

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 12th November, 1968.

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

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, 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); Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister of Trade, Tourism, Co-operatives and Fisheries); Mr. R. ST.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P.; Mr. L. A. LYNCH, J.P.; Hon. N. W. BOXILL, (Minister of Communications and Works); Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (Minister of Agriculture, Labour and National Insurance); Sir G. H. ADAMS, C.M.G., O.C., B.A., D.C.L. (Hon.), (Leader of the Opposition); Mr. W. C. B. HINDS, Mr. C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P.; Mr. J. B. SPRINGER.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: There are, I am afraid, no Minutes for confirmation.

STATEMENT *Re* STRIKE THREAT BY
HOUSE REPORTERS

I have a statement to make, and I shall proceed so to do now.

Hon. Members may have read, or heard, of an alleged "Strike threat by House Reporters". Facts of the matter are that on 24th July, 1968, as Chairman of the Debates Committee, I was informed by Barbados Workers' Union that the members of the Reportorial Staff of Parliament had joined the B.W.U. which sought recognition for itself as the accredited representative of that body. Recognition, as sought, was granted by the Debates Committee in August, 1968, and at a meeting of Debates Committee on 2.IX.68 the Union's letter was duly considered. On 10.IX.68, another meeting of Debates Committee took place, was attended by Senator Walcott, O.B.E., General

Secretary, B.W.U., and Messrs. Callender, Whittington and Alleyne, Reporters. An exhaustive discussion took place before the meeting was adjourned to 17.IX. 68 when unfortunately there was no quorum. On 3.IX.68, the House had adjourned for its Summer Recess until 29.X.68. A meeting of the Committee fixed for 6.XI.68. was abortive through lack of a quorum. A meeting was summoned last week for 13. XI. 68, consequent upon failure to obtain a quorum on 6.XI.68. However, a letter dated 7.XI.68 (received at House last week-end) from General Secretary, B.W.U., stated *inter alia*: "I was invited to attend two meetings of the Debates Committee and both were abortive through the absence of a quorum. The employees of the Legislature are entitled to proper treatment from their employers -- the Debates Committee, in all matters relating to their employment. I am, hereby, informing Your Honour that the Reporters will not be available for reporting the Debates until the Debates Committee meets the Union to settle this outstanding matter." Yesterday morning at ten o'clock, I issued instructions for summoning a special meeting of the Debates Committee yesterday afternoon. This meeting duly took place. Consequent upon this meeting I spoke personally -- on the phone -- to B.W.U.'s General Secretary; and it was decided that the Reporters would be (as indeed they now are) available for reporting today, and that he would attend the meeting of the Debates Committee fixed for tomorrow afternoon, to continue our discussions. It is regretted that the Secretary of B.W.U. did not receive (as he should have) any formal notice of, or written invitation to, tomorrow's meeting, until I spoke to him yesterday.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I should like to have Your Honour's guidance as to whether it would be in order for any Member to comment on these circumstances.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would prefer comments to be deferred.

DOCUMENTS TO BE LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, there are no documents to be laid.

APPOINTMENT OF MR. J. MILLIKEN AS AUDITOR
OF THE SUGAR INDUSTRY AGRICULTURAL
BANK

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to inform hon. members of my receipt on the 9th of this month of a letter

dated the 8th of this month from Messrs. Pannell Fitzpatrick & Co., Chartered Accountants;

"Sir,

Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank

I wish to offer myself for re-employment as Auditor of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank for the year commencing 1st July, 1968, under section 4 (7) (1) of the Act — 1943-15, at a remuneration of £125.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,
J. MILLIKEN."

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Mr. J. Milliken be re-appointed for one year as the Auditor of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank as from 1st July, 1968, at a remuneration of £125 per annum.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I beg to second that.

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

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

A Resolution to place the sum of \$112,000 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1968-69, in Part II — Capital, as shown in the supplementary Estimates 1968-69 No. 37 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to place the sum of \$120 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1968-69, Part I — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1968-69 No. 38 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to place the sum of \$60,000 at the disposal of the Government to Supplement the Estimates 1968-69, Part I — Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1968-69 No. 39 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to place the sum of \$1,500 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1968-69, Part I — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1968-69 No. 40 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to authorise the Accountant General to make advances from time to time out of the Consolidated Fund to the Postmaster General for the payment of pensions.

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

A Resolution to place the sum of \$13,689 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1968-69, Part I — Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1968-69 No. 41 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.
12.25 p.m.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Bill:—

A Bill to amend the law relating to the Admiralty jurisdiction of the High Court, legal proceedings in connection with ships and aircraft and the arrest of ships and other property and for purposes connected with the matters aforesaid.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, in respect of the Resolution for \$112,000, the Resolution for \$120, the Resolution for \$1,500 and the Resolution for \$13,689, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to deal with these Resolutions.

In respect of the Resolution for \$60,000 it is my intention to ask leave of the House to proceed with this in all its stages today. Copies of this Resolution, I believe, Mr. Speaker, have already been circulated to hon. members.

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, while the Opposition is not objecting to dealing with the Resolution, it is rather unfortunate that a matter like this in which we would like to get some details from the Government should be sent at such short notice, especially when it was promised that Government would not be attending many Conferences. This is a very serious Resolution to be handed to us some time late yesterday afternoon.

NOTICE OF REPLIES

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I should like to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 248 asked by the hon. senior member for St. James, is ready.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I should like to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 205, asked by the hon. senior member for St. James is ready.

Also, Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 225 asked by the hon. senior member for Christ Church is ready.

I intimated two sittings ago that there were two Replies to Questions asked by the hon. senior member for St. James which were ready. One should be printed and the other left over.

QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: There are no Questions on my Notice Paper, but I am informed that certain Ques-

tions have been duly handed in in the appropriate time. Due to very careful processing, they are not available for my Notice Paper. In view of the fact that they have been handed in, I am giving permission if processing is completed before the close of this meeting, for them to be asked.

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE

Mr. SPEAKER: A Select Committee Report has been prepared, but when the Hon. and Learned Member for Christ Church signs it, I will allow it to be presented.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. N. W. BOXILL, seconded by Hon. J. C. TUDOR, a Bill to amend the law relating to the Admiralty jurisdiction of the High Court, legal proceedings in connection with ships and aircraft and the arrest of ships and other property and for purposes connected with the matters aforesaid, was read a first time.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, earlier today I spoke with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to ascertain from him whether or not they wished to proceed with Private Members' Business today. At that time it was not possible, I believe, for him to consult with his colleagues because none of them was present, but now I would like an indication; if not, I would like to move the suspension of the Standing Orders.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the suspension of Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16, 18, 19, 40 and 45 for the remainder of today's sitting. I should like to say also that Question Time at the appropriate point will be available.

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

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing, and it is to resume debate on the second reading of a Bill intituled "The Wireless Telegraphy (Amendment) Act, 1968."

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister of Communications has informed me that it is not his intention to proceed with that Bill today.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Chairman of Committee has not recovered from his illness of last week; therefore it becomes necessary for the House to appoint a temporary Chairman for today's sitting.

I beg to move that the hon. junior member for St. George be appointed Chairman of Committees for today's sitting.

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

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move an amendment to that motion by deleting the words "for today's sitting" and substituting therefor "of this parliamentary session".

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: As at present advised, I cannot accept that motion of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas.

Mr. MOTTLEY: As at present advised by whom, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER: By myself.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, we have always accepted you as an authority on the English language in here.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am at present advised by myself, but I will give the matter my further consideration if the present Chairman of Committees remains ill.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that what applies to the House of Commons applies to us, that this House can do anything — pass any law except to make a man a woman or a woman a man.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am prepared to go so far after careful consideration.

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

12.35 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair, and the House go into Committee of Supply and that it be an instruction of the House while in Committee of Supply to deal with the Money Resolution for \$60,000 of which notice was given earlier in today's sitting.

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

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1968-69 No. 39

CONFERENCES AND DELEGATIONS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, in introducing this Resolution I should like to apologise, first of all, to the Committee for two things, certainly, for the shortness of the time which hon. members have had to be acquainted with this Resolution. I should explain later why it has become urgent and give hon. members all the information concerning it; but the fact that hon. members received information of it at such short notice is due to circumstances entirely beyond our control. The second thing for which I want to apologise to the Committee arises out of the first; because of the shortness of time at our disposal, we could not make the addendum as full as we would have liked in order to meet today's sitting of the House, and I have therefore prepared, for the benefit of the Committee, the information which I should give in the course of the discussion. I wish hon. members to believe this; we do not like springing this kind of surprise on the House; we do not like it even sprung on ourselves; but I ask the Committee to take what I am going to say in good faith and to accept my *bona fides* in this respect.

The provision of \$60,000 is required to supplement the vote which comes under Head 16 — Prime Minister's Office — Item 17 — Conferences and Delegations. The original provision was \$125,000 and this provision is exhausted as follows:— Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that I will have to tire the Committee, if I may put it in this way, in giving this information, because I think it is only proper that the Committee should know for itself how the money was spent, and why the provision which was admittedly generous in the Current Estimates is now exhausted. I cannot give the number of meetings and conferences participated in, but hon. members will see the total number, in other words, I have not got the total, but I have them individually.

The first is, the Orientation Seminar of the Inter-American Bank in Trinidad which was attended by representatives of the Planning Unit. This cost \$858.00. Then there was the Inter-American Meeting on Foot and Mouth disease and Zoonoses which was held in Washington and attended by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Dr. Proverbs. The cost of that was \$900.00. Then there was an official visit to Bermuda and New York by the Hon. Minister of Education and that cost \$1,118.70. Then there was a second meeting of Working Party on Regional Air Carrier in St. Lucia which was attended by Mr. Went, the Director of Civil Aviation, and Mr. Ian Archer, at a cost of \$710.24. Then there was a Conference of Commonwealth Chief Justices in Trinidad attended by the Hon. Chief Justice at a cost of \$589.50. Then there was the 13th Meeting of the Standing Advisory Committee for Medical Research in the British Caribbean in Jamaica. That was attended by Dr. A. V.

Wells, and Dr. W. Dos Santos at a cost of \$1,335.20. Then there was a meeting of the Inter-American Centre of Tax Administration in Buenos Aires, attended by Mr. D. C. T. Grannum of the Inland Revenue Department at a cost of \$1,842.65. Then there was a visit to New York in connection with the Smocking Industry, and that was attended by Miss Marjorie Blackman and Miss M. Manning, I believe, of the Social Welfare Department, at a cost of \$1,000.90. Then there were the Telecommunications Discussions in Trinidad which were attended by the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works and his Permanent Secretary at a cost of \$238.75. Then there was a meeting of the Regional Development Bank and the launching of CARIFTA, attended by the Hon. Prime Minister, the Financial Secretary and Mr. N. W. Nicholls at a cost of \$625.00. Then there was the 21st World Health Assembly in Geneva, attended by the Hon. Minister of Health and Community Development costing \$2,850.05. Then there was a discussion on the Caribbean Development Bank in Trinidad attended by Mr. Osbourne, the Financial Secretary, costing \$183.80. Then there was the International Congress of Supreme Audit Institutions held in Tokyo and that was attended by the Auditor General, and the total cost of that, including subsistence allowance, passage and everything was \$2,486.95. Then there was a seminar on Food and Nutrition at the U.W.I., I suspect that this would have been held at the Mona Campus, and that was attended by Miss Muriel Bourne, Inspector of Nutrition in the Ministry of Education at a cost of \$125.00. Then there was the U.W.I. Appraisals Committee meeting in Trinidad attended by the Hon. Prime Minister, costing \$20.00. Then there was the return Air Passage to Dominica by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and the Chief Agricultural Officer, Mr. E. C. Pilgrim, costing \$159.00. Then there was a visit to Puerto Rico in connection with the Water Fluoridation attended by the Hon. Minister of Health and Community Development and Mr. A. B. Archer, at a cost of \$280.00. Then there was the 52nd Session of the International Labour Organization held in Geneva and attended by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Labour and National Insurance, the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union and a representative of the Employers' Federation, Mr. Darnley Lewis, and the Chief Labour Officer, Mr. Carlos Smith, and the total cost of that attendance was \$14,497.00.

12.45 p.m.

Council meeting of Team Teaching project in Cambridge, Mass., attended by Sen. H. O. Gittens and Mr. G. C. Miller, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Education — \$2,530. Meeting of Technical Advisory Group at U.W.I., St. Augustine, attended by Mr. H. E. Williams, presumably from Canada — \$135.25. Special Security Conference in London, attended by Deputy Commissioner of Police, Mr. G. C. Springer — \$1,650.40. Meeting of Officials on Regional Co-operation in the Development of Tourism, attended by Mr. F. J. Odle — \$419.60. Return Air passage Barbados/Guyana/Barbados, Hon. E. W. Barrow — \$191.15. Refund of Air fare to Mr. Robin Austin in connection with investigation

of Scotland Factory — \$384.09. Refund of expenses incurred in connection with IATA 17th Technical Conference, attended by Mr. T. E. Went — \$95.74. Refund of expenses incurred in connection with meeting of Regional Development Bank and CARIFTA; Return Air passage to Trinidad re 1st Meeting of Regional Air Carrier (Mr. N. D. Osbourne \$7.90). (Messrs. Went and Archer \$143.35). CARIFTA Meetings in Guyana, attended by Hon. G. G. Fergusson and Mr. R. McConney — \$420.00. Regional Shipping Council Meeting in Trinidad, attended by Mr. John Patterson — \$183.30. U.W.I. Vice-Chancellorship Committee Meeting attended by the Prime Minister — \$50.00. Meeting of CARIFTA Team of Advisers to Montserrat, attended by Mr. C. H. Clarke — \$193.25. Return Air passage to Jamaica in connection with Oils and Fats Conference, attended by Hon. G. G. Fergusson, Messrs. J. C. King and H. F. Alkins — \$117.00. The Sixth Annual Meeting of the Caribbean Food Crop Society in Trinidad, attended by Mr. W. DeC. Jeffers — \$402.50. Seminar of Leprosy Control in Mexico, attended by Dr. L. Harney — \$370.50. Visit to Trinidad U.W.I. Meeting, attended by Hon. E. W. Barrow — \$40.00. Session of Caribbean Plant Protection Commission in Surinam, attended by Dr. V. Kumar — \$941.35. WISA Meeting in St. Lucia, attended by Mr. N. D. Osbourne, Mr. L. I. Worrell and Hon. P. M. Greaves — \$686.95. Refund of expenses re CARIFTA Meeting in Trinidad, attended by Mr. R. McConney — \$144.46. Refund of expenses re Population and Housing Census in Chile, attended by Mr. C. G. Alleyne — \$299.00. Refund of expenses incurred by Mr. P. M. Welch in connection with the Ninth Labour Conference in St. Lucia in August 1966. This sum of \$178.00 was paid by the Accountant General to the Accountant General of St. Lucia who advanced this money to Mr. Welch. Representation at Grenada National Day Celebrations attended by Hon. J. C. Tudor — \$45.00. Agricultural Marketing Protocol Meeting in Guyana, attended by Mr. R. McConney, Mr. L. Austin, Mr. C. Blades and Mr. M. L. Ward — \$960.00. United Kingdom and Commonwealth Caribbean Governments Finance Officials Meeting in Jamaica, attended by Hon. P. M. Greaves, Mr. N. D. Osbourne — \$1,095.00. Return Air passage to Trinidad re Blind Conference, attended by Mr. C. Gollop — \$50.00. Return Passage to Guyana for Dr. Duff — \$98.30. Seminar of the Food and Nutrition Institute in Guyana, attended by Dr. F. C. Ramsay — \$100.50. Regional Shipping Council Meeting in Trinidad, attended by Hon. N. W. Boxill, Mr. W. R. Lowe, Mr. C. M. Thompson, and Mr. John Patterson — \$1,116.20. Eighth Caribbean Met. Council Meeting in Trinidad, attended by Hon. P. M. Greaves, Mr. A. W. Symmonds, and Mr. G. Rudder — \$1,937.25.
12.55 p.m.

The Seventh International Conference of Mental Health in London where Dr. A. J. Dacre was the representative — \$523.90.

The CARIFTA Meeting of the proposed customs in St. Vincent, the representative being Mr. L. A. Deane — \$150.00.

The Finance Ministers' Meeting in Jamaica — The Hon. Prime Minister and Mr. Osbourne attending — \$675.00.

I have not totalled this myself, Mr. Chairman, but I think, if hon. members when they see it set out would total it, they would find that it has all but committed the vote. The first thing I would like to draw to the attention of hon. members is that they will see from this that contrary to what is widely believed by even some members of this House on both sides sometimes, and by a wide cross section of persons outside the House, the travelling of Ministers is represented by a very small proportion, something less than 15 per cent of the whole amount.

Now the difficulty with Government always is to be able to make a decision on which Conferences, which meetings and which Seminars should be attended and which should not. I should like to give the House the assurance that although this seems to be an extraordinary number of things to be participating in, say, from April to the present time, it probably represents half of what we have been invited to participate in, and it will probably be just as much if you reckon it up with what we have quite firmly but sometimes with deep regret refused to attend. Our policy, roughly speaking, in these matters is to attend those Conferences which signify Regional or Commonwealth or other commitments which we regard as important and inescapable; to ignore or refuse to attend any Conferences which although they may be valuable as meetings go, cannot be shown to be of direct value and return to the people of this country. We are willing to go along with anybody who says that perhaps we ought in future even to prune down more carefully and more rigorously the number we should attend. For instance, we did not attend the big United Nations Human Rights Conference in Teheran this year, not because we would yield to anybody in the firmness of our attachment to Human Rights or anything like this, but simply because the cost was prohibitive. There have been one or two and possibly three fairly important Commonwealth scientific conferences taking place this year of which we knew. Of the three we have accepted only one invitation, and that is for Pakistan to which we are sending the Deputy Chief Agricultural Officer because he is involved in research, and our understanding is that the Technical discussions at this Conference in Pakistan will be of such a nature and at such a level that Mr. Jeffers will not only be able himself to make a personal contribution to the discussions, but will bring back tremendous insights which will help him in his work in agricultural research.

It is difficult always for us to know until we are up against the situation what exactly ought to be attended and what not, but we try with a certain amount of care and scrutiny to work out something which is more than a rule of thumb, because we do not do it on a hit-and-miss basis. We try to work out some clear idea of what Conferences we should attend and what meetings and discussions there

should be participation in. As I said to the Committee the general rule is that if we are invited to something which already underscores the commitment which we have to the region or to the Commonwealth or to some international body from which we get benefits which are both direct and indirect, we maintain that connection and we attend the Conference. If there are technical Conferences the discussions of which are designed to show under-developed or undeveloped countries how best they may use their resources to their betterment, we like to attend those; and if there are Conferences which, though perhaps not bringing any direct benefit but at the same time enable us to show our solidarity with wider groupings of countries, we like to attend those. I wish to give the Committee the assurance that we do not act cavalierly or carelessly in these matters. We do give some scrutiny and attention to it, and we always try to participate in meetings abroad which will bring us some benefit to this Island.

Now I want to be fair to hon. members because some hon. member may perhaps ask why it is that in this breakdown there is no mention made, for instance, of the Prime Minister's visit to Washington or my own visit to the United Nations, or the visit which I made earlier to Washington in connection with our O.A.S. country review. The reason is simple.

Parliament has already provided in the Estimates — I cannot recall the Head, but if you will look at it, you will see this, Mr. Chairman — under the External Affairs vote an item in its Head called "Special Missions", and it is from this Special Missions Item that visits like the Official Visit of the Prime Minister to Washington or my own visit in connection with Latin American or Caribbean Affairs other than visits of courtesy are financed, and the rule here which we try to observe with anything which directly concerns External Affairs either originating with them or something which they themselves are involved in or following through is that expenditure be met from provision in their vote, but the majority or the greater part of Conferences and meetings in which Government participate are not meetings or Conferences which originate with External Affairs as such, do not arise out of their normal duty, as for instance I.L.O. would not, nor would Pan American Health Organisation Conferences. These would originate in the Ministries which normally handle these duties, and this is why it would seem strange to them that the External Affairs vote is not exhausted and is well in hand, but that the Conferences and Delegations Vote become exhausted so quickly. I cannot think of anything else that I can tell the Committee. I shall of course answer any questions if there is any matter hon. members wish to raise.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, there are just one or two things which I intimated that I would have asked the Hon. Leader of the House while he was on his feet, but I must congratulate him for making, or at least giving us, for the first time, all the facts surrounding this matter, or at least as much as he possibly had there; but there are still one or two things which I would like to know. Some time ago, the Prime Minister invited citizens of Barbados to prosecute B.W.I.A. — immediately after devaluation after they were charging more than this Government and B.W.I.A. had agreed upon for passage. I want the hon. member to tell me this first. Can you say if, at any of these Conferences to which all of our people had been going — and I understand they were still travelling by B.W.I.A. — they were paying the pre-devaluation price or the new price which has been charged. That is Question No. 1. I am sure that the Minister would like to answer that. Is there any ambiguity in the framing of that question?

The next question is this: Can the Minister say, as to the number of Conferences which he has called out, if this applies to Conferences held in Barbados too? Mr. Chairman, before I say what I am going to say, I would like to preface my remarks by saying this; I think that I was the first member of this House many years ago when the now Opposition was in power, to say that I did not like the idea of having the Premier and the now Leader of the Opposition ducking about and going into the subway and so on, when he had to go to England and other places, but he should have a car and so on. I do not like the extravagance of some of the gentlemen of the Other West Indian places, but what I want to ask is this; as to the amount allowed to Ministers and the amount allowed to Heads of Departments and to Civil Servants, is it the same? I am not quarrelling or making a speech on this yet. I am not the type of person who would feel that if an Executive Clerk is going somewhere, he should be allowed the same things as the Prime Minister or the Minister of Communications and Works or anything of the sort. I am not niggardly that way because I am in the Opposition. Those are the questions which I would like the Minister to answer. The Minister mentioned something about being invited to Grenada and I think that he had to pay the expenses. I cannot understand that. When we invited people to our Independence Celebrations, we stood all the expenses, which was right. If you are invited to Grenada to join in their Celebrations of Associated States there, I cannot understand our having to pay our expenses there. As to the Conference here in Barbados, before any

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would not mind giving way, when he asked about Conferences held in Barbados and I nodded my head, I was, of course, wrong because expenditure for any Conference held in Barbados would come from the Government Hospitality vote and not from this one.

Mr. MOTTLEY: No, no! Expenses for Conferences held in Barbados would come from the Government Hospitality vote.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If you had to provide transportation for people, this would come from the Government Hospitality vote.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, why I want to get that right is that I want the public to know the exact figure which we would be spending. About how many Conferences between the beginning of the financial year and now did we have locally, and what would they cost? We want to know that because we want to add this to that figure. If the Conferences held in Barbados, and they have been quite a number, are being paid for from the Government Hospitality vote, that is a different matter altogether. Anyhow, the Minister should be able to answer the questions which I have asked before I speak on this matter. I do not think that anybody would be parsimonious enough to get up and say that with the cost of living as it is today and so on — I believe the hon. member for St. Thomas knows what was allowed to Delegates to the Independence Conference — nobody is going to be parsimonious enough to say that this should not be allowed or that should not be allowed. I note that the Minister of Health and Community Development attended a Conference in Buenos Aires, but that was not paid for by us at all. In such cases

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order Mr. Chairman. The Pan American Health Organization paid for the air passages and expenses of one Delegate, the Chief Delegate who happened to be myself, and I want to say that, as far as the World Health Assembly goes, we had the refund of a return fare for one Delegate which was about \$2,400. which was not mentioned. Inadvertently, it was not included here. There was also a refund in the case of the World Health Assembly of roughly \$2,400 which goes back into the Treasury.
1.15 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if you will recall that the Press made it quite clear at the time that the Pan American Health Organisation would pay for this. It is very interesting to hear that the Minister has explained that. Of course, it might have slipped the Leader of the House. In other words, they only paid for one person. It would be necessary for the Minister to carry along an Adviser with him.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I want to make my position perfectly clear. The amount was voted, as the Hon. Leader of the House has stated; but when the refund comes by way of a cheque for the value of a return first-class ticket, which I brought back from Geneva, that is paid into the Treasury and it does not go into the Conference Vote. I just want to make that clear.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I hope the Minister does not think I am accusing him of doing something wrong, but we have to get this position clear. There are some Conferences that World Organisations pay for; there are some that we must pay for, and there are some that are held here. The ones that are held here, I understand from the Minister,

are paid for from the Government Hospitality Vote. But the important thing we want to know is of the \$125,000 which we have spent in Conferences abroad — you do not go abroad by getting into a motor car or a donkey cart: you have to travel in an aeroplane, and very few people use boats unless they are going on a fancy trip. What I want to know, and what the public should know and ought to know — I am not saying that the money was too much, or it was not enough. I would like to know what amount has been paid to British West Indian Airways? In other words are you paying the pre-valuation amount? (ASIDES.) Somebody said the pre-valuation amount. If, therefore, you are paying the pre-valuation amount, then there is some advantage being taken of the public. The Government should not stand for that.

Further, I am going to ask the Minister how many trips have been made. Most of this money has been spent in air passages. If you invite people to bring cases against British West Indian Airways, they have backed out and allowed you to pay the pre-valuation fares, and Tom, Dick and Harry must pay post-valuation fares, it is time that the Government should step in and protect somebody. Something is going wrong. I would like to hear the Minister on this point. I know that most of the \$125,000 is being paid for air passages. I hope I am right in saying so.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I think we have had some discussion in this House already on this point. So far as my memory goes, the Prime Minister was asked, maybe by the same hon. member, to explain Government's position in this matter. The position is simply this. For the purpose of Government travelling, we do not, as it were, face the air lines' counter ourselves. When I say "we", I am not speaking about a Minister, but of the Government. We work through Travel Agents, and from the time of devaluation until now — I can speak of this personally in respect of my own travelling because I know this is a fact, and I suspect it to be the same with the remainder of Government travelling. From the time of devaluation, the Government has never paid any increased fares above the level obtaining at the time of devaluation. That is a fact. Now, the hon. Member says that if this is so, we are exposing the general population to some hardship. I do not see it quite that way.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I did not say anything about "exposing the general population to some hardship". I said that some dishonesty was going on somewhere. I said that if 7 1/2% is what the Agents get and you are buying direct from the Agents, the 7 1/2% cannot cover the increase cost. Is there a special fare charged for Ministers, or Government travelling? (ASIDES.) "There is none," says the Leader of the House. If there is none, then something is going wrong when you are charged pre-valuation fares. These are discriminatory rates, and the Government should not stand for discriminatory rates. As a matter of fact, a girl going to Canada as a domestic will get into a plane and she has to pay more than a Minister, or a

Government official, or anybody attending a Conference abroad. Will the Minister sit down and allow these discriminatory rates to go on? This is unfair.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Member really has a good point, but to try to turn this argument against the Government is unfair. It is all right to say that the Government should do this and that, but in this same House we have heard charges made about political interference and improper directions allegedly being given to Crown Law Officers and the people who are supposed to prosecute people. I, certainly, know of no reason why a prosecution could not be brought by the people who are responsible for bringing prosecutions if they care to do it. It, certainly, would be improper for any of us, as politicians, to tell the Director of Public Prosecutions to do this or do that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am not talking about politicians; I am talking about the Government.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Please let me make my point. We have been wrongly accused of this already, and we are going to take special care that this should not be said of us, whether true or not, and, if said, it must always be untrue. Expenditure which the Government controls — like the purchase of air passages for Ministers or anybody connected with the Government — of course, the Government will say that it is not going to pay more than it should pay. (ASIDES.) You cannot accuse the Government of allowing the — it is true the hon. Member did not say that the Government was conniving at the dishonesty but the hon. member as good as said that if the Government gets what, in effect, is fair treatment and allowed the public to get unfair treatment, then there is dishonesty. I must make this absolutely clear. It is not that we are allowing the public to get unfair treatment. That is not the case. At least I have been advised by people who know the law — I do not — that it is open to the public to have his or her rights vindicated in a matter like this; but it would, certainly, be most disgraceful if the Government itself were, in expenditure which it can control, to allow itself to pay fares above the level which it thinks it should pay.

1.25 p.m.

The population has already had this drawn to its attention. In fairness to the Prime Minister, I think it ought to be stated that he did say what he thought the issues were. (ASIDES.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please let us have a little order.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Let us try to take a commonsense view of the matter. I am not defending B.W.I.A., God forbid, or any airline; I would not put myself in such a silly position. I am only saying — and I say it because I believe it — that the Government of Barbados has made this issue sufficiently clear to the population of Barbados that any person who feels himself called upon to pay more than he

hears he should pay, can take steps to defend himself and to vindicate his rights. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Is it as simple as this?) I do not know if it is as simple as this. All I know is that the very fact that widespread interest has been aroused in it must mean to me that people know they should not pay the increased fares. This is how I see it. You cannot have it both ways. After all, there is a limit even to what the most energetic Government can do. If a Government, in sizing up a situation tell the population that they think that such a course of action would be wrong, and if you go and pay these fares you would be conniving at your own robbery, but as for ourselves, and as for the expenditure we control, we are not going to pay more than at the level that existed before the devaluation (Mr. MOTTLEY: Therefore to hell with the population!) The hon. member cannot draw that inference. Hon. members, Mr. Chairman, cannot have it both ways. You cannot say that the Government is, as it were, throwing the population to the mercies of the airlines who are over-charging, and then follow that up by saying it is the Government's duty to institute prosecutions or have prosecutions instituted for over-charging..... (ASIDES.) By inference, to protect the public would be to institute prosecutions. If you do not mean that, it is difficult to know what you mean. On the other hand, you are constantly warning the Government that it must not interfere in the administration of justice, not that such a warning

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I will remind the hon. senior member for Bridgetown that he will have his opportunity to speak.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg your pardon, Sir.

Mr. ST. JOHN: I am asking the Leader of the House to give way because he said that the Government has not been paying the travel agents. I understand that is a fact, but I also understand that it is a fact that the travel agents issued tickets to Government members for the new fares, and the travel agents have in fact billed the Government for new fares but the Government have refused to pay the new fares.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The hon. member says it is his understanding. I am not prepared to contradict him, but all I know is that we have not paid at a level above the level existing before devaluation.

Mr. HINDS: Have you been billed for new fares?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: How would I know this? I am not prepared to say I know something if I do not know it. All I am prepared to say, and I state this categorically, is that up to the present moment of my being here speaking, on no occasion have we paid more. (Mr. MOTTLEY: But you have been billed for more.)

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, on 30th April this year I tabled a question in this Honourable House about the journeys made by Ministers of Government or Civil Servants travelling at Government

expense on B.W.I.A. and asking what fares had been paid, and the question in fact is still incompleated because on the 6th August supplementary questions were still being asked when Question Time ended, and this matter was canvassed extensively then. It seems that the thinking of the Leader of the House has not advanced one whit since August, because, Mr. Chairman, what we really have here is this situation: two travel agencies at that time were prepared to accept the lower fare from the Government although airline regulations demanded that the tickets have the proper fare from the airlines point of view printed on them, and I do not know if the hon. junior member for St. Thomas can remember what was on his ticket. I think he was the first to travel to St. Vincent unless I am mistaken, but I can be corrected, on B.W.I.A. after devaluation.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Did the hon. member say that we had brought in a reply to this Question?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Yes, the reply is still being done. Anyhow, I mentioned the hon. junior member for St. Thomas because if he still has the stub and the ticket on which he travelled in his possession, or if he still has access to it, I daresay he will see that it shows not the \$34.50 which the Government paid, but it shows the larger amount which B.W.I.A. charged the travel agent. Now this is clear evidence that an offence, if the Prime Minister says that to charge a higher fare is an offence, has been committed, because the fact that a ticket showing a higher fare is received by B.W.I.A. from a travel agent is clear evidence of a demand of an illegal payment and a receipt therefor, and all the Government has to do is to hand that ticket to the Director of Public Prosecutions. There is no suggestion that the Government has to give a directive, and it is hypocrisy, Mr. Chairman, to introduce that argument. Well perhaps not hypocrisy; perhaps only ignorance. There is no suggestion that what we on this side are saying is that the Government must tell the Director of Public Prosecutions to seek out people to give evidence against B.W.I.A. What we are asking is that the Government make available the evidence which it has just as any private citizen can make it available, that whichever Minister has travelled on a ticket that shows a higher fare than the lawful fare, the stub of that ticket and the receipt therefor be handed to the Director of Public Prosecutions and an investigation carried out.

Mr. Chairman, the question which I asked was whether the Government would make an investigation as to whether the travel agency or agencies, at that time Jemmotts Travel Agency and DaCosta's Travel Bureau, through whom the Government had made these bookings, had in fact paid B.W.I.A. the higher fare. Mr. Chairman, that also is something which the Government can do without giving directions to the Director of Public Prosecutions, because

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member. I do not mind being thought ignorant because, quite frankly, I do not know everything. The

hon. member has just made a point which I personally accept — and at least I am certain that my colleague, the Minister of Communications, and, I suppose, the others feel that way too — and I would like him to continue on that point, because there is something which I think we can do and something we can act on.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If now the Minister is willing to act on it, why was he not willing to act in August? (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Because I did not understand it.) After all, Mr. Chairman, am I so persuasive that a minute-and-a-half of speaking in the House of Assembly is more effective than a question written down and studied by experts? Are there no brains in the Ministry which had to answer this Question capable of saying: "Let us look at the tickets" or "let us ring up and ask Jemmotts' for a direct answer as to how much he paid B.W.I.A.?" That is where, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the hypocrisy comes, because Jemmotts Travel Agency and DaCosta's Travel Bureau were willing to accommodate the Government so that the Prime Minister would not have to eat his words. The Prime Minister said in Independence Square how B.W.I.A. were going to be prosecuted. They were faced with the problem of getting the Minister of Communications to an island where only B.W.I.A. ran, and they did not want to put the Minister to his undoubtedly great ability as a swimmer. We know the Minister can swim; he is accustomed to the sea; but to swim to St. Vincent might have been a bit beyond even what the Prime Minister expects of his Cabinet. The Government was faced with this problem of how to get Ministers to islands where only B.W.I.A. goes, and these travel agencies were prepared to accept the loss involved in getting a lower fare from the Government and paying the new ones to B.W.I.A.

It is an open secret that in the business it is assumed that there has been a *quid pro quo*, namely, that these travel agencies get a little extra share of the B.O.A.C. and Pan American and T.C.A. travel to make up for what they lose on B.W.I.A.; that you were giving to Jemmotts' and DaCosta's a little extra something so that they could absorb the loss on their B.W.I.A. accommodation by getting a good profit on these larger fares. You only have to think of what a travel agency would make out of a first-class return ticket, which the Hon. Minister of Health referred to, to realise that the profits that the Government can give a travel agency by directing business to it are very great indeed.

1.35 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, we may be wrong, but it is assumed in business that back-scratching was going on. The Prime Minister's back was being scratched by the two travel agencies, and their backs were also being scratched in due course, not necessarily by the Prime Minister. I am not for a moment suggesting he has any personal knowledge of any transaction in that direction, but there might be people who wanted to save the Prime Minister from embarrassment or from having to eat the Independence Square words, and therefore, they tried to arrange a com-

promise. Mr. Chairman, to say that the Government will not make an investigation as to whether the travel agencies have been paying B.W.I.A. the allegedly legal fares or the allegedly illegal ones, is to go right outside of what the Prime Minister said on TV and in Independence Square. Either you are going to prosecute B.W.I.A. or you are not going to prosecute them. No amount of trying to shelter behind remarks by saying that you cannot direct the D.P.P. and so on — no amount of sheltering is going to prevent people from thinking that if you do not prosecute B.W.I.A. — in other words, if you do not put your money where your mouth lay, no amount of prevarication around the subject is going to prevent the public from thinking that this is another occasion on which the Prime Minister put his foot in his mouth. That is that issue.

Very briefly, Sir, I would just like to ask the Minister when he is replying to deal with the suggestion, which again and again you hear from the members of the public, that the Conference vote and arrangements for Overseas travel, are sometimes stretched in the direction of letting the Ministers have an opportunity to have a holiday spree to visit London for health reasons or other matters of that sort. We have read in the Press that the Minister of Communications and Works was going to Canada to speak to Farm Workers. We read that he and the Minister of Agriculture were going together to speak to Barbadian Farm Workers. Soon after they should have left, I spoke to the Ministry of Agriculture and realised that he was still here. He indicated in broad outline that the Minister of Communications and Works was deputising for him. That is what the Press said. I cannot accept that it is any part of the duty of the Minister of Communications and Works to go to Canada to see about how Barbadian Farm Workers are getting on. I cannot accept that, and, true enough, it turned out that when he returned

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Communications and Works has had long experience in industrial relations. *(Laughter)*.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Communications and Works has a very clever spokesman today. I was going to say, Sir, that when the Minister returned, the ostensible reason for his going to Canada was to look after buying Canadian buses, and a Press release soon after he came back said that he discovered that the buses would not be suitable because they were nine feet wide and the widest buses in Barbados were only seven feet wide. I believe that if the Minister had written to any bus manufacturer or had written to Mr. Williams, the High Commissioner in Canada and a competent Civil Servant, and asked him to find out how wide the Canadian buses are, for the price of two 25¢ letters, he would have found out that they were nine feet wide without going to Canada for himself. If we are to vote money for people to go to Canada to find out if buses are nine feet wide, we are making a joke of the Government's money and of the taxpayers' money.

As to this Conference with regard to Foot and Mouth Disease, the Minister of Agriculture has to go and hear and learn about Foot and Mouth Disease! Mr. Chairman, I am the last person in the world to deny the fact that everybody needs a holiday, but it would be such a good thing for the reputation of all of us, if it did not appear that Ministers go away on trips in circumstances which cause people to say "He is not going away for anything; he is going away to get a holiday at the taxpayers' expense. He must have got somebody in Canada whom he wants to go and see; so he says he is going to measure the buses." Mr. Chairman, it does not do the Government or the Opposition any good for that to be said. It does not do any of us any good to hear that the Ministers are in Europe, Canada, North America, Bermuda and so on. The Prime Minister in the course of his travels, stayed at the Hilton in Athens; he visited Egypt; he visited Israel, I believe, in all of these little activities. Once he gave an instruction to an Air line that he was going to some East African Country's Independence, that he wanted to see some new countries and make sure that they take him on an Airline that did not go through London. The Prime Minister will well know to whom he said that and the result of that particular jaunt. I use the word "jaunt". The public looks at the Conference vote that a lot of it is jaunt; a jaunt to Buenos Aires, a jaunt to Bermuda, trips to Canada and New York are common places. We have brothers in New York, friends in Canada, cousins in England and sons in London. We all know that. *(Asides)*.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I take the asides on my left to indicate that the spoils are not even divided equally among the Government members — the spoils of travel; but it is a point, perhaps dealt with a little bit facetiously, but none the less it is a point which the public really do look at; the point about the amount of travelling which Ministers do at Government travel expense is really something which the public considers. All Governments — the previous Government was also subject to attacks, and the previous Government never spent one-quarter of what this Government spends on travelling. As to the travelling done by the members of this Government, the travelling done by the Senators — I do not recall that any of the Ministerial appointments in the Senate ever travelled to Europe or North America at the Government expense during the regime of the Barbados Labour Party. The travelling done by Senatorial Ministers, the travelling done by Ministers here, and the travel bug, I suppose, is spreading right down to the Parliamentary Secretaryships and among the backbenchers. We realise, when we come to meetings of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association and see that serious Conferences are regarded only as opportunities for rewards for available service on the backbenches — you can look forward to seeing the hon. senior member for St. Michael nominated as a delegate for some future C.P.A. meeting. Mr. Chairman, it is something which the public looks at and it is something which I re-

spectfully suggest to the Leader of the House that the Government should consider seriously. Do not come and ask for this supplementary vote for \$60,000 and expect that it is going to be passed just by saying where everybody has been. The public feels that the Government spends too much of the taxpayers' money in going away, flying away, and people are always out of the Island. They are not lacking in people to see that. They feel that a Minister likes to be out of the Island because he gets an allowance of so much and so much, and so he does not have to spend his salary. I have heard that said of the Prime Minister. I do not imagine that the Prime Minister's travel is actuated by a desire to save his salary; I think that the Prime Minister likes travelling. I do not think that money enters in it to that degree, but the public says it and these are things which we have to think about.

1.45 p.m.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, there are one or two things I had intended to ask, but the hon. Member for the City has already asked them. I am going to put things a little more pointedly. What necessity could there ever be for a Minister to go to a Seminar, or to go to a Conference, where policy is not involved? How I had proposed to begin my question to the Leader of the House was this: What is the difference in the allowances to a Minister and to Civil Servants? The hon. Member asked that question, and I am asking it again in case the Leader of the House did not make a note of it at the time. What I would like him to tell the House is why should a Minister ever go to a Conference where a matter of policy is not involved. There is no question of there being certain things which only the Minister can do, or say, or no question of secrecy. At all of these Conferences, the real delegate is the Head of the Department. No Minister in this world could possibly equal the Head of a Department — from the Minister of Great Britain down could not begin to know what the Head of a Department knows. He is a politician and not an expert. Think of any country in this world where you find Ministers travelling about like that, if the system is not a corrupt system!

Mr. Chairman, they talk about the OAS, this, that and the other, but there is nothing to follow: South American Ministers, or South American dictators. I, unlike the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, do not look upon this as a matter of laughter. I think it is shameful that Barbados for centuries, not just years, had a reputation, whatever else may be the fault in those days, for absolute honesty. They did not get joy-rides out of taxpayers; they did not get anything out of taxpayers. Of course, you have the answer that they were all rich men in those days, and they did not want payment for membership of the House. That is one of the answers. I, certainly, differ most profoundly from the hon. senior member for St. Thomas in putting it as if it were something at which to laugh.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is shameful. If there is nothing to hide, if everything is above-board, is it only

a coincidence — some people I know, this is by the way, and I hope the Reporters would not mind my dashing off at a tangent — sat down and asked: "Whose turn next for a trip to New York or Canada?" The hon. senior member for St. Thomas mentioned that. It is disgraceful for Barbados to be tarred with that sort of brush that Ministers take advantage of the fact that they can go abroad to attend a Conference although they may not be able to contribute anything whatever to that Conference. I say again, and you must forgive me for repeating it: What Minister ever lived who was the equal of the Head of his Department in knowledge of the subject for which the Conference was being held? Not in Great Britain, I repeat, not in Germany, not in France and not anywhere where you have a sound Civil Service.

Mr. Chairman, it is worse than regrettable that Ministers should have these joy-rides. I say this simply because I feel deeply about the subject. It is lamentable if it is a coincidence, and disgraceful if it is not a coincidence, that a Minister goes abroad — a Minister of Home Affairs made a Deputy Financial Minister, or a Minister of Finance, and he goes abroad and has an operation as soon as he gets there! What is the connection between the Minister of Home Affairs and Finance? Who, looking at those things, does not say: If the Government is absolutely above-board, then come out and say why it was necessary to send a Minister on such-and-such a Conference? Above all, a seminar!

I have tried my best to keep up with everything, writing very fast, that the Leader of the House read out. There are one or two other points I have made. The I.L.O. Conference in Geneva. The Leader of the House mentioned that the Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union and the employers — I presume he was merely giving us information that they were delegates, but I hope he was not suggesting that any expense came out of the Government. Who, in the name of heaven, could defend that?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is just only to tell the hon. Member, if he will give way, that this is something which we found.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this is the first time I have ever heard of that. You invite the Employers Association of a country to come to a Conference; surely the Employers Association does not expect the Government of that territory to pay for it. I do not know if the Hon. Member thinks he is being funny, or has scored a point. I remember on one occasion we had to petition — the Barbados Workers' Union when I was President of it —

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Sir. The Hon. Member better than anyone in here, ought to know that according to the Standing Orders of the International Labour Organisation — he is an expert in these affairs and he ought to know — a delegation attending an I.L.O. Conference must — the Government cannot send a Minister unless the employers and the workers are represented, and they go not as

employers' representatives but as representatives of the Government. It is the responsibility of the Government to send that delegation, and I.L.O. would not accept a Government calling on the Employers' Organisation, or the Workers' Organisation, to pay their way to an I.L.O. Conference. This is a Standing Order of the International Labour Organization, and the hon. Member is an expert in this field. He has more knowledge of it than I have, and this is a fact. If he does not remember, he should say so. It is a fact that the Government is responsible for sending that delegation, and the Government cannot send a Minister, or a Chief Labour Officer, to a Conference, because they would not be accepted by I.L.O.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, that does not answer my point. Any Regulation that the I.L.O. may have saying that there should be full representation is not a question of money, or a question of who pays. I repeat that when I was President of the Barbados Workers' Union we had to come here and get —

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I am stating categorically, despite the representations of the hon. Member, if he forgets; at his age he can forget something. If he forgets, he should say so. It is dishonest to come here today and say that the Government should not pay for it, when he knows for a fact that it is the responsibility of the Government to send a delegation.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I have not objected to the use of the word "dishonest". This gutter-snipe abuse is normal, coming from the hon. Member who has just sat down.
1.55 p.m.

To accuse me of dishonesty is unparliamentary.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: It is not a question of guttersnipe nonsense; it is a question of fact, and anyone who does not want to accept a fact and wants to twist it to suit his own purpose could only be a village idiot, as the hon. member said, when he is coming to talk foolishness.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Even those words I do not object to because he cannot help it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us have some order, please.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: You cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear. He is accustomed to using gutter-type language and he uses it in here too. What the hon. member said has nothing to do with my point. It is who pays.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The Government pays for the delegation and he knows it.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: No I.L.O. or any outside person can tell a Government what in a case of that sort they have to do. When I have been all these years, the Government paid. The Government pays

because the Government gave the assurance — in the old days there was nothing by way of assurance — that the money would be paid, and I.L.O. would refund it to the Government, and that happened for a long time until this Government came into power, when it was some two weeks before B.W.I.A. could get any passage booked, because the Hon. Minister responsible sent to the I.L.O. to ask if it was in order, I having done this for something like twelve or fourteen years before that happened. The Government pays and the I.L.O. pays back as far as my representation is concerned.

I say again that a delegation must go which includes a representative of the workers and of the employers. Whether the Government tells the workers or employers to pay back what they paid has nothing in this world to do with the I.L.O., and if the Government has been in the habit of paying and not calling on the Barbados Workers' Union and the Employers to pay them back their share, then the Government is not doing its duty. Imagine anybody could be so silly as to believe that the I.L.O. could tell the Government that they must send a representative of the Employers Association and pay for him. Who has the power to tell even a Colonial Government that? The money goes from the Government. The money has to come for my fare to Geneva and back, and whether the Government pays for it is a different matter. In one case the I.L.O. paid, and in the case I am pushing it is for the Government to get back from the Union and the Employers Association. One year the most we could do was to beg the Government to pay towards sending a delegate. I think only one of us went because we could not afford it, and it was a question as to whether Senator Walcott who was then Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union and I should both go. We could not get enough money from the Government, and it was decided by the Union to send me alone; but that was a specific request to the Government. The Union approached the Government and the Government agreed to send this. I ask whether they should not be made to give back whatever money the Government may pay before hand to an I.L.O. conference.

You need not be a lawyer; you need only just have some nodding acquaintance with the position of a Parliament. Can an outside body tell a Government what money they can spend? It is sheer nonsense.

Another point, and I hope some Minister is making a note of this for the Leader of the House: what about Mr. Welch? Why this 1966? Now that the Hon. Leader of the House has returned, I just want to ask about Mr. Welch.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Since the hon. member has replied, there seems to have been some confusion in his mind as to whether I suggested that the Government should prosecute. What I have said and will repeat again is that you cannot sit by and say you are paying no increase on the pre-devaluation rates and therefore it does not matter who else pays. The hon. senior member for Christ Church said that the Government is being billed for it. I do not know if this

is so or not, but what I do know is that in this matter I am satisfied that the greater amount has gone for air passages. When the Prime Minister over the radio and in Independence Square invited people, if they went to buy and had to pay more they should prosecute, I considered that that was to a gullible public and that you cannot fool all the people all the time. The first thing you have got to prove is the evidence and the agreement and so on, and if the Government and its officials are paying less, and I have every reason to believe the statement made by the Leader of the House that they are paying less; they are paying less in accordance with what the Prime Minister said about the agreement which they had before devaluation that had nothing to do with I.A.T.A., and therefore they continued to pay less; but there is such a thing as an Aviation Licensing Authority. It is something like \$100 more for a return ticket to the United States, and I just instance to the Hon. Leader of the House that I am sure he would not like to know that some little girl from St. Lucy who has been chosen to go to America as a domestic would have to pay \$50 or \$60 more than he has to pay to travel to New York. From all the talk we heard, we thought something would have been done by now to avoid these people paying the increased fare; but I just sat by and laughed. I said to myself that this was just another joke, because if you do not pay B.W.I.A., you are going to pay Pan American and the other airlines.

On the question of having rides and so on, the general public feel that some of these Conferences are not necessary, but on the question of going to England or America and becoming ill, I would say that this is just an accident, as I remember in 1962 when I was in England and I was called at midnight, because the Prime Minister had to go to hospital for an operation. This was an accident. Possibly if he had not been in England and had been here, it is the type of thing to which he would have succumbed. That does not prevent the general public from feeling that some of these trips are not necessary; but I just want to make it clear that I am not suggesting that you must tell the Director of Public Prosecutions that he must prosecute. Today reveals to the General Public that from March to the end of November, of the \$125,000 spent for Conferences and trips abroad, Ministers, Civil Servants and the like who go on Government Conferences are paying less to B.W.I.A. than John Citizen, and this is something in which the Government should offer protection to the public. I am not saying to offer protection by suggesting to the Director of Public Prosecutions to prosecute, but if you know that you are this powerful, then stop travelling by B.W.I.A., because it looks to me that when you travel by Pan American and B.O.A.C. you are paying the full amount.

2.05 p.m.

There can be no argument to it. The average citizen looks to the Government in power for the time being, for protection, and when the Government admits on the floor of this House today that we are paying the same fare which we paid before devaluation, and we

tell you now that the general public is paying the increased fares, you should do everything in the matter. It is like saying: "We are buying rice at 10¢ a pint and the general public must pay 14¢ a pint for it and we do not care;" or, "we are buying gasoline at 60¢ a gallon and the public must pay 80¢." It comes to that. The general public looks to the Government for direction and a tremendous number of people are not travelling just for a vacation or the like; a lot of people go out of this country to get jobs in America and Canada. At the time when that remark was made, I took it with a grain of salt, but I never believed it. I thought it was all nonsense. Nobody with discretion would have said it; but they have said it, and having admitted on the floor of this House that you are paying less, it is up to you to offer protection to John Citizen and the general public. What is the general public paying? They are paying more, we pay less and you go to hell.

I hope that the hon. member will do something about this now. I was not talking about any prosecution because with this talk about prosecuting these people, I know that this was so much of a joke. Prosecute what? You must have evidence when you go into a Court to prosecute people. What evidence could the average person, the average girl from Christ Church have, to prosecute on? This is only a joke. You have the Licensing Board; you have the power in your hands; but there are other things which I would not like to say here today because it might be dangerous to say them. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition knows that I carried the sobriquet of "Mr. Pan American" at one time in this House in fighting year after year that Pan American should come in here. B.W.I.A. was giving a very good break in this country. I had a lot to do with B.W.I.A. I caused people in this country to be Directors of B.W.I.A. When I first raised the question of having B.W.I.A. pay a trade tax at the time, the late Sir Archibald Cuke was advising us and we had to send him down Trinidad to go into the books, and it was found that while they made money between Barbados and Trinidad, they lost money in other places. I am not a Chartered Accountant; I am not an accountant at all. I admit these things and let them go; but B.W.I.A. went along nevertheless, and did a lot of the tourist business and so on. It is therefore regrettable that the Prime Minister should have made this statement leaving people in mid-air, and we know today from the statement of the Hon. Leader of the House that they pay less, that Civil Servants pay less when they are on Government business, of course, and the general public must pay more. They must pay the price, and that is the end of it.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I really should not have come into this debate. However, in order to set the record straight, I want to say on the floor of the House that travelling today does not hold any glory for me. A couple of years ago, travelling used to hold some glory for me because I used to be paid to travel. Today when I travel I have to pay, and at any time when I leave Barbados to go out, whether it is on Government business or otherwise, I always come back minus and not plus. That being said for

the record, I want to dispel a lot of the stupidity which was said on the other side. The hon. senior member for St. Thomas said that I went to Canada to measure a bus, but what he does not know is that when he was in England running all around, I was working at the Barbados Workers' Union as Organizing Secretary, and I have made my mark. Furthermore, for the hon. member's information, I will also say that I was a Unionist before his father was. Long before his father thought about joining the Union, I was a Unionist. (*Asides*). Here in Barbados

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I did not refer to the hon. member's Union Career in my speech. If he is going to deny something which I said, I did not refer at all to his Union career in my speech.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I did go; I do not have to tell him this, but for the benefit of the Chamber, the Hon. Minister and I visited almost every farm in Canada that the Barbados Workers were working on. (*Asides*).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I must ask for order.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, when they are talking, they like to hear themselves; but when somebody else is talking, they always want to interrupt him; but they cannot stop me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the Hon. Minister please continue with his debate?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I am a Minister of Government and when I leave here on the Government's business, I do not have to tell them what I went about. However, Sir, the senior member for St. Thomas has said that during the Barbados Labour Party's regime, they never did as much travelling as during the regime of the Democratic Labour Party. That is the first Government in the history of Governments that they had a trial Government; they had a Ministerial trial system in the Barbados Labour Party. Do not let us forget this. The next thing in our favour was that when the Barbados Labour Party was in power, the British Government had to look out for everything for them. We are independent today, and if you are forgetting this, let me remind you of it. This is an independent country, and therefore we cannot ask Great Britain to look out for our interests anymore. We have to look out for our interest ourselves. That is the reason why Ministers have to travel. Do not let the hon. member believe that he is giggling. I know that you feel ashamed. (*Laughter*.) Do not try to make people believe that Ministers on this side want to run about on the taxpayers' money. Every Minister, when he goes out on Government business, comes back mourning his losses. (Mr. HINDS: If he is a Minister like the Minister of Home Affairs). (*Asides*). What the members on the opposite side of the House do not seem to understand is that the relativity between sickness and health is so close that it is even thinner than a razor's edge; because today you can be well and tomorrow you are dead, or even today you may drop dead.

A man can go to England and be taken ill. We could have sent the hon. senior member for St. Peter to the C.P.A. Conference and what would have happened with him? Would he not have taken ill too? Has anybody got any control over illness? Do not get on like village idiots!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, Please!

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, will you call for order or name somebody?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have called for order, and I mean it.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition on the floor of this House today tried to give the impression that he is the keeper of the Breach.
2.15 p.m.

He is this great man for everything that goes right, but he does not know that we know that some time ago he left this country around 1957, went to England and, maybe, gallivanted all over Europe, too. (*ASIDES*.) I do not know, because I was not there. I refer to the Leader of the Opposition. What I do know is that we have been asked after, I am sure, he left here with subsistence allowance to the tune of \$7,000, to pay this \$7,000 for hotel and subsistence. I know he would get up when I say that.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Maybe, the hon. Member wanted me to get up, That is so patently offensive, so patently a charge of dishonesty, that I would like him to say when I went and ostensibly to what Conference, and how it is that any subsistence is paid to a member of the Government going abroad? Nothing is put in his pocket.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, apparently, he knows now that nothing goes into the Minister's pocket when he is involved, but, when the Ministers on this side travel, he says that they travel to get money. (*ASIDES*.) You would not understand the English language: he implied that, and that is why I got up to set the record straight. Every time I leave this country to go on Government business, I come back here minus not plus. (Mr. St. JOHN: That is not so.) You would not understand, because you would not even buy a coat. I am talking about the senior member for Christ Church.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, will you please call for order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have; will you please continue.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I cannot continue, if I am going to be interrupted by a lot of uncouth people. (*ASIDES*.) What I was saying, Mr. Chairman, is that the Senior member for St. Thomas tried to make out — (*INTERRUPTION*.) Mr. Chairman, I cannot continue, if I am going to be interrupted.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us have some order in this Chamber. This is my last plea.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, the hon. senior member for St. Thomas says that the Prime Minister travel because of some other reason. As far as I know, I can vouch for the Minister of Trade and Fisheries. He went to Europe on two occasions, and on each occasion he came back lamenting. (ASIDES.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Must I remind members again that there should be order in this Chamber?

AN HON. MEMBER: How often did the hon. junior member for St. Andrew go?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: The hon. junior Member for St. Andrew went as often as the present senior Member for St. Joseph went when the Barbados Labour Party was in power. Before you put the question, Mr. Chairman, I want to make things explicitly clear. I heard some nonsense about somebody went up and had an operation. The person who went for the operation is not Verwoerd of South Africa. He did not leave here to go and have an operation. Do not let us forget that Freddie Miller left this country when he was Minister of Social Services and went up to study Hospital Administration. He used about three to four months of the taxpayers' money, and nothing was said about it. The Leader of the Opposition did not say one word. He says that memories are short, but I want him to understand that my memory is long. (ASIDES.)

Mr. Chairman, I have always said that there are good talkers, but never good listeners. That is the problem you will get all the time. Freddie Miller went out of this country on a course. (Mr. MOTTLEY: He did not go out of this country on a course.) Mr. Chairman, one of these days I am going to say something on the floor of this House, and I know that the senior Member for the City is going to walk straight over here and give me a cuff. I am not going to hit him back, because I respect old people.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I hope I will not be in the Chair at that time.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I am sure he is not going to like what I have to say in here. I remember distinctly that the Leader of the Opposition used some very offensive remarks to the Senior Member for the City. (Mr. MOTTLEY: I have used offensive remarks to everybody in here.) It is now very strange to find that he is always this great disciple of the Barbados Labour Party! I am going to say something in this House now.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. In my 22 years in here I was always in the Opposition. I do not believe the Leader of the Opposition had a quiet moment in here when he was in the Government and I was in the Opposition. The hon. Minister said that a Minister of the previous Government went to do a course in Hospital Administration. I was in this House and that could not have

happened. The Minister went to examine things concerning a Hospital and not to take a course in Hospital Administration. Everybody knows that is so. As a matter of fact, I met the Minister in America. The Leader of the House was in here at the time, and he would not have sat down and allowed the Minister to go on a course in Hospital Administration. A course in Hospital Administration is for somebody administering a Hospital.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL rose —

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will both hon. Members take their seats. Will the Hon. Minister please continue the debate.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, how would the Leader of the House know what a Minister does when he leaves here? (ASIDES.) I knew what he had done, because that is what he said when he returned to Barbados.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, that is not so. I hold no brief for Freddie Miller.
2.25 p.m.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: What I have said, Mr. Chairman, is that the hon. senior member for Bridgetown got up to say that he did not go on a Hospital Administration course, but I was told so.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There is too much talking across the floor.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I was making my point.

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

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I notice the hon. member sat down without either confirming, substantiating or withdrawing his accusation about me. If he will say it outside the floor of this House and prove it, well, the whole world will know that I have been accused and have been proved to be a thief. If he does not say it outside of this House, I will know it to be cowardly.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I object to the word "cowardly" being used towards me.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: If he would not substantiate it in a court of law, then I know he is a coward.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I object to the word "cowardly" being used.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There is too much talking. Please listen to the Chair. The hon. member objects to the word "cowardly" being used.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I say again he has made a gross accusation against me. Go and prove it in a

law court. Say it outside, and see if you would not get a summons from a Solicitor the day after.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is making a speech. I object to the word "cowardly".

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to hear the sentence or the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition re-read. Mr. Clerk, would you please get the notes from the Reporter?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The words given to me by the Clerk are as follows:

"Mr. Chairman, I notice the hon. member sat down without either confirming, substantiating or withdrawing his accusation about me. If he will say it outside the floor of this House and prove it, well, the world will know that I have been accused and have been proved to be a thief. If he does not say it outside of this House, I will know it to be cowardly."

The last sentence begins with the word "if" which supposes "unless"; so I consider that to be a condition under which the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was speaking. Therefore I do not deem the word "cowardly" to be unparliamentary in that particular instance.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, before you report progress and ask for leave to sit again, I want to go back to the question of the statement made by the Hon. Leader of the House here today that the Government was not in fact paying the additional

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I may inform the hon. member that we are coming back.

Mr. St. JOHN: Very well, I will wait until you come back.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for three-quarters of an hour.

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

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

On re-assembling:

Mr. SPEAKER: When the sitting was suspended, the House was in Committee of Supply. To that it now reverts.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the suspension of the sitting, the hon. junior member for St. Thomas was speaking. If he so desires, he may continue his debate on the Resolution.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL did not rise to speak.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The question is

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend making a long speech today on this Resolution, but I have here before me in the figures given by the Hon. Leader of the House that an Appraisals Committee meeting of the U.W.I. was attended by the Prime Minister. I wonder if I have my figures correct, that it cost \$20 or something like that. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I said \$40). Do you know where that meeting was held? (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: In Jamaica). I wonder if the Minister can explain how that \$40 was arrived at.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: That would have been in this way. As you know, we contribute to the finances of the University so that the expenditure of the University meetings, except the Grants Committee meetings, are met from the Central University Budget; so that the Prime Minister would only have been entitled to his two days' or one and a half days' subsistence allowance or whatever it was. But the other expenses would have been covered in the University Budget.

Mr. HINDS: I intended asking the Minister how long this Conference lasted, but I understand from him that it lasted one and a half days or two days or something like that. There is one other point and that is with respect to a refund of air fares to Mr. Austin who had come to the Scotland factory.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would give way, Mr. Austin resides in Canada. He is a sort of engineer who was carrying out a sort of study. This was not only in connection with the Scotland Factory, but it was in connection with the future of the factories in the North of the Island. We have Spring Hall, Fairfield, Scotland and there is another one down there possibly Porters, and they are operating inefficiently. If you will remember, the Farley Commission recommended that the Island be divided into three areas where you will have three sugar factories as against sixteen or seventeen that there are now, and Mr. Austin was here looking at the possibility either of extending the Scotland factory or looking at the needs for a factory in the area with a view to making recommendations to the Government for an approach for external aid in putting down a 40-ton sugar factory. This is where the cost of this exercise was borne from the vote for Conferences and Delegations. It was a question of making certain recommendations to the Government in connection with the approach to the Canadian Gov-

ernment or any external agency to finance the construction of a factory which, it is estimated, would cost something like \$10 million.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, while I do not follow the remarks of the Hon. Minister who has just sat down, especially his explanation as to the reason for having this particular refund of air fares coming under the vote for Conferences and Delegations — I just do not follow the reason why this expense has not been borne from some other vote, particularly in respect of the factory in relation to the Sugar Industry, rather than being borne from a vote such as this.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I can help the hon. member. The answer is simple. We did not take money from the factories, and so on, to finance the Farley Commission in connection with the Sugar Industry. Sugar is the mainstay of the economy of this country today, and the Government is concerned about the future of some of the factories or the future of the Sugar Industry — the efficient running of the factories — and representation has been made that Fairfield is being operated uneconomically now and we can say the same thing about Spring Hall. Porters which, although it has a greater capacity, is not getting the volume of sugar cane. The most efficient factory in the North of the Island operating today is Haymans. The Scotland Factory was losing money, and we had even come out with a proposal where it might be possible to site a large 40-ton factory in the area around Bakers, a central spot somewhere around Pleasant Hall or somewhere like that. The hon. senior member for St. Peter will know what I mean, but the proposal was to set up the factory somewhere centrally so that you would get canes coming from even St. Thomas to this large factory where there would be greater efficiency, and people would be able to get a higher price for their canes and so on. All of that was gone into. We could not go to the A.D.C. and say that that should be done; this was done in the interest of the Sugar Industry generally. We had been even considering whether the Government would try to get this financed by an external agency, hold the responsibility for it and pass shares in it to all interest concerned like the managements of plantations, the owners of plantations and so on. We had gone into all of this. We had even had a survey — it was more feasible to put down a factory of this sort. The only place where we could pay for the passages and so on of this gentleman was from the vote for Conferences and Delegations, because this gentleman was doing something for the whole country and not for a particular factory.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, having heard how the \$125,000 has been disposed of, surely, the Hon. Leader of the House would now be in a position to tell us how the \$60,000 which he proposes spending, was arrived at.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I hope that the hon. member will understand that I could not say this in detail.

I know that, in a general way, we have been spending an average of \$15,000 a month and there are several commitments. For instance, one thing which has not been mentioned there, but I know that the vote is committed to it, is the Minister of Education's visit to UNESCO which has just taken place. That has not been mentioned. As to the Minister of Trade's visit to Germany, all the Bills for that are not yet in and they have not been mentioned here. There is likely to be a Heads of Governments Conference coming up, if not in December, in early January. The Minister of Agriculture tells me that there is an important one coming up in respect of CARIFTA in which both Ministers and their Staffs will be engaged. There is another big Civil Aviation one coming up, there are about a dozen big ones coming up between now and the end of March in which we must participate, and we anticipate that this amount will be required for that.

I do not know if that satisfies the hon. member; I can give the assurance also that when we meet in March during the Estimates, not only will the hon. member ask for a breakdown, but he will get one because by then we will have (ASIDES.) yes, similar to the one I gave him today. It will be important enough to be circulated beforehand. I agree with this.

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

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply.

3.35 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman has reported to me the passage in Committee of Supply, of one Resolution.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I propose to do only one more item under Government Business.

It is item No. 7, and I am asking leave to take it as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to proceed with Item No. 7 as the next Order of the Day under Government Business. In the absence of any objection, leave will be granted. There being no objection, leave is granted and I declare that No. 7 is the instant Order of the Day. It stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Andrew, the hon. Minister of Agriculture, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilization and Labour Welfare) Order, 1968.

APPROVAL OF THE SUGAR INDUSTRY (REHABILITATION, PRICE STABILIZATION AND LABOUR WELFARE) ORDER, 1968

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, this is the normal Resolution which comes annually to approve the various levies on Sugar. Last year the levies were as follows:

		\$	¢
Capital Rehabilitation Fund	..	4.80	
Price Stabilization Fund	..	2.60	
And as to the Crown in right of its Government of the Island for the Labour Welfare Fund	—		
	..		
(a) From basic levy	..	4.80	
From above average levy		1.26	
From Provident Fund levy		1.00	
		<u>14.46</u>	

Last year the total was \$14.46. This year it is proposed that the rates of levies to be imposed on sugar and fancy molasses be \$13.20 per ton plus \$2.90 wine gallons respectively, and all the money received by the Sugar Production and Export Control Board by way of these levies should be allocated to the Board as follows:

		\$	¢
Capital Rehabilitation Fund	..	4.80	
Price Stabilization Fund	..	1.97	
Basic Levy		4.80	
Severance Pay		.63	
Provident Fund		1.00	
A Total of		<u>13.20</u>	

It is to be noticed that provision is made here for severance pay, because during the last crop season and at the end of the last crop season Colleton and the Scotland Factory were closed, and provision had to be made for severance pay for the workers. In the case of the Scotland Factory Workers, they have already been paid. The Colleton workers will be paid in the next few weeks.

This is a normal Resolution. I do not know if hon. Members want a further explanation on it, but I can hardly think so. I, therefore, beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I take this chance now, as I usually do on these occasions, to remind the Hon. Minister that the Provident Fund that is to be of benefit to agricultural workers — those who have passed the age where they can still pursue work —

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I think I can anticipate what the hon. member has in mind. If the hon. member would give way, I can bring him up to date.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let me ascertain the position. Rather than have two hon. members on their feet singing a duet, I would ask if the Hon. member would give way; he would not lose his right to speak.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I will not lose my right to speak; I am inquiring about the Labour Welfare Fund.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: It was only last week, Mr. Speaker, that I had my final meeting on it. The Bill was drafted and it had to be sent to the Workers' organisation, the Employers' organisation and other organisations for their comments. It came back to the Ministry last week; I had a meeting on it, and the recommendations of these organisations, which have been accepted by the Ministry, will have to be inserted in the legislation as amendments. The Bill is now before the Crown Law Officers for final vetting. I would hope that in another three weeks — that is the latest I have given them — I would have the Bill introduced in the Legislature. I gave an undertaking that it will be introduced in the Legislature before the end of the year, provided I can get it out of the Crown Law Office. I have every assurance that I will get it; so the hon. member need not be afraid. The rate is \$3.60 a week. Everything is more or less arranged, and the Bill will be introduced in the Legislature in three weeks' time. Your constituents will be happy and mine will be happy, too.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Hon. Member giving an assurance about my constituents?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Yes, Sir, as well as those in St. Joseph.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am grateful.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, with that assurance, I will wait. It is very pressing now, especially in these days when we find many of these workers not being able to benefit from the National Insurance Scheme.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I understand that some hon. members have questions to give notice of.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, there are certain Questions which had not been completely processed when the

House first met today, and there is a Report of a Select Committee which the hon. Chairman has not yet signed. I understand he has so done.
3.45 p.m.

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE

Mr. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, with the leave of the House and with Your Honour's permission, I beg to present the Report of the Select Committee which was set up on the last occasion to go into a Bill to be called "The Manning and Company Road Improvement Act, 1967."

Mr. SPEAKER: The Report is duly presented.

QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: There are certain Questions which I now have before me on my file. The first stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would not mind, would he allow them to be printed, and take the giving of notice as done by the House and they will be printed in the usual way?

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member proceed as expeditiously as he normally does.

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

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Is it a fact that on 23rd August, 1968, the services were dispensed with of five Barbadian recruits in training at the Police Training School at Paragon Christ Church?

2. Were these five recruits part of a batch of seventeen recruited on the same date?

3. If the answer to No. 2 is in the affirmative, will Government take into consideration the fact that these men were dismissed after completing 18 weeks of a twenty-six week training course?

4. Is it a fact that these men were dismissed because it was found they would not become efficient policemen?

5. What is the name of the Recruiting Officer or Officers who recruited these five recruits out of a selection of seventeen?

6. Why did it take 18 weeks to determine the potentialities of these five men?

7. Did the Commandant receive any adverse reports on these men with respect to their aptitudes, abilities and general conduct? Did their class instructor make the report?

8. How long had the Officer making the adverse report been attached to the Police Training School before he wrote the report; and what opportunities did he have of observing these men on and off the Parade Square and in and out of barracks?

9. Is it a fact that Recruit No. 230 Miller of Batch No. 42 was dismissed as not being likely to become an efficient policeman after he had completed 24 weeks of a 26-week training period?

10. What did reports on these men disclose at mid-term? (i.e. the end of the 13th week)?

11. What does it cost to train a recruit for 18 weeks?

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

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

How many watchmen are employed at the Government's Primary and Comprehensive Schools in this Island?

2. Are these watchmen employed on a nightly basis or on a "period" basis?

3. If they are employed on a nightly basis, when does the tour of duty begin and when does it end?

4. If they are employed on a period basis, how many hours constitute a period? And how many periods does a watchman work between one pay day and another?

5. Is it a fact that these watchmen were paid during 1966-67 and 1967-68, some at the rate of \$35.20 and others at \$30.80 for 7-periods of work?

6. Is Government aware that as from the beginning of the present school-term these watchmen have been paid reduced wages as follows — \$30.80 and \$26.40, for the said 7 periods of work as heretofore?

7. Why have the wages of these men been reduced and who authorised the reduction?

8. Is it a fact that a Relief Watchman works for 36 hours and receives a mere \$13.20?

9. Will Government take steps to correct this situation and cause such arrears as are due to be paid to those watchmen whose wages have been reduced without their consent either individually or collectively?

10. Will Government take immediate steps to appoint watchmen at such schools as are now without?

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

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

Is the Minister aware that Specialist staff attached to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital are unhappy over having medical doctors in private practice seeking direct consultation with doctors on the staff of the University of the West Indies, rather than referring their cases to the Specialists at the Hospital?

In the interest of the sick and of the doctors involved, would Government consider taking steps to bring about a better understanding on this very important matter?

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

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Will Government seek to acquire an area of land — 5 acres or thereabout — from the present owners of Heywoods Plantation in the Parish of St. Peter for the purpose of providing a Community Centre with adequate playing field facilities for the youths of St. Peter and neighbouring St. Lucy and for other residents in this Island?

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

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Is it a fact that Capital Works projects are carried out by Maintenance Staff at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital?

2. What constitutes maintenance work at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital?

3. Is it a fact that Maintenance Staff at this Institution execute Grade "A" work, but receive Grade "B" pay for such work?

4. Is it a fact that Maintenance Staff "on call" from 12 noon Saturdays to 7 a.m. Sundays are paid a mere \$1.25 for such periods?

5. Is building construction classified as maintenance under the terms as applied at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital?

6. Have Fitters and Fitters' mates constructed steel gates for use at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital?

7. Are Fitters paid as maintenance staff?

8. Who executed the change-over of the two laundry boilers from Natural Gas consumption to Diesel Oil?

9. Are the persons referred to at No. 8 above members of the Maintenance Staff at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital?

10. Is Government aware that there is grave dissatisfaction amongst maintenance staff at the

Queen Elizabeth Hospital over conditions of work and pay staff shortages, sick leave and casual leave?

11. Will Government take steps to have the grievances of these workers investigated without delay?

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

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

How many policemen were allowed to withdraw from the services of the Royal Barbados Police Force during the year ending December, 1967. How many during period ending 31st October, 1968?

2. What are the grounds upon which these policemen were allowed to withdraw?

3. How many of these allowed to withdraw had completed 10 or more years service? How many with five years or less than five years service?

4. How many of these policemen sought permission in writing to withdraw before they quit the Service?

5. How many sought leave and did not return to the job?

6. How many withdrew from the Service without being allowed to do so?

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

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

What steps, if any, have been taken by the Ministry of Education to inform pupils and their parents, as well as staff of the St. Leonard's Boys' School that the school has been given Independent Secondary School Status?

2. What took place in 1966 to influence the taking of this decision?

3. Is it Government's policy to grant this status to other Government Secondary Modern or Comprehensive Schools?

4. Does the Ministry experience any conflict of interest in administering one independent secondary school and several Government schools at the same time?

5. What steps Government propose taking to remedy this unwholesome situation?

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

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Is a jeep in the service of the Soil Conservation Department used for conveying children to and from

School between the parishes of St. Andrew and St. Joseph and elsewhere?

2. Whose children are conveyed by this jeep; and is this a proper function of the jeep?

5. Is the jeep insured for conveying that type of occupant?

4. Will Government take such action in this matter as is necessary in view of the fact that Soil Conservation workers are denied the use of the said jeep?

3.55 p.m.

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

Will Government cause Fire Services and the Town and Country Planning Department to visit and inspect the building at Speightstown which is known as the Northern Welfare Headquarters and Community Centre and to determine whether the said building is safe for persons to assemble therein for community activities in view of the fact that the first floor is nearly 10 feet from the ground and the said building is not equipped with a fire escape for use in case of accident and had only one entrance to the main assembly room and no adequate exit?

2. Will Government prohibit the use of this building for community or other purposes until Fire Services and Town and Country Planning Departments have inspected and reported thereon?

3. With a view to minimising any suffering to the social Work being carried on at this building, will Government act immediately to remedy any defects, such as providing the necessary exit East of the said building for the convenience of persons leaving the said assembly room?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Joseph. His Question re payment of overtime allowances to Inspectors.

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

When does the Government intend to make available to Grade One Inspectors of the Ministry of Communications and Works payment of their overtime allowances, bearing in mind that these officers are required to be available for duty at any hour of the day or night, and often have to travel long distances in the course of such duty?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. and learned senior member for St. Thomas:

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works:-

Is the Minister aware that it is the practice of police officials to refuse to allow persons to take driving tests on vehicles equipped with automatic gear shift?

2. Will the Minister state what Regulation supports this practice and whether he considers that the practice is justified in view of the increasing trend towards the manufacture and use of motor vehicles with automatic gear change?

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

Is the Minister aware that certain statutory forms required for use at the Customs Department, including those relating to the entry of foods exempted from customs duty, are not obtainable at the Customs House but have to be bought from the Government Kiosk in Independence Square?

2. Will the Minister take steps to have all Customs forms made available for sale at the Customs, as well as supplies of stamps for receipt purposes?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works:-

Has the Government got any plans for installing a system of street lights in Porey Spring and surrounding districts of St. Thomas and if so, will the Minister state the date on which work on their installation will begin?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works:-

Will the Minister take early steps to repair and resurface those portions of Highway 7 between Hastings and Worthing which have become pitted and cracked following resurfacing by the Barber-Green machine?

2. Can the Minister say what is responsible for the conditions referred to above?

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

1. Is it a fact that earlier this year the Postmaster General wrote to two members of a family resident at Bennetts Tenantry in the parish of St. Thomas, inviting them to attend at the General Post Office in connection with complaints against a then postman, Mr. Milton Wiles?

2. Did either of the two persons referred to attend at the G.P.O. on the day in question?

3. If the answer to 1 is "Yes" and the answer to 2 is "No", will the Prime Minister say which of the statements contained in question Number 242 answered in this Honourable House on the 5th November, 1968, were, as described in that answer, "unfounded"?

4. If none of the statements in the said question No. 242 can be shown to be unfounded will the Prime Minister withdraw that part of his answer as being an unwarranted slur on a member of this Honourable House?

Mr. SPEAKER: That appears to complete Questions which I agreed to be allowed to be asked at this stage.

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to submit the Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider and report on the Bill entitled the Manning and Co., Ltd., (Road Improvement) Act, 1957.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry that the hon. member has been permitted to go astray. That was done by the hon. senior member for Christ Church already.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I am aware of that. I thought it was a new procedure.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry that the Clerk has misinformed the hon. member. I apologise.

ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, that concludes Government Business for today. I beg to move

Mr. SPEAKER: Just before the hon. member makes his motion, I would like to say this in respect of a motion which was made earlier this afternoon in connection with the Chairman of Committees. I would just remind hon. members of Standing Order 4 which reads as follows:-

"1. At the commencement of every Session, a Chairman of Committees shall be elected whose duty it will be to take the Chair in all Committees of the whole House. The election of the Chairman shall be conducted in a similar manner to the election of the Deputy Speaker.

2. In the absence of the Chairman, the House may elect any Member then present to act as Chairman of Committees."

I merely point out that we cannot have two Chairmen of Committees, but we can have one and an Acting one.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, may I ask, if the Chairman of Committees dies, how does this Rule operate? Surely, the House can change its mind.

Mr. SPEAKER: At any moment if the Chairman dies, then that member is not Chairman of Committees. The Chairman of Committees, it is implied, must be a live person.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, my point is this: is not the House in order — I do not say that anything is going to happen, I do not say that we will get a majority; but suppose the majority of the House wanted the Chairman changed during the course of a Session! Surely it is in order to have a majority vote for it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, the House would then have to proceed by way of removing the Chairman of Committees just as it might remove the Speaker by a majority vote on a substantive motion and elect someone in his place.
4.05 p.m.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I apologise if I seem to rise too often. We are quite serious and we want to establish that the House may at any time make a motion which, if a majority agrees to it, becomes the decision for the rest of the Session, or until it is altered.

Mr. SPEAKER: I merely point out that we cannot have more than one Chairman of Committees at the same time, but we may have someone to act for a Chairman of Committees who is absent. Anyhow, if we can get more co-operation than we have been getting in the past, from a staff point of view, we may soon have our new Standing Orders ready, and No. 4 may be amended to suit the will of the House.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I apologise for getting up again. It has nothing to do with altering the Standing Orders. Have not we, up to today, suspended certain Standing Orders? If a motion is carried by a majority, what would be the position. At any moment you can make a motion here. Although we do not think we could get a majority for this, we could make a motion that the Speaker and the Chairman of Committees change places.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 19th November, 1968, at twelve noon.

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

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 19th November, 1968, at twelve noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
4.09 p.m.