THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 26th November, 1968.

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

PRESENT

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

Prayers were read.

Messrs MOTTLEY, LYNCH, SPRINGER and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the Meeting of the 29th October, 1968, have been printed and circulated amongst hon. members, and unless there is any objection, those Minutes will be confirmed. *(A Pause).*) Hearing no objection, I declare those Minutes duly confirmed.

CORRECTION IN ORDER PAPER

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members will have noticed in today's Order Paper on page 21, right hand column, a Resolution standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. James. Below this Resolution, there is no mention of the date on which notice was given of the Resolution. I apologise to hon. members for this unfortunate omission from the Order Paper, which I will see is corrected in the next Order Paper.

PAPERS LAID

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

Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for seven months ended 31st October, 1968.

Statement showing the sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of Money Orders, the amounts repaid to the Accountant General and the amounts due by the various Post Offices to the 30th June, 1968.

Statement showing the sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of Money Orders, the amounts repaid to the Accountant General and the amounts due by the various Post Offices to the 31st July, 1968.

Statement of sums of money paid over to the Accountant General for the Quarter ended 30th June, 1968, by the Commissioner of Police.

PETITION

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a Petition on behalf of the Moravian Church of Barbados praying the House to pass a Bill incorporating the Moravian Church, Barbados Conference with such powers of acquiring and holding real and personal property and other powers as to the House shall seem fit. I think most hon. members know the work which this Church has done here. The Petition is respectfully worded and I ask that it be taken as read.

The Petition was taken as read.

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 $2,164 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1968-69, Part I Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1968-69 No. 43 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. YEARWOOD entered the House and took his seat.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the Shops Or-

der, 1968. I should like to ask for permission to deal with this Resolution in all of its stages today. I have copies which will be circulated to hon. members. It is the usual thing which we have done for the past two years for the early and late closing of shops in the urban districts during this week.

I also beg to give notice of the following Bills:-

A Bill to amend and consolidate the Acts relating to bank holidays and public holidays.

A Bill to consolidate and amend the Acts relating to Shops.

REPLY LAID

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 269, asked by the hon. junior member for St. George, is ready.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next Meeting in order to deal with the Money Resolution of which notice has just been given.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to give Notice of a Bill to incorporate the Moravian Church Barbados Conference.

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

WHEREAS the economy of this Island is derived in the most part from the cultivation of sugar and its marketing and sale abroad;

AND WHEREAS the growers thereof comprise large and small plantation owners, large and small peasant farmers and others who employ labour in the process of growing canes and in the manufacturing of sugar;

AND WHEREAS there are trade union and other demands for increased wages for those engaged in the industry at all levels below that of management;

BE IT RESOLVED THEREFORE that to ensure adequate remuneration to all persons employed in the industry, in the growing and manufacturing process, this House requests Government to cause enquiry to be made to determine -

(a) What agency or other arrangements exist: both locally and overseas for the marketing, handling and selling of both sugar and molasses;

(b) The name of each such agency and the proprietors thereof;

(c) The functions of each such agency and what percentage per thousand tons of sugar or molasses marketed or sold is paid to or retained by any such agency for such services as may be rendered;

(d) What relation any such percentage bears to the amount made available for paying direct to workers engaged in the industry;

(e) What percentage on the per thousand tons of sugar or molasses basis is payable to such transporting and handling agencies as may exist in the industry;

(f) What percentage on the per thousand tons of sugar or molasses basis is payable to such Boards, Agencies or other existing organisations for administrative expenses in connection with the sale and marketing and handling of sugar and molasses for export;

(g) What percentage from the sale of the entire sugar and molasses crop is paid directly to factories, plantations and peasants;

(h) What percentage is made available for paying to workers engaged in the industry, and,

(i) What, apart from the late dispatch from Barbados of final shipment, is responsible for the late payment of final instalments due to plantation owners and peasant farmers for canes supplied to factories.

12.25 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, WHEREAS there is established on this Island a United States Naval Base at St. Lucy;

AND WHEREAS there are a number of Barbadian Nationals employed at the said Naval Base/ Facility rendering satisfactory service as clerks, typists, switchboard operators, security guards, motor mechanics, transport vehicle drivers, carpenters and in general maintenance;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House take full cognizance of the foregoing and appoint a committee to meet such United States Authorities as would be necessary to facilitate an enquiry into;

(a) Terms and conditions of employment; whether by contract, and if so to whom;

(b) What provisions exist, if any, for ensuring such workers adequate pay, pension or other rights; and if no pension rights exist what steps should be taken to ensure these workers enjoy all and every condition of service with all rights thereto as are enjoyed by other United States personnel serving overseas and, as in the case of some workers who have completed almost 10 years of faithful and satisfactory service the initiation of a scheme whereby such service can be rewarded either by gratuity or other means and, that the retirement age for such workers be determined as not to be in conflict with any United States regulations or terms and conditions applicable to United States personnel anywhere overseas.

QUESTIONS

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Question;

To enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works:-

1. Is the Minister aware of the practice of some tourist agencies to engage the services of selected owners of taxicabs before the arrival of tourist ships at the Bridgetown Harbour?

2. Does the Minister agree that this practice is contrary to the principle that taxicabs are vehicles that ply for hire at fixed places or stands and are hired on the further principle of "first come first served"?

3. Does the Minister agree that the custom of pre-employment by the aforesaid agencies inevitably leads to discrimination against some taxicab owners and / or drivers and to their loss of earnings unfairly?

4. Will the Minister take steps to see that legislation prohibiting this practice is sent down to the House speedily inasmuch as the tourist season has already begun?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to incorporate the Moravian Church Barbados Conference be read a first time.

Mr. LYNCH: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend and consolidate the Acts relating to bank holidays and public holidays be now read a first time.

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

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to consolidate and amend the Acts relating to Shops be now read a first time.

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

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 3 be taken as the First Order of the Day.

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

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

THE HIGH COURT (ADMIRALTY JURISDICTION) ACT, 1968

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take this item in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is seeking its leave to take charge of the Bill in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works, and, unless there is any objection, leave will be granted. There being no objection, leave is granted to the Hon. Leader of the House to take charge of Item No. 3.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Bill, as hon. Members have seen, is to vest in the Supreme Court of Barbados, in addition to any Admiralty Jurisdiction which it may now possess, the same Admiralty Jurisdiction which exists in England in the High Court of the United Kingdom according to the terms of the Administration of Justice Act, 1956. Quite some time ago the Cabinet had decided that these provisions should be extended to Barbados and that legislation, such as we have before us now, should be drafted to give effect to the same.

However, before the legislation was prepared, the Cabinet decided that the matter should be referred to the Hon. Chief Justice to ascertain his views as to whether or not the enlarged jurisdiction should now be vested in the High Court of Barbados. The Hon. and Learned Chief Justice agreed that this should be so, and that this jurisdiction should, by legislation, be conferred on the High Court of Barbados. The draft, in this way, is before us now.

Hon. Members will see from the text of the Bill that it covers a wide range of matters in connection with the carriage of goods in ships at sea; the claims arising from salvage; claims arising from towage in respect of ships and aircrafts; claims arising from the repair of refurbishing of ships arising out of dock charges and deck dues as well as arising from collisions.

I beg to move that the Bill be now read a Second time.

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, there is no need for any comment from this side, because we are satisfied that if the Chief Justice says it is all right, it is all right.

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

12. 35 p.m.

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

Clauses 1 to 7 inclusive were called and passed.

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

On separate motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE MOTOR VEHICLES AND ROAD TRAFFIC (AMENDMENT) (NO. 3) REGULATIONS, 1968.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of this in the absence of the Hon. Member.

Mr. SPEAKER: In the absence of that Hon. Member, the Hon. Leader of the House is seeking leave to take charge of this item and if there is no objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted the Hon. Leader of the House to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) (No. 3) Regulations, 1968.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I think hon. Members will recall that the Hon. and Learned member for St. Thomas asked a Parliamentary Question - I believe it is No. 143 - to which a Reply has been given. He had asked a Question in connection with the parking space available in the District "A" Court area, and the Reply was that consideration would be given to the matter of reserving a limited number of parking lots for legal practitioners and solicitors, in addition to the reserved parking space for staffs of the Court and Registration Office. The Cabinet further concluded, in addition to the terms of reference contained in the Question, that Regulations should be made to enforce the proper use of such parking facilities. After the Regulations were drafted, they were sent to the Hon. and Learned Chief Justice and he has stated that they appear to be in order. Consequently, the Regulations were made by the Chief Technical Director and sanctioned by the Minister, and this Resolution is to approve them.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister mentioned the legal practitoners, solicitors and other officers of the Court. I presume he means Magistrates, Judges and so on. I do not think he could allow other officers of the Court who do not necessarily have to do travelling, because if you designate every boy or girl who works in the Court and gets a car to bring him to work as an officer, you would never have enough space. I hope you see the point I am making. This should be clarified.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If the Hon. Member would give way, the Hon. Member's point is well taken. As a matter of fact, from what I recall of the Reply given to the Hon. and Learned Member when the Question was asked, it was stated that the space available for parking in the general area of the Courts was limited, but that we were giving consideration to reserving an adequate portion of that limited space for barristers and solicitors, and of course, in addition to them, space would be reserved for the staffs of the Court and the Registration Office. The Hon. Member is, I believe, enquiring about other persons who may have legitimate business, but who may not be on the staffs of the Registration Office or the Courts. Well, I think in a case like that they would have to have what space is available after the Judges, Magistrates, barristers and employees of the Registration Office have been served. That would be the most he could do.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. senior Member for Bridgetown gave way.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sometimes the judges complain that after they park somebody brings a jalopy, and parks behind their cars. You know what the youngsters give nowadays. Some youngsters about the place would park behind the Chief Justice's or other judges' cars and go away, and the Judges cannot get out. Good as these regulations may seem, you need to have somebody to regulate parking there, because it puts the Judges in a difficult position. Fortunately for me, I have somewhere to park my car in Coleridge Street, but I have seen Judges waiting because they could not get their cars out, and they did not know to whom the other car belonged.

12.45 p.m.

A clerk who might just be appointed there, gets a lift down with his friend, and the car is parked behind the Judge's car; the Judge cannot get out and people who have legitimate business cannot find any place to park. This matter needs more than the Regulations; this needs supervision to see that the Regulations are carried out. I notice that the Prime Minister, in speaking yesterday to the Police Association, talked about seeing that Regulations are carried out. The Regulations may be all right on paper, but what we want to see is that the Regulations are carried out. I am just telling you what I know the Judges complain of.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, these Regulations on paper seem to be very good. I admit that the Chief Justice and the other persons there should have parking space allotted to them. What I would like to find out is this; when I go there, will I be prevented from entering the premises or parking there? Regardless of whose car is there, whether it be the Chief Justice's car or the Lord Pope's car, if I have business there, I am going to park behind it.

I want to know if I will be charged for parking my car in there when I have to do business in the Courtyard. If the Regulations are such that I cannot park there, what are you going to do with people who have business there? Are you going to close the gate completely and only let in those people for whom spaces are marked? If I have business there, will I have to leave my car outside and walk? I am just as important in there as anybody else, and I want to know what is going to be done with people who have business in the Courts. I may have a case there; I may have to do business there; and if I drive into the premises, will I be charged? I cannot carry the car on my head into the office; I have got to stop it. I am wondering if the Hon. introducer of this Resolution - although he would not know much about this because he is only acting now - I think there is some space somewhere at the back of the Courtyard where they used to try out the buses and so on - a space where these Officers should be parking and allow the front part to be free for the use of people who have business there. You must remember that the Chief Justice's car will be there for a long time, and the lawyers' cars will be there for a fairly long time and rather than inconveniencing the public from getting that little space around the Court, they should park in those spaces down there at the back. I am wondering if there is sufficient room down there which could accommodate the Officers' cars. You must remember the public; you cannot think in terms of "A" and not in terms of "B". In other words, if we did not have any business, there would not be any Court; you would not want a Chief Justice or lawyers. I cannot sit here and allow this Resolution to go ahead without being told something. I want to know if I will be charged with going in there and parking, because if I see a space in there I am going to drive my car in it and stop there. I do not care what policeman comes, the policeman can lock up the car because I am going to do my business and come back out. I do not think that I should be embarrassed in that way.

Let us get it straight. I have not been there for a very long time, but I believe that there is some space there where these cars could be parked. The clerks and everybody else could park there, and that limited space should be left for people who have to do business there.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I cannot agree with my colleague and as this is not a matter of principle, I will openly differ from him. It is a matter of opinion, perhaps; but everybody knows that Barbados, small as it is- or perhaps because it is small, it is presenting difficulty on this question of parking. Some people park a couple of miles away from where they are going because they know that they cannot get any parking space, and they take a taxi or bus or a tube or something so as to get where they are going. This is a question of opinion now; I do not agree that anybody whose permanent work is connected with the Courts or Public Library should be put into the background because some member of the public wants to do business at the Courts or the Public Library. I do not agree with that at all. If the worst comes to the worst and the distance is too great to walk, you should take a taxi; you should park your car in the garage somewhere and take a taxi to the place of business as an ordinary member of the public. I put forward that opinion because I see that it is happening all over the world, and it will inevitably happen where you have these roads which were built years ago, they are not wide and you have not got parking spaces and so on. I think that the Hon. Member must have had experience of himself or a friend of his or some acquaintance, having to park his car far away from where he is going. I really got up to suggest, and if I had spoken before the Hon. Member who has just sat down, I perhaps would not have said what I have just said, because I was going to make a general suggestion. I am suggesting that the whole question of parking, including what we have discussed earlier this session like allowing people to rent a place monthly or so in a public parking space-with which I profoundly disagree incidently-needs to be gone into- the whole question of queueing up for buses, the question of this yard for that matter; because as far as I am concerned, I can see that Your Honour's car is the only car in this Island which can be sure of not getting any interference when people park. I have often had to wait and wonder where the driver of a car happens to be, because he has blocked me or other members of Parliament who may have parked across the way, from getting out. He has gone on his way and he is not in the Post Office or anywhere around here. I think that the Hon. Member's difficulty would be met by having a part of the duty of the Police to be in and around the Courtyard and see that people do not park in front of you. You could have a Regulation which says that some particular area is a prohibited area. I suggest that the Minister of Communications and Works should sit down with the Commissioner of Police and get people to come and give their experience about parking all over Bridgetown, and try and hammer out something which causes less worry to people using public places than exists at the present moment. I must say again that in ordinary circumstances, as a matter of principle, I would not even appear to differ from my colleague or other members of the Opposition. This is a matter of opinion, and therefore I press my opinion firmly; but the ordinary member of the public must be embarrassed if the choice is between embarrassing him or the Chief Justice, barristers, solicitors, the Public Librarian and so on. It is the ordinary member of the public who must give way, and not one of them.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am at a disadvantage because I have not heard the speeches which have gone in the earlier stages on this Resolution.
12.55 p.m.

I am sorry that the Minister of Communications and Works is not here, because I know that he has given the matter some thought. Although I want to say something generally on parking and Regulations, I fear that it will fall on deaf ears in the absence of the Minister himself. I hope that the Parliamentary Secretary, whom I do not think deals particularly with

this aspect of his Ministry's work, will be able to take notes that will assist us.

Mr. Speaker, the number of vehicles in Barbados has increased much more quickly than the willingness of the motorists to park a distance from the place where they intend to go; and also it has not yet penetrated the consciousness of the Police that to leave a vehicle on the open road so that another vehicle has to draw up behind it in order to let oncoming vehicles pass has been, for at least 25 years in England, automatically a ground for prosecution for obstruction of the highway; therefore, we have a great deal of difficulty with obstruction and parking generally.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, those who study traffic, I believe, consider that parked vehicles and the problems associated with parking are responsible for most of the holdups of traffic in Bridgetown and, certainly, are 90% responsible for all holdups of traffic outside Bridgetown. Outside Bridgetown where they do not have parking places, even though there is a side road, people still leave their cars on the main road. The people in Barbados accept it as a matter of course that when driving down the road and there is a parked car and cars coming in the other direction, you will have to wait until you can go on. That is accepted in here as a matter of course, but the American Police and the English Police prosecute people as a matter of course for that.

Now, I mention this as a preface, because, the day that it is realised that you cannot park a car on a road generally and there is no general right to stop your car on the highway, and if somebody has to stop behind a parked car on the open highway to allow traffic to pass that that is an obstruction - the day that such people are prosecuted here, as they are prosecuted in the United States and in England, we will have this car-parking problem worse than ever. It is fairly bad already, Mr. Speaker, because, as you will know, if there is one thing that is very difficult to defend it is a parking charge for parking somewhere where you should not park. You may be able to defend an obstruction charge, because the Police are not familar, as yet, with the full depth of the law of obstruction, nor are the Courts, nor, indeed, some of the lawyers, if I may say so. Parking charges resulting from parking a car where the sign says "No Parking" are the most difficult of all to defend.

Now, the Law Courts and various places. I am going to charge the Ministry of Communications and Works, first of all, with being so unfamiliar with the law as would demand the need of special Counsel assigned to them. There is no general power, although they do not seem to realise it, for the Minister of Communications and Works to appoint car-parking places. I mention this because I know how this has come about. I asked a Question in this Honourable House, Mr. Speaker, about this self-same subject. The Registrar was asked to make some comments. A Magistrate, upon hearing of this Question, apparently, made some remark about the windscreen of a car flashing in his face when he is sitting, and he does not want cars parked near the Writ Servers' Office. So the first result of my asking a Question about car-parking space for Barristers was that in certain places where Barristers' cars are traditionally parked next to the Writ Servers' Office at the foot of the steps leading to the Criminal Court's Office, large "No Parking" signs were being illegally placed there, without the knowledge of the Minister of Communications, and were being ignored, Mr. Speaker, by those who felt they had the law on their side.

I presume this Resolution is now before this House to regularise the position; so that if the Magistrates do not want windscreens flashing in their eyes, the Chief Technical Director may now do legally what he attempted to do illegally at some time in the past. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that a little more respect will be paid to the Question than was paid to it last time. It is not only in the Courtyard that we have had the problem with car-parking, because there is an underlying principle that anybody who has to specify car parks in any country in the world, from Moscow to Timbuktu, has to balance two conveniences: the convenience of people who come to the particular spot where the park is to be laid out - they come there to transact business and may go away again, and the convenience of persons who work there and who want to be able to park their cars near their work. Mr. Speaker, it is generally the former convenience that prevails.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the experience in here soon after your chauffeur, not being able to park your car in its usual place, was arrested by a policeman, who did not even ask his name, under the blanket charge of failing to give his name and address. As you, Sir, are only too familiar, when you give what a policeman considers as a "little lip" over a motoring offence, he does not ask for your name, but he puts his hands in your trousers' belt, if he thinks you are a person that he can do this to, and carries you to the Police Station. At the Station, for the first time, you hear you have been arrested for failing to give your name and address. You, Sir, complained to the Commissioner of Police, and on a subsequent occasion a policeman and I also had a word or two about parking out here. I also complained to the Commissioner of Police, and the Commissioner indicated that it would be a little hard on members of the staff of the Post Office, and so on, who work here not to be able to park here close to their work. Mr. Speaker, that is what the Independence car park is there for. We do not arrive here, as Members, early in the morning when we can find spaces in the ordinary way, but people who work here can do that. They come here early enough to find the best parking spaces. People who come here later for purposes of resort are the people who actually need the space. I would apply this argument to the new car park opposite DaCosta's as well. People who have parcels and are shopping are more in need for parking spaces in that car park than the people who come into Bridgetown at eight o'clock in the morning and go home at four o'clock in the afternoon without using their cars between those hours. (Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I do not

agree with that.) They can put their cars a little distance away, but the people who come to shop are the people who need something to put their parcels in. That is why I am going to move, if necessary, a Resolution to restore daily parking in the parking lots in Bridgetown itself. If Hanschell Larsen and the other businesses really want to reserve space, such space should be reserved for customers and not for employees. That is my view, Mr. Speaker.

Now, applying the same argument to the Law Courts, there are people I know who work, not even in the Law Courts, but who get there early in the morning, put their cars in the Law Courts, walk out through the door and do not appear there again for the rest of the day. We have seen a boycott of car parks provided at the taxpayers' expense - we have seen it happen with what, I think, is now the Elite Bus Stand in Constitution Road. We saw a deliberate boycott by people who felt that they could not leave their cars up there because it would be too far to walk.

1.05 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, there are about 12,000 cars in Bridgetown, and in ten year's time it will be 20,000; and as we move into an age where there are many more motor cars, we are going to have to learn the use of the legs again. We are going to have to learn to park in places and walk, and it is time that the privileged spots be retained and kept for those who should enjoy the privilege of parking within them. Now at the present time there are also signs illegally placed in the Court Yard for the Registrar, the Deputy Registrar, Clerks, 'Chief Marshal's Office only' and so on. As I understand it, up to the date of the making of these Regulations, none of those signs was legal, but nevertheless the Police could be found to enforce them. But if a barrister tried to find somewhere to park his car, coming in a hurry, perhaps, from a country Court to help a client, very seldom could he find a policeman to assist. Indeed again illegally, because the Police seem to think they also have the right to make roads one-way at will, the exit from the Law Courts onto Tudor Street is blocked sometimes. I think you will agree, Mr. Speaker, that this is a straightforward obstruction of the highway, and if the Commissioner of Police orders that it be blocked, he can be prosecuted just as anybody can be prosecuted for obstruction of the highway. All these little illegalities are done that prevent barristers coming from the Northern Courts and driving through the back of the Court yard in order to find somewhere to park their cars.

Now I am a barrister; therefore I have an interest in parking in the Court yard. I do not think it is an unreasonable interest, Mr. Speaker. I happen to know, because I used to have to drive a car close to the Law Courts in London and various places like that, that when I was a non-practising barrister, for example, I could not park my car in the Law Courts in London. You had to have a proper sticker to put on your car, and they are only issued to practising barristers and persons who really need to use these Courts. Spaces were reserved for Judges, Registrars, Masters and so on, and spaces were reserved for practising barristers, and practising barristers are more ambulant than the regular officials, because the reason why we have to carry a car to Court is that when you finish in one Court, you want to be able to get into your car easily and go away to another Court. That is why barristers seek the use of car parking spaces close to the Court.

These Regulations from my point of view, Mr. Speaker, since we seem to be speaking personally over this side on this matter, were long required. One thing I would say is that when the Minister is making Regulations, I would ask him to bear something in mind which I want to take the Attorney General up on. It does not concern parking; it concerns traffic. We came here to a Select Committee which has now reported and were asked to repeal certain Bills. In the course of the debates of the Select Committee, it was revealed that the Chief Justice or the Commissioner of Police in fact has no jurisdiction over placing a "No Entry" sign on Coleridge Street when the Supreme Court is sitting, and we were also told that the jurisdiction to block Rickett Street when the Legislature is sitting rested only on an Act, I think, of 1909. We objected to repealing this. We were assured by the Attorney General that a Regulation would be made embodying the terms of the Act which we were repealing. It is, I believe, a year now since then, and at least two sets or perhaps more of amendments have been made to the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Regulations, and that has not yet been done. That is a matter which affects members of this Honourable House. I can hear traffic noise outside now, Mr. Speaker, and Rickett Street is full of motor cars. I very much hope that whoever is responsible for reminding the Attorney General of his pledges will remind him of this, and ask how long would it be before we have this particular Resolution.

Since we are talking about car parks and Regulations, I had partly expected that some colour of law would have been found to justify the sign on the wharf going into Da Costa's car park saying "No Through Road Vehicles: For Car Park Only". To my knowledge people have been convicted for not obeying that sign, and there isn't anything in any Regulations that says that the sign should be there, and I have never obeyed it, and I warned a policeman on one occasion to get out of my way when he stood up and told me I could not pass that way. I hope that all these anomalies will be cleared up, that Regulations for car parking will in future be made only where they are legal, and that everywhere where it is sought to have Regulations, we can come here in the House and discuss whether it is a good thing to have Regulations about the Public Buildings yard, Regulations about the Courtyard of the Law Courts and so on. I very much hope that the Minister or the Parliamentary Secretary for the Ministry or the Leader of the House can get up and tell us that it is intended that space be allotted for the parking of barristers' cars within the precincts of the Courtyard. That is where we are expected to work. (A VOICE: He said that.)

I am very much obliged to hear that the Leader of the House has said so, and I understand there is

also an aside from the Parliamentary Secretary signifying he knows that as well. I am very glad to hear that, Mr. Speaker, and I would recommend to them if they think there should be some cash nexus for this, that I do not seek to pay out money, but if there is some such idea of a little licence which should be issued to barristers by the year who wish to park their cars - some nominal sum of $1.20 a year or something like that; the cost of the licence, in other words, to park their cars in the Court yard - I would be perfectly happy to see that principle introduced "for Class "A" licence holders only" or whatever the case may be. You put up a little notice which says "Class A" and you buy the licence and you put it there.

In the days when I used to park, firstly in Grays Inn and secondly in one of the Law Court precincts, I used to have to pay for my sticker on my car, and I do not think that that is too much to ask if you want to be sure that practising barristers and solicitors are the persons who are using the spaces reserved for persons of that class. I would not mind that as long as they do not make it a new tax. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, since we have to pay $120 a year, they could give us a sticker for our car at the same time that we pay the $120 licence a year. That would be one of the things we would get along with the receipt - the right to park in the Courtyard. It is something that could very easily be done.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1 is the instant Order of the Day, and it is to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Island.

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

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1968-69 No. 42

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, there are four gardeners and one Head gardener at Government House. The Governor-General has requested that early consideration be given to providing an additional gardener because expansions have been made to the gardens, and this additional gardener is required for the preparation of more beds.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am sorry to interrupt the Hon. Member, but I do not see that on my Resolution.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I think it was a typographical error by the Secretary. You do not have garden beds at Government Headquarters, and in the Addendum mention is made of garden beds. It is really for Government House, and I do not think it materially affects the Resolution in that the Addendum is only the explanatory note and not part of the Resolution.

1.15 p.m.

I should like to apologise for that typographical error. It should be "Government House" instead of "Government Headquarters". (Mr. MOTTLEY: Codrington House?) I am referring to the House at Codrington Hill. *(ASIDES)*. Whatever it may be, this is where we meet. However, the annual amount for the additional gardener would be $1426, and for the remainder of the year, the amount required at $26.40 per week would be $502.

I will deal now with Item 77 - Entomological and Pest Control. Since the construction of the new Terminal Building at the Airport, provision has been made there for Entomological and Pest Control. There has been provision made for a Plant Quarantine, but it was not anticipated that this provision would have been ready before the end of this financial year. Since it is now ready, it is necessary to purchase certain equipment, and I will itemise that equipment for Hon. Members: (1) a bench with covers, and the cost of that is $245; (2) a table with drawers, $85; (3) a Dexion metal rack, $120; (4) a 14-inch electric fan, $83; (5) an electric lamp, $40; (6) two chairs $46 and one window curtain, 6'X 6', $21. That amounts to $640.

In relation to Item 100 - Equipment, provision has already been made in the 1967-68 Estimates for the purchase of a sludge pump, and that is for Groves Agricultural Station. We keep pigs there; the pigs' urine and filth come out and settle in a hole, and this sludge pump is for the purpose of pumpimg away the faeces and the urine and the water is used for washing down the pig pens there. The reason why we have to get this type of pump is because solids pass through it. Perhaps, we could get a cheaper type of pump, but it would not do the job. The cost of that is $2,000. What has happened is that the provision for this machine was made in last year's Estimates, but there were negotiations going on in respect of specifications and the assembly of the machine. This took sometime, and therefore the machine was not paid for before the end of the last financial year. Now that we have got it, provision has got to be made for it. It was anticipated that we would have received it before.

Mr. Chairman, the next Item is Item 102 - Motor Vehicles. In 1967, a contract was awarded for improved services with a land Rover, and this was bought for Codrington Experimental Station. This is a land Rover with a canvas hood. When reference is made to equipment, this is included in the equipment. Although this was received some time in March, and the voucher was written receivable to Motor Services Ltd. for the amount in March, it was not submitted to the Treasury for the cheque before the end of the last financial year; therefore this land Rover was not paid for. It was anticipated that it would have been paid for by 31st. March, but the voucher was not submitted and in order for them to receive the money, this amount will have to be voted. Approval was already given by this House.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I come to the Barbados Marketing Corporation. This House has already approved the granting of a loan if $1.35 million to the B.M.C. In that Resolution, it was pointed out that, of the $1.35 million, the Government would be responsible for $700,000 and would pay it over a ten-year period. No provision was made in this year's Estimates for the amount being repaid on behalf of B.M.C. this year. This is a sort of subsidy; hence we are asking for $51,000 which would be for the remainder of this year until the end of the financial year to meet the payment to which the House has already agreed. The House has already agreed by Resolution that the B.M.C. would be allowed to borrow this $1.35 million. The money has already been borrowed. The House has further agreed, because it has passed a Resolution, for the Government to be responsible for the $700,000 as a subsidy to be repaid. (Mr. MOTTLEY: How much of this has been stolen?) I am going to give you good news now. The first time since the establishment of the B.M.C. that it has made a profit, was in August this year.
1.25 p.m.

August was the first month since the establishment of the B.M.C. that they have ever been able to make a profit. *(ASIDES)* The rental of the place for the B.M.C. is treated as equity. (Mr. MOTTLEY: What is the meaning of that?). You will have to ask the Hon. and Learned senior Member for St. Thomas, one of the legal luminaries in Barbados. The position is that since the B.M.C. have been relieved of some of the burdens which they had, and since they have been refinanced, they are making a move in the right direction. In July they experienced a loss, and in August they were able to make enough profit to erase the loss. (An Hon. Member: What was the amount?). The loss experienced was something in the vicinity of $6,000. After writing off the depreciation in July of $14,000, they made a profit of over $1,000 in August. *(ASIDES)*. I am saying that after the $14,000 was written off for depreciation, after operational expenses, salaries expenses and administration expenses were taken into consideration, a profit was made in August. That is something that has never been experienced, before; so you will see that with your assistance from the side of the Opposition and your co-operation, the B.M.C. has begun to move forward.

This month we expect to do much better. We have seen where we were losing money. We have seen that we have been losing a lot of money in the Abattoir. We recognised the fact that the fees chargeable there were too low, and that the slaughterers were not pulling their weight. They were the best paid workers in this country; they worked for a 20-hour week, or a 30-hour week, rather than a 44-hour week, or a 32-hour week, and they were paid overtime for any time beyond that period. They have been the most easy-going workers in the country. At one stage, they were working 20 hours a week, and they were paid overtime after that. That was responsible for the large amount of losses experienced in the Abattoir section. *(ASIDES)* Hon. Members can have their talk when I have finished. I am telling the House what I know.

The point is that the conditions of service have been changed to some extent. Instead of working 20 hours a week, they are working 32 hours a week. I think that they should be working 44 hours a week like anybody else, and that overtime should be paid thereafter. However, they are represented by the Union. The Union has fought their case, and they are now working a 32-hour week. That is where we are losing money in the B.M.C.

In August there was a loss of $1,222 in the Abattoir section; in July there was a loss of $3,000 in the Abattoir section, but, because of the fact that I instructed the Superintendent of the Abattoir to see that more work was done by the people under closer supervision, we have been able to cut down cost. I am telling Hon. Members what we have been doing to stop the Abattoir from losing money. We have increased the slaughtering fees by approximately 50%. From next month I do not expect the Abattoir to lose money. (Mr. MOTTLEY: The price of pork will go up.) How how can the price of pork go up? You pay 40¢, or 44¢, a pound for pork on the hoof. Are you going to pay 44¢ for pork on the hoof, and then sell it at $1.10 per pound?

Mr. Chairman, the price control was removed from pork so that the question of supply and demand would play its part; but, if this situation continues, we may have to resort to putting a price control on pork again. They are paying the farmers and pig growers-people who have to buy animal feed at an exorbitant price - 42¢ per pound for pork on the hoof, and they should not sell the pork at $1.10 per pound. If you took off one-third of the live weight of the pig as waste, and calculated what you would get for the remainder, you would find that they are charging almost 200% for the pork. They go to the people in my consituency and pay them 40¢ a pound for pork on the hoof. I think this is highway robbery. If this situation continues, we will have to do something about it. We have increased the fees for slaughtering; so let them carry up the price of pork, then!

Mr. Chairman, I think it is ridiculous to pay farmers and peasants and housewives in St. Joseph 42¢ a pound for pork on the hoof, and then sell the pork at $1.10 per pound. I think we will have to take a serious look at the matter. I, personally, do not

like price controls because there is no competition, and supply and demand does not play its part. However, when we find certain people taking the people in the country for a ride, something will have to be done in the matter. *(ASIDES)*

Mr. Chariman, I was explaining to Hon. Members where the B.M.C. has been experiencing losses. In July they experienced a heavy loss in the wholesale section, and made a heavy profit in the wholesale section in August. I have not yet received the report for the month of September.
1.35 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, is this heavy loss in the wholesale section in addition to the $3,000 in the Abattoir?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The Barbados Marketing Corporation operates in sections, and I told you what they lost in the Abattoir and what they lost in the wholesale section in July. The Abattoir has cut down its losses by approximately $2,000 in the following month, and the wholesale section did not only cut down that loss, but made a bigger profit. There is one other section which experienced a loss, and that was the cold storage. The Hon. junior Member for St. Michael knows about this machinery better than I do. What has happened is that they had three of the cold rooms closed without anything in them because they did not have business for them in August, but they still had to operate three engines to keep one or two cold rooms that were in operation. This meant that they lost something like $400 for the month, because they had to be operating engines without having trade, so to speak. (Mr. MOTTLEY: How much did you lose on the flying fish which you threw away?). I have no knowledge of their throwing away any flying fish in August. I can only give you what was represented to me, and I am going to give it without any fear, because when I have discharged my conscience and performed my duties, God in Heaven cannot do better.

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

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, before I speak on this Resolution, I want to say that tomorrow in the *Advocate* you will see headlines reading "Barbados Marketing Corporation Made A Profit", because of the dishonesty with which reports go out and with which the *Advocate* reports things, instead of reporting the honesty with which the Minister is trying to tell us what happened. This will be done to make us look like a lot of damned fools in here. It does not make any difference to me. I have been in here long enough, and you must try and see if you can put me out.

I would like the Minister to note that Under Item 31A he is asking for more money for a gardener at the Governor-General's House. I so term it because it seems necessary. I should be the last person to prevent our Governor-General's House from being kept up to date. What is the position with the prisoners working there? Don't they attend to the gardens?

The sludge pump which you asked for in this Resolution is, I think, necessary, and at least I will support it. Money is also required to furnish a room in the Terminal Building at Seawell. I think that is necessary and your explanation is very proper. With regard to the Land Rover from Motor Services Ltd., you said that the voucher was not presented. You can make a note of these and reply. I understand with absolute authority that there are some vouchers which the Government had in hand for people since the beginning of this financial year, and people have tried to collect them and cannot do so. I want to know from you when you say it has not been presented whether you mean that Motor Services Ltd. did not present their voucher for payment.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that Motor Services Ltd. did not present the voucher for payment before 31st. March.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You are making fun. This is one Company that I hear does not like to get money quickly into the business. Your understanding is that Motor Services Ltd. did not worry to collect their money. We will not worry about them. I hope the Hon. Member will not take refuge in the fact that we are criticising a Resolution which was passed in this House during this Session. I am making my grounds clear before you look for any Rule Book, Mr. Chairman, because we are at liberty as soon as you come back with a Resolution for money to offer our criticism on this. Now the Hon. Member has been somewhat frank in his explanation of Item 106 - Subsidy to Barbados Marketing Corporation. I have so often said that the Barbados Marketing Corporation does not exist today as it was started, and there are a few things I want you to answer. You said you made money one month. For the first time you made $1,000. I have not seen the Balance Sheet and I believe the reports should go to the Minister in charge and he would explain them to the House.

I have got to be very careful, Mr. Chairman, because if you ever attempt to pay tribute to a Minister for the frankness in which he speaks as I have had to do to this present Minister in charge of the Resolution, it is alleged that he is allowing the Opposition to run his Ministry; but I still want him to answer questions and he has to answer these. Isn't it a real shame that we must pay $51,000 to subsidise the Marketing Corporation? I like you, do not believe in controlled prices. I believe in competition where you get better prices and where prices level themselves off, but to pay $51,000 as a subsidy is something which gets under my skin. I do not see why we should do it. Now you have for the first time made money. I asked you a question, and though you did not refuse to answer, you shifted into saying that it was a question of equity. I really do not understand that myself. You used to be a schoolmaster, but I would like to say that you cannot run a business and decide you have made money if you are occupying premises free, gratis and for nothing at other people's expense.

You know that as well as I do, and to make $1,000 in this particular month and to have paid no rent or written off anything for rent is something which leaves me somewhat worried. If you are doing business in your own place, you have to set off for income tax purposes. If you live in your own house.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of elucidation, I have pointed out to the Hon. Member that the $1,000 was net profit after $1,400 had been written off for depreciation.
1.45 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I appreciate that. I understand a little about business. Rent is not depreciation. I have only asked a simple, straightforward question, and this is something which every member of the Opposition wants to know. Do you pay rent to the Government for the place which you occupy? (Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: You do not write off depreciation so heavily) You might be writing off depreciation for spoiled pork. Depreciation is an expense. Anyhow, I am not taking you to task for that. What I want to know is this: you seem to be running this business now on different grounds. I understand that the last man who was appointed, I do not remember his name.. (Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: He has been fired.) Did he fired you or you fired him? (Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I asked him to fire himself). You are going on good ground. What I want to know is this: you have the right to buy a certain percentage of the shrimp business.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I must apologise to Hon. Members for the absence of the use of this microphone. This happens not to be in use and I find it very hard to keep order. Let the Hon. Member proceed and let there be no cross talk around this Table.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, when I am on my feet I can cross talk as I like. You have to look at the other members over there. Now, Sir, through you I am asking the Minister this; is it not a fact that you have the right to buy a certain percentage of the shrimps which are brought in here? Is this a fact or not? If it is a fact, do you carry out the right to buy these shrimps? Is it not a fact that when certain firms in Bridgetown send out for 2,000 pounds of shrimps and what not, you never take advantage of the right which you have to buy these shrimps? On the question of the fish, will the Minister say from Balance Sheet which they have given him, if they ve lost any money? Will the Minister say if, on his depreciation there was any improperly frozen meat which had to be disposed of and what steps has he taken to offset that? You are telling us something about July, August and you are coming right down. You had a Balance Sheet to show what happened in the month in which you made a profit; I am asking you if during any of this period from April down, you had any improperly frozen meat in this Profit and Loss account which they had given you. There is no point in hiding anything because it is, in my opinion, criminal to subsidise this business. I would rather subsidise the television, which may be educational, for the people of this country. You have a lot of people standing up down there with one half of Trinidad grape fruit juice and one half of some other people's Orange juice, and it is criminal to offer any subsidy to a business like this when people are coming into this type of business.

I have made suggestions to the Minister more than once. Do you think that any firm in Bridgetown would carry on a business like this? What benefit do you think the people of Barbados could get from this? Of this $1,350,000, we must pay $51,000 which is our share of this loan. Of course, we agreed to this, because it was passed in this House and whether we opposed it or not, it was passed by the House, and therefore it becomes law. You have said that you made a profit of $1,000 in the month of July but whose $51,000 is this which is going to be paid as subsidy? Did you really make a profit? Figures can prove anything. Did you really make a profit of $1,000 and you are still coming here for a subsidy of $51,000 to be thrown down the drain? How can you make this profit? Now let us be honest about it. If this had been your business (Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: It could not be in that position) it could not be in that position and I do not think that any Member over there would want it to be in that position. But you are dragging from an old milch cow, the taxpayers, Imagine this! A profit of $1,000 is made by the Barbados Marketing Corporation, but now you come for $51,000 to pay a subsidy! How did you make a profit?

Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister to tell me this; he said that if it goes on like this, they will have to do something about it. You have pork bought at 42¢ a pound, sold for 90¢ a pound and some at $1,10 a pound - well, I have never paid that price for it, I have paid 90¢ a pound, but pork is the ordinary food of the common man in this country.
1.55 p.m.

You said that you increased the slaughtering fees which the Government can charge to butchers and other persons who wish to have pigs slaughtered there. Will you tell us how much you have increased the amount to? (Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Fifty per cent.) How much does a butcher pay for slaughtering a pig? (Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: $3 or $4 more.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister has a right of reply.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, we are getting along quite well. Having increased the fee by 50%, do you not envisage that the price of pork would go up? You gave us the assurance here today that if the price of pork goes up, or continues at the present high price, you would do everything in your power to see that it is controlled although, like myself, you do not believe in price control. You believe in open competition where people can get things better.

Mr. Chairman, as far as the Resolution is concerned, I am going to vote for Item 31A, Item 77, and Item 102, and I am going to move as a matter of protest - this House has agreed to pass the Resolution relative to paying from the sum of $700,000 -

we cannot allow the Marketing Corporation to go on in this way, and we must reduce the amount by something to show our protest; if not we would be condoning the things that are going on at the Marketing Corporation. Offer the Marketing Corporation for sale, and let somebody else get into the business. There are other things more beneficial to the people of this country that you could spend money on. If the money was being spent on giving school children lunch, I would feel much better.

Sir, he moved Sides; he moved Johnson and all sorts of people. Cheating, stealing, and all sort of things have been going on at the B.M.C. All types of crooks were sent down there, and you now have people there who do not know anything about running a Corporation.

I beg to move that the amount be reduced by $1.00 to show our protest against it.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now 2 p.m. This sitting now stands suspended until 2.30 p.m.

On Resumption:

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time. Question No. 269 standing in the name of the Hon. junior Member for St. George.

GAS IN WELL AT MOUNT, ST. GEORGE

Mr. HOPPIN: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minster:-

Can the Minster say whether the gas found in the wells at the Mount, St. George, will be used to extend the natural gas services to the community?

Will the wells at the Mount make any substantial difference to the belief that the exploration for oil in Barbados has not yet proved commercial?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker the reply is as follows:

Results of test indicate that there is insufficient gas to justify the cost of running a pipe line to connect this well to the domestic gas system.

No, Sir. Oil in commercial quantities have been found in wells at Fisher Pond, Woodbourne and Prior Park. Tests carried out so far are encouraging and there is good reason to believe that further exploration will be undertaken in these and other areas.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, can the Minster tell us if the quantity found in Prior Park belt will give us a supply along Highway No.1, from the Lazeretto going north.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, there are two separate things: the reply to the first Question dealt with natural gas; with reference to No. 2 at Prior Park, it is a matter of oil and not gas.

Mr. Speaker, there is also a reply left over from two meetings ago. Question No. 247 was asked by the Hon. senior Member for St. James.

Mr. HINDS: Did you find gas at Fisher Pond, Woodbourne and Prior Park as well?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: No gas - not in any appreciable quantity; it was just oil at Fisher Pond, Woodbourne and Prior Park.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 247 standing in the name of the Hon. senior Member for St. James, at page 12, right hand column. Supplementary questions were being asked when time was called at the last meeting. Are there any further supplementaries?

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Member is not now in his place, can it be allowed to remain on the Order Paper?

REQUEST FOR NAMES BEFORE USING SANITARY CONVENIENCES IN BRIDGETOWN

Mr. SPEAKER: I am told that Question No.245 asked by the Hon. and Learned senior Member for St. Thomas is still outstanding.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, has the Minster made any attempt to get in touch with Professor James Bond?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister has not made any attempt to get in touch with Professor James Bond.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, since the Minister quoted Sir Selwyn Clarke as being an authority on the habits of Windward Islands owls, will he, perhaps, agree that Professor James Bond is not only the greatest authority on West Indian Birds, but probably the greatest authority on West Indian Birds who has ever lived?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, that is only a matter of opinion.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister say what his Ministry thinks about Professor Bond's qualification?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister speaks for the Minstry. If the Hon. senior Member for St. Thomas wants me to give him a statement about how the Minstry feels about the qualifications of Professor James Bond, he can ask it by way of a substantive Question, and I will make the necessary enquiries in the Ministry and let him have the Reply. 2.40 p.m.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister instruct the Ministry to write to Professor Bond and put to him the objections to the institution of barn owls which other informed opinion has can-

vassed, and invite Professor Bond's opinion on that? I am sure he would give it for nothing.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: After having had discussions with my Technical Officers in the Ministry, if they feel so, I will do it.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are no other questions to which answers are ready, and therefore it becomes Private Members' Business.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, there are some questions which have been on the Order Paper for almost one year, from 12th December, 1967.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member may put a substantive Question as to when they will be answered.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: Apparently my speaker is not working now. The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the Hon. senior Member for St. Joseph, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution requesting Government to make a substantial amount of money available to the Rediffusion Needy Children's Fund to help at least 500 children or more.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the Resolution reads as follows :-

WHEREAS there is a dire need for financial help for hundreds of hungry and naked children of Barbados, whose parents are sick or incapaciated and extremely poor;

AND WHEREAS the sponsors of the Rediffusion Needy Children's Fund are experiencing great difficulty in their effort to provide Christmas fare and cheer for all those children who really need such assistance;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House request Government to make a substantial amount of money available to the Rediffusion Needy Children's Fund to help at least 500 children or more.

Sir, I should like to emphasise that this is for the various parishes, as I am not confining it to St. Joseph alone. Now I was looking around to see if I would have seen someone from the Government side waving to me to sit down and let this Resolution pass; but I have not seen that and I will have to make out a case for these hungry children. Before I go further, I have a few pictures which I wanted to pass around to Hon. Members, but I have not seen the Marshal. The children in them do not look so well, but that is really not from food; it is really worms.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced this Resolution last Tuesday, and as a result I have received a letter relative to the work and how these people arrive at the very neediest children, and with your permission I should like to read it so as to let Hon. Members know the hard work which the Rediffusion people have to do in a job of this sort. Before I go further I should like to thank Rediffusion for the good work they are doing as a whole not for the needy children alone, but through their educational programmes our people are learning a lot by their broadcasts. About two or three months ago we had a very small transcript of what had been done in this House on the evening after, and I can assure you that the people in this country are looking forward to it and are beginning to learn what they should have known long ago, and this is done at the hands of Barbados Rediffusion. The time has come when more broadcasts of this sort should be done, and I feel that the Government should allow Rediffusion to do a little more so as to educate the people. I will begin to read the letter. It is addressed to Mr. Lloyd Smith, M.P., Tweedside Road, Bridgetown.

Dear Sir,

> It is of great encouragement to me to know that you will be using your great influence in getting help for the poor children of Barbados which the Rediffusion Needy Children's Fund plans to help with garments, shoes, school supplies, school uniforms, toys and a party, with a large food hamper for each family. Our aim is the care of one thousand children from every Parish in the Island. Sad to say that even when we complete this amount there will still be hundreds seeking help, the majority of which on investigation would prove just as deserving as those already accepted."

I will pause here for a moment to say that, as you know, Sir, the Rotarians take the children home after the treat given to them. When I take back the parent and the children, I am always embarrassed when two or three children from the home run out to meet the car and ask in real Bajan parlance "Ma, what you bring for us?" Remember: there are one or two that I have just set down out of my car, and when the mother reaches home you find about two or three more starving ones asking what she has bought for them. I always have to provide something from my pocket for these little children. Now, Sir, Rediffusion would never be able to cater to all of them, but they are trying their best. The public are contributing earnestly and cheerfully, but yet there is still a gap to be filled. You satisfy three for that afternoon, and the others are yet hungry at home. 2.50 p.m.

This is a very tremendous effort which is being made by Rediffusion people. I will go on to read:-

> "I would like to say here that even though we have already invited the thousand children, we are not yet in a position to take care of them. I am optimistically going ahead with my faith firm in the compassion that will in sufficient number show its support for this most deserving Cause. In the fifteen years I have been involved with the Radio Demerara Needy Children's Fund and then the Rediffusion Needy Children's Fund, I have not once been let down. Although we rely on voluntary contributions, a lot of work is also put in with Fund-raising projects such as the Ball that was held at the

Marine on Nov. 2nd which I'm unhappy to report was not the success it was last year. If we clear two thousand dollars this year after expenses we will be lucky. Last year's net profit was five thousand six hundred dollars. This is quite a gap and we are in dire need to fill it as it is on the strength of this that I aimed again for a thousand children. Your indication of your willingness to help and to obtain help from others are causes for renewed hope.

"As I mentioned before, my involvement with this Fund is some fifteen years old, starting with a humble appeal for second-hand garments for five poor boys. The response to that appeal made it possible for me to take care of two hundred and forty three children. At that time I had no intention of making it an annual project but, as Christmas drew near, the people of Guyana, presuming it would be a yearly affair, sent contributions and those in need sent appeals. It was then that the Fund was officially launched on an annual scale moving up from five children to fifteen hundred a year. Incidentally, in 1961, I was honoured by Her Majesty with the MBE for my work in this field via broadcasting.

"When I came to Barbados five years ago it was not my intention to start such a Fund. Instead, I tried to help other Organisations with their projects. I soon realised that Barbados, like the rest of the world, had their poor, and that with the far-reaching facilities of my job, I would help in a more tangible way by starting a similar project here. I suggested it to my listeners with an aim of helping one hundred children. They responded so well that in that first year we were able to take care of three hundred children. The following year I aimed for three hundred and together we took care of six hundred. Still there were many more to be helped. From then on our aim has been a thousand and so far we have not failed.

Perhaps you are wondering how I decide on who the deserving ones are. By going to them. Although I get help in the many ways needed to bring this project to an end, investigations are my responsibilities. I have to be satisfied that those selected are among the neediest. There are many who can compile a very impressive letter of appeal, but on investigation, are not found to be in any great need. Saying "no" is more difficult than saying "yes". Every family that has been accepted by this Fund has been investigated by me, regardless of where they are; and I can tell you, Sir, some of them are in places that many Barbadians would not believe exist. How can they, for when they go for an outing they keep to the Main road.....the beauty spots. Who among them would go to places like Goat Hill, Delamere Land.... Church View. Very often they are in places a car cannot even get to. This cannot be held against people since there is no reason for them to go through rough tracks, etc. But because they have not seen them, there's sometimes an ostrich-head-in-the-sand attitude thinking they do not exist. Having our poor is nothing to be ashamed of, for you'll find them the world over. But not doing anything about it is being callous and unconcerned.

"There are others also who will ask "Why do these people not go and look for work instead of having children"? You know, Sir, as willing as a Country is to see its population fully employed, its resources are not always up to its demands. Unemployment and under-employment exist, whether we like it or not.

Again you'll find a woman starting out her adult life with a man who promises her the moon. After a few short years with perhaps a child for each, and usually when she is heavy with child his eyes wander to younger and greener pastures - he deserts her and the children. She's got to provide for those children. There is nothing left for her than to start with a new man.. a new provider who invariably follows in the footstep of his predecessor. Through all the tribulations of desertion I am yet to find one mother who had left her children. Through all their miseries she sticks with them. It is these women and their children, tomorrow's adults, that we are trying to help. And even though our help seems so little as compared to their wants, I know that they are helped. I know children who have been attending school because of the school uniform that we have provided them with. I also know that it is the only uniform they have. For even a year after they have got them, they are brought out and shown to me. For twelve months they have been worn through the week, washed at weekends and back on the job again on Monday morning."

Mr. Speaker, I will pause here again for a moment. This paragraph refers to a young woman starting out in life and a young man starting out with her, and as soon as young men can see greener pastures, these mothers are left alone with, I suppose, their two or three children. Now, Sir, I am saying this; I am warning the Government to consider for now, these poor ,needy children. However, Sir, we are not going to encourage or we are not encouraging men to be running all around getting children here and there and leaving them year after year for the Needy children's Fund cheer, and then the Government has to prepare and provide for these children. This may sound unpopular or it may cause me to lose a few of these wild boys' votes. I call them wild boys because, for a person to make a child and then run away and leave it, I have no regard for him, regardless of the consequences. As representatives of the people, we will have to put our foot down on these things. We are preparing to help those who are here, but we must not encourage this type of children to come into the world any more and then they have to be left up to others.
3.00 p.m.

As soon as I am finished with this letter, I will tell you what I have witnessed. We will have to do something about this matter. If a man picks up a woman, he must be made to stick to the woman by the

law, the whip, paying money , or something; but he should not leave the children to be wandering all about and going into stuff bins. I will tell you what I have seen later. Some children go into the stuff bins looking for food. This Government cannot, or should not, stand for such things happening in our little community. As the lady has told you in this letter- Mr. Speaker, she is quite right; and we must do something about the matter. The men cannot just get a child and run off!

Mr. Speaker, when I was a member of the Public Assistance Committee in St. Joseph, meeting after meeting you would find women coming to us with two, three, or four children. When it was not a husband, it was a man who had gone to England and would not send back one cent for his children. Suppose we were to brush aside, say, the ordinary man, just imagine a husband and the real father of children leaving here, and, just because the Police or the Bailiff cannot find him to summon him for maintenance, he forgets he has children behind in this Island. The woman then has to go and work for herself and four children, and sooner or later the taxpayers have to maintain the children. I believe the people who have left here to work in England are earning enough to enable them to maintain their children over here. Why should other people have to contribute to the maintenance of these children?

Of course, it is understandable that it is difficult to find the fathers overseas easily and these children are thrown aside. What the mother cannot do for them public assistance must do. The children do not want food alone; they want clothes to go to school and Sunday School and so on. I feel that Government should take a serious view of this matter. The letter goes on to state:

"It costs us approximately $12-$15 per child, depending on its age. Each child (girl) gets a pair of shoes, a pair of socks, panties, an attractive dress-made exclusively for her, a school blouse and uniform, school supplies (exercise books primarily) a toy in keeping with her age. The boys: two shirts - one khaki, one sports shirt (Elite, we find them the best), pants, canvas boots, socks, the standard school supplies, a toy. All attend the party dressed in the garments we provide. Their bus fares to get there and back are also provided by us. The children who live out in the distant parishes are taken home by the Rotarians in cars or specially chartered buses.

"At this point I still need some of everything but my biggest need is food for the hampers. These are large plastic bags, bigger than a pillow case. They are filled with all the fundamentals such as rice, sugar, salt, butter, meal, etc., plus canned goods such as milk, corned beef, sardines, etc.

"Our finances are supervised by the Company's Accountant. Acknowledgments of contributions are made daily at 2.30 on "Woman's World."

"I would like to thank you for the time you have taken to read all this..... for the time you will take to present the Cause to the other gentlemen. Win or lose, I would like to salute you for your concern and compassion for the very poor children of this Island.

May God bless your efforts.

Sincerely

(Sgd.) Olga Lopes-Seale"

Sir, you may have noticed the pictures which have been passed around to the various members. Do not be fooled for one moment by the big bellies and think that is the result of food. You will notice some children with very large bellies, and one may say that some of them look very good and are in a handsome condition. The big bellies were not as a result of eating too much food, but they were the results of malnutrition and worms. These are the children that we are dealing with, and we are asking for assistance for them.

I mentioned that I would get to the point where I would support what I have just said when I referred to the children going into stuff bins looking for food. i will not call the name of the parish. I was driving home one day, a Sunday, and I noticed something in a tall bin. I thought it was a dog climbing into the bin. When I got near, I saw that it was a little boy searching in the bin. I stopped and inquired for what he was looking. He told me that he was hungry, and was looking for food. I asked him why he went there to do that. He told me that somebody was cursing his brother and telling him that he was starved out, while he had food that he could throw in the stuff bin. On hearing those remarks, the boy went into the stuff bin in search of food.

There are two houses: one neighbour has enough food that he can throw some in the stuff bin, and the other neighbour has none. I took the boy in my car, carried him to my home, and fixed-him-right. I am now in trouble; he does not want to leave my home because he was really "fixed right." As the people say: "I handled him so for purpose." My mistress pur some of everything in a basket, and I took him home. I would not call it a hamper, but she gave him something in a basket. When I got to his parents' home, they said: "We did not worry to tell the Police that a man carried away our child in a car, because we were told that it was Mr. Smith from Sugar Hill, and we knew that he would be happy."

3.10 p.m.

When I took him home the boy cried like anything to come back, and I promised him I would come back. I told them to send him to school, but I was told he only had one suit of clothes. I gave the mother money to buy a suit and every Friday afternoon the boy comes to my place and stays until Monday morning, and I take him back myself along with a hamper. Imagine, Sir, that there are children who go into the stuff-bins looking for food! Now that we are coming to Christmas, the Government cannot do everything, but there are a lot of people who band themselves together to give Christmas cheer. We as representatives of the people must do likewise. Sir, I will make this promise before I go further.

If every Hon. Member in this Chamber contributes privately $10, your humble servant would give $10 to each. It is my intention to do it. That may sound fantastic, or it may sound as if I am a millionaire, but I know what it is to be poor and to be hungry; and when the lady referred to these children's parents having to wash their clothes at weekends so as to have them ready for school the following week, I am not ashamed to say here and now that I was one of those boys. I am not ashamed to let it be known on the floor of this House, and I will always be on the side of the poor because I was never rich. I do not know what it is to be rich. I do not know what it is to be holding $1,000 at one time. I have held more than that, but in a different way. These children need help, and if Rediffusion is working hard to treat 1,000 of them, I am asking this Government to do something more to extend it to help 2,000 or 3,000 more if possible, because this would be money well spent. Nobody would be able to say that you are frittering away the taxpayers' money, or criticise you for letting it go down the drain. It would help the parents of these needy children to get at least two suits of uniform for them to go back to school, and a Christmas dinner in some form or fashion. You may wonder how it can be done. It is very late because today is the 26th November, and you might as well say that November is ended, but at least by 14th December the money should be forthcoming to help these people.

I do not know if it is too late to set up a small Committee along with the Rediffusion people. I do not know if the Public Assistance Officers in the various parishes could be of any help, or if the Public Assistance Board could help at this very late hour, but it is never too late to do a good thing. I feel that something will have to be done, but I do not know if the Government feels it is too late to take this upon themselves to advance the money to these people who were doing it from long ago. They are people who can be trusted, and they have signified their willingness to assist, and have proved to the public and the parents of these children already that they have succeeded in doing work of this sort, and we should do something to help these children.

The lady spoke of places where these people live, but I am sure she does not know where politicians have to go. She may think it very strange to see people living in these places, but you and I, Sir, and others who have to canvass have to know such places. Some of us do not have to canvass or do anything. They do not even have to pull our pockets, but still find ourselves in here. The lady mentioned Goat Hill, but I can tell her of places called Mount Al Gully, LessBeholden and Barrows Gully. I do not mean Barrows in St. Lucy; this gully is part of St. Andrew and St. Joseph. These children are children that should be made happy at least for Christmas, and when Christmas has passed, I am going to ask Government to set up a Committee or take a census of children of this sort, find out where they are, and if they have fathers we must find ways and means of making them support these children, and at the same time we would have a record from which to determine how much money we will have to provide in the Estimates for these poor, hungry children yearly. We cannot shirk our responsibility. I would never criticise any Government at any time for spending money on the poor. I would criticise them for levying a tax and then forgetting the poor and needy.

Mr. Speaker, I would never want to be a Prime Minister of Leader of any Government; but if I had succeeded in getting in, no Opposition in this world could get me out. I would be in there for keeps by keeping my ears to the ground and listening to the calls from down there, not above, and see to it that the children of this country are well fed. Could you get me out then? You have the education and you may be a hard man. I do not have any education, but my heart is soft; so I am bound to win. I should not be saying this now because I may be telling the present Government how to hold the Government, but I must say something to soften their hearts to vote this money to help these children at this time. It would be unfair to these children, knowing their sufferings, not to let it off the bat by telling Government how to care for them.

3.20 p.m.

As you know, Sir, we always read the Bible. I can remember that some time ago some Bibles were circulated around here. Some of us may be more taken up with law books than with the Bible. Anyhow, a Bible was given to each of us and in some parts of it, it is written: "Suffer the little children to come unto me and forbid them not." Now, Sir, as to these children, our Saviour's heart and soul and compassion were on them, and what are we going to do today? It looks to me as if I have convinced the Government; I have a lot of notes; I do not want to keep back the House; but I will still have to do my bit in order to let the people in this Government know that these children are sick and suffering. It is a fact that we always learn that what is given to the poor is lent to the Lord. Let today, therefore, be a day of begging for the poor, and I hope that I will be successful in getting something for these children. I am not asking for it for myself.; I am not asking for it for St. Joseph alone. This is for the entire Island. Every parish has hungry children, and it would be a blessing if the parents of these children were to come to realise that the members, their representatives, were instrumental in giving them at least a slice of ham in some form or fashion - something as a change and not for them to be going into the stuff bin.

It is a fact that these pictures, when you see them here, are a sample of what these children are experiencing. You will notice that there is one which, if you stuck it with a pin, you may be able to fill a bucket of water; but it is not water or air; it is malnutrition. When a child is starved out, the worms take possession of it and it is swollen like that. It is not eating food, and this means that the poor mother, whoever she may be, can only try to keep its two eyes open. This has happened at Bloomsbury in the parish of St. Thomas years ago, Mr. Speaker, I can call the parish in this particular instance. The mother went to work leaving one child to keep another, and it is a good thing that the mother turned up on time. The bigger child had the little one in the pot, water had been poured in, and that child was lighting the fire. *(ASIDES)* You were not born yet. It may be hard

for you to believe that because you went to a good school.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Hon. Member still addressing the Chair?

Mr. SMITH: Yes, Sir. A layman has to be very careful when asides come from a lawyer. This happened many years ago. *(ASIDES)* The "Truth" was not in existence yet, either. That person is still living; I can go now and put my hands on the man. *(ASIDES)* The boy was the one who was to be cooked; his sister was going to cook him, she was so hungry! Those are the days when you did not have any Party or anything like that; but we give thanks to the Barbados Labour Party: otherwise you would have had a few more cooked. Since it is good that we know ourselves and I tell you about this thing - it appears as if I am going to be helped and therefore I will not go any further. I will come to a close, but really and truly, if we should be successful in helping these poor children, when the roll is called up yonder we all shall be there. I now beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the motion for the passing of this Resolution. I do not think that I should have to make a long speech in doing so, because the hon. mover has really spent a long time in explaining to the House the reason why he saw fit to bring this Resolution before us. Every one of us around this horseshoe already knows that the Rediffusion Needy Children's Fund is popular in Barbados, and many charitable organisations take advantage of this effort and send their subscriptions on to this Fund. The hon. mover of this Resolution has asked the House to approve of this Measure in order that the Government might see fit to increase the number who usually benefit from this Scheme. I have no doubt that after listening to the remarks of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, the mover of this Resolution, all hon. members in their places will vote for and give their assent to this laudable Resolution.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member who moved the passing of the Resolution, can have the immediate and ready assurance that his intentions and his desires will not fall on deaf ears on his side of the House. Not only do we accept the principle and the compassion by which the hon. member been motivated, but we fully share with him his ire that something should be done to help necesus children, certainly at Christmas, and not only Christmas but at all times. Where perhaps we might differ from him - and this would not be a difference in principle but only a difference of approach - is that we would not like to tie ourselves down to the precise method of assistance which he for very excellent reasons, has suggested in his Resolution. We certainly agree with him that the Rediffusion Needy Children's Fund has done outstanding work in the last few years, particularly through the personality of Miss Olga Lopes-Seale in this community, and it has done at least as much as any other agency - and certainly more than some agencies - to assist children at a time of the year which, quite frankly, is the children's holiday.

3.30 p.m.

However, the Hon. Member would, I think, understand that it would be somewhat awkward for Government to undertake to make financial disbursements to a particular sponsor, or a particular organisation, if only for the fact that others doing the same kind of charity and covering the same much-needed field would be entitled to make similar requests which it would be hard for that reason alone to gainsay. If, however, we can come to some arrangement whereby we accept the Hon. Member's contention that needy children ought to be assisted, and that all the sponsors of all the charities - not only the one named here - whether some are unknown to us or not - should in some way be further assisted in this worthy cause, I believe, I think, that we would have identity of outlook on both sides of the House.

I, therefore prepared, in consultation with my colleagues, an amendment the terms of which we feel would safeguard the Hon. Member's point of view and at the same time confer authority on the Government not only to investigate as far as it can all such cases, but to bring assistance to those cases when investigated on an Island-wide basis. The amendment which I am suggesting would be as follows:

In the second paragraph of the Resolution after the word "fund", I would suggest that we put the words "and others".

This would read:

"AND WHEREAS the sponsors of the Rediffusion Needy Children's Fund and others are experiencing great difficulty in their effort to provide Christmas fare and cheer for all those children who really need such assistance;"

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House request Government to investigate through its appropriate agencies" - this would mean the Social Welfare Department and Public Assistance Organs - "such deserving cases with a view to providing some assistance for our needy children at Christmas."

Now, in case Hon. Members might feel that if the Hon. Member surrenders his own wording to accept this we are in some way reneging, or watering down, his intention and desire, I wish to give him the assurance that not only is this not so, but actually while he was speaking and describing in some detail the plight of the children, according to Mrs. Lopes-Seale's record, something occurred to me which, I think, creates an area in which the Government might, perhaps, be able to help.

I spoke to the Hon. Minister of Community Development and two other Ministers near to him, and all

of us immediately agreed that, perhaps, we might recommend to the Cabinet that disbursements might be made from School Meals Service Supplies of that portion of food which comes to us from the World Food Programme and which would not be required to be used over the Christmas period when the schools were closed and which might, therefore, be in danger of spoilage and would be a wicked waste. Some portion of the commodities might be dispersed to needy cases through the Social Welfare Department and the Public Assistance Agencies of Government and certain recognised charitable organisations like this one. The Jaycees who of course, provide Christmas cheer, and others like that might be the agencies through which this can be done.

We have, as I know, a considerable amount of cheese which has come to us from the World Food Programme; a lot of canned meat; a lot of dried fruit which is highly vitaminised; a lot of pulses as they called them, but we call them peas; some milk powder and about half a dozen other commodities which we have in abundance and which we have received from the World Food Programme, and some of which, I certainly believe, we are so prepared to recommend to the Cabinet, can be disbursed at this time to fill this aching void.

The Hon. Minister of Community Development, who is more familiar with this matter than I am, may be able to tell the House the ways in which machinery for this kind of thing can be set up. I say that we are prepared to recommend this to the Cabinet, and what we may be able to do in this respect would be worth several hundreds of dollars and, perhaps, even thousands of dollars, and it would reach the widest number of persons including, of course, agencies including the Rediffusion Needy Children's Fund, the Jaycees, the Salvation Army and all other agencies which at Christmas provide for and sponsor this kind of cheer and fare.

I am, therefore, asking Hon. Members to accept my assurance that there is no cleavage of Members, or no disagreement between us, as to the facts, but there is a slight technical difference of approach. If the Hon. Member would accept our suggestions as embodied in this amendment, he will find that all that he desires will be done and, perhaps, on a wider scale than he himself is now suggesting.

Sir, I have already given notice of the amendment which I now move.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second that. In seconding the motion for the amendment, I should like to state that at present treats and fairs are provided by Government for children at the various Homes and Government Institutions. I refer to the Nightengale Home, Farrs, St. Peter, St. John's Children's Home, and at the St. Michael's Infirmary there is a section which looks after poor children.
3.40 p.m.

There are treats at these various Centres and at all the various Day Nurseries island-wide, especially those conducted by the Housing Authority; so Government still does a fair amount of this treating at Christmas time. I appreciate the Resolution which has been moved and promoted by the Hon. senior Member for St. Joseph, and I would like to compliment him for presenting the case on behalf of the children other than the ones to whom I referred a few minutes ago. I know there are thousands who stand in great need apart from the unfortunate ones who are at Children's Homes or Day Nurseries, but I have had the privilege of attending one or two of these functions recently, organised by Rediffusion Service Limited by Mrs. Olga Lopes-Seale, and I must say that I was very impressed with the cheer and goodwill that were brought to the hearts of those little children at the Y.M.P.C. where the last function was held. I know that the Junior Chamber of Commerce does its part; they provide treats, fairs and functions of that sort for needy children at Christmas time. I think about 1,000 children are given a treat, toys and so on, and I do subscribe to the points made by the Hon. Leader of the House that something more could be done, but it is a great pity that the Government has not been actually approached through its Social Welfare Department for this type of assistance. We know that in the political arena this Resolution would come in any case, but it may well have been that if a direct approach had been made through the Social Welfare Department, this among other organisations would have been given due consideration by way of assistance. It may be that it is not too late to do that, but I can say it has not actually been done. In other words, it is not that Government has been approached for financial assistance or assistance in kind and has refused; it is that no application has been received. I have just checked it; so I speak from first-hand knowledge, and it will be the last word in that up to now no application has been received.

The Resolution as moved is a very laudable one, and we on all sides of the House agree that something more should be done to make our children island-wide feel happier at their season of year which is Christmas. They should not have one Father Christmas appearing in Bridgetown and probably another in Speightstown; we are probably in need of quite a number of other Father Christmases island-wide to bring cheer to children on an island-wide basis and to see that children at this time of the year do enjoy some of the extra benefits and facilities which many people enjoy at Christmas time. I will do whatever lies in my power to see that the Rediffusion Children's Fund and other such organisations that are working towards that goal receive some form of assistance in kind and a piece of ham, as put by the Hon. Member.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the amendment, the Hon. Minister who has just sat down laid some stress that application might better be made to Government through the Department of Social Welfare. I am to say at this stage, Sir, that the Minister could never have been travelling on worse ground than to make that suggestion. There is nobody, and I repeat, nobody in the Department of Social Welfare who is the type interested in this Resolution as ex-

pounded here by the Hon. Mover, and we are to warn that had the Social Welfare Department been doing its proper duties, there would have been no necessity for a Resolution of this kind. I challenge the Minister to produce right now any figures to show that the Social Welfare Department is so much in touch with the needs, hopes and aspirations of the poor of this country that he could tell us how many refugee poor there are in my own constituency of St. Peter, and how many there are in his own. The point is that much can be done for the poor, but what we want to guard against is this: when the Social Welfare Department is going to dispense any charity or whatever you might care to call it as coming from Government, there is too much of that political flavour associated with social welfare and everything that is done by that Department; and while we must bear in mind that the Social Welfare Officers do it as a job, it is so handled as to make it appear to the receiver that this is something being given by his Government or by a political party which is in power when in truth and in fact it is not so. I am sure that the Resolution in itself does not have any political flavour whatsoever. It is a case where an organisation such as Rediffusion, and more so an employee of Rediffusion, has taken it upon herself to whip up what interest there can be to raise funds and do any and everything that is humanly possible to bring cheer to these people at Christmas time.

When the Hon. Mover of this Resolution decided to bring it before this Honourable House, it was not with a view to bringing politics into it, so to speak. This was his forum, his medium and the best place he could come to get support in the quantity that is needed; and whilst we are very appreciative of what hon. members on that side have promised to see that they recommend to Cabinet on behalf of the children, we want to make it clear and we want it to be known that we want the children to get help by all means. We want it to be established once and for all that the Social Welfare Department is the wrong organisation through which it should be handled, because I can say that we as politicians meet our people more often, and as a member of Parliament I am in a position to recommend children. Similarly Hon. Members of this side as well as on that side know in their constituency the people who have need of any charity that may be dispensed at Christmas or any other time, and I can swear that the Department of Social Welfare is too far removed form these people to know exactly who needs it most. I would ask, in whatever might be done, that you draw on the experience of the schoolmasters, school teachers and the Church bodies, because they are the people who are in touch with the poor in the districts, and they can better assist Government in deciding who must be served at this time. Do not lay it under the hands of the Social Welfare officers to make them and the people feel that this is some political favour that is being dispensed at Christmas time.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking on the amendment so that I can have the right of final reply.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member has the right of final reply, but in as much as he is exercising it as indeed he must after an amendment has been made, it can be equivalent to his exercising his right of final reply, at the same time replying to the amendment. May I suggest to the Hon. Member that he wait to see if any other Hon. Member desires to speak?

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, am I in order if I spoke on the amendment?

Mr. SPEAKER: Certainly, because the Hon. Member spoke before the amendment and he has no right of final reply.

3.50 p.m.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I must admit that I did not hear all that the Hon. Leader of the House had to say when his turn came to put forward his amendment; but from what I have gathered, although Hon. Members on this side are appreciative of this expansion which he has offered, yet I understand that he mentioned something about aid and assistance more so in the way of foodstuffs, whereas if I remember rightly, the mover of the Resolution did not confine this aid and assistance to food-stuffs, but rather expanded it to include things like school uniforms, shoes and things of that nature, garments and clothing. I would not like the Government in its expansion, it may be, to help people, to use the agencies at their disposal to forget that there is the need, the dire need, to aid and assist those very needy children with clothing at this festive season of the year. Every one of us is just too familiar with the dire poverty existing in certain homes, and among children who have what cannot be proper homes. With that in mind, I hope that the extension mooted by the Leader of the Government will not in any way debar the children whom it is hoped to serve from getting additional help by way of clothing, shoes, school uniforms and so on. I want to make that point because I understand that so much was said as far as aiding and assisting throught "Y" agencies is concerned but the experiment seems to have been confined to items of food. It is not only a question of providing food at Christmas time, but it is also a question of distributing toys.

I belong to an organisation which has on one occasion at least, if I remember rightly, sent some help to the Rediffusion Needy Children's Fund. I understand that, in some instances, toys are given to children. I do not know if the Leader of the House is hoping to expand this because we would think that at Christmas time it is not only a question of food; it is not only a question of a full stomach which is a good stomach on which to feel cheer. Food is quite essential; but children like toys and sweets and little trinkets - it may be cowboy's suits and things like that - and wherever possible you should make children feel that Christmas is more than a day. I think that that should be seen to. I just had that to add at this stage.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Hon. Member exercising his right of final reply?

Mr. SMITH: Yes, Sir. I have to thank the Hon. Leader of the House for making a very strong effort in trying to help these children. Now, as the Hon. senior Member for St. Peter has said, I can quite clearly see that the Hon. Leader of the House is going to do his utmost as far as providing food is concerned, or in other words, as far as the cheer for Christmas is concerned. That is very good because food comes first, but it is my intention that these children should be helped, and as I have read out here from the letter from this lady, they are helping with garments, shoes, school uniforms and so on. After the Christmas season is over, these children still have to go to school; after you have filled their bellies to the top for Christmas, they still have to go to school. I think that helping them to go to school is more important than providing them with food, because the food is only for Christmas and that may be only for a day or two. After that, these children will need two suits of uniforms and shoes, and we would like to get these children into school as these people are already doing. They are preparing to provide for 1,000 children giving them hampers, a treat and clothing. Therefore, I would ask the Hon. Leader of the House if it would be his intention to take up this matter with his Cabinet and let them know, that, apart from providing the food, some allowance should be given for clothing. A Resolution of some sort should be brought down in this connection. If we are going to feed these children, we will feed them for Christmas; but there will be time enough for a Resolution to be brought down for a certain amount after careful investigation has been made for the provision of clothing.

If the Hon. Leader of the House gives me that assurance, I will gladly accept his amendment. *(ASIDES)* The Hon. Leader of the House has assured me that he will take into consideration the provision of clothing as well as food. However, Sir, before going further, I would like him to speed up the matter and have this provision made for uniforms now that Christmas is around the corner, and if there should be any lack or anything of the sort, these children will not see Christmas as the others will have seen it. I can quite clearly see the attitude of the Government at the moment, but we should still, as it is my intention to do, contribute to the Rediffusion Needy Children's Fund. I am appealing to Hon. Members for help and I will be sending around my list to them and asking them to contribute to it for now. This will be our contribution, not the Government's. As I have promised, Sir, I am willing to put $10 to each $10. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: All Hon. Members?) All Hon. Members. I am sure that the lady will read out the names and I am going to ask that that be done emphatically, that the names be read out very slowly. *(Laughter)* (Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I will contribute now, but I do not want my name to be called.) I will ask that the names of persons who have contributed be called so that if anybody does not contribute we will know. *(Laughter)* I am appealing to Hon. Members to help with the sheet which I am sending around to them so that the lady will do her part and the Government is going to do its part.

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

ORDER POSTPONED

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Leader of the Opposition:– to resume debate on the passing of a Resolution condemning the Government's financial proposals for the Fiscal Year 1968-69 as contained in the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals made on 2nd July, 1968, by the Hon. Minister of Finance. When this Resolution was last debated, it was, on the motion of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, seconded by the Hon. and Learned senior Member for St. Thomas, that further consideration was postponed. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition can continue his address now if he so desires.
4.00 p.m.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that consideration of this Resolution be postponed.

Mr. SMITH: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 3 also stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Leader of the Opposition. I recall that when last the Hon. Deputy Speaker presided over the discussion on this matter, he was, I understand, to give a ruling.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I should like to move that further consideration of this Resolution be also postponed.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Member for Christ Church whose seat I observe presently to be vacant.

Order No. 5 standing in the name of the Hon. senior Member for St. Joseph, and it is to resume debate on the passing of a Resolution requesting the Government to review the Regulations relative to the National Insurance and Social Security Act for the purpose of protecting those workers who were qualified at the qualifying period by paying of the required amount.

When discussion on this matter was last heard, the Hon. and Learned Member for Christ Church moved that further consideration be postponed. That Hon. Member is presently absent, but that motion was seconded by the Hon. Leader of the House.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, we are not ready to proceed with that today.

Mr. SPEAKER: I wonder whether Hon. Members would intimate to me what matters they are prepared to proceed with.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: There are none, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I rightly assume that there is no other matter under Private Members' Business?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, No. 6.

RESOLUTION re INCREASED STAFF AT THE GOVERNMENT PRINTERY AND A REDUCTION IN THE PRICE OF OFFICIAL GAZETTES

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 6 stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Leader of the Opposition, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution relating to the delay in the publication of the Official Gazettes and requesting Government to send down a Resolution to provide for an increase in the Staff at the Government Printery and to reduce the price of the Official Gazettes.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, although, apparently some Hon. Members will be glad to go home, I think that there is some time left for Private Members' Business and I should deal with this. It has become more than obvious, and Hon. Members will pardon me for really repeating the obvious, that since the *Advocate* newspaper has come under new ownership, and also had the misfortune of fighting on the wrong side of the Law Courts, the public knows very little of what takes place in this House. One way of giving more information to the public would be to make the *Official Gazette* cheaper even than a newspaper.

After all, we spend quite a lot of the taxpayers' money giving people joy rides and other things. This is infinitely more important to give people the means of hearing or reading what they cannot find the time for and they should know at first hand. Many a man has to work just at the time when we are working, or at night, perhaps, he is too tired to come in and listen to our speeches. I say this not arbitrarily, because I have given thought to it. There is no reason why the *Official Gazette* should not come out at a price of 4¢ at the most.

As long as there is no heavy subject, every Barbadian has a perfect right to come here and listen, provided he observes good conduct. It is his duty even to come and listen, and I do say that none of us should mind spending the extra money so as to make the *Official Gazette* dirt cheap. As regards its coming out too late, I do not want to say more than I, personally, know about reasons for criticising its lateness and so on.

4.10 p.m.

If I knew and felt it my duty to crush corns, I would crush them. But all I can say is that an *Official Gazette* that comes out sometimes with a debate a year old is just scrap paper. It is not enough to have an *Official Gazette* with the things that by law it must publish, like Court Notices, Notices of Trade Marks and all that, and the *Official Gazette* should not have debates being put to the public long after they are forgotten in some cases. I am told, and perhaps I should not say this in view of what I have just said about knowing a thing personally, that there is a Senate debate for over a year that has not even been translated from the shorthand. Now that sort of thing should not be taking place. Whatever the cause of it, at any rate it should be brought to the notice of those responsible. I believe Your Honour is responsible, as far as the debates of this House are concerned, in seeing that they come out at all, and I only wish to say and I am trying to say it as mildly as possible, that this week should be the last week in which it is possible to say the public would not be able to read a speech until next year. I am sure that nobody on this side would hesitate to vote any sum of money that the Government found necessary, in order to subsidise the *Official Gazette* or find it necessary to come down here and ask us to vote for in order to provide an *Official Gazette* at three cents or four cents.

Having said what I said from the beginning, I merely add again that if it becomes necessary to ferret out the causes of the delay and to name names, I unhesitatingly say I will do so; but I do hope that the Government ultimately, and primarily the persons responsible for one reason or another for the delay, will take this warning to heart.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I respectfully beg to second the motion. In doing so, time is against us and I would like this to pass before the time is up; so I would not be too long on it. I will go a little further and say that I can remember that in the first Session of the present Government, all the work done at the last meeting used to be laid on the Table for us the following Tuesday. In other words, the debate used to be edited and printed and circulated by the next week. Something has gone radically wrong since then, because it quickly stopped. I feel that the speeches at least, if they cannot get through with the entire Gazette in a week's time, should be done as before, and I am sure they will find a ready market, because every living human being would buy a copy of the speeches. I understand there is a place in Independence Square where you can buy literature; so I feel that if the Government printed the speeches and put them up for sale, and at the same time circularise Members with theirs within a week's time, they would be doing something educational for the people.

Mr. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise to move that further consideration of this matter be postponed, principally because I did not anticipate that we would have reached thus far in Private Members' Business today, and therefore this side is not prepared in the sense of not being ready to participate in this debate, because we have a point of view of our own on this matter which on examination will probably not be so very different from the point of view of the other side. I only wish to say this in passing: this Government, and particularly the Prime Minister has said so time and again in the last six years, would like to have the debates of this Hon.

Chamber in the hands of the reading and buying public not later than seventy-two hours after the words have been spoken in this House. This is what we have always said we would like to see. To this end the Debates Committee of which, as Your Honour knows, I am a member as well as Your Honour and other Hon. Members on both sides of the House have been working most back-breakingly, if I may say so, for the last few months especially.

The position in respect of the production of Hansard is that the Reporters of the House are, so far as I know, and I speak in respect certainly of last week, up to date in their work. I do not know of a single instance in which, perhaps except for the Estimates debate which is of course voluminous, the Reporters are more than three or four days late with their manuscript. The fact however is that in addition to preparing the manuscript, the editing of debates has to be done and this at the moment is in the hands of the Clerk of the House. Without trenching on a full report which the Debates Committee is at the moment preparing for the House, I would like to disclose to the House that the Debates Committee has been made aware of the fact that at least up to the last time it met, although the manuscripts had been handed in by the Reporters up to the meeting before the time we last met, nevertheless the editing of some twenty debates had not yet been done - debates going back as far as 26th March. In the light of that disclosure, the Debates Committee unanimously decided to recommend to the House the appointment of an Editor of Debates as well of course as other things. But I would like the House to know this as well; it has also been having discussions with the Barbados Workers' Union with respect to certain proposals for increase of salary of the Reporters which the Committee has accepted.

I just go this far because I do not want the House to believe that I am speaking now authoritatively for the Debates Committee, because out of courtesy and out of duty to the House the Debates Committee will shortly present a full report on this matter. I just only want the House to know that we are as concerned in that Committee as all other Hon. Members of this House are, and that we have tried over a long period to create some sort of system out of the chaos that seems to exist, and the reason why I move that further consideration be now postponed, is that I would like, when next we debate this matter, to be able to present or perhaps to give Mr. Speaker the opportunity to present the Report of the Debates Committee with the recommendations to the House. I personally believe that in order for the House to come to grips once and for all with these difficulties, it may be necessary for us to break precedence - I do not know if this has been done before, but I would certainly be myself inclined to ask for this - to have a secret session of this House in order that we may be able to discuss these matters domestically and thoroughly, and reach a proper conclusion as to what should be done and must be done - and done quite soon - to re-organise the work of this Chamber. I am hoping, therefore, shortly, to ask for a private session of this House so that the House may be able to come to grips and speak its mind freely, and so that all its Members may be able to contribute forcefully and meaningfully to the solution of this problem.

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

The question that further consideration of the Resolution be postponed was out and resolved in the affirmative without division.

4.20 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If Hon. Members are not willing to start anything new in their section of the Order Paper, I beg to move that Government Business be now resumed.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: *(ASIDES)* Apparently, the Hon. senior Member for St. Thomas thought that the remaining Resolutions unless at least touched on today, will go off the Order Paper because of the time during which they have not been dealt with. If there is a danger of that taking place, I will formally move that all the Resolutions remain there. We still have about five minutes in Private Members' Time. Some Resolutions have been taken off the Order Paper because of the interruption of time. I am putting back on the Order Paper some of mine which have been taken off, but we do not want that to happen because they have been on the Order Paper and have not been touched since February. In order to avoid that, I will formally move, or ask Hon. Members in whose names the Resolutions stand, to move that further consideration of them be postponed. In that case they will be renewed as from today.

Mr. CRAIG: There is a Resolution No. 12 on the Order Paper....

Mr. SPEAKER: I referred to that at the beginning of today's proceedings, that for some extraordinary reason there is no mention, as there should have been, as to when that Resolution was given notice of.

Mr. CRAIG: Apart from that, Sir, the whole Resolution is worded wrongly. I am sure that there is a line or two left out. This is not the Resolution which I handed in, I can assure you.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not surprised to hear that.

Mr. CRAIG: What would be the position with my Resolution if no date as to the notice is given? Will this be taken off the Order Paper in another three months or so?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that I will have to perform a lot of duties other than those of the Speaker. I will see that the matter is rectified.

Mr. CRAIG: I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am in a little difficulty. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition has seconded the motion of the Hon. Leader of the House for the resumption of Government Business.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I did not second it formally, but I bowed assent which could have been taken as seconding the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is the normal, gracious manner in which the Hon. Leader of the Opposition seconds.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, before the postponement of further consideration of Private Members' Business, speaking on that Resolution, I would respectfully remind Hon. Members of the House that the House could give its assent to keeping a Resolution on the Order Paper under Private Members' Business for a period longer than three months, even although it has not been dealt with. Since I have been in the House, I have not seen this done, but I do not know any reason why, subject to the joint wisdom of the Hon. Leader of the House and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, a rider could not be attached saying that the next four Resolutions which will be removed from the Order Paper between now and next Tuesday, will remain on the Order Paper by the leave of the House. I do not know if an amendment is necessary to add the words "and that Resolutions Nos. 6 to 9," whatever they are, "under Private Members' Business remain on the Order Paper not withstanding....." *(A PAUSE)* The Clerk has kindly drawn to my attention the authority which I cited from memory, that is, Standing Order No. 24 (3) which states:-

If an interval of three calendar months has elapsed after notice of a motion has been given without further action having been taken on the motion, the motion shall be deemed to have been withdrawn unless the House otherwise orders."

It should not be beyond our wit, otherwise, to order that these motions be not deemed to be withdrawn on this motion before the House.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Let the House order that they remain; let it be the wish of the House that they be retained on the Order Paper.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not see any reason why that motion might not be made, that the House may not so order some time during the time of Government Business, which is now, but I am not going to irregularise what was not regular.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I take it that some time before the adjournment is taken, opportunity will be taken to ascertain the pleasure of the House.

RESUMPTION OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now 4.30 p.m., of the clock, time for the resumption of Government Business. When Government Business was last under consideration, the House was in Committee of Supply.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the House was last in Committee of Supply the Hon. senior Member for the City was speaking on a Resolution for the sum of $58,887. I observe that the Hon. Member is not now in his seat.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I take it that we are dealing with the Resolution for $58,887. Speaking on Head 31 and Item 106 - Subsidy to Barbados Marketing Corporation - for some long time now, this House has been in the habit of expressing great and grave concern over the operations of this Marketing Corporation. It has been a long story now, although this Corporation has not been working for a very long time. Some time ago there was what amounted to a scandal at this concern, and of course, the sort of action which some of us on this side of the House would have liked to see take place, did not occur. However, I believe that a Marketing Corporation should be a success, provided that those who manage the business are knowledgeable and that they get the full co-operation of the staff under their control.
4.30 p.m.

That is, provided they do not have to deal with square pegs in round holes. Not so long ago I heard that an officer had been appointed to serve at the Corporation, and the Chairman knew nothing about his appointment. When this gentleman showed up for work, he did not know what work he should do. He was soon afterwards told not to worry with that question, but to take it for granted that that man had to be considered as an appointee on the staff. Now if that is so, we can begin to understand why this Corporation will not work.

The Minister has told us today, among other things, that for the month of August and for the first time this Corporation did show some profit. I repeat that for the month of August, 1968, and for the first time this Corporation has shown a profit. Before the Minister got to that climax, he said that he had good news for the House. That was the good news. The goods news amounted to this: for a single month, not last month, this is now the month of November.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS rose...

Mr. HUSBANDS: I will not give way, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Two Hon. Members are on their feet.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, that is not right; that is no point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I want no direction from anyone.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There are now three Hon. Members on their feet, and I am asking all three to take their seats.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Two Hon. Members are on their feet. I would like to hear what the Hon. senior Member for St. Andrew has risen on.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

At this stage, Mr. HUSBANDS left the Chamber.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to point out that the last Report which came to my Ministry and which I have seen was for the month of August. I made it clear that I have called for a monthly Report on the operations of the.....

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. What the Hon. Member is doing is not a point of order. Can it be a point of order to break one of the Standing Orders? He is making an explanation and a speech.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am entitled to listen to what the Hon. Member has to say when he says that it is on a point of order. I am to determine whether it is a point of order.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Does Your Honour say that if a person abuses the procedure of the House; gets up and says on a point of order, and then proceeds to do something else - what does the Hon. Member say? He says: "I am making a personal explanation." At that stage you should have stopped him. Your Honour sometimes gives Rulings - do not interrupt me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order. I am on my feet, and the Hon. junior Member for St. Joseph must take his seat.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am putting it to you that the Hon. Member has not shown that anybody on this side of the House has broken any of the Standing Orders governing the procedure of this House. You seem to have forgotten that you are a servant of the House. You are there to interpret the Rules and not to lean on one side. (Mr. CRAIG: He cannot interpret the Rules.)

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Again two Hon. Members are on their feet.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS took his seat.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, only one Member is now on his feet.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I was addressing the House on a point of order, when I was continually interrupted by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, and I have not been able to make my point.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, speaking on this Resolution, the Hon. Minister is performing the role of the Devil's Advocate. When I rise on a point of order, it is my duty to direct Your Honour's attention to the fact that I am speaking on a point of order. In the absence of any such direction from me, I am making a speech. I am satisfied that the Hon. Minister has advanced a lot of argument here, today, with which he himself does not agree.

Now, as you know, I decided to deal with Item 106 first. You will observe that the Barbados Marketing Corporation is reported to have made its first profit since it has been in existence during the month of August this year. We have learnt from the Minister that the Corporation suffered heavy losses during the month of July in the wholesale section.
4.40 p.m.

I am to wonder, since the Minister knows so well what were his profits for the month of August, if he can tell us what were his losses from the wholesale section during July. Similarly, Sir, he had losses in his cold storage section. He has not told us that these losses were encountered since August when he made the profit; so I am to wonder if he is also in a position to tell us what were his losses in the cold storage Department prior to the month of August. Now he has told us that during the month of August when he made the profit, he also lost $1,222 in his abattoir, and in July he lost as much as $3,000 in the same abattoir. We know as well as ever that figures can be made to represent something today and those same figures can be taken to represent something else tomorrow, especially so when dealing with the Barbados Marketing Corporation. What I have just said, the Minister himself has an abundance of evidence thereon.

Now the Minister set about to put before us the position as regards the slaughterers. Undoubtedly the slaughtering of animals as is done today calls for a certain amount of technique and skill. It is not as animal-minded as it was in the past; so when you find that the slaughterers are reported to be working now for thirty-two hours a week, is it the fault of the slaughterers that they are only working 32 hours or work less hours than on a previous occasion? If the Minister would so organise the work and the industry as a whole, he would find that consumption of the meat would entail the present amount of slaughterers working much more than 32 hours or 20 hours they had been working in the past. I am to say that the slaughterers are willing to work for 40 or 44 hours, if necessary. It is not their fault if they are only working 32 hours. The truth is that there are not enough animals to be slaughtered.

There is one point the Minister has not told us, and it is that animals are left alive because the slaughterers did not work more than 32 hours. He has not told us that there were animals to be slaughtered, but because the slaughterers only worked 32

hours, so many head of stock or cattle remained on their hoofs. He cannot tell us that, because it is just a case where the slaughterers work every possible hour that is required of them; so what else do you expect? Why should they work more than 32 hours when there are only 28 or 30 hours of work? They might just as well work 30 hours and rest about the premises for another two.

Why will the Marketing Corporation forever lose money? I do not want to call names at all if I can avoid it, but for instance, the Hon. Leader of the House was very instrumental in placing people there who go to work armed with a newspaper, and all they do for the balance of the day is to read a newspaper on the job. I am saying this because I would like the Leader of the House to have a Private conversation with a friend.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Is the Hon. Member saying that I placed people at the Corporation to read newspapers?

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, he did not place them to read newspapers; he placed them there, I feel, to give an honest day's work for an honest day's pay; but he now knows that instead of giving an honest day's work for an honest day's pay, they take to reading newspapers as well. I do not feel he knew it before I said it, but there is one thing I can tell him, and it is that he knows beyond the shadow of a doubt to whom I refer. I do not want to trouble him further.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, if the Hon. Member is giving the House information, I think he ought to give the House information. He cannot say I know something merely because he says it. That would be stretching credulity too far.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I just rise on a point of order to make it abundantly clear that the Leader of the House has absolutely nothing to do with the appointment of members to the staff of the Barbados Marketing Corporation.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister is making a farce of this House. The Leader of the House has not objected to my saying that he placed people there. The Leader of the House got up and raised objection to another point. He said he did not place them there to read newspapers. So what is the Hon. Minister trying to do with our Leader of the House?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, we must not add to the confusion. I asked whether the Hon. Member was saying that I placed people there to read newspapers. That is what I asked.

Mr. HINDS: And Mr. Chairman, I replied that the Minister would not do that, and that he would place them there to give an honest day's work for an honest day's pay. I just repeated what I said earlier, and I said further that he is not responsible for any person going there and reading newspapers for the greater part of the day. He would not be a party to that at all, not even if it were his own in-law. I have greater confidence in the Minister than that.

We are losing money in the Abattoir, and it would be interesting to learn from the Minister exactly from which Department he found they had made this profit for the first time; and what is more, if the Minister could tell us what contributed to his being able to tell this House today of this profit in August for the first time. I would like to sit down at this stage and have the Minister answer that one point. It would help me considerably.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to announce to the Hon. junior Member for St. Peter that there has been a directive from me through my Permanent Secretary to the Chairman of the Board instructing the Manager of the Board to let the Ministry have a monthly Statement of the affairs of the Barbados Marketing Corporation as soon as possible after the end of that month. Now the point which I am trying to make is that the last Statement which reached me which I have dealt with was the Statement for the month of August. Now I have every reason to believe that the Statement for the month of September is now being processed in the Ministry, but it has not reached my desk yet; but immediately I saw that trouble was brewing up over the B.M.C., I instructed that I must have a Statement of the affairs of the B.M.C. every month on the monthly operations, and this has taken place as from 1st July. The first of these reports came in during the month of August for the month of July.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I know that you are capable of conveying to the Minister what point I wanted a reply from him on. All we have heard from the Minister does not answer what I wanted.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: If the Hon. Member would give way. The point is that in the normal day-today- administrative arrangements, there are certain arrangements which pass down through the administration of the Ministry to the administration of the B.M.C. These are administrative arrangements, and you do not have to call Board meetings for these things; so I cannot tell the Hon. Member if the Board knows, if they even had a meeting since they experienced this profit in August or not. All I know is that the Ministry knows it and I know it.

Mr. HINDS: He has come to the point; I am telling him now. The Minister knows that they have made a profit, but the members of the Board do not know that. I will tell you this, Mr. Chairman; I am willing to bet that with the audited Statement for the year as presented, I challenge the Minister to lay a Statement showing that they made an over-all profit during the month of August. (A MEMBER: That is what it should show.) I am not concerned with what it should show; what we do know is that the Barbados Marketing Corporation will forever and ever go on losing money when its principal operation is competing against the Bridgetown supermarkets and

other merchants. You will find, for instance, that the B.M.C. tried to make us feel that we can grow tomatoes. I can tell you that there is hardly a supermarket in Bridgetown which carries a larger stock of imported Tomato Ketchup than the B.M.C. They are telling us to grow tomatoes here, that we can do every sort of thing and yet they stock corned beef, polish, razor blades,- why they do not cut the throats of some of these people, really I do not know. Everything that you can buy from a supermarket about here, the B.M.C. is pushing their hands in; whatever you can think about, all imported foods, they are dabbling in and therefore they must lose money because they are really dabbling in things with which they have little or no experience. We have some clever Bridgetown merchants who, I can assure you, will sooner or later join up to ruin the trade, and remember, Sir, you must not get angry with them because the B.M.C. is competing against them. You will find sooner or later that items will be dumped down there at the B.M.C. They will be encouraged to stock some particular item, but the demands will be met from elsewhere. Why will you find a situation like this? I heard the Minister say in an aside that if it had been his own business, the results would have been different. I compliment him on that; so you will understand that it is the taxpayers' business. People are being taxed, double taxes, all sorts of taxes they are being called upon to pay, and what have you got today? The sum of $1,350,000.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: If the Hon. Member will give way on a point of elucidation, Mr. Chairman, when I said that if it was my business it would not be in that position, what I meant exactly was that I would be looking after my business and nobody will look after your business as you would be looking after it yourself. I would see that my business makes a profit. Any business that I have to go into I would have to make a profit out of it or I would not be operating it. I am not at the B.M.C. every day to see that this is going wrong and it is corrected. If I had been the Manager of the B.M.C., if it was my business, I could not lose that sort of money.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, that is the point that I have been making. The Minister would carry his expertise to the business and he would see that it makes a profit; but you are employing all sorts of rogues and vagabonds - thieves. And not only that; the Minister and his Ministry are turning around and shielding and protecting the thieves, the crooks, holding all sorts of parties about here and having them all about, The crooks who are at the Barbados Marketing Corporation issue cheques to themselves as if it is their own business and the same Ministry.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The Hon. Member says that the Minister is holding parties. I do not know of ever having invited a crook from the B.M.C. to my place.

Mr. HINDS: I never said the Minister did that; I never said that. I will tell you something. This Government, as the B.M.C. will show, owes a far greater responsibility to the public than some Members seem to realise. The B.M.C. employs a Manager there, and I heard the Minister say that he had to call upon him to tender his resignation or to quit the service. On the floor of this House it was trotted out in no uncertain terms, the reasons why the Government should try to get rid of this particular Manager; but do you know, Sir, that the B.M.C. is still now about to enter into a contract with the same rascal that they had to get rid of? The Corporation is now to enter into a contract with the same rascal to produce vegetables to sell to the same Marketing Corporation. That is it. 5.00 p.m.

A crook got away from the Marketing Corporation, formed a Company, and went around the Island buying all the vegetables and robbing the poor farmers and peasants. The money he would have stolen from the Barbados Marketing Corporation, he is now stealing from the poor farmers. The same Barbados Marketing Corporation is now entering into a contract with that man. That is the reason why I said that the Minister is performing the role of the Devil's Advocate. Deep down in his heart of hearts and deep down in his conscience he knows that it is dishonest to come to this House to say one word in favour of the Corporation, or to influence this side of the House to vote one penny for anything called the Barbados Marketing Corporation. I do not know when they will get a rum licence so that some people can go down there and get a snap of rum. The only thing they are not selling down there nowadays is a snap of rum.

Mr. Chairman, I can say that the Corporation has displayed absolutely nothing even in the presentation of the commodities that they market. They do not have any super-attraction for anybody. You get better service in some of the supermarkets. I am praying and beseeching the Minister that he will one day come to this House of Assembly and say: "My conscience no longer permits me to be associated with the Barbados Marketing Corporation." and bring a Resolution either to hand it over to private enterprise, or whatever else he can do. But, for God's sake, do something to save the taxpayers in this country from sending down the drain another $1,350,000 on something called the Barbados Marketing Corporation.

Mr. Chairman, from the very beginning we had gentlemen in this community who decided that, if they had remained on the Board, the good name that they had built up in this country for years would go in two minutes of association with the Barbados Marketing Corporation. Fortunately for us, Sir, the Leader of the House has every reason to rise up at this hour and to support what I have just said that those gentlemen dissociated themselves from the Barbados Marketing Corporation, because they did not feel that they could have retained their good business name and respect in this community by retaining membership of that Board.

Mr. Chairman, the history of the Barbados Marketing Corporation is one that would bring tears from the eyes of the poor peasants throughout the country districts. The poor peasants have been crying out for

short weights. The people who send their vegetables to the Marketing Corporation were robbed. The Minister might not know of all of this, but strangely enough, the Minister saw to it that the people who were associated with the short-weights method no longer remain with the Corporation. It might have been done by accident that some of these short-weights officers no longer remain with the Corporation. If the Corporation is robbing the farmers, why is it that they are still losing money? If they are giving short weights - 14 ounces for a pound - why are they still losing money? Is it that somebody is carrying away the profits and the benefits from the short weights, too?

Mr. Chairman, the Minister owes this House and the community a service.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The Hon. Member said that the Corporation is giving the farmers 14 ounces for a pound.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, that is not a point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The Corporation is buying from the farmers; so if they are giving 14 ounces for a pound, they are giving the farmers something and not taking away anything from them.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: That is no point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: When I get up in here, I have as much authority, and as much liberty, and as much privilege in here as anybody else who will get up and talk nonsense. I talk sense when I get up, and I do not talk nonsense. Some people get up in here on a point of order and they do not know what they are saying.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, would you really like me to continue under such conditions? It might be a point on which the Minister rose. He says that if the Corporation is giving 14 ounces for a pound - but the point I am yet to make is how much they take for a pound. We know that they give 14 ounces for a pound, but we want to find out what they take for a pound. Many housewives have gone to the Barbados Marketing Corporation, bought fish and other commodities, and on reaching home they found that they were given 14 ounces for a pound. But what we are now against is that the same Barbados Marketing Corporation is giving licence to someone, whose character and whose dishonesty they could no longer retain or condone, to go around this Island - in other words, he was too much trouble for the Corporation; so they loosed him on the poor peasants in the country districts. In other words, he is going to develop a Marketing Corporation of his own that will deal directly with the Barbados Marketing Corporation.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The Barbados Marketing Corporation enters into contracts with farmers themselves. They deal directly with the farmers; so the Hon. Member's statement is incorrect. The B.M.C. does not enter into any contract with any individual contractor for produce produced on other people's farms. This was not the purpose for which the B.M.C. was established, and it is not the way in which it handles its contracts. The B.M.C. enters into direct contracts with the growers of the various commodities.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, that is not a point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I have told you not to trouble me. Let me do my work to suit myself and stop disturbing me, because I can get very rough, too. As I was saying, the B.M.C. enters into contracts with the farmers and growers, and there is absolutely no reason why any permission should be granted to the B.M.C. to enter into a contract with a contractor who is contracting with farmers.

5.10 p.m.

Their instructions are to enter directly into agreement with the farmers who produce the commodities, and as far as I am aware that is what is happening.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, have I lost my rights in here when you sit in that Chair? Mr. Chairman, the Minister is trying to test the amount of information I have on the Barbados Marketing Corporation and its contracts. I appreciate the fact that the B.M.C. will enter contracts with peasant farmers; but if I, for instance, formed a company cultivating lands, planting vegetable crops, entered a contract as a peasant farmer with the Barbados Marketing Corporation, is the Minister going to jump up again and tell me that after I as a peasant enter a contract with the B.M.C. to supply vegetables that I cannot turn to my neighbour and relieve him of having to carry his small quantity into Bridgetown or let him use my scales and weights, and they buy all from me? Let the Minister deny that Calvin Sides has formed a company in this Island. The crook that they got rid of, Calvin Sides, will be growing potatoes, tomatoes, cabbage, carrots and all these things. His company is going to supply the Barbados Marketing Corporation and will be buying up from as many small fellows as they possibly can to supply to the Corporation. Is the Minister going to tell me that that cannot happen in Barbados? I will call the names of the plantations and estates that have been taking vegetables from the small farmers. Some of these peasant farmers who work on the estates have small plots on which they grow tomatoes, cabbage and the like, and they carry them to the plantation, the manager weighs them, gives a ticket, and along with what he reaps from the estate sends them down to the Marketing Corporation. Are you going to tell me that this does not happen? I will encourage you to leave your office at times and go about this Island and see what is happening, and do not support the Barbados Marketing Corporation and its agents in robbing the poor peasant farmers of this Island. This is what I am charging you with now.

In all seriousness now, I am to say that a Minister who supports this and asks us to vote this

money this afternoon is a Minister void of a conscience and void of anything called responsibility to the poor taxpayers of this Island. There are a few organisations in this Island run by Government, Mr. Chairman, which sooner or later must go into liquidation. They cannot thrive on wrong for long, and I am to urge upon the Minister now, if he does not know what is going on, just not to take figures that are presented to him for one month. Just imagine! Here is a Corporation that has been dumping the taxpayers' money out to sea month after month and year after year, and for just one month of August the Minister is going to tell us that they made a profit. Mr. Chairman, if that Minister really had any respect for his position and the Corporation had really made a little profit, he would have said it in an aside rather than from the floor of this House while standing on his feet. It is nothing to the credit of the Minister, nor is it any credit to the Corporation when you pitch your gains or so-called profits against the millions which you have lost. Why are we here today debating this Resolution? Is it because of the careful management of this institution? Do you think we are here because these people are careful down there? I will tell you this? It is all of these when properly put before the taxpayers of this Island that will raise them up in no uncertain terms to tell all of us as legislators that we will only get their votes when we rise in defence of their money which is being washed down the drain. I do not want to trespass on the others that are losing money, but we know them. You will soon see that we on this side of the House are going to invite the Ministers on that side to take us on an inspection tour of all these projects and institutions that belong to the Government. We have a reason for it all. They are buying up all the properties - this place and the next place for this purpose and the other purpose - just as they have gone in Black Rock right next door to a gasoline station and a big rum distillery to put up a Children's home! Within fifty yards of a gasoline station and next door to the Lazaretto they are going to put the poor little children! You look for the Rules, Mr. Chairman, because I am saying how they are losing money.

Let us leave the B.M.C. for a while. You will find that under Item 77 we are to provide money for supplying electric fans for the new terminal building at Seawell Airport. Mr. Chairman, you have a right to know Seawell Airport like all of us. Would you be reluctant to agree with me that having to spend money to provide fans for a wind-swept place like Seawell Airport in a new terminal building is an utter disgrace to modern architecture?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I am forced to get up because I think the Hon. Member has missed the point. This is for the Plant Quarantine section which has got to be kept closed, and you have officers working in there. A plant can bring in some sort of disease which can be transmitted by the air; so in order for a plant to be quarantined, it is kept in a place that is closed so that it can be inspected. Hence you must have a fan. You cannot expect officers to work in an oven. You must have a fan or air-conditioning for the room.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I have been to Seawell and I have had discussions with people immediately concerned with this. The Minister touched on a very good point; air-conditioning is the answer but with mondern science and a place like Seawell Airport, all that has happened is that there has been so much faulty imitations of architecture up there that they have gone and provided a choked-up room for this Plant Quarantine. They have put it in the wrong place, and that is the real trouble.
5.20 p.m.

That is the real trouble with Seawell Airport. They have now put down this new Terminal Building - and I will tell you this; there are no possibilities of carrying out proper security arrangements there at all. The Officers there can have absolutely no control; motor cars can go so near to passengers before they reach the Terminal Building that the Officers can have no control of the position. It is a tremendous blunder which has been made at this new Terminal Building at Seawell Airport. (Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I did not build it.) Mr. Chairman, I did not accuse the Minister of building it; he would have built something far worse.

Mr. Chairman, as to Item 100 - Equipment - I am anxious to know how this pump is going to be operated. Is it going to be driven by its own electricity, or is it the compressor type or have you got to get current from the Barbados Light and Power Co., to get it into operation? What I think we will soon have to pay considerable attention to, Mr. Chairman, is this; you have companies or business houses importing into this island household equipment, refrigerators and even mops and other necessary gadgets and what not, but these importers pay little or no regard to the spare parts. Even brandnew motor cars are imported into this Island, and if something should go wrong with one of them, you have got to house it for months before you can get a part from a garage which sold you the car to make a replacement in order to get on with the business. Mr. Chairman, you may be able to bear me out on that. I am saying that as to the importers of these refrigerators and all of these various household gadgets, the Government has to do something about this matter before they are given permits to import all of this equipment in here and then they do not see about providing the spare parts. That is not fair to the consumer. You buy a commodity for $400 or $500; you use it for five weeks or ten weeks as the case may be. I have my own experience in a matter of this sort. One City firm in Bridgetown has been trying for eighteen months to get a part from Canada for a refrigerator That is not fair to the consumer.

As to this Land Rover (Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: It is operating.) I hope it is not operating in carrying children to school. It was imported for Codrington Experimental Station, but have we still got Codrington Experimental Station? (Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: It has been removed to Graeme Hall.) Is the Minister now telling us that Codrington Experimental Station is now at Graeme Hall or is it the Graeme Hall Experimental Station? Which is it?

We are serious now; have we still got in existence a Codrington Experimental Station? *(ASIDES.)*

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Member has given way and I hope that I will not be criticised by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition for speaking. At the Codrington Experimental Station, we are having a new industry which we hope to begin some time next month. This is a Horticultural Industry where we are growing plants and so on for the export market and so on. The place is going to be leased from the Government at the rate of about $12,000 a year - the Agreement is to be signed now - and this new industry is expected to employ some 200 people in the first stage. The other thing is that because of the experiments which we have got to carry out in agriculture - it is only a matter of 90 acres of land at Codrington; the Ministry is expanding; and this was not enough land for the purpose of carrying out our experiments, and it was not the best land to carry out the experiments, either. It was recommended that the experiments should be carried out at Graeme Hall, and therefore we have already started some of our experiments there. The sugar cane breeding, the variety testing and so on - all of that is being already done at Graeme Hall - the experiments on potatoes, the citrus nurseries and so on - all of these are already at Graeme Hall. The only part of the portion at Codrington Station which has not as yet been removed to Graeme Hall, is the portion which we must have for covered sheds for plant propagation, and this will be removed early in the new year because we have to erect these buildings there.

Even although this company is operating, we will continue to use what we have at Codrington, with the permission of the people who are operating there, until about May next year when we will have erected our own sheds for plant propagation at Graeme Hall. A part of the work is being done at Graeme Hall and a part is being done at Codrington as it now stands, but in the new year by June all the work will be done at Graeme Hall. It is not a question of Codrington Station; it is a Government Experimental Station being used for variety testing and other things.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I made use of the term "Codrington Experimental Station" because I was following the Minister. Since he has answered so cleverly, where is the jeep, the Land Rover? The Hon. Member has said that the Land Rover was at Codrington Experimental Station; but since there is no such station operated at Codrington, and all the experiments are being carried out at Graeme Hall, will the Hon. Minister tell us where the Land Rover is? (Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: It is still housed at Codrington). I think Mr. Chairman, that I have covered enough ground. I know how anxious the Minister is to see me sit down; I will sit, but I will promise him that immediately the next speaker raises any point which I feel should be carried further, I will be on my feet again.

5.30 p.m.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, who would have thought that the Barbados Marketing Corporation would have come again so soon to plague us, when we consider that for the last two years the Minister has had to make apology after apology for the shootings down there not only of animals; for the money thrown into the Harbour through the loss of pork, rotten vegetables, the racketeering, the stealing, the Chairman carrying away the money and so on - who would have thought that the Barbados Marketing Corporation is still coming before us, Mr. Chairman? Indeed is there still something to say about the Corporation? But it seems that in the middle of all the revelations there are still one or two things which have remained hidden in what the Prime Minister called "the nasty corridors of corruption." I do not have here today to do any such exposé as the Minister himself did all too effectively on the Chairman, or as the senior Member for Bridgetown did on the Manager some time ago. Sufficient to say that the Chairman and the then Acting Manager are no longer with us.

I want to come right down, Mr. Chairman, to the narrow point of the B.M.C. and money-making. I do not know if the Minister is, at any stage, in an apologia and is going to say how other Marketing Corporations lose £2 million. I remember once hearing him say that the Jamaica Corporation had a loss of $2 million, and I questioned the Permanent Secretary of the Jamaican Ministry of Agriculture and the Chairman of their Marketing Corporation and was told that the £2 million was a misprint for £200,000. That may have been a charitable way of putting it, but I was definitely told this. I can assure the Minister of that.

Of course, the Jamaican Marketing Corporation has difficulties which ours does not have. Barbados is a small Island; there is no question of Land Settlement Schemes in the distant interior such as you have in Jamaica where the transport costs for the vegetable produce grown in these relatively obscure places of country are so high that necessarily the Corporation has to accept and regard themselves as subsidising the production of these distant farms. Barbados is small; the farthest you have to go from the Marketing Corporation; presumably, is St. Lucy or St. Philip - relatively short distances, and you have a retail outlet. Anybody who can lose money in a retail business, Mr. Chairman, is not worth keeping - not a retail business of vegetables when tomatoes cost $1 a pound. You have a retail outlet close to a Bus Stand and close to Bridgetown with lots of space in the outlet itself; so there is no reason why you should lose money on the retail business. As a matter of fact, I am informed that no money is lost on the retail business.

Mr. Chairman, you have a money maker there in the Shrimp Plant, which the Minister informs me is now organised as a Department separate from the ordinary cold storage. There is untold money to be made there from shrimps. The Cold Room is always full; shrimps are sold in Barbados more expensively, I am informed, than they are sold in Florida after they have been processed here and sent to Florida. You have everything in your favour where the Shrimp Plant is concerned. (Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: That

is not true.) The Minister says it is not true; perhaps he will publish the retail price of the shrimps in Florida. I challenge him to do that, if he thinks it is not true. He must show all of the prices.

You have the Abattoir. Well we, Mr. Chairman, are not responsible if, as the Minister, in effect, has said, the wages of the slaughterers at the Abattoir are too high. The two Ministers who have been presiding over the Barbados Marketing Corporation for the last two years are sitting down there in close conclave. I presume they have known for years that the wages of the slaughterers were too high. It is they who said it, not us. When the Minister said that his friend the senior Member for St. Thomas could explain something, I really had to say that he was truly talking of friends, because he was genuinely making an Opposition speech at the time. It is he who has to come here month after month and expose the deficiencies of the Department under his administration.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise on a point of order to refute a statement made by the Hon. senior Member for St. Thomas. He said that I said the wages of the slaughterers are too high. I did not say that the wages were too high. What I said is that they were the easiest-working people in this Island or in any part of the world. To tell me that you are going to work for 20 hours a week and receive what is equivalent to a week's pay is good. This is nothing to do with the overtime pay they receive. Every hour over the 20 hours, as I have explained, they get paid for overtime.

I am not arguing that they should not be paid at the rate per hour which they are paid. What I am saying is that they should put in more time under normal working hours. You can appreciate the fact that if over 20 hours a week they are going to get time-and-a-half for overtime, then they will carry up the expenses of the Abattoir. I am not saying that the rate per hour which they are paid is not reasonable. I would like to see them getting more; but the point is that they should work as everybody else works for a 44-hour week at the normal rate rather than working at time-and-a-half, or double time, over 20 hours a week.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry if, in my paraphrasing the Minister, I have struck a phrase which he finds unpalatable. His explanation of saying that he has not said that their wages are too high, but that they get too much overtime is not good enough. I think he should do better than that, Mr. Chairman. I think I will lend him a book called 1984 in which he will learn double-talk and double-think even more effectively, or rather he would learn it effectively, if he wishes to make explanations of that sort.

The Minister is also the Minister of Labour. If he studies labour relations and arguments about shorter hours of work, particularly in Europe, he will know that the argument for a shortened working week is not an argument for more leisure, but an argument for more money. He will know that when people call for a 40-hour working week when they know that the business in which they are engaged demands 48 working hours, then they are asking for eight hours of overtime. In other words, they are asking for a concealed rise in wages. Anybody who knows anything about Union negotiations and labour negotiations knows perfectly well that when you find challenges made to industry to reduce the hours of work, it is a disguised way of asking for more pay. So the Minister by saying that they only work for 20 hours a week is only saying that they do not want to give them a big hourly wage, but they will give them a very short working week in order to allow them to make astronomical wages without the appearance of having an astronomical wage per hour.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister can look at the booms - the great employment booms of Western Europe. I dare say that there must be books in the Ministry which will explain the take-home pay of workers in Germany, France and Britain as based on an overtime boom, which itself depends on shortening the hours of work. Nevertheless, this is a digression. It is just as true, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister and his predecessor, the Hon. junior Member for St. Michael, have allowed the slaughterers at the Abattoir to involve them in making a 20-hour week a basic working week, that they are industrial noodles. There cannot be any private employer in Barbados in his senses who allows a basic 20-hour working week. Everybody knows that, and it is commonsense that the shorter you make the working week, the more the people try to get overtime. Everybody knows that; so do not come in here with a revelation about 'these people are working 20 hours a week, and they have to be paid overtime because there is more work to do.'

The Minister's solution - perhaps it is politically impossible as well as even socially undesirable for example, to refrain from filling slaughterers' places as they become vacant or anything like that. His solution is to put up the price of slaughtering so that we will all have to pay more for our pork. That is the solution; make the public suffer because the Barbados Marketing Corporation negotiated a cock-eyed agreement with the Union in the first place. Who pays?

5.40 p.m.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what one can well understand, if such conditions as a 20-hour working week have been tolerated, is that the Abattoir is going to lose money. It has now been put up to 32 hours. I ask the Minister if he has investigated the possibility of raising the hourly pay and putting the working week up to 40 hours. I ask him to investigate that possibility and restore a little sanity into industrial practices down there at the Slaughterhouse. Now even if the Barbados Marketing Corporation has made some petty profit by organising the books carefully during the month of August, even if it were to make an operating profit over the course of the entire year, Mr. Chairman, the fact still remains that it is a disgustingly-run business. It is a business which by

reason of past misdeeds and even by reason of continuing - and I am emphasising "continuing" - misdeeds, the Minister must not think that coming in here and covering himself with sackcloth and ashes means that we are going to say that he has entirely purged himself both of his sins and those of his predecessor. There are even continuing faults in the structure of the B.M.C.

Now a little past history. I believe I am right in saying that around October, 1966, just before the General Elections, a pork-processing plant was hastily purchased and brought down here and installed at the B.M.C. It was intended that this would be an election issue, but of course it never processed any pork at all, and it is down there - I do not know if rotting away is the operative phrase; it is probably freezing away. All that has to be paid for, Mr. Chairman; but instead of trying to get the pork-processing plant operating, the B.M.C. prefers to go on month after month paying interest on its cost, and having it there as a wasting asset. The very depreciation that the Minister talks about is partly the depreciation on that machinery, and there is something much more - something which as far as I know, has not yet seen the full light of day, and that is the Feed Plant purchased at a cost of $98,000, more than this Resolution asks for, and genuinely rotting away at Lancaster in St. James. Interest is being paid on that every week. $8,000, a year is being paid out in interest on the feed machinery at Lancaster. I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that this in fact has been explained by the Minister in the House at any stage. I understand that at one stage somebody was prepared to make the Government an offer for this machinery and take it off their hands at an old iron cost. I think the Minister knows who is one of the best known purchasers and sellers of old iron, and it was only at the last moment that the Government was advised that to throw away $98,000 in machinery would be too much of a scandal even for the Democratic Labour Party to endure. If the Minister had any hand in preventing the racket that would have been involved in the sale of that machinery, I congratulate him; but it is disgraceful that the possibility should have arisen at all. When we consider the whole problem of feed, Mr. Chairman, the B.M.C. was to produce feed to reduce the cost of raising your pigs, chickens and cows. All this is a very laudable aim; but what has been done? The price of feed is controlled by a number of persons in this Island who make it their duty to maintain close contact with the Government. I am going to call the name of Mr. K. R. Hunte in particular. He is the greatest obstacle to having cheap feed in Barbados, because cheap feed, cheap chicken, cheap pork would mean less money in the pockets of Roberts Manufacturing Company, and his is not the only business which stands to lose and which exerts political and other influence in order to keep the price of feed up in Barbados. The Minister knows full well, talking about Greenland, St. Andrew, that there was an attempt to bring pollard into this Island not from distant parts, but from Trinidad, at a cheaper price than it is being landed here by certain importing agencies.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: It was not pollard, Mr. Chairman; it was coconut meal.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I say 'pollard'. If the Minister knows about coconut meal and I know about pollard, I still know about pollard. Letters were written - let the Minister ask for the letters - saying that if they supplied even the Government with pollard at six cents a pound, the importers who imported large quantities to sell here at eight cents or 8 1/2 cents, making 100 per cent profit on it from Trinidad - they bring it up on schooners and it is not an expensive freight - would cease to import it any further, and the Government backed down or rather did not support its own operative. The Trinidad suppliers said they dared not supply even the Government farm with it.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I think the Hon. Member has given way. We are in Committee; so we can try to help each other. The position is that there was a firm here, Corbin and Pile, bringing in coconut meal. The Hon. Member knows a little about what he is saying, but he does not have all the facts correctly. There was a firm bringing in coconut meal selling not only to Greenland, but even to the dairy farmers and pig farmers at six cents a pound. This resulted in a reduction of the consumption of certain manufactured feeds, because when the farmers used the coconut meal as one of the ingredients of their animal feed, they found that rather than paying 11 cents a pound for animal feed, they were cutting down their feed costs to something like 8 1/2 cents a pound with other ingredients like Soya bean meal and so on. This is what the farmers have been doing; therefore the sale of manfactured feeds dropped.

It has been represented to us that as a result of certain businessmen going to Trinidad or sending to Trinidad and offering to pay a higher price to the manufacturers of the coconut meal and offering to contract with them for all the meal sent to Barbados, for some three weeks previous to last week coconut meal could not be bought in Barbados, not even for the rat campaign, because the Agricultural Society mix the rat poison with coconut meal. They themselves could not buy coconut meal because it was not being shipped to Barbados then. (A VOICE: That is not a point of order. It is not a point of order; I asked the Hon. Member if he would give way for me to give an explanation to assist him in this problem, and we are in Committee and I think it is in order.

The position is that it is an established fact that some of the edible oils being used in this country are not manufactured here and it is argued that what comes from outside is of little better quality; therefore this very firm in Trinidad has been sending oil here and the agent who imported the coconut meal made it clear to the firm in Trinidad that if he could not get the coconut meal to sell, he would not be bringing in their oil. But the coconut meal is now in Barbados being sold at a penny a pound more than what it had been sold at. I think it is sold at $8.50 per hundred pounds,

when four weeks ago the same coconut meal was sold at $6.00 per hundred pounds. This was a means of preventing farmers from getting a cheaper feed and we know this.
5.50 p.m.

I will show you what action we have taken. We have had talks with another producer of another country where coconut meal is produced, here last week, and it is proposed that even if these people do not let us have the coconut meal from Trinidad, it is proposed to bring this coconut meal from this other country. It is expected that this coconut meal will be brought into the country to be sold at an even much cheaper price than what the coconut meal from Trinidad is being sold at here. *(ASIDES)* I would not say now; if I were to say now, it means that we will find that the businessmen are going to this country and offering them twice what the farmers here will pay for it. That is what happens in this country.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to hear that the Government finds itself as unable to deal with the coconut meal problem as it did with the pollard problem. Although I am very glad to hear about the coconut meal, I am really talking about wheat-ends. I do not know if that makes more sense to the Minister than pollard. I am talking about something else as well, and it was particularly Greenland that I was talking about. I think that this product is called wheat-ends. Is that right? (A MEMBER: Wheat millings). Wheat millings; the Hon. Member knows what I am talking about when I say wheat millings instead of pollard because the firms are involved more maliciously in the wheat millings than in the coconut meal. Mr. Chairman, according to what was reported to me, there was an element of possible criminal conspiracy in what certain firms did so as to keep the price of the wheat millings up in Barbados to the same, I believe, 8 1/2 cents per pound or $8.50 per hundred pounds. The Government finds itself unable, although it has a $98,000 feed plant at Lancaster to do anything about the high cost of these imported feeds. It cannot be said that the Government has declared war on the businesses who it well knows are engaged in a conspiracy to keep up the price of feed because those businessmen enjoy the seats of honour just as well, just as much as they always did. Mr. Hunte will be found with the Prime Minister at the Hilton Hotel with only one bodyguard in attendance, exchanging confidences just as much now as ever before; and if the Prime Minister... *(ASIDES)* it is the same Mr. Hunte who brought in, whom Rock had paid Mr. Mapp to have water meters fixed in people's houses because he had brought in 4,000 water meters and some use had to be found for them. *(ASIDES)* The Prime Minister said that at Green Hill in the 1961 election campaign. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Hunte is not now in the Senate; so we can say what we like about him. The furthest I have ever heard that any Member of this Government has gone in putting Mr. Hunte in his place is on one occasion when the Prime Minister told him that he will see to it that he does not sell him out just as he sold out Grantley Adams. Anyhow, that is by the way.

Mr. Chairman, what is the wheat plant there for if it is not to provide cheap feed for Barbadian farmers? Is it just there so that interest can be paid every month to make it a profit and make it necessary for us to come back to the House constantly? We hear that now it is to be put into operation and who is to be in association with it? - Purina Feeds - one of the very people....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, this is news to me. There has been no decision to put the.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What is the Hon. Member speaking on?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The Hon. Member has given way. I was saying that there has been no decision to put the Feed Plant into operation with Purina Feeds involved. The instructions of the Ministry are that the A.D.C. takes over and operates the Feed Plant and, of course, they will have to have consultative advice, and therefore they will have to seek the advice of someone. As a matter of fact, Mass Mix has offered advice on it. Mass Mix is producing animal feed in Trinidad which it offered to sell to Barbados at $8.50 per hundred pounds c.i.f. That is what Mass Mix is doing and it has offered to be consultants to the A.D.C. in their running of the Feed Plant. I have instructed that the B.M.C. sell over the Feed Plant to the A.D.C. I am the person who stopped the operation of the Feed Plant after they had put it up, or after they had begun to put it up, because I was not interested in throwing any more money down the drain at Lancaster. I was not satisfied that they were equipped to run a Feed Plant. I think that the A.D.C., with the assets and with the land attached, could grow corn and other ingredients for making feed, and they were the people to operate the Feed Plant, because they had more agricultural know-how and expertise than the B.M.C. That is how I felt about it, and that is why the Feed Plant was not operating.

The Hon. Member has been labouring on the matter of the pork-processing plant. This plant cost $29,000 duty free. The B.M.C. went along and put it up in some place without the permission of the Town and Country Planning Officer and they had to take it down. This happened where you had one man dictating what was to be done, and no meetings were called. The plant was put up without the permission of the Town and Country Planning Officer; nobody ever asked him permission to do it and therefore they had to take it down. Since then, we have been negotiating with another concern, two people who are coming in as a Company, and they are to offer 30% of the shares. The proposals were that the B.M.C. would provide the building, they would get more machinery with this, and have a big pork-processing plant, and the B.M.C. would have 30% of the shares and the other two companies would have

the other 70%. The B.M.C. would provide all the pork necessary for processing in the plant and sell it at a negotiated price, which would be reasonable to the producer and also to the consumer. It would be a separate thing and it would not be run by the B.M.C. The only reason why action has not been taken on that is because I was not satisfied that all was well with the proposals and I called a meeting with same B.M.C. and the two companies who are coming in, to let them understand how I felt about it. I felt that what negotiations were going on were not all in the interest of the B.M.C., and I did not allow them to take any step for which they would be sorry afterwards. We would hope that these negotiations are finalised in the near future, and I can assure this House that they are not going to pull anything over my eyes, and that whenever we can come to a reasonable agreement, the pork-processing plant will be going up.
6.00 p.m.

We are not losing any money on it, despite the fact that we have paid $29,000 for it. That is what we will get for it. The Feed Plant will not be sold as old iron, because it will soon be in operation.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, that is one of the most elaborate explanations to which any Hon. Member of this House has been exposed for a long time. I still want to get on with the question of feed. I will say in passing that the Government is losing money if it is only getting $29,000 for the Plant, because it was admitted to this country duty free. When it was landed in Barbados it was worth more than $29,000 - and a good bit more, too; but that is by the way. Let the Minister deal with that in his reply. The Government will also be losing what it has paid in interest since it was brought here. Mr. Chairman, it is also interesting to see that the Minister is not satisfied that the B.M.C. is equipped to run a Feed Plant; he is not satisfied that they are equipped to run a Pork Plant. Why does not he just shut down the Corporation instead of asking for more money, if such unsatisfactory persons are down there?

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister has denied that any decision has been taken to give Purina a share in the feed operations. This concerns the B.M.C., because of this $51,000 that is needed, some of it is required to pay interest on the money out of which that Feed Plant was bought. The Minister has not denied that Purina has been considered. I suggest to the Minister; has he never yet heard the argument: "Man, you take away all the milk from us, and now you are going to take away the feed as well? Give us a break." Has the Minister not heard that argument?

Mr. Chairman, it is an argument with a lot of sympathy about it. We are dealing with the taxpayers' money. If the price of feed is too high, and we are having to vote money for things like the B.M.C. for a Feed Plant, then something must be done to bring it down. You cannot deal, however much sympathy you may have, with the burglars who are responsible every time you shut the door for going and breaking open the windows at the back - you cannot make the burglar the watchman in front. I have named Purina and there may be other feeds, too, who have made approaches to the Minister. Other people may be involved who have suggested that they be given some share in operating the Feed Plant. They see the money being made at Pine Hill Dairy, and they feel that if they lose money on the imports, they will make it back on the local production. With all the sympathy in the world, we cannot allow feed importers to recoup their potential losses merely by becoming feed manufacturers.

There are many reasons, Mr. Chairman, why Barbados will never be able entirely satisfactorily to organise the manufacture of feed here, apart from the economies of scale, at a cheap price. The very best quality enriched feeds, as I am informed by a gentleman who is on the Board of Pillsbury Feeds and who visits Barbados every year - he did not even know that there was a feed problem here, incidentally - but I had the privilege of hearing from him, and, if the Minister is interested, I will give him his name privately so that he can get in touch with him next month. He informed me that a lot of high-quality feed in America depends upon the necessary by-products of an antibiotic industry being available at what is, in effect, waste prices and that a lot of what goes into Pillsbury Feeds is a by-product of penicillin and other antibiotic industries. Things that would have been thrown away, normally, are bought on a large scale by feed manufacturers and used for enrichment. Therefore, we are never going to get down to really high-quality feeds at 3¢ and 3 1/2¢ a pound. When we start buying these expensive ingredients, the price per pound is going to go up. We can still do the best with what we have, Mr. Chairman.

I do not know what caused the Minister to think that the A.D.C. is going to run a Feed Plant any better than the B.M.C. If he has reasons for thinking so, other than the fact that they have estates, I would be glad to hear them. I do not know whether the Government estates near to Lancaster are suitable for growing corn and other ingredients for feed. I cannot imagine that the Minister is going to turn over Dodds and Fairy Valley to corn in order to carry it up to Lancaster. Let us beware of faulty accountancy that will appear to show a profit, when, in fact, you start taking land that can be profitably used for cane, such as the land at the Government estates in St. Philip and Christ Church that makes a very substantial profit indeed, and probably the most profitable of all the Government's undertakings run as they are on a business basis - let us hope that they are not going to take land from cane production to produce corn or whatever is going to be produced to put into a Feed Plant to see that the Feed Plant makes money when the plantation makes that less money. That is not clever economics; that is merely clever accountancy, and yet not so clever that it would not be exposed should something like this be done when the time comes in the House.

Mr. Chairman we really have heard too much about the B.M.C. in these last two years in here. It hurts my heart to see the Minister having to come in to do a demolition job on the part of his own responsibility. I remember Mr. Chairman, when, without the detailed knowledge of the Minister of Agriculture, a Civil Servant in England, called Mr. Eastmond, refused to give back a man his land down in Dorset which had been requisitioned during the war. I also remember when the Minister of Agriculture, Sir Thomas Dougdale, cried in the House of Commons like a child when he announced his resignation because mistakes had been made over the land which were not of his own making and not to his knowledge. He cried and resigned; so it does not make any difference.

The Minister, perhaps, was the Minister at the time when the Pork Plant was being messed about. The Hon. junior Member for St. Michael has been shifted to another Ministry; so we can say that, at least, the person primarily responsible during the period of worst mismanagement has been put somewhere where that kind of mischief can no longer occur.. But it does not help the Ministry, and it does not help any Government to say: "We made Johnson the Chairman, and he turned out to be an incompetent racketeer." The entire Government has to take the blame for the mistakes made by the former Senator Johnson when he was busily engaged in bankrupting the B.M.C. just as he bankrupted his father-in-law's business and tries to steal from it as well. The entire Government is involved if persons reach the height in its Party that Senator Johnson was allowed to reach before his career had to be checked. If we had not started the expose', if we had not discovered that he was carrying away the money, or had signed cheques at the B.M.C. to give himself money, he might still have been Chairman of the B.M.C. today, and still a Senator. It is no use to come in here and pretend that Johnson is the only whipping boy that can be found. When management of a Government-owned business is at fault, the entire Government stands indicted.

I may say that the Minister does not show a duly apologetic sense. If he is so busy divesting the B.M.C. of Feed and Pork Plants, it shows that he does not have any confidence in its management. That is the direction in which we are going to expect him to set the B.M.C.'s house in order. There should be a thorough weeding out, root and branch; get out all the incompetents, the misfits, the Party political appointees, the brothers-in-law, girlfriends, and so on. Get rid of the supervisors who carry on campaigns of political warfare against innocent shrimp packers because they cannot trust their politics. You must get rid of all of that. You cannot have a properly run business in which political loyalty is one of the considerations of appointment, or for keeping your job. The B.M.C. will be rotten with corruption - if not financial corruption, it will be rotten with moral corruption until a drastically new approach to its management is made.

6.10 p.m.

No business can be run satisfactorily by placed men; and if the Minister's confidence in the A.D.C. is in any way based on the fact that they are fewer placed men there, that there are fewer jobs for the boys to be had at the A.D.C., fewer political plums to be swallowed, then I say at least his confidence has the beginning of a foundation; but I sincerely hope that we will not have to be coming back here in a couple of years' time and voting money for the Agricultural Development Corporation.

Mr. Chairman, one last word on the B.M.C. The Hon. senior Member for Bridgetown demolished the question about depreciation. Let us not forget that the B.M.C. is not only operated within the framework of Government loans and Government finance and writing off old debts and so on; it is also operated apparently, I gather today, within the framework of the fact that the Government is even giving it its premises, that the Government does not charge rent for the premises, nor are the premises reckoned as capital cost against the B.M.C. No wonder in these circumstances, Mr. Chairman, that it could make a profit in August. How real and true the profit is, the Minister himself in the secret of his heart can really judge when he sees the figures.

Now Mr. Chairman, very briefly I want to say something about Item 31A and the gardener at Government House. I am not against Government House getting an additional gardener. I certainly think that more assistance is needed. I see there has been a lot of ripping down near to the entrance. Nothing that I can observe so far is put in its place; and if getting a gardener would remedy that, well I hope so. I would just recommend in my very humble way that I hope when they re-do Government House that they will construct one or two vistas. At the moment it is just a formal garden, but there is certainly room to construct a vista or two as you have at Villa Nova , St. John which the Earl of Avon, now owns. I think a little landscaping as opposed to formal gardening might very well turn out to be a good thing at Government House, but I just cast that out for the Minister to think on. I do not think there is any very competent landscape gardener in Barbados. I think that they are better at formal gardening, producing a setting but not landscaping - putting a hill there or a valley there and a row of trees going down, leading to a view at the end. I hope that now you have some open space in front - it would be to the south-east, I suppose - of Government House that you can do some little vista work there. But that is only in passing. I believe the Minister will listen to it and may take action on it in due course. But, Mr. Chairman, I observe if we are talking about gardening, that a place sadly in need of some bushes and a little gardening is the space between Martindales Road and Constitution River. A bulldozer is working on it now. We in the B.L.P. pressed at one stage for it to be made a garden area to provide additional parking space, in effect, for city dwellers. Let us hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Agriculture, if he is not already concerned with it, will contact his colleague, the Minister of Communications, and see if something can be done. There are some reasonable trees there; the drainage problem I hope has been solved, once you get rid of Miss Hinkson's houses which you would not do for

another few months since the Legal Officers have left it too late, I cast this out for the attention of the Parliamentary Secretary. She is going to win her cases. Those last few houses in Martindales Road are going to be there for some time; but once you get rid of them and clear the space, have a gardener for that, too, as well as Government House. It is close to the Hospital and it would cheer up the patients if they can see some flowers from the windows as they go into the Hospital. It really needs cleaning up, and the time is ripe for cleaning it up and putting roads in order. So I hope that when the Government is thinking about garden work, it will think about some garden work for Martindales Road as well as for Government House.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, as I whispered to the Hon. Member who has just sat down, it has the one item I had intended to speak on, but not along the same lines. I am asking the Hon. Minister when was the sum of $51,758 computed. You are with four months still to go, coming and asking for $502. This is a new item; so presumably it was carefully computed for these expensive improvements, and before the financial year is up you have spent apparently $51,758. I am asking Hon. Members to note that. It is not round figures. In short, $51,758, was calculated down to the last half-penny for the financial year, and here now in November with four months to go, you are asking for $502. How was that $51,000 arrived at and why is it that it did not last until March next year?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, there were some questions asked by Hon. Members on the other side which I would like to reply to, and the first was the question of the allocation.....

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to finish. I merely asked that question hoping for an answer. I had not finished altogether.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I thought the Hon. Member was finished, because I wanted to reply.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I appreciate that, but if the Hon. Member can answer that first, I will go on after he has answered.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I did not fully get the meat of the question asked by the Hon. Member.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: In the Estimates under Item 31A, this sum of $51,758 was allocated to Government House as distinct from the other places like Culloden Farm, Ministry of Works and so on. My point is that this is an exact sum which, therefore, must have been carefully calculated, for one Head gardener and four gardeners. It is not round figures to say: "we went astray; we thought it would cover $1,000, but it turns out now to be $1,057" or something like that. It is an exact figure; therefore it must have been calculated to cover wages and the amount of labour for digging the fancy things that the Hon. Member for St. Thomas referred to. I am sure, and I suppose I speak for Hon. Members on the other side too, that I would prefer it to be spent on the gardens at elementary schools.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: What I am asking here for, Mr. Chairman, is an additional gardener. In my introduction I pointed out that the wages for 52 weeks for the gardener at $26.40 a week would amount to $1,372. Then provision has got to be made for two weeks' pay for relief gardeners, and this amounted to $52.80, and the amount required for a year for one gardener in addition to the two weeks' relief gardener would be $1,426. Now part of the year has already gone; so what I am asking for is $502 to employ an additional gardener at $26.40 a week for the remainder of the financial year. The $51,758 do not come into this at all. This is something new, but because of the fact that part of the financial year has gone, it would be $502 divided by $26.40 to give the number of weeks that the gardener will be employed for the remainder of the financial year. The $51,758 has already been allocated for the Head gardener and four gardeners, and whatever expenses there are in connection with gardening; but in order to employ another gardener for the remainder of the financial year at $26.40 a week, we would need $502. I hope this satisfies the Hon. Member.

6.20 p.m.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: It does not, because if that is the answer - I am not suggesting that the Hon. Member is saying something untrue - but why does it not appear here? It is clear as daylight, and I do not believe that I am the only person who has come to this conclusion, that you are saying here: "Considerable improvements and extensions to the gardens at Government Headquarters are being undertaken and more assistance is urgently required for the preparation of garden beds, and upkeep of the gardens. A sum of $502 is required to meet the cost of providing the necessary assistance for the remainder of the current financial year."

This is a supplementary. Would not any human being reading this, feel that the $51,000 would run out before March, and we need $502 more? There is not one word that this money is only for an additional gardener. Because of the "considerable improvements and extensions to the gardens,.... more assistance is urgently required,.... and this sum is required for the remainder of the current financial year." That is absolutely different from the explanation which has now been given.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, the assistance which the officers in the Ministry referred to here would be the gardener. I was kind enough to this Committee to explain that the assistance which I am asking for is a gardener at the rate of $26.40 per week, and I am asking for $502 to employ the assistance, which is a gardener, to the end of the financial year. I could not be more explicit and explanatory than I have been. I went out of the way to explain it as fully as possible to Hon. Members.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I say again that any one reading this note would not know that all that

is meant was that we need another gardener at Government House. That is the Minister's present explanation. Why do you repeat all of that? - Because of the considerable improvements, we need extra assistance. Anyway, that is by the way. Whether other Hon. Members agree with me or not, I suppose that all of us love beautiful gardens, but it is a question of priorty. Why do you waste this money on Government House when there are so many more important things to do? Previous to the Governor-General being appointed, in my life time Government House had the best gardens which it has ever had. People come here and praise us for having such good Government House grounds, because we take up from Guyana, Jamaica and big places like that, which can afford to splash about and have elaborate gardens. As compared with the rest of the West Indies and also the fact that we are so flat and have no landscape and all that, people praise Government House grounds. You do not have to spend money on Government House grounds to the tune of $51,000 that does not run out to the end of the financial year.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, this sum of $51,758 provided here is for all the Government gardens. What has happened is that the Government is not satisfied with the state of the gardens, whether they are gardens at Government Headquarters, Culloden Farm, the Mental Hospital or wherever the gardens are. It was felt that the gardens should come under the Ministry of Agriculture where you would have proper supervision, people who are trained in Agriculture, people who would know when there is a particular fungus on a plant or that some virus is attacking the plant, where you would have the people with the know-how and the technical knowledge of operating gardens. Since this matter was passed on to the Ministry of Agriculture, there has been a great improvement in the gardens. For example, in relation to some of these gardens, the people who look after them do not know that they would have to give these gardens sulphate of ammonia at times, and other fertilizers, and therefore you had some ugly-looking gardens. Today the position is different. These gardens are under the supervision of the Ministry of Agriculture and the provision of $51,758, which was voted under Head 31 Item 31A, is for the purpose of paying 3 Head gardeners and 27 gardeners. The Hon. Member is an expert on taking things out of their context. He has mentioned that this is under the Head of Government House and he has not looked at the explanatory note to the Head. In the Estimates you have the sum there and then you have the explanatory notes, and these are the notes by which the Auditor General and the Accountant General go, and by which we go in here because we approved of them. Item 31 A reads as follows:-

Provision made to meet wages of gardeners previously paid as follows:-

Governor-General	1 Head gardener	4 gardeners
Culloden Farm	1 Head gardener	1 gardener
Ministry of Communications & Works	1 Head gardener	22 gardeners

There are 30 people in all involved in being paid from this amount $51,758. If the Hon. Member had only looked over to the right, he would have seen it; he would have seen the explanation of what he was asking.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: For at least twenty minutes I had these Estimates before me; but when you read this Note, it emphasises the improvements at Government House and tells you that this assistance is needed. Would you not imagine that this was all they were asking for at Government House? As it is, from what the Hon. Member has said now, he does not say, in fact, whether this extra gardener is wanted at Govern- House or somewhere else, although the Note says so.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I said that we wanted the additional gardener at Government House. I was at pains to explain this, unless the Hon. Member was deaf.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: The Hon. Member can go along as long as he likes, but I will not pay him the honour again of objecting to any offensive remark. He was born in the gutter apparently, if he goes on like this all the time.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Just like you and other Hon. Members. You were born in the gutter before me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Two Hon. Members are on their feet. will both sit? *(Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS took their seats.)* I hope that no more of this behaviour will go on for the remainder of the day.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: If you were not born in the gutter, you would not tell me that I was born in one.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will not tolerate any more of this behaviour. This is Parliament and it should be treated as Parliament.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: You were not born in a gutter, you were born in a closet.

The question that this Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative.

A division was taken as follows:-

AYES: Hon'bles J. C. TUDOR, C. E. TALMA, G. G. FERGUSSON, A. DaC. EDWARDS, Messrs SPRINGER, LOWE, CORBIN, SARGEANT, WEEKES and HOPPIN - 10.

NOES: Messrs LYNCH, HINDS, J. M. G. ADAMS, HOLDER, and Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS -5.

6.30 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of one Resolution in Committee.

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

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution be now read a first time.

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

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution be now read a second time.

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

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution be now agreed to.

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

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

THE SHOPS ORDER, 1968

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the next Item be a Resolution to approve the Shops Order, which is in the name of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day, accordingly, is a Resolution that the House of Assembly sanction the Order set out in the Schedule hereto made by the Minister, under Section 4 of the Shops Act, 1945, and that the Senate be invited to concur herein and, if concurred in.

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, today I introduced two Bills (one dealing with amendments to the Bank Holidays Act, and one dealing with amendments to the Shops Act.) This Resolution should not have been necessary had we been able to introduce the amendments to the Shops Act before, but the mechanics of this Act would take some time to work out, and they could not have been gone into before December when this Order is to be implemented. Therefore, it was necessary as we have done last year and the year before, after having a Committee reporting in 1965, I think it was, on the opening of shops, to bring this matter before the House.

We have been accustomed now to an Order such as this. We have had one last year and the year before giving late closing days and early closing days to shops during the month of December, especially during the week prior to Christmas. This is the normal type of Resolution which we passed last year, and I move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to prevent Hon. Members on the other side from going home, but each year at this time this House is pressed into service to pass a Resolution of this kind. What I am particularly concerned with is that the Resolution makes provision for a change in the opening hours and closing hours of certain categories of shops, and provision is also made for the payment of overtime to such workers as may be employed during those hours.

Now, we welcome any change in the opening hours, if it means additional employment for any section of the community, but I am sure the Minister knows that the complaints of many of these workers still remain unanswered. They are called upon to do work, but they are not being paid in accordance with the provisions of this Resolution. Some of these people are afraid to go to the Labour Department, or the Police, and complain because they would lose their jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure it is not beyond the Department of Labour to send its officers to these stores to make checks to find out to what extent some of these workers are suffering. I am sure that some of them who complain will be able to speak the truth under such circumstances. Merely to pass the Resolution, give people permission to open stores and to retain the staff on the premises for these additional hours and then deprive them of adequate overtime payment is not good enough.

6.40 p.m.

If the staff is deprived and is unable to complain because of fear of losing their jobs, it is not good enough. We would like to know what machinery Government proposes putting into operation to see that the terms of this Resolution will have full effect, particularly where these workers are concerned. We do not subscribe to the view that workers should be employed and not be adequately paid, particularly in this case in accordance with the terms of the law passed by this House, and I am asking the Minister to do what he can to let his Labour Department exercise some sort of vigilance for the protection of those workers who may be penalised if they make complaints.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member is aware of the fact that there is a Minimum Wages Order for shop attendants, and there are

specified hours for these attendants. Now they have two alternatives, either to join one of the Unions and be represented thereby, or make representation either to the Labour Department or the Police. Now we can only make the law. People know that the law is there to protect them, and it is a matter for them if they do not have the courage of their own convictions to report these matters. I can assure you that the first employer found guilty of breaking these laws will not be spared prosecution by the Chief Labour Officer because we are aware of the problem.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, did the Minister say the first employee or employer?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The first employer. We can only ascertain a mistake or the fact that an employer has broken the law by the employee reporting it to us; but if they are too cowardly and do not want to take the bull by the horns and report the matter, we can do nothing. There are situations which have been reported to us in which although it is said that the minimum wage to be paid to a shop assistant is something like $18.00, we understand that some of them pay $14.00 and the same people go and sign for $18.00 but receive $14.00. What are we to do with this? It is they who are encouraging the employers in this business. If they were organised by the Union, or if they were not afraid to report the matter to the Labour Department, this nonsense would not be going on. My appeal is not to the Labour Department, but to the workers themselves, to report these matters to the Labour Department, and then they will be protected even if they are not organised by the Union, because it is the duty of the Labour Department to protect them. If these people sign as having received money which they did not receive, what more can we do?

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, this concludes Government Business for this evening. I believe the other side, as far as indications went today, wish to ascertain the pleasure of the House in respect of certain items which remain on the Order Paper under Private Members' Business.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS. Mr. Speaker it would obviously be easier, cheaper and everything else to let these remain on the Order Paper than for them to come off and we just write them out tomorrow morning and hand them in again; so I am asking the House to approve of a motion that these items remain inspite of the lapse of more than three months from the date of their having been given notice of.

Mr. SPEAKER: In as much as they have not yet lapsed, I am prepared to take the feeling of the House, and if there is no objection, I will allow several matters as specifically referred to by the Hon. and Learned Leader of the Opposition to remain on the Order Paper for another three months.

I hear no dissent; so I take it to be a matter of general assent. These matters will remain on the Order Paper for another three months as from today.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 3rd December, 1968, at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, on the motion for the adjournment, I should like to say that on the last occasion when this House met, we had an intimation from the Leader of the House that we would have been coming today to deal specifically with the Income Tax Bill. We have come to the end of Government Business and we have not dealt with the Income Tax Bill, and I think that under the circumstances the Leader of the House owes an apology to us on this side.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Scarcely an apology, Mr. Speaker. If the Hon. Member believes in Party Government and Party discipline, he would have expected me to inform the Leader of his Party, which I did. It is not for me to comment on the defects of organisation on that side if the Leader of his Party has not so informed him, but I first communicated to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition the difficulties which we encountered, and gave the assurance that the Minister of Finance would be proceeding to the second reading of that Bill next week. The problem was, Mr. Speaker, that we had asked the Law Society, the Chief Justice and other Bodies to submit their comments, and they none of them came in before the end of last week. It will be neccessary, therefore for the Minister of Finance himself to be aware of them and to start to draft whatever amendments may have been necessary after his study. This he proceeded to work on this morning; so he obviously could not be ready for today; but he will be ready next week.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the adjournment, I am reminding Hon. Members that I will be sending around a sheet to them asking for donations to the Children's Fund, and if my messenger does not reach them during the week, I would ask them to bring them along for me next Tuesday.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it the point will arise then as to whether one would be entitled to an income tax rebate in respect of these contributions.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, one other point.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid the Hon. Member has already spoken on this motion.

Mr. HINDS: In as much as I cannot speak again, I would not be able to ask the Hon. Member when we

are going to get the Law Books that he promised. *(Laughter.)*

Sir. GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that the information which the Leader of the House gave us was duly passed on. The Hon. Member for St. Peter, I understand was not asking why this did not happen, but asking for an apology for its not having happened.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I would really rely on the Leader of his Party to give him.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 3rd December, 1968, at 12 o' clock noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

6.53 p.m.