fact that the Hon. Minister is not sure about how many inmates have gone to St. Lucy, will the Hon. Minister have an investigation carried out at St. Thomas' Infirmary for the sole purpose of finding out the bad arrangements and bad living and sleeping conditions up there, and report back to this House the findings?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would be quite willing to do that; but if he wants he could ask a substantive question along those lines, and I could probably give him all the information; but in any case I will make the investigation and let him know exactly what is the position.

QUESTION re DISTRICT "D"
MAGISTRATE'S COURT

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Question No. 114 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas.

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

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. Is the Government aware that the need for improved accommodation for the Magistrate's Court of District "D" in the parish of St. Thomas continues to be acute?

2. When will work commence on the replacement of the present Court Room, funds for which have been voted under Head 105 of the Capital Estimates for 1967-68?

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

"Yes, sir.

2. The question of the siting of both of the Courts at District "D" and District "F" is being reviewed and consequently no action has been taken to commence work on the replacement of the present Court at District "D". It is expected that a decision in respect of both Courts will be reached in the coming financial year."

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, can the Minister say which site has found favour as a replacement for District "D"? perhaps that would be anticipating the decision. If he finds it impossible to answer that, could he say what sites are being considered and what representations have the Chief Justice and the members of the Government received in respect of this matter?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If the hon. member would like, and I really mean this seriously, to remind me about this question when we are considering the Estimates next week because I really have not made myself familiar with this matter, I will see that the information is available then.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I may just say so, this is a wider matter than just District "D" and Bissex Hill, because I think the question of a Court in Oistins should also be considered and District "B", because District "B" serves no central population. I hope that the entire matter of Boarded Hall, Bissex Hill, Rock Hall will all fall to be discussed in the Estimates next week.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I said just now, I did not have chance to peruse the Estimates, but I am asking the Hon. Minister in view of the fact that the living conditions at District "F" are very bad, if any decision has been arrived at for its removal, and when.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I think I can certainly answer the first part of the question by saying "yes". As to when, I cannot tell the hon. member, but I know that the proper authorities, including the Attorney General and other interested people, have been very actively considering the removal of District "F" Court. I know this to be a fact.

QUESTION re NEED FOR COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Question No. 116 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. James.

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

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. Is the Minister aware that there is a need for a Comprehensive School to serve the pupil population of the Northern parishes of the Island?

2. Will the Minister consider the construction, at the earliest possible time, of such a school, to be sited in the parish of Saint James, preferable at or near Folkestone, Hometown?

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

"1. The Minister is aware of the needs of the pupil population of the northern parishes as he is of the needs of the pupil population of the Nation as a whole.

2. Consideration is being given to the construction of a Comprehensive School in the parish of St. James as part of the Development Plan 1968-1972. Construction will commence at the earliest possible time within the context of the national educational needs and it will be sited in the most convenient spot in relation to feeder schools."

QUESTION re DOMESTIC CLASSES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Question No. 124 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas.

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

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

1. Will the Minister responsible make an investigation as to why a request from 30 ladies resident in Redmans Village area in the parish of St. Thomas addressed to the Ministry of Education on August 19, 1967, asking for the opening of Domestic Classes at Welches Combined School, St. Thomas was not acknowledged by the Ministry until December 28, 1967?

2. Will the Minister see that such classes are started as soon as possible?

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

"1. An investigation was made before the reply dated 28th December was sent and the Minister does not consider any further investigation necessary.

2. Any extension of the provision of domestic science training courses will be determined in accordance with priorities arising from study of the overall needs of the Island. Accordingly, this Ministry cannot at this stage undertake to arrange for classes in Domestic Science at Welches Mixed School."

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, will the Minister agree that it was an act of gross discourtesy to the thirty ladies and to their Parliamentary representative who forwarded their request not to reply with a letter for five months?
4.25 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I concede, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the young ladies definitely had cause for complaint, but I do not think that any discourtesy was intended. The hon. member knows, as well as I do, how these things happen. To imply that a discourtesy was intended just is not so. I believe that both the Minister and his staff sincerely regret that it took such a long time to answer the letter.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Will the Minister say if 30 young men had written this letter in, would he have taken so long to reply?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, does the Minister regard it as a coincidence that the same Ministry that takes six months to answer a letter is the same Ministry that takes twelve months to answer a Parliamentary Question? Is it a coincidence, or incompetence?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I cannot answer that at all. I think the hon. member is certainly right to be aggrieved at the fact that a reply was not given promptly when it was expected. I do not think, as I said before, he should read more into this than there is. It is regrettable that these things happen, and that correspondence with Government Departments is not expedited. Nobody would condone this, but I do not think you need think that there is anything sinister in it. It is just one of those regrettable things that ought not to happen, but which, in fact, happen.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Is the Minister's reply about regrettable a synonym for incompetence?

Mr. St. JOHN: Will the Minister undertake to see that all Departments of the Government are informed of the need to reply promptly to correspondence by M.P.'s concerning their constituents? That would save a lot of time.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, has there been a change of policy relating to the opening of domestic classes since the change at the Ministry itself? The answer which we have received today, second-hand via the Hon. Leader of the House, is not the kind of answer that he was giving on domestic classes a year ago. Has there been a change in policy?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have no reason to believe that there has been any change of policy. I think the hon. member will agree that it is for the Ministry itself to evaluate its own work and its own programme and, without prejudice to anybody, to say where it will replace a given facility, and no question of discrimination need arise in that kind of decision. It is for the Ministry to say what its own programme should be, having regard to its work and its development in the entire Island.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Is the Minister aware that Redmans Village is the fastest growing area of St. Thomas; that 30 is a very large number of ladies to sign their names to a petition for domestic classes; that there are no domestic classes readily available for persons who live at Redmans Village, and that the provision of domestic classes serves a generally useful purpose in a unified community such as Redmans Village and its environs?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I am not aware of the first three questions, but I certainly agree with him in the latter. What I can do is to undertake to draw to the attention of my colleague all the points which he has made as to the desirability of quick action in this matter, and convey the hon. member's desire in this respect. More than that I cannot undertake to do.

RE-LETTERING OF MONUMENT AT HOLETOWN

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Question No. 129 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. James, but I do not see him in his place.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the junior member for St. James:

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Will the Minister, now that the tourist season is in full swing, take immediate steps to have the inscription on the monument at Hometown, St. James re-lettered?

I am told that it has already been done.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the answer is that the inscription on the monument at Hometown has been re-lettered. Unfortunately, the reply was ready, I believe, a few weeks ago, but we have not had Question Time.

ROADS NEAR THE PLAYING FIELD AT THORPE'S HOUSING AREA

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Question No. 131 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. James.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the hon. junior member for St. James;

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Is the Minister aware that the roads and byways near the playing field at Thorpe's Housing area, St. James, are in urgent need of repair?

Will the Minister have the said roads and by-ways repaired and re-surfaced as soon as possible?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The reply is as follows:-

1. Yes, Sir.

2. Consideration will be given to the repair of these roads when the 1968-69 road works programme is being prepared.

EMPLOYMENT OF VISITORS AT HOTELS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Question No. 136 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. James.

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

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

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

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

1. No, Sir.

2. Does not arise.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to enquire from the Leader of the House if he tried to find out, or carried out any sort of investigation?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I regard that as being a very fair question, because, had I myself not seen the report, I would never myself have believed it. It appears from the information here that the Chief Immigration Officer reported as follows:

"I have had enquiries in this matter conducted throughout the Island. No instance of the employment of any visitor to the Island at a hotel at which he or she is or was a guest without the necessary work permit has been found."

This is what I have been informed, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, would the Hon. Leader of the House say how long ago was such a report made?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member asked his Question on the 23rd January, as far as I can see, and this report came in on the 14th February, 1968.
4.35 p.m.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before this matter is thoroughly investigated, can the Minister perhaps get a proper legal opinion as to

whether there is such a thing in Barbadian law as a work permit and what it means?

SYSTEM OF SELECTING STAFF AT THE SCHOOL MEALS CENTRE

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Question is Question No. 140, standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

1. What is the system of selecting staff for employment at the School Meals Centre under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Education?

2. Is it a fact that the Minister of Education enjoys a "prerogative" of making recommendations of persons for consideration for such employment?

3. Has the Minister of Education or his immediate predecessor ever made specific recommendations for the employment of persons in the School Meals Service?

4. Will the Government take steps in future to stop or prevent such Ministerial recommendations as referred to in paragraphs 2 and 3 above so as to avoid the accusation of political favour in the dispensation of the taxpayers' money?

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

1. Appointments to the staff for the School Meals Service are made by the Chief Personnel Officer on behalf of the Governor-General from names submitted by the Minister of Education after consultation with the members of the committee which may from time to time be concerned with the processing of applications.

2. Yes.

3. The Minister and his predecessor in exercise of the responsibility, made specific recommendations in accordance with the method set out in 1.

4. The Government has no intention at the present time to depart from the system as set out in 1.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the Minister admitting that the Ministers of the Democratic Labour Party Government have the prerogative and the right to appoint persons to positions unestablished it is true, to the Government service? Is that what he is saying?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes, that is what I am saying, because my answer is based on the qualification which he has put into his Question - unestablished, it is true.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, let us get it quite clear; let us get it absolutely clear

as it is the first admission. The Government is saying that the Minister personally is choosing persons to work on the unestablished positions in the Civil Service.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The Minister is not saying that; the Minister is saying that appointments to the staff are made by the Chief Personnel Officer acting on behalf of the Governor-General from names submitted by the Minister after consultation with the members of the Committee which may from time to time be concerned with the processing of applications. That is what I am saying.

Mr. St. JOHN: Can the Minister tell us if there is any incident that the Chief Personnel Officer did not accept the recommendations of the Minister?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I do not know of any incident during my time.

Mr. St. JOHN: In your time did the Minister recommend a lady known as Norma Jackman?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If the lady was appointed, certainly.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: What is the Minister's answer to the accusation of political favour in the dispensation of the taxpayers' money in this respect? Will he agree that political favour is shown?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No, I do not agree at all.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Will the Minister accept that the only public qualification of Miss Norma Jackman for appointment in the School Meals Service - she is a very pleasant lady, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not saying a word against her - but the only public qualification is her standing in the Democratic Labour Party?

Mr. MOTTLEY: It is not only for political favour in respect of that lady. Everybody knows. *(Asides)* I am not saying anything. I am a serious man in this matter. If you are saying that you can appoint them, what is wrong with saying that you appoint them for political favours? Something may be wrong in appointing them for other favours. The Minister will agree with me. But for political favours, what is wrong? We know that you are doing it. This is one time that the Minister has made an honest, straightforward statement. If you had said that you are not appointing them to the unestablished staff, I could tell you that that is not true; but you honestly said that you are appointing them. I see nothing wrong with that because if I were appointing them, I would appoint them for political favours too. But I do not see that you should have the right to appoint them.

Mr. St. JOHN: Will the Minister state if there are any other Departments of Government in which casual employees are appointed on the recommendation of the appropriate Minister by the Chief Personnel Officer?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: This I do not know.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Will the Minister consider whether or not we may be introducing the spoil system into Barbados and if so, whether it is indicated to these employees that they stand to be dismissed if they were appointed for political favour?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I do not agree that we are introducing the spoil system, and I can only imagine that these employees would be dismissed if they were not satisfactory. I cannot think of any other reason.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, can't the Minister understand that the corollary to political appointments is political dismissal? Is the Minister completely absent of political common-sense? Are you going to have these employees appointed to the School Meals Service, say that you do it, in effect, for political favour - the Minister of Agriculture asks what is wrong with that? Are they not made to understand what the spoil system is? If a politician appoints you, when he goes out of office you go out too. Is the Minister going to admit of this situation or does he realise that that is what has happened?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If the hon. member wishes to tell me that with a change of Government this could happen, I am willing to hear him. I did not know that these employees would be dismissed for that reason. *(Asides)* I would have thought that any succeeding Minister, whether he be of this Party or of another one, would examine this sort of thing on its merits and would either (a) decide to maintain the system which he found or (b) change it. I did not know that it would be incumbent on me or on my colleague to give notice to the people in the employ of the School Meals Service that if the Labour Party came into power or any other Party for that matter, they are liable to be dismissed. I thought that they would be dismissed for incompetence or for some such thing, but not because they were appointed by us.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Does the hon. member not see that appointment by the "Dems" under the spoil system is equivalent to appointment by incompetence, and that therefore any succeeding Government would dismiss them not merely because they were appointed by the "Dems" but because they were appointed, however incompetent, by the "Dems"?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No, I do not think so. This opens a lot to us now. When Mr. "Freddie" Miller used to say that if the Barbados Labour Party came back into power, he would break up the pots and pans, I took it as a joke, but now I see that he was right. 4.45 p.m.

Mr. St. JOHN: Will the Minister state whether the Public Service Regulations made by the Governor-General under the Public Service Commission Act authorises the Chief Personnel Officer to accept recommendations of a Minister?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I really cannot tell. All I know is that this is the decision which the Cabinet took at the establishment of the Pilot Scheme and that is the policy which is now in operation.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: You will agree that this is a new departure in Government appointments and, further to that, in view of the reply to the last supplementary, is the Minister saying that the Cabinet took a decision on appointments to the Public Service - is the Minister saying that he, a responsible Minister, was ignorant of the Public Service Regulations?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No. It is not that at all. All I am saying is that I understand from the hon. members opposite that they are saying if they were in power, they would not appoint to any such post or posts people who supported them, no matter how competent they were. That is how I understood them.

Mr. St. JOHN: Will the Minister state whether this procedure has been questioned by the Chief Personnel Officer or by the Public Service Commission?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Never, to my knowledge.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I have had the occasion to put this question to him before. Does the hon. member think that he is talking to mentally retarded children? Nobody on this side has suggested that you fire anybody from a job merely because the Dems - I used the expression "merely because the Dems appointed them." If the Labour Party or any other Government see an efficient man, could we suggest that he should be fired merely because he was appointed in a way that somebody else was not appointed? But if you find an inefficient man, of course your duty is to fire him. We are talking about people taken on now - it would be out of order to say the office in the Other Place - really because they either put money in the coffers of the Dems or because they are the friends, the sisters or the brothers-in-law of some member of the Dems.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Can the Minister understand the position in which he has put all Ministers? For ever and ever in Barbados in any Party this system has to be continued. That is what I am getting at. Can the Minister understand when it becomes known that the Government is responsible for appointments to a particular part of the Government service that, first of all, when somebody else is not appointed it is only the Government Ministers themselves who can be blamed or will be blamed by the electorate? That is something to be deplored by all of us because Mr. Speaker, already is not the Minister aware that people cannot get in the School Meals Service because of political spite? Is not he aware of that?

This is something which can happen to him, and if we continue with the system it would happen to us. Can the Minister understand the dangers involved to themselves and everybody in any system of political appointments in the Public Service? I do not expect the Minister of Agriculture to understand it, but I be-

lieve with the Leader of the House's experience of seeing other Parliamentary systems at work, he should be the first to know that a Minister take an incredibly dangerous system on his back when he starts dispensing the taxpayers' money politically. Those who do not get blame the Ministers, and those who get would be all too ready to sell out the Minister if they think the Government is going to be changed.

Can the Minister make some approach to this problem on the basis of reason, agreement and intelligence?

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, would the Minister be able to state if there are any qualifications by way of supervisory posts or kitchen cook or a maid in order to get into the School Meals Service? In view of the fact that there is a Hotel Training School which turns out such people, would the Minister say whether these people are given priority?

Mr. St. JOHN: Can the Minister say whether advertisements or public notices are put in any journal so as to notify applicants from a broad number of people with the requisite qualifications? Will the Minister state what were the qualifications he demanded when he made the regulations to appoint the people whom he appointed?

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to ask just a supplementary so that the Minister would be able to answer all at the same time. Would the Minister tell us how many persons are involved?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would just like to draw to the attention of the hon. senior member for the City that Standing Order 26 still exists.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Yes. I can get rude because I have been in here a long time.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is that a supplementary?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Yes, it is a biting one. I have been in the Opposition all my life and I joined the Minister in the Opposition when the Barbados Labour Party formed the Government. I joined the Minister when we attacked the Government by saying that they did this sort of thing with respect to the Housing Authority. Would the Minister say that that is not true? Now having joined you to attack them with this, do you think it is fair and correct now to do it?

The same thing you preached against when you were in the Opposition. You said that they were doing it in the Housing Authority. Do you think that it is a right thing to do now? All appointments must go to the Public Service Commission, but the appointments which are being created specifically for people at big salaries, those appointments cannot be made without causing confusion.

I still have not reached the age when I have to stay at home all nights now. Quite a number of people who are appointed accommodate Ministers at night when they are unable to get home.

The question which I am posing is that having been in the Opposition and opposed it when we thought it was being done by the last Government, I can do nothing more than to oppose this being done by them and I gather that it is being done.
4.55 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are four supplementaries with which I have to contend and my memory is very sketchy. The hon. senior member for Christ Church asked about advertisement. Yes, there was initially advertisement, but what we have discovered at least up to the time that I left the Ministry is this: that you had and continually had such a long accumulation on the waiting list, the practice being for persons interested in this kind of work to come into the Ministry of Education, take a form, fill it out, send in that filled-in form with testimonials get put on a waiting list and ever so often be interviewed by the Application Processing Committee, so that if there was a vacancy anywhere now, it would not be necessary to advertise for it. What you would do, Mr. Deputy Speaker, would be to take up the waiting list and interview the required number of people or rather more than you wanted, and on the basis of the recommendations of the Committee, the Minister would proceed to make the appointment. At least this is what I have experience of; so that I do not think you could hold it against the system merely because you did not advertise. There was no point in advertising if you have a waiting list of 100, 80, 120 or 150 people, and you do not want people so often that that waiting list becomes exhausted.

The hon. senior member for St. James asked about qualifications and experience. The practice is in interviewing people to ascertain their level of competence and their experience in this kind of work. Most people who have been to the Housecraft Centre and who have done well there have the best chance. This has been my experience, although in some cases what I call qualifications have been placed against experience and *vice versa*. With respect to the question about the Hotel Training School, the School Meals Service was of course established before the Hotel Training School begun, and the training given at the Hotel Training School is not precisely what is required in bulk school feeding, although a person who has been trained at the Hotel School could in time become very expert in this other field, but we would not actually ask a person who has been trained as a waiter or a barman. If a person had been trained as cook or chef, he would be a person suited for this kind of work, provided the training had to do with bulk feeding and not with specialised cooking.

The hon. junior member for St. Peter asked about the persons involved. With the expansions which have recently taken place, I would think that this must be about 100 or 120 people. I speak under correction. It could not be many more than 100 people all told.

There was one other Supplementary. There is the one from the hon. senior member for Bridgetown, the point that we are doing something which we con-

demned them for doing. This is not strictly true. The position is this: The School Meals Service - I do not need to beat around the bush with this - is particularly a project of the Democratic Labour Party which we had instituted in the teeth of the most bitter and most determined opposition. In late 1962 or early 1963 when we were establishing the pilot scheme, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it was my recommendation to the Cabinet that the post should not be established. At any time that it wishes to, presumably my successor could if he wishes, make a contrary recommendation to the Cabinet that the posts be established. If the Cabinet were to establish the posts, the responsibility of the Minister for making appointments would cease forthwith. This is quite clear; but as long as the posts are not established, and the Cabinet decision of 1963 that this procedure should be followed still stands, the Minister will exercise this responsibility.

Speaking for myself, I do not know of any occasion in which I have gone against the recommendation of the Processing Committee or that I have interfered unduly or even duly with the recommendations coming up to me. It could well be that the recommendations coming up were precisely what I expected, but that is not to say that I asked for them or influenced them in any way, and I am sure hon. members opposite when they have experience of this kind of thing will not blame this Government too much, and will find that they themselves are not really averse to this kind of procedure, because it does not do any harm and might easily do a lot of good.

QUESTION re PENSIONS FOR MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Question No. 149 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas.

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

"To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

Will the Government take urgent action on the report of the Select Committee of this Hon. House on the payment of pensions to members of Parliament and Ministers of the Crown?"

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

"The Government is willing to act on the recommendation of Parliament after the report of the Select Committee has been debated."

I wish to say to hon. members in extension of what I have just said, as I said a few weeks ago in a matter like this, it would be in my view grossly improper for the Cabinet to take the initiative. When the House makes its pleasure known, the Cabinet will accept the recommendations of the House whatever the recommendations are, and therefore a motion from either side of the House, though outside of the Ministerial circles, would be supported. I thought hon.

members would understand this, but we cannot take the initiative because it is a matter for the House to declare its pleasure.

QUESTION *re* PARADE AREA
AT GARRISON SAVANNAH

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Question No. 150 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Question reads as follows:

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. Is the Minister responsible for the Barbados Regiment aware that, notwithstanding the recent resurfacing of a part of the Barrack Square at Regimental Headquarters, the Barbados Regiment is still without proper facilities for holding large parades?

2. Will the Minister take steps to improve the Regimental Parade area on the Garrison Savannah whether by filling and draining or by providing a hard surface?

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

"1. Yes, sir.

2. As stated previously in reply to the Question No. 82 given to the Hon. Member on 29th August last year, it is intended to provide an adequate parade area for the Regiment."

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, wouldn't the Minister agree that the reply to Question No. 82 related to the barbergreening of a part of the Barracks square? Let him get the reply out of the file. The reply to question No. 82 did not relate to any hard surface or training on the Garrison Savannah; the reply related to Barbergreening the Barrack square; it related to work to be done, which work has been done since then, and this might be another case of Permanent Secretary incompetence if they think that the two questions cover the same problem.
5.05 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: What he says is true up to a point, but we did say in the reply then that the provision of an adequate parade ground is already receiving consideration.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, at this stage, I am enquiring from the Minister if the cyclostyled reply to my question is ready.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I do not know that. I handed my only copy to the Clerk, and I am even waiting to get that one back.

SUCCESSFUL STUDENTS AT THE
"O" LEVEL EXAMINATION

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: We will now revert to Question 46 which stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter. His query *re* Schools. The question has been answered already, but we are awaiting typed copies of the replies. Question No. 46 was asked shortly after 2 p.m. today, and the hon. senior member for the City asked that typewritten copies of the replies be circulated.

Mr. MOTTLEY: We have not got the information for private schools.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: You have it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Yes, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are there any further supplementary questions?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I can present one fact here regarding St. Gabriel's that is not correct. This is not right. (Mr. HINDS: "My notes say 0 and 5.") The printed copy circulated to us is wrong. You had better amend your copy.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: That is not my fault, and the hon. member will understand this. The original copy is correct, but there has been a typographical error in the cyclostyled copy. It should be "0 for 1965 and 5 for 1966."

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I knew it was wrong because my daughter got 8 subjects in 1966 at St. Gabriel's. This copy has "0" and "0", but it should be "0" and "5".

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That brings to an end Question Time for today. When the sitting of this Chamber was suspended at two o'clock today the House was in Committee. It now reverts to its business in Committee.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1967-68 No.48

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Speaker never leaves the Chair with a member addressing him. If, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I had not known you so well, I would say some very uncomplimentary things and, possibly, some very rude things on my feet. As long as the Speaker is not out of the Chair, if he puts a question or not, and a member is on his feet the Speaker should not ignore him.

Mr. SMITH: On what is he talking?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not care what the hell I am talking on. I am entitled to be heard in here.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would expect better behaviour from the hon. senior member for the City. When the House was suspended the hon. senior member for St. John was speaking. He may do so now, if he so cares.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, every member of this House is entitled to a certain amount of courtesy.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: If the hon. member has some specific point, I am quite willing to give way. We are in Committee, and I have the right to speak. How can two of us speak at the same time?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There are two hon. members on their feet. I will ask both of them to sit. The hon. senior member for St. John will now proceed. 5.15 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, when the House was in Committee of Supply, I was explaining the procedures of Government expenditure, because loud accusations were made by the hon. members on the other side that..... *(Asides)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would expect the hon. senior member for the City to observe Rule 29 (6).

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I was explaining in answer to - I would not like to call them questions - the rather insulting remarks made on the other side that the Government expenditure in respect of water services had risen spectacularly during the past years under Head 106 of the Capital Estimates over and above the million plus dollars that the Government had projected during the financial year 1967-68. *(Asides)* Can I be heard in silence, Sir? The Standing Orders apply to all hon. members of the House. That is how I understand it, Sir. They do not apply to the Government alone or to the Opposition alone, and therefore I expect them to observe them on that side and we will observe them on our side. *(Asides)* I can have the question put if hon. members do not want to listen; it is all right with me. The hon. senior member for the City said that you can put the question.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Head 36...

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am still on my feet, man. *(Laughter)* . I beg your pardon, Mr. Chairman; that was only an aside.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not take asides when an hon. member is on his feet. *(Laughter and Cheers)*

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I think that out of courtesy to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph who did appear to ask questions and not to deliver a harangue, I should explain what the procedure has been in relation to this vote. I am not going back over the Capital Estimates of over \$1 million in contrast to \$550,000 in 1965-66. Obviously, when you are extending main services, the ancillary services increase, because you just do not extend water mains without extending them for the purpose of having branch mains and so on. The increase under this

Head 36 - I am not now dealing with the Capital Estimates - as far as I remember, was only \$31,200 over last year's vote, whereas the increase on capital account - I think the Standing Orders apply to the Officers of the House too, Sir. The increase in the current year's Estimates from over last year was only \$31,000, whereas the increase on capital account was of the order of over \$300,000, so that if you work out the ratio, you will see that there was an under-estimation of what the expenditure - extensions and so on - would be.

The amount voted under Mains, Hydrants and Standpipes is independent of the amount voted under the Capital Estimates for the sort of major development programme for the Waterworks. For the plumbing which is fully recoverable, \$401,800 was voted and the increase anticipated at the time when the Chief Engineer wrote in was 50% over what we estimated. But that is not surprising because if you compare \$600,000 with \$1 million, you will see that the increase is a considerable amount, which is of the order of 60% over the previous year. When hon. members say that the money was spent, that is not accurate, because on the 17th November, the Chief Engineer of the Waterworks said this:

"The expenditure on plumbing cannot be predicted with accuracy since, besides plumbing, attention is paid to applications for new service connections as well as new mains for development projects." There has been a heavy expenditure on development projects this year, not by the Waterworks, but we have had about five or six apartment hotels, new housing projects, and so on, going up during the financial year, which, of course, hon. members can see in driving around the country. The Chief Engineer continued: "and there is every indication from enquiries received and estimates given that this will continue. The provision of \$200,000 as requested will permit installations and repairs to continue at the present rate."

That is what the Chief Engineer said in November. In other words, if they went on at the present rate without getting this \$200,000 he anticipated on the 17th November that he would run out of money. That is the submission made to the Ministry. The matter then went before the Cabinet, and I can accurately say that the vote had not been overspent at the 17th November, and will illustrate that it is not even overspent now, because of the way in which the Waterworks is financed. The matter went to the Ministry, it eventually reached the Cabinet on the 11th January, and it had to go to the Finance and various Sections to be checked. The decision was made in the Cabinet to go to the House for the supplementary vote on the 11th January this year. (Mr. MOTTLEY: We are going to pass it.) If they ask questions and make accusations against the Government, I will show you how ridiculous these accusations are about the Government spending money. In the first place, it is the Engineer of the Waterworks Department who lays out his programme and he knows and the Permanent Secretary will know, as Accounting Officers, that they cannot spend the money unless they have it. The

Accountant General does not certify expenditure unless he is satisfied that there is money left in the allocation.

5.25 p.m.

The Chief Engineer of the Waterworks acted quite promptly in this matter in that he applied to the Ministry when he realised that at the current rate of the expenditure, his money could not last until the end of the year. He applied on the 17th November, when the financial year was two-thirds of the way, for a supplementary vote because of this rush for new apartment buildings, and so on, when people were getting ready for the tourist season. He was anxious to get on with the job because of this.

Now there is a section in the Waterworks Department known as unallocated stores. Let me explain that. According to procedure laid down by the Accountant General - if hon. members listen they would not get up and make foolish statements about public officers and the Government - there is a section in the Waterworks Department that deals with unallocated stores and it is under the control of the Accountant General for very obvious reasons. You have to order Iron Pipe and so on in advance. You cannot say that this eight feet of pipe which I have here is for Bowmanston and this Tee which I have here is to go down at the Deep Water Harbour.

What you do is to keep a stock pile and inventory. That has \$300,000 worth of unallocated stores not specifically appropriated to any particular job. This is how members got confused and said how can you spend \$200,000 in a matter of four weeks. I am not going to say that we are going to spend all that money. He has to go to the Accountant General on this unallocated stores account and say, "I have drawn off so much for certain projects which have to be carried on." If those buildings are to be completed on schedule, whether they are the Financial Buildings, a hotel or otherwise, or whether those buildings are going to be capitalised work, he has unallocated stores.

Now, what the Chief Engineer can do is this, as he did in this case. He drew on his unallocated stores; so he has to reimburse his unallocated stores. This is all under Waterworks. At the end of every month he charges to the vote the amount of unallocated stores he has drawn out and he accounts for this to the Accountant General.

When he got to the end of these votes under 35 and 36, he ran out in December of money; so he had to stop there. But had the Resolution come down to the House before the end of December, the work would have been proceeded. So he drew on unallocated stores to the amount of \$401,800. That he did under the provision, and when he got to the end of that, he had to stop that work.

What I am illustrating is this. He can very well work the day after the Senate approves of this Resolution because he does not now have to send to England, Germany or any other place to order mains. He

can go now to the unallocated stores and draw the mains against this vote. His labour costs have been carried out, but he has now reached the end of his funds for labour. That may be where the hon. senior member for St. James complained that people have had to be laid off. There has been a hiatus of some five weeks before the matter came up, but that is the way the Government machinery works.

Now I am not in a position to say whether all of this money would be spent before the end of the financial year, but we cannot go back and bring fresh calculations. If it is not spent, it would lapse at the end of the financial year. It took five weeks to get to the Cabinet in the first place. It took another four or three weeks to get from the Cabinet Office to the House for a variety of reasons. It has taken us two weeks to get it debated. We cannot go back and ask them to make a calculation of how much money you can spend between now and the end of the month. We have to get on with the job.

The unallocated stores ran out. The \$300,000 as stated would be exhausted, but it is money under this vote which has been exhausted. However, since the Cabinet gave consideration to this on the 11th January - and I must explain this to the House - in order to finish off jobs which were started, the Chief Engineer under the direction given to Department as regards labour costs, has overspent by \$19,000 in the case of Item 34 and \$23,000 in the case of Item 35; but this money was not overspent before the Cabinet's decision was made.

Since the Legislature was invited to deal with it, he completed the jobs which he had in hand and which were urgent. This is something which is accepted once there is a vote in the Estimates for the Head, and the Cabinet says that it would vote for the supplementary. Once there is urgent work to be done, it is the practice to allow them to do so once they have some other funds that they can draw on and those other jobs are not priority jobs. They are allowed to use those funds until the Legislature makes the provision.

The total provision which we are asking for to-day is \$242,000. Technically, this is not money spent, it is only \$42,000 that has been overspent - \$19,000 in the case of Item 34 and \$23,000 in the case of Item 35. But these are strictly in respect of labour costs to keep the labour employed until these projects are finished or to finish the projects with the available labour. No money has been spent. Stores have been drawn on Capital Account. They had to stop that in December because the Accountant General would not allow them to draw any more, the vote having been exhausted. That is all, Sir.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: We were content to accept the notes to this Resolution while we had our reservations about the competence of the estimating Department. We also have, it appears now, some very founded doubts as to whether some of this money had not already been spent. Nobody, Mr. Chairman, who heard the Prime Minister opening when he said that

the only money overspent was the sum of \$7,000 relating to the Leader of the Opposition, could have believed that when he said so, he was going to admit to an overspending of \$42,000.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Sir. I would like to explain to the hon. member. I never said anything about overspending in respect of the Leader of the Opposition. I said spending for which there was no authorisation. That is a different thing altogether, and I would press the hon. member to see that we were even very reticent on this matter. I have all the relevant data and there are letters in the possession of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition which I advise him to go and read before he reopens this matter. I do not think it is savoury or in the best interest of Parliament to reopen it here.

5.35 p.m.

There is a different thing from having a token vote or a vote and exceeding the vote as in the case of the Financial Building, in contrast to doing something for which there is no authorisation at all. That was the distinction which I was making; so I do not think he ought to press me on that. He had better go and consult with the Leader of the Opposition and let him refresh his memory from certain correspondence, copies of which I have here.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: That may be as it is. I had better advise the Hon. Prime Minister to refresh his memory on the statement he made that not since he has been Minister of Finance were the Leader of the Opposition's journeys to Geneva paid for, because they have not only been paid for.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I said that I was amazed to hear the statement of the I.L.O. because we had never had a request to pay any passage for the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to the I.L.O., neither did we meet any such payment which was a new matter altogether and completely unrelated to what I was referring to, which up to now the hon. member is ignorant of.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let me advise both hon. members that I think that is completely outside the Resolution which is before us, and I would certainly like the hon. member who is on his feet now to get on with the Resolution rather than dealing in personal matters.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: It was presumably just as irrelevant when the Prime Minister raised it, Mr. Chairman, but nobody would believe that the Prime Minister could have evidence of unsavoury dealings by the Leader of the Opposition and wait until March, 1968 to reveal them.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is by the way. Let us get on.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: That is by the way. Mr. Chairman, I listened to the Prime Minister's speech and as far as I was concerned he made a most able speech against passing this Resolution. The only mo-

ment at which I thought there was going to be a break through into rational explanation was when he started to talk about the unallocated stores, and I formed the impression from what he said at first that there was a stock of unallocated stores which could be called on over and above the vote, and I listened carefully, I flipped through the Estimates and the Prime Minister put me right - fact, not put me right because I searched the vote and saw that there was no possibility in any of the votes of there being unallocated stores in the sense of contingency stores. The contingency votes that we find in our Estimates are votes of \$100 and \$150. What the Prime Minister is talking about is no more than a red herring in respect of this item. What he is talking about is the general Waterworks stores, that the Waterworks Department has a store of pipes and mains which is unallocated, because they need to shift them from job to job; so it does not advance us any in this Resolution.

The fact of this Resolution is that the Waterworks Department needed \$200,000 on November 17; they did not get it. They managed to scrape by until now with only overspending \$42,000, but the Prime Minister is saying: "Notwithstanding everything else, please let us pass it even though we know it is going to lapse." (Hon. E. W. BARROW: Don't pass it and see if you will get water in St. Thomas.) The Prime Minister has said not to pass it and see if we will get water in St. Thomas. Well, maybe he wants all the people in St. Thomas not to bathe. Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, the debate has come down to a level where the facts have been revealed. The things that we were worried about have every single one been proved well-founded, that the money is not needed now, that this is more than is needed, and in fact some has already been spent. These are the arguments on this side relating to the actual Resolution. This is what we have said; and look at all the vilification. He talks about vituperation and vilification; look at the vituperation and vilification that the Leader of the Opposition had to face before the Prime Minister could finally come out and do a better job than the Minister of Communications. If for no other reason, I would be glad that he is away because at least I could say this: if the Prime Minister has not made up his mind to conceal the facts, presumably he will be able to at least to read the file and we can deduce what the facts are from what he reads out. Personally I cannot deduce even what the words are when the Minister of Communications reads out something, because what with the match-sticks in his mouth and the matches inside his head instead of the brain.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, that is not related or relevant to the Resolution, and I think that hon. members should refrain from attacking other hon. members especially when they are not in their places and are away doing Government Business, because he knows very well that if the hon. junior member for St. Thomas was here, he would not be able to make those remarks and get away with them. He would hear a few home truths. But I am not going to enter into any myths with them. I think that

the hon. junior member for St. Thomas can take care of him.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If there are any other hon. members beside the Prime Minister who think that the hon. junior member for St. Thomas does not keep match-sticks in his mouth, I would like to know who they are, and if they are any who think that he has anything in his head of more value than match sticks, I would also like to know who they are; but I appreciate what he says about the hon. member being absent. (Mr. MOTTLEY: You see you do not have any chin.) I have no chin. He has match sticks enough for all my missing chin. He has enough belly to make up for my chin.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think that is irrelevant to this Resolution.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: It was meant to be an aside, Sir. I am sorry.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not take it as an aside when a member is on his feet.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, everything we have said is true. The money is overspent, all the money is not needed and part of it has already been spent, but we will still vote for it.

The question that Head 36 - Waterworks - stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Resolution was passed.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1967-68 No.48

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the supplementary estimate here is for the sum of \$362,000 for the Development Board. The total amount budgeted for by the Board for the current financial year was \$727,000. We spent money on factories for Husbands Wrought Iron, the Industrial work shops at Pelican Village, a double unit factory at Newton and the International Scientific Factory at Seawell International Airport. Then work was commenced on Issa Nicholas (Barbados) Limited at a cost of \$110,000, and there was another three unit factory at Newton at \$111,000 on which work has not been commenced. We are fast running out of factory space and at the time when this paper was submitted, the amount of \$362,000 was needed for the building of new factories both at the Harbour and at Seawell Industrial Estate. So this amount is, apart from \$25,000 for the purchase of land, entirely in respect of construction of new factories.

Again, Sir, the submission by the Board was made way back in October, and when these things go through the mill it becomes difficult to go back and ask for a revision as we get close to the end of the financial year. I am not quite sure what the procedure is with the Board, whether once we give them money it goes into a Suspense Account and whether they carry over. I have not checked on what their

procedure is, but the chances are that they could not spend this money. However, they have to start construction of these things, because people are, to put it literally, running them down for factory space. It was initiated by the Board on 4th October, and if it had been brought here by the middle or the end of October, the factories probably would have been completed already. Again I will say that it is possible that the amount will lapse, but we do want to get on with the job, and therefore I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, we quite appreciate the fact that factory space is very much in demand, and we feel that it is the duty of the Development Board to hasten to meet the requirements of these industries that would be set up as time goes on, but there is, Mr. Chairman, a situation obtaining in the Development Board and its operation with some of the factories as has happened to the Grazettes Industrial Estate. I want to make a statement here. Mr. Chairman. It is this: the Fire Services were summoned to Grazettes Factory some time last year, and one place where they had to pump off some water was at a factory trading as Cavalier Limited. At Cavalier Limited there was a stock of cloth which did not find a ready market when made into certain garments, and they could not find sale for them. When the Fire Brigade left Cavalier Limited, there was no evidence of cloth having suffered any damage by water.

5.45 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. I must protest. It is true that the hon. member is comparatively new in here, but we must not abuse the privilege of the House by coming here and making statements. In the first place I object because they are irrelevant. What has water poured down in a particular factory on a bolt of cloth to do with this Resolution? In the second place, it is highly contumacious.

Mr. HINDS rose.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The point the hon. senior member for St. John is now referring to, I have just been giving it serious consideration and I have here before me Standing Order 26 (2) which states:

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

That is what I was considering while the hon. member was speaking. I would like the hon. junior member for St. Peter to stick as closely to the Resolution as possible. (*Asides*)

I wonder whether the hon. senior member for St. James would observe Standing Order 29(6). Let the hon. junior member for St. Peter proceed to speak on the Resolution before the House.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I quite appreciate your anxiety and that of the hon. Prime Minister, but I am going to stick to the Resolution. In sticking to the Resolution I must, in duty bound, bring to the notice of this Honourable House a matter such as I will now proceed to refer to, and I will prove to you, Mr. Chairman, the relevance of it. Why does not the Prime Minister sit in his chair and listen to what I have to say?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That part is not relevant to the Resolution before the House.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, the Barbados Development Board has been building factories. A factory was built at Grazettes.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are not now dealing with Grazettes. If the hon. junior member for St. Peter were to read the addendum to this Resolution, he would see that it reads:

"Due to the successful promotional efforts of the Barbados Development Board and the desire to expand on the part of some existing industries....."

I would like the hon. junior member for St. Peter to stick to the Resolution.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I want to confine myself to the Resolution. If I am not to make mention of Grazettes, am I to mention all the names of all the sites of all the Development Board's projects all the time, Mr. Chairman? Nothing is mentioned here about expanding its works at Grazettes, at Newton and at Seawell, etc. Any hon. member is entitled to get up and make reference to the Development Board's projects, whether it be at Grazettes, Gall Hill, St. John, or anywhere else. Mr. Chairman, contain yourself; do not become nervous because the Prime Minister gets up and makes himself.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not nervous; I hope never to be. Let the hon. member proceed with the Resolution.

Mr. HINDS: Do you agree with me, Mr. Chairman, that it being a money Resolution that I am well within my rights to (Asides)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I wonder whether the senior member for the City understands standing Order 29 (6). This debate seems to be taking place between two hon. members: one sitting and one standing.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I would never do anything to interrupt you in the Chair. I was only drawing to his attention to tell you - if you do not mind; I am sorry that you were listening to my asides - that this being a money Resolution, you cannot be interrupting him so. He is a fool if he does not continue to talk on it.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am apologising to you, if you said I interrupted, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I deem you to be completely out of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Don't you want me to apologise to you, Sir?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. junior member for St. Peter continue?

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, at one of the Development Board's factories at Grazettes reports went out to the Fire Services.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have already ruled that that part of the hon. member's speech is irrelevant to the Resolution now under discussion. I have already ruled that.
5.55 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: A building put up by the Development Board and tenanted to people carrying on industries, suffered an inflow of water. This is a building which was put up by the Development Board as a factory in its successful promotion of its efforts. It necessitated the hastening of the Fire Service to relieve the suffering tenants and one might claim that it was faulty construction by the Development Board in its successful promotional efforts; but, nevertheless, it happened that by the Fire Brigade working in this same building set up by the Development Board and tenanted to people carrying on their industry there, the water was pumped off, and at the time of the Fire Service leaving the building - this is the Development Board's building and the Development Board undoubtedly has been conducting, according to the Addendum to this Resolution here, a very successful promotional effort. But we find that when the Fire Brigade left the factory - the Chairman has said that I cannot mention that it was at Grazettes, because I am out of order; we find that when the Fire Brigade left the factory, there was no evidence of damage to any material, but inside the building belonging to the Development Board and tenanted to the people carrying on an industry there, and this is in the very successful promotional development of the Board, the same material which could not find a market here.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Again, the hon. member is trespassing on irrelevancy.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I am just asking you..

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What are you speaking on?

Mr. CRAIG: I am speaking on a point of order. You were there sitting on the day when the Prime Minister brought down here a Resolution for the feasibility studies.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order, and will the hon. member sit down? That is not a point of order. Will you sit down?

Mr. CRAIG: Don't shout at me, Sir.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, with the greatest respect to you, I am saying that whenever something is being suppressed, that is not a remedy.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not here to suppress anything.

Mr. MOTTLEY: But you cannot. I, as a member of this House, am saying that if a member.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to know what the hon. member is speaking on.

Mr. MOTTLEY: As far as I am concerned, we are in Committee and I am on the floor.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member was speaking first.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Suppose he is finished speaking.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not know.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You do not have to know. The hon. member does not have to tell you that he is finished speaking; this is not in the House. He can get up again and again. I am with you, Sir. The hon. member has mentioned Grazettes and he mentioned something about water coming down. The fact that it is being suppressed will make us begin to feel that there is something suspicious. Let him say what he wants to say. He cannot incriminate anybody. The Prime Minister did not go and put out any fire up there. The Prime Minister is not building any house up there, and why can't the hon. member talk about Grazettes and the flooding of the water? I am suggesting to you that you should not suppress it. If the hon. member were to get up here to abuse one of the Ministers behind his back, I know that the Hon. Leader of this House is competent enough to get up and stop him as soon as he hears something said against a Minister or against his character. If the hon. member is saying something which is in the public interest - this is our money, the Development Board is our money and if he is saying something that he knows has happened and something which is entangled with an insurance company, why do you suppress him? I have said today in here and you know me quite well enough - you know that I do not make any accusations against anybody unless I have the facts. I will deal with the Development Board and the slimy nastiness which is going on there very soon. You cannot prevent me from saying that. After all, I have been in business for over thirty years in this town.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. member speaking on the Resolution which is before the House?

Mr. MOTTLEY: What else could I be speaking on? You must contain yourself, Sir. You are in the Chair. All the hon. member has to say is that he has finished speaking and he can get back up again. I appeal to you not to let it appear that you are cloak-

ing up something for the Development Board. The public is bound to feel that way if you do not want the hon. junior member for St. Peter to talk on it. What does the Addendum to the Resolution say? It says: "Part 2 - Capital, Head 106 - Office of the Prime Minister." This is not any money for the Prime Minister; it is under his portfolio and that is all. The Addendum says this:

"Due to the successful promotional efforts of the Barbados Development Board....."

And where the Board got buildings? - Grazettes, Newton, down on the Wharf, Seawell. For God's sake, it is about time that the Clerks who have experience in here and who are trained Solicitors, get up and tell you that the hon. member is entitled to talk on this. I will not stand here and let anybody be suppressed like this. After all, we have certain rights. What does the Addendum go on to say?

"and the desire to expand on the part of some existing industries" they do not tell you where. It could be at Grazettes. The Addendum goes on: "the demand for factory space exceeds that budgeted for by the Board in the current financial year. The sum of \$362,000....." we are talking about money, not buttons. And then it says: "is accordingly required to meet the cost of factory construction and the expansion of industrial estates by the Barbados Development Board." 6.05 p.m.

We do not know if the factory construction is at Grazettes; we do not know if the factory construction is at Seawell; we do not know if the factory construction is at Newton; we do not know where it is. Yet, you are saying that you are not allowing members to discuss this Resolution.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have already asked the hon. senior member for St. James to observe Rule 29 (6). This is the third time I am calling on him to do that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Yes, Sir, I was saying that he is young. The indiscretion of youth is something which even though, Mr. Chairman, you are young you have to put up with. You have not reached my age of maturity yet. I used to be very "hot" in here at one time.

I am telling you, Mr. Chairman, with the greatest respect that it does not say where it is. When a member is being suppressed, I am bound to rise. It is infringing upon the rights of hon. members and I am surprised that the hon. member for Christ Church has not risen on this. You are infringing on the rights of an hon. member.

It is a money Resolution surrounding the Development Board. If he were going to talk on the Hospital or something that happened at the St. Andrew or the St. Peter Infirmary, I would say that you are right; you are perfectly in order; but this is the public Development Board and something that happened with the Development Board.

I suggest with the greatest respect that there is nothing sub judice in Court and he is entitled to talk about how this money is being spent. He is entitled to talk about the Fire Brigade and to talk about everything right down the line. The Development Board paid out money. Do not you think that he is entitled to tell the public of this country - the taxpayers - that it was wrong for the Development Board to pay out this money?

I am going to deal with the Development Board right now. Are you trying to suppress that, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have never tried to suppress an hon. member.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If a statement like that is made, the particular Minister has to make a note of that and to enquire about it. The Government is supposed to be like Caesar's wife - above suspicion. That is the sort of Government which we have. You must be above suspicion. We say that they are above suspicion; but if he finds something wrong with a wing, branch of Government, or a Board, maybe something which they of the Government know nothing about, he is not doing anything wrong to draw it to the attention of the House. He is not accusing a member.

I do not agree with you, Mr. Chairman, and I certainly would not sit here and let you try to suppress him. If it is the last breath that I have, I would defend his right to speak on a money Resolution surrounding the Development Board. He can say that the Development Board is paying out money for insurance which they were not entitled to pay out. This money is paid out and it is a trick; it is a scheme. All of that he can come in here and say. The Minister can reply and say that the statements made by the hon. junior member are absolutely untrue. These are the facts, and so on. I appeal to you, Sir; do not suppress anything.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I merely wanted to tell this House that the Development Board would in future have to be ultra cautious in dealing with some of its tenants. Why do I say so? I say so because the firm of Cavalier Limited requested fire services. It was after the Fire Brigade had done a perfect job relieving the tenants of the Barbados Development Board that you find the Manager of the Development Board being called in, and when the Manager of the Development Board was called in, he was called in to see a quantity of materials soaked and a claim was made, not on the insurance company, but on the Development Board. That is what we are concerned with.

But there is a lot that is going on which would have to be brought to this House about the Barbados Development Board, and you can rest assured, Mr. Chairman, that I believe you would have to jump up in here at Estimates time when we are discussing them to prevent all hon. members on this side from saying what they have to say about the Development Board and its malpractices, because, believe me,

there is hardly anything to which the Development Board has put its hands that can stand the scrutiny to which it ought to be subjected as we would have it on this side of the House.

Rank dishonesty, Sir, from top to bottom in every project with which the Development Board has been associated during the last three years. As a matter of fact, the Board's policy has been such that if you are employed there and you show any semblance of honesty, they get rid of you even if it is by promotion. That is the policy of the Barbados Development Board. I say no more at this stage, Mr. Chairman.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1967-68 No.54

JUDICIARY

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution supplements Head 5 - Judiciary. There are several items of small amounts.

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.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1967-68 No.55

HEAD 25 - POLICE

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, this supplementary is for items under Head 23 - Items 14, 27, 28, 29, 33, 53 etc., along with the new Item 93. I would think that every hon. member would agree that the Addendum gives a tremendous amount of information on all of these items with full notes, as far as I can see. If there are any questions, I would certainly be pleased to answer them.

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.

6.15 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1967-68 No.59

Head 11 - Pensions - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, this supplements Head 11, first of all Item 7 - Widows and Children's Pensions, Item 15 a larger sum, and Item 17 - Ex-gratia Gratuities.

I beg to move that Head 11 - Pensions - stand part.

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

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

Head 15 - Statistical Services - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 15 - Statistical Services - stand part.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Resolution for \$63,901 do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1967-68 No.60

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, this supplementary provision arises because of certain contractual obligations which Government has with respect to the carrying of mails, and more particularly arises out of the increase in salary given by the contractor to the van drivers. It meets the cost of the increase from the period 1st April, 1966 to 31st March, 1968.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is only for a small amount, but it has a bearing on a subject which has caused some concern in the Post Office Department. Now as is known, Mr. Chairman, the mail vans painted "Post Office" or "Her Majesty's Post Office" do not belong to Her Majesty's Government; they belong to the Courtesy Garage. The drivers are paid by the Courtesy Garage, notwithstanding they may wear uniforms. The mail is carried at a price of \$1,500 a month, and there is this clause in the contract saying that the drivers shall be paid in accordance with the usual Public Contract Wage Act; the drivers shall be paid at rates current in similar service in Government employment. Now on behalf of the drivers, all members of this House should take note that this money is back-pay going back to 1st April, 1966. It apparently was overlooked, and these drivers went on driving at \$20.04 a week for a very long time after they were entitled to their back-pay and their increase to \$29. I am a little worried about the arithmetic, because I understand there are five mail van drivers, and I do not see that \$3,604 is going to give five mail van drivers more than \$8 a week going back to April, 1966. If I am mistaken in the number of mail van drivers, I would be glad if the Minister would interrupt me at this point, but my information is that five need to be paid, which is \$40 a week. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that this is too little

anyhow, because if the men are to get \$8 a week more and there are five of them, that would be \$40 a week, there will be vacation pay in addition, and \$40 a week for two years in my calculation is more than \$4,000, and you cannot pay this sum net of income tax; it must be paid to the Courtesy Garage gross of income tax for the Courtesy to deduct the appropriate tax and National Insurance contributions, because it may mean restamping the men's cards at a higher rate; but these are all technicalities. The Minister will no doubt search the file.

What I would like to say is that we support this, but why is it that these men had to wait until now, because this request, I understand, only went up in December? Why did they have to wait until now to get their money? The hon. junior member for St. Thomas, the Minister of Communications, thought that one of them was carrying *Beacon* Newspapers to St. Thomas Post Office, and he chased that man all down in St. Andrew accompanied by a policeman, a Permanent Secretary and the Acting Postmaster General to ask him about a *Beacon* Newspaper for six cents, instead of looking to pay the man the \$8 a week that he was entitled to from 1st April 1966. This is the kind of small-minded Government we are dealing with, and what kind of ignorant persons must there have been in the Ministry who could look through the contract and see that these drivers were being underpaid at the rate of \$8 a week - and they saw it - but they worried more about whether or not the Postmaster General did give permission for the mail drivers to carry *Beacon* Newspapers? I hope that no member will be induced to vote against this Resolution on the basis of the false and wicked accusations which have been made against these mail van drivers and against an honest and decent postman in St. Thomas by the Minister of Communications and Works.

It has been pointed out to me - and I am going to praise the loyalty of the Minister of Agriculture for pointing it out - that the Minister of Communications is not in his place; therefore nothing should be said about him. It is unpleasant, but it has been raised to his face before, and he could not get up and deny anything. All he could say was that the same postman had been moved from delivering mail in Welchman Hall because he, the Minister, is politically stronger in Welchman Hall than he is in other places and he did not want the postman canvassing against him up there. That is all the Minister could say when faced with serious accusations, of a serious attempt to victimise a public servant for his political views. In the Other Place - I am not reflecting on the conduct of members in the Other Place - Senator Phillips was quoted as saying that the Barbados Labour Party has a case to answer over this carriage of *Beacons*. I am the Secretary of the Barbados Labour Party and we have no case to answer. No policeman has called on us for any case to answer. The Minister of Communications has not asked us to answer any case, because we have done absolutely nothing wrong in connection with any business involving Government expenditure under this Head - Annexed Estimates, Post Office, Item 19 - Inland Mails. Let that be absolutely clear. There are things,

Mr. Chairman, on this Item which should be said, about this mail van driver and St. Thomas postman issue. Accusations were made that the *Beacon* Newspapers are being carried by mail vans as if this is something unique. I know of two Post Offices where the *Advocate* Newspaper has been sold, and it used to be delivered to them by mail van; so this is not anything that previous Postmasters have not sanctioned. Up to today I heard of specific sanction given to the carrying of things by mail van. Up to this very day we made an investigation about the carrying of things by mail vans after it was understood that the Postmaster General, following the visit of the four musketeers to the St. Thomas Post Office, gave an instruction to the effect that nothing was to be carried in the mail vans.

6.25 p.m.

The instruction was to the effect that nothing should be carried in the mail vans, and I have discovered that since that date bags of feed have been regularly delivered by the same mail vans. It seems that bags of feed can be carried, but the *Beacon* newspaper cannot be carried. There is some worth in bags of feed which permits them to go by mail vans, but the *Beacon* newspaper cannot go by mail vans!

Just let me say this, Mr. Chairman; the *Beacon* newspaper is delivered by post to a very large number of persons in Barbados, bearing the requisite stamps and everything else. There is no question of evading payment of postage, but the Post Office cannot undertake to deliver *Beacons* in quantity in time for a Saturday distribution - in other words, the day that the newspaper is published. If the Postmaster General has now stopped the circulation of the *Beacon* newspaper by the Post Office, that is not to say that an earlier Postmaster General had not given his permission, in view of the fact that the Post Office could not distribute the *Beacons* ordinarily.

Now, in Another Place Senator Phillips took occasion to say, or to suggest, that the Postmaster General, because he is the son of the hon. senior member for St. Peter, was in some way biased, prejudiced, or otherwise influenced in his actions in this matter. Let me say at once that I am not reflecting on Senator's Phillips' conduct. I cannot reflect on it; therefore, I cannot say it was a disgraceful and unwarranted thing to say, but hon. members will have their own opinion. At least it was not said in this House, and this House was not disfigured by such language in respect of the particular issue.

Mr. Chairman, there are one or two good things about this aspect of the Post Office's case, because it has been made clear from meticulous analysis of the background of Mr. Wiles' work, the St. Thomas postman, and the background of these mail van drivers, that no criminal offence against Civil Service Regulations, no offence of any sort has been committed.

(Asides)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like the hon. senior member for St. Andrew to observe Standing Order 39(6). Let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am only too sorry, Mr. Chairman, to be detaining the hon. senior member for St. Andrew. If he wishes to stay to vote against this Resolution, I can understand it; but I am urging members not to vote against it. He can go, if he so wishes.

Mr. Chairman, on an earlier occasion I revealed in here that I knew that the Attorney - General, the Solicitor - General, the Director of Public Prosecutions, had all advised that no criminal offence had been committed in connection with this matter. Yet, the newspaper reported that the St. Thomas postman would be disciplined. There was a suggestion -- and unfortunately we have to deal with a lot of prostituted journalists sometimes - not at this moment, however - that the poor St. Thomas postman was going to be made to suffer and so on. It was asked of me by persons how I knew that the officials have said that no crime had been committed. Now just for the record let me say this: no Civil Service Legal Officer told me the facts. What I was told about the legal opinions given were not told to me by a Civil Service Legal Officer. You can draw your own conclusions as to who told me, and draw your own conclusions about the sincerity of the Attorney-General's speech, if it was correctly reported in the Other Place on this particular issue.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, I really would like to hear from the Minister, because it does seem to me, from the information I have, that this amount is too small. I cannot move to increase it, of course. I would like to hear from the Minister whether, in fact, the figures are correct, because if it is five mail van drivers it is too small.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, there are four contract mail drivers, and the increased rate of pay would be \$8.58 more per week.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, if it is four mail drivers, then the amount, allowing for holidays, will probably be correct. I think that, probably, the fifth driver is paid by the garage and not by the Government. If it is only four the Government is paying for, then it probably means that the garage has a fifth man which it is paying.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1967-68 No. 61

A Resolution for \$4,000 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, this amount is required to replace a Government Headquarters van, which was involved in an accident. It is a replacement. The insurance amount has already been paid into General Revenue, and this amount is being sought to purchase a replacement. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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