

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 5th November, 1968

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.00 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*); Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (*Minister of Trade, Tourism, Co-operatives and Fisheries*); Mr. R. ST.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P.; Hon. N. W. BOXILL, (*Minister of Communications and Works*); Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (*Minister of Agriculture, Labour and National Insurance*) and Mr. C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P.

Prayers were read.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS entered the House and took his seat.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: There are, I regret to say, no Minutes available for confirmation other than those Minutes which were sent out to hon. members before the meeting of last week. There was a request that those Minutes, at least their confirmation, be deferred in order that hon. members may have an opportunity of perusing the Minutes of nine Meetings. Those Minutes are as follows:-

The Minutes of the Meeting of the 9th July, 1968. Unless there is any objection, those Minutes will be confirmed. (*After a Pause*). I hear no objection, and accordingly I declare those Minutes duly to be confirmed.

The Minutes of the Meeting of the 16th July, 1968. Unless there is any objection, I will declare those Minutes duly to be confirmed. (*After a Pause*). There being no objection, I declare those Minutes duly confirmed.

Likewise, in respect of the Minutes of the Meeting of the 30th July, 1968, unless there is any objection, I will declare those Minutes duly to be confirmed (*After a Pause*). Hearing no objection, I declare those Minutes duly confirmed.

The Minutes of the Meeting of the 6th August, 1968. Unless I hear any objection, I will declare them duly to be confirmed. (*After a Pause*). Hearing no objection, I declare those Minutes duly confirmed.

Likewise, in respect of the Minutes of the Meeting of the 9th August, 1968, unless I hear any objection, those Minutes will be duly confirmed. (*After a Pause*). There being no objection, I declare those Minutes duly confirmed.

The Minutes of the Meeting of the 13th August, 1968. Unless I hear any objection, those Minutes will be duly confirmed. (*After a Pause*). There being no objection, I declare those Minutes duly confirmed.

The Minutes of the Meeting of the 17th August, 1968. I hear no objection to their confirmation and accordingly I declare those Minutes duly confirmed.

The Minutes of the Meeting of the 30th August, 1968. Unless I hear any objection, I will declare those Minutes duly to be confirmed. (*After a Pause*). Hearing no objection, I declare those Minutes duly confirmed.

Lastly, the Minutes of the Meeting of the 3rd September, 1968, unless I hear any objection, I will declare those Minutes duly confirmed. (*After a Pause*). There being no objection, I declare those Minutes duly confirmed.

Messrs HINDS and CORBIN entered the House and took their seats.

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:-

Annual Abstract Account of Receipts and Payments for the year ended 31st March, 1967.

Statement of Assets and Liabilities as at the 31st March, 1967.

Statement of the Public Debt of the Island and the Sinking Funds as at 31st March, 1967.

Statement of Loans and Credit Guaranteed by the Government and Outstanding at 31st March 1967.

Statement of Advances and Loans Outstanding as at the 31st March, 1967.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilization and Labour Welfare) Order, 1968.

REPLIES 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 beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 268, asked by the hon. senior member for St. James, is ready.

On my own behalf, I beg to give notice that the Oral Replies to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 251, 256 and 258, asked by the hon. junior member for St. Peter, are ready.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 247, asked by the hon. senior member for St. James, is ready.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 245, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, is ready.

WORK OF SELECT COMMITTEES

Mr. SPEAKER: In respect of the Reports of Select Committees, I appreciate that hon. members are greatly concerned about the very slow progress apparently of the work of Select Committees and, in particular, the Select Committee appointed to consider and revise the Standing Orders of the House, which met as long ago as the 2nd October, 1968. Only this morning was I able to get a copy of the Minutes of that meeting although I had been pressing ardently for same for more than the past two weeks. Now, I will be able, as I hope other hon. members have copies of the Minutes of the meeting of that Select Committee as I received my copy today - I hope I will be able to summon a meeting of that Committee again not later than next week.

SELECT COMMITTEES DISCHARGED

Mr. SPEAKER: There are certain Select Committees who have completed their functions, namely,

the Select Committee appointed to consider and report on the Bill to incorporate the Lions Club of Barbados. With personal thanks and the thanks of this House I hereby discharge the Members of that Committee who have duly completed their labours.

Likewise, the Select Committee appointed to consider and report on the Bill to incorporate the Barbados Association of Mentally Retarded Children. The members of that Committee have performed their duties in a creditable and expeditious manner and I hereby thank them for their services and discharge them.

12.25 p.m.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE FOR Mr. YEARWOOD

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I have received intimation that the hon. junior member for St. John, the Chairman of Committees, is indisposed and will not be attending his place in Parliament today. I, therefore, beg to move that the hon. junior Member for St. George be appointed Chairman of Committees for the remainder of today's sitting.

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

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

THE WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1968

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works, and it is to resume debate on the Second Reading of a Bill intituled The Wireless Telegraphy (Amendment) Act, 1968. When debate on this matter was adjourned, the hon. and learned Leader of the Opposition was addressing the Chamber.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, if I am permitted to speak later, I would really like to hear from the Minister what, if any, amendments are proposed to be made in the Bill before I speak. I understood the Hon. Leader of the House to say that he would take into consideration the criticism made on this side of the House before coming back. I just want to know if there has been any results from those reconsiderations.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, in fairness to the hon. member, according to the Crown Law Officers, there is no need for the amendment which we all thought should be inserted. This is what they have said:

"The Section, which the draft Bill seeks to substitute for the existing Section 11 of the principal Act, substantially repeats the wording of the authority of the existing section which was altered only to include C.B.C. as an authority which may appoint persons to enter premises for the purpose of ensuring compliance with the Act and Regulations, but in respect only of such provisions thereof as relate

to television." Apparently, the fears hon. members on the opposite side had raised, and I had somewhat agreed to, had been in force before this amendment came in. They say further:

"It grants a power to be exercised for the purpose of preventing or detecting the criminal offences created by Section 17 of the principal Act by Section 17 (2) (e) of the Constitution; and

(b) the principal Act is an existing law within the meaning of Section 26 of the Constitution, while Section 26 (1) (a) of the Constitution - - "

So the safeguards which the hon. members wanted me to put into this Act have already been implemented. We had the Constitution here, but not being a Lawyer - thank God about that - I was not too emphatic. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Do not say that.) I am glad I am not a lawyer, because I would have to represent people like you.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not quite follow the hon. member.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I was really talking about Constitution of the country and pointing out that it protects an individual. I do not think anybody would be so mad as to want to go into people's place at any time; but if you were to specify a particular time, say, from six in the morning until six in the afternoon, there is nothing to prevent a man from moving out his T.V. set, or hiding it during that time, and bringing it back during the night. You do not make laws so that people could run into anybody's place at any time, because anybody running into my place unwarranted would suffer dire results. We do not want this to happen. If you will look in the Act, or in the Constitution, you will see that you are protected against this sort of thing.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, if I may comment on that, what we on this side pointed out and are still pointing out, and will continue to point out, is that the original Act is a war-time measure. It could not be more stringent. It should have occurred to the draftsman of the Act that a phrase that is common in draftsmanship and common as regards the Law Courts is "at any reasonable time." The Court would hold that eleven o'clock at night is not a reasonable time. According to the Act now, a spiteful man could walk into your place at one or two in the morning. I am not saying anything more, because I have other things in mind.

We also attempted to point out that the whole of the old Act needed redrafting. There is still a Section in that Act which forfeits to the Crown any apparatus found. That was a war-time measure. That was to prevent people from having sending apparatus and not only receiving apparatus. It used to be said - I hope the House will forgive me if I said this last time - that there was one official in this Island who was actually called up and examined as to whether he was a spy. German submarine officers have been

known to come into Barbados at night and go back out. That has been done in other West Indian Islands, too; therefore you had to make the Act as drastic as possible. Every conceivable thing is in the Act as it now stands.

For instance, a man forgets to pay and he allows a week or two to elapse; the inspector can walk in, acting perfectly legally at one or two in the morning; finds he has not paid his licence, seizes the instrument, and it can be sold out at auction. Do you want that to remain in the Act? That is what we were endeavouring to point out from this side of the House. Of course, the people must pay their taxes and rates, but to have some Sections of a stringent war-time Act remain there unamended is nonsense.

I never dreamt that I would express a desire like this, but I do hope that, when this reaches the Other Place, some members up there will persuade the Government to make the necessary amendments.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will give way, I must say that the point he is making seems eminently reasonable to me. We will take it back and let them have another look at it. I, personally, am a bit disturbed about it.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I must thank the Hon. Leader of the House, and I hope he will be here for some time to be as reasonable as he has just shown himself to be.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I must thank the hon. member for that most generous compliment, and I must return it in kind. I also hope that he will be there as Leader of the Opposition as long as I am Leader of the House.
12.35 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has not yet concluded his speech.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I think the motion then would be that further consideration be postponed.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that further consideration of the Bill be postponed.

Mr. SMITH: I beg to second that.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

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

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1968-69 No.32

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is for the sum of \$2,364 and the Addendum sets out that this amount is the balance due on Simultaneous Interpretation Equipment ordered for use at the Mental Health Conference held in Barbados in August, 1967, and at any subsequent International Conferences. The explanation of this matter is that a cheque for the amount of money in question was received in the Ministry of Health in November, 1967, attached to a letter from the President of the U.S. Caribbean Aid to Mental Health Incorporated which stated that the money had been promised in support of certain aspects of the recent Health Conference held in Barbados, e.g., Simultaneous Translation Equipment, Educational measures, Conference Organisation Costs, etc. Apparently it was originally planned for the money to be sent direct to the local Mental Health Association on the receipt of a copy of the Conference's Financial Report at the U.S./ C.A.M.H. Incorporated Office in New York, and for any net savings accruing on the Conference Account to be refunded to the Barbados Government after all takings had been collected; but when it became clear that the Conference's Audited Report would not have been available before 31st December, 1967, that is, at the end of the U.S./ C.A.M.H. Incorporated's Financial Year, the Executive Board of that Body agreed to remit the funds to the Ministry of Health instead. This money has been deposited with the Accountant General and is pending decision as to its disposal. The money has been received and this is a financial matter which we are trying to regularise in a legal way.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1968-69 No.33

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, under the Capital Estimates of 1967-68 an amount of \$12,600 was provided under Item 7 of Head 105 - Home Affairs - for the completion of payment for the Police launch "Trident" which was under construction at the time, and, of course, to meet the cost of fees to the Surveyor of Shipping. Of that amount \$10,226.22 was spent as follows: payment of second instalment to contractors on the installation of engines and electrical equipment \$10,000; insurance premium \$201.22 and the survey report by the Surveyor of Shipping \$25. This left a balance of some \$2,373, and owing to an oversight this amount was not included in the current year's Capital Estimates. Consequently the Barbados Boat Company in accordance with the terms of an agreement has submitted a claim for final

payment of \$2,000 which has been due to them since May, 1968, but there are no funds available from which payment can be made.

It is therefore necessary to seek this supplementary of \$2,000 to make the final payment to the Barbados Boat Company for the Police Launch.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Hon. Leader of the House can tell us what is going to be the final cost of this launch. Normally when I look at the Addendum I do not see more than a contract for the building of a Police launch. In this case it is specifically stated "the Police Launch 'Trident' ". Can the Minister tell us if another launch is being built or was being built at the same time as the "Trident", and if there is any particular significance attached to the word "Trident" in this particular case? As I said earlier, I want to know what will be the final cost of this particular launch.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The hon. member may recall that some two or so years ago there was one built called the "Arawak". This is the second one which has been named the "Trident". The final cost will be \$10,226.22 plus \$2,000, making a total of \$12,226.22. This \$2,000 is now required to complete the final payment and that will be all.

Mr. HINDS: How does this compare with the original estimate, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The original provision was \$12,600. This will now be \$12,226, a difference of some \$300 or so.

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

12.45 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1968-69 No.34

A Resolution for the sum of \$33,618 was called.

HEAD 2 - SERVICE COMMISSIONS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution starts with Head 2 - Service Commissions, Item 16 - Loans to Public Offices - and supplementary provision of \$1,364 is required.

I beg to move that Head 2 stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 14 - INLAND REVENUE

Head 14 - Inland Revenue - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, under this Head there are two Items to be supplemented, namely Item 23 - Stationery - and Item 38 - Equipment and Furniture. I beg to move that Head 14 stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 15 - STATISTICAL SERVICE

Head 15 - Statistical Service - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, under this Head, there is a new Item - Item 24 - Overtime in the Statistical Service. It is payable for work done outside of normal working hours. I beg to move that Head 15 stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 26 - FIRE SERVICE

Head 26 - Fire Service - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Under this Head, Mr. Chairman, there are various items to be supplemented, namely, Clothing, Equipment and Appliances and Medical Treatment. These are Items 11, 12 and 15 respectively. I beg to move that Head 26 stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 34 - MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS
AND WORKS

Head 34 - Ministry of Communications and Works was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, under this Head, there are two new Items. There is Item 125 - Senate Chambers - for which Note 6 explains that, it is relative to certain renovations to the Other Place and its precincts as recommended by the House Committee of that Body. There is also Item 126, and Note 7 explains in respect of that Item, that the amount required is the supplementary provision to settle an outstanding debt in respect of a steel frame building which was purchased in 1966 for the purpose of extending and enclosing the Inspector's shed at the Department of Highways and Transport. I beg to move that Head 34 stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, in respect of the Senate Chamber, the Note states that there is an amount in respect of 360 sq. yds of floor covering. If you would just, for a single moment, look beneath the soles of your own feet, in other words, if you were to look at the base, the platform on which the Speaker's Chair stands beside you, is it not a perfect disgrace to this Chamber to find that such neglect, such a total disregard for the dignity of this Chamber is to be accepted in here when you find that in the Other Place attention is being drawn and steps are being taken to remedy every sort of defect which is humanly possible to bring the Other Place in keeping with all that is to be expected of it? It seems to me as if any shabby old rag - all this old tattered cloth, look at it! Sir, it is a perfect disgrace to any Speaker. I am to say now that I believe that only the present Speaker that we have would be satisfied with what is there. I feel that this is.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would give way, I do not think that that would be a nice remark to make about the Speaker. The point is that, as with the Other Place who set up a Committee to advise them on refurnishing their Chamber, so it remains with this House to do the same thing. Any member of this House is competent to initiate this matter and to do so now. If the hon. member wishes a Select Committee to refurnish or refurbish Mr. Speaker's platform or indeed anything to do with this House, he may move for this.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, does the Hon. Minister seriously make that suggestion? Surely, any Resolution involving the spending of Government money can only come from the Government. I thought that the hon. member would have ended up by saying that he proposes to establish the same sort of Committee.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The hon. member has heard me say time and again in this House that I do not think it is proper for the Cabinet to take any initiative in any matters dealing with the House. I think the House should make known its views to the Government and the Government should then acquiesce. That has been my feeling before I was a Minister, and it is my feeling now. I would not like to see the day come when the Cabinet, any Cabinet whether mine or otherwise, should have to take the initiative in telling the House what the House should have for its own comfort. That is what I believe.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: The hon. member apparently misunderstood me. Anything which involves the expenditure of money must come from the Government. Surely, if the Hon. Leader of the House feels that the Cabinet should not take the initiative in saying what we ought to do, surely, they can put up one of their own members, just as they did with the Hilton Hotel last Tuesday, to ask a Question so as to get something which would be a good advertisement for them. Surely some non-Cabinet member on the other side could propose a Resolution coming from the House to the Government calling on the Government to appoint a Committee to see what

should be done. On this side we could go on day after day, Tuesday after Tuesday making suggestions about spending money and, of course, we would be met by the proper answer, that is, that the spending of Government money is a matter for the whole House. It comes from the Cabinet to the House and the House approves or does not approve.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, that is not all. We have already established that the base of the Speakers' Chair reminds us somewhat of Carnival in Trinidad, but inside of this Chamber is hot. We need an air-conditioned Chamber. It is time to see about these things. We definitely need an air-conditioned Chamber, and this is something that cannot be delayed for much longer. If hon. members are to give of their best when they come here, they should be able to sit and carry on their debates in considerable comfort and with as much ease as possible. I am sure that any sum of money which is spent in making this Chamber an air-conditioned Chamber and more in keeping with what is required would be well spent. You will agree with me, Sir, that we have been experiencing temperatures very much in excess of those of years past. We have been experiencing these temperatures recently and I urge that the appropriate action be taken. Am I to understand, Sir, that I am in order to move that this be done now? (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: After we have finished.) I am quite willing to make any such suggestion.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, this point is so well taken that there is no need for either of us to argue it. I would suggest that later this evening one or two of us consult with Mr. Speaker and get a Committee appointed to go through this thing and make recommendations both about cooling this Chamber (*Asides*) as well as any other thing which the House may desire. I think we can settle this within a few minutes.

12.55 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, you will recall this, Sir. You have been sitting at my side, and I have had to borrow kerchiefs from you on several occasions. It is a good thing you brought out clean ones. On several occasions I have made the point here that this Chamber should be air-conditioned. This Chamber is more important than any Senate, and not one member on the other side can say that I have not raised this matter in here. Do you think I would vote for money to put down a carpet in the Senate? Cut my vote out. Put down a carpet in the Senate, while we are sweating in here! Mr. Speaker does not want the windows open because the glare gets into his eyes. Is that right, Mr. Chairman? Look at this Chamber! An hon. member has just had to send home for more kerchiefs. In here smells stink. When this Chamber is varnished, it smells stink.

I was shocked when I saw the Other Place air-conditioned. They have air condition over there; but every member in this House, Minister or otherwise, never stops spending money to be elected here. I do not know whether the Leader of the House has stopped spending money, but I do not know of any member in

here who can say that he has stopped spending money. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I never had it.) The hon. member says he never had it, but he is one of the lucky ones and I will take him out. He is the only member elected to Parliament who has never spent money to get in here.

Mr. Chairman, I am serious about this. The hon. member said something about letting members get together and make a Resolution. I do not agree with the Leader of the Opposition when he says that some member of the Government should do this. There is nothing wrong with passing a Resolution here to take care of this matter. We can show our disapproval here today. Are we going to become subservient to the Other Place? You give them carpet; you air-condition their Chamber, and we are to remain here sweating? Look around and you will see that the windows are closed, Sir. This is a very serious matter. I consider this elected Chamber the most important place in the Island; therefore, why should we be so uncomfortable when we are in here? Every day we come in here we have to work under these conditions. If everybody starts to pull his jacket off, I want to know what the Minister will say. Look and you will see the Marshal is now going to open the windows! (*At this stage the hon. member removed and replaced his jacket*) (Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Put on your jacket) My shirt is not torn today.

Mr. Chairman, you know as well as I do that it is time we register our protest against this. We are most uncomfortable in here; we come in here at twelve o'clock, and we have to remain until eight or nine o'clock at night working under these conditions. Do you think either one of you could leave this Chamber and go to meet a lady? You would smell badly. I cannot vote for this amount of money, Sir. Further, I want the hon. Leader of the House to know now that this is about the twentieth time - the chairman can bear me out on this - I have raised this question of air-conditioning this Chamber.

I have nothing against the Senate, but sometimes when I look around, assess the ability, think of what some of the Senators have done for this country and compare it with what members of this House have done - Anyway, it is stated here:

"360 Sq. yds. floor covering \$2,102."

I beg to move that the Item be reduced by that amount as a protest. I hope the Government will see to it that something is done to this Chamber. It does not matter what sort of education a man has, but when he comes here he has been elected by the people and he is of more importance, in my opinion, than anybody you send up to the Other Place. I repeat that I beg to move that the amount be reduced by \$2,102.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this is a real, bad error. I would not accuse anybody of anything. I beg to second the motion and, in doing so, I wish to draw the attention of the hon. Leader of the House and the hon. member who has just sat down to this very question of what we should do in our own

case. I am drawing attention to Standing Order No. 59 dealing with public money: This is contrary to what the Leader of the House was saying.

"1. Except on the recommendation of the Cabinet, the House -

(a) shall not proceed on any Bill (including any amendment to a Bill) which makes provision for imposing or increasing any tax, for imposing or increasing any charge on the revenue or other funds of the Colony or for compounding or remitting any debt due to the Colony; and

(b) shall not proceed on any motion, the effect of which is that provision shall be made for any of the purposes aforesaid."

That would be any Resolution put up by anybody which does not come from the Cabinet.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I could not sit idly by and allow an opportunity like this to pass, because I feel that members of the elected Chamber are being ignored to some extent and I have been in here too long to be ignored. I have been in here 21 years, elected, in the first instance, in 1944. Here we find Senators who have been pitchforked, who have never faced the tape, who have never spent a dollar, and who do not grant full recognition to their Ministerial duties in many cases, and who have failed to stand up to the request of the people of Barbados who have elected us to power.
1.05 p.m.

We as elected members must see the people; we must try to help them in every conceivable way, and I think we all try to do, especially the elected members whether they belong to the Government or the Opposition; but Senators I am afraid have no obligation whatever. They treat people discourteously and in many cases they are not assisting the Government or the people at all. They are pitchforked over our heads, they are made Privy Councillors and all sorts of things, but people who have stood the brunt of the day are ignored completely. I will not be a party to this at all, and although I belong to the Government and am in duty bound to support this measure, I feel it should be postponed until such time as appropriate measures are taken for the House to see that it sets its Place in order. This is how I feel about it. There is a lot more I can say on this. A lot of Senators, wherever they come from, are pitchforked over the heads of the ones who have been elected for over 21 years, and the ones who have been elected are forgotten and left by the wayside. Anyhow, in duty bound, I must vote with the Government for now, but the day may come.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member is suggesting that the Head be postponed.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am afraid my eye caught the Leader of the Opposition first.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate the Hon. Minister who has just spoken, not just because of the sentiments, but because he has courageously established something that we are so apt to forget. He has said nothing compared with what members of the Labour Party quite recently said about the House of Lords and threatened the House of Lords if they did not behave themselves that they would abolish them. I say that perhaps for personal reasons, because you may remember I had a Resolution which has come off the Order Paper, I hope only because it has been a long time not dealt with, criticising the Other Place, and I intend to go on with it; but this feeling that this House cannot attack the Other Place if the occasion warrants has got to be killed once and for all. I myself who believe in saying that the wishes of the elected representatives should prevail over any wishes of the Other Place was surprised at the strength of the language recently used in the House of Commons about the House of Lords, and the threat to which eventually the House of Lords succumbed that; "you pass the Bill which we are sending up to you or we abolish you." That had the effect of getting a majority, not a terrific or big majority, but at any rate a majority for the wishes of the Lower House to prevail.

As I am on my feet, if the hon. senior member for Bridgetown does not mind, in view of what the Hon. Minister has said..... (Mr. MOTTLEY: You can have permission to second my motion. You know that I know my way about.) I have not got to ask the hon. member's permission, but in deference to his old age, I bow.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, if this is how the hon. member feels about it, in view of the speech which the Hon. Minister of Health and Community Development has made to the effect that it could be postponed instead of moving to vote against it, the matter should be postponed. The trouble is that you get outspoken Ministers who can get up and say things, but you get backbenchers, some of whom are as dumb as a dog my aunt had which had the tongue out. This is an important matter, not that we are against the Other Place having this comfort, but we are saying that this is the most important Place, and we have to sweat it out here all day; and if the Hon. Leader of the House feels that the postponing of this matter is an indication of our feeling towards making this Place more comfortable for members, I would be perfectly willing to withdraw my motion for the reduction of the amount by \$2,102.

I would like to hear the Leader of the House, because members over there usually vote quite rightly by the feelings of the Leader. I hope he understands what I have said. As far as I am concerned, if I voted alone on this reduction, I would vote; but in view of what the Hon. Minister of Health has said, if the Leader of the House would agree that this matter can be taken up and discussed, he would be able to point out to his Cabinet that the feeling of the House is to postpone the matter, not because they have anything against putting the Other Place in proper order, but because we would like it to be known that our

feeling is that we cannot take second or third place to the Other Place.

If you go into Bridgetown and enter the offices of the Shipping and Trading Company, or the offices of the lawyers in James Street, you will find that they are all air-conditioned. I would not be surprised if the garages where people have to work are air-conditioned. The Trade Union is demanding that working under the conditions that exist with galvanised roofs that they either be covered or air-conditioned; but we, the law makers of the country, must live under these conditions. I would like to hear the Minister on this before I withdraw my motion.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I am only going to say this; I am not going to say anything more on this matter. I am going to tell the Prime Minister now that it is his Government and he must come and run it, and that I am no longer going to lead this House. That is all I have to say.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, do we understand that the Leader of the House is resigning?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have no intention of saying that. However, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph caught my eye.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am surprised at the actions of whoever is responsible for this Resolution in caring more about the Senate than about this Chamber. This is not the first time I have had to draw to the Government's attention the treatment that is meted out to hon. members of this Chamber, and that accorded members of the Senate. Not so long ago we were invited to some function at the Garrison pasture and members of this hon. Chamber had to sit on cement seats while carpet was provided for the Senators. Why is it that the Senate must have more than this Chamber? It is time that this Chamber should have the same cooling facilities as the Senate, but nobody cares about the elected members of this Chamber. Regardless of whoever is elected here, they had to go to the people and the people had reasons for sending us here, but in the Senate any and everything can be selected, and the people of this country have nothing at all to do with it.

1.15 p.m.

I am saying that the time has come now, and I am glad to see that hon. members have taken this stand today and to show to the Government that this Chamber is first or there is no Upper Chamber at all. We are the elected members or representatives of the people and we should have all the facilities. I think that the time has come even when the Hon. Leader of the Opposition should have an office somewhere on the precincts of this House. If you are going to place any emphasis or confidence in the Leader of the Opposition, you must do that, because the Opposition is of just as much importance to the people of this country as the Government, and the Leader of the Opposition should be recognised as such by the Government. I will go further and say

this; I know that in other Parliaments the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has his Secretary and not merely an office in which he can sit. He has a Typist even. Well, I am not asking for that yet, but if you give it to us, we are not asking for too much. The time has come when the Leader of the Opposition must be considered.

You must remember that Prime Ministers become Leaders of the Opposition, and therefore it must be of great importance that Prime Ministers can quickly become Leaders of the Opposition. The Opposition must be felt and the time is now. I am not voting one cent in this regard unless this Chamber is given the same facilities as the other Chamber is given. We must do that, and if we do not do it here when will we ever get to it? If we pass this amount here now, that Chamber will be done and this Chamber will still be here; therefore, we must respect it as such.

Another point is this: I am not trying to take advantage of your being in the Chair, Mr. Chairman, because you have just gone there; but I am drawing to your attention Head 34 - Ministry of Communications and Works and Item 126 (New) - this Transport Inspector's Shed and things of that sort. I am drawing to the attention of the Government that long, long ago, more than two years ago, I believe, I asked the Minister of Communications and Works to consider giving the Inspectors their over-time pay. I was promised that it would be done, and up to about two or three weeks ago, nothing has been done to pay these men their overtime; but something is done to decorate the Senate Chamber with something called chandeliers or something like that, when these poor men really want something. You are installing two chandeliers, picture lamps and wall lamps in the Senate Chamber, and what is the meaning of this thing in the Senate? Do you have bed-rooms up there? Do the members of the Senate go to sleep up there? I am only asking. They are supplying these things at a cost of \$2,582, but the Senators do not live there. The Senators go there once a week and they spend about two or three hours and what are we going to decorate that Chamber for? These lamps can only be seen at night. The illumination will have to be at night; do they intend having night sittings? For what do they want to spend this \$2,582? That Chamber was there before I was born and some good work went on up there too. I believe if you were to change some of the Senators, you would get better work done up there and you would not want the lamps. However, Sir, as to these Inspectors who are being called upon all the night at any time to go out to accidents and things of that sort, this Ministry of Communications and Works cannot see fit to pay these men their overtime pay! Up to about three weeks ago, not one thing has been done. Do you know what I can quite clearly see? Some of these Permanent Secretaries run the Ministries. (A MEMBER: Not proper Ministries though.) and the Ministers in some cases do not know what is going on in their Ministries. It seems to me that the Permanent Secretary gets together with other people and puts things through and very nearly makes the policy before it gets to the Minister. That is as far as I can see.

Up to three weeks ago, well, I would not talk too clearly in this case, but when it was discovered, one individual said that this has been done, the other individual said that it has not yet come to him and that is over two years ago. That is telling me that the Minister - well, I will not blame the Minister because I might be a Minister myself and certain things may not be; but I would instruct any Permanent Secretary that anything which comes to my Ministry he must let me see it first before he makes a reply. He must let me know about it so that if any of my constituents should meet me and ask me anything, I will be able to answer it. In this case, this thing for these Inspectors has been shelved for long and long enough, and nothing has been done. The Minister was not in the Island at the time, but I am sure that the Prime Minister was a surprised man when he came to find out that nothing has been done as far as these Inspectors are concerned, and yet we were told on the floor of this House that this would have been done and that would have been done. Nothing has been done at all and I am warning the Government now. I think that this Government should take more notice of its employees. They are bringing down these large sums of money to do these things; they can bring them down to be spent here, there and everywhere and the employees cannot get a berry. This is a very serious thing and I am making this statement now. Well, Sir, we have not got to it yet, but it is the same Head. The postmen and Policemen are asking for more money and nothing has been done for them. The Union boss is waiting until the people with their little letters come in with dollar bills and pound notes to get a Christmas dinner to hold up the thing. This is his opportunity, regardless of the poor old man or old woman who is waiting until his or her little envelope comes in from America with a dollar bill and from London with a pound note. They will be all there in the Post Office and these people will not be able to buy a Christmas dinner. I want to know what the Minister is doing about it.

1.25 p.m.

They are only bringing down Resolutions for these large sums of money and are forgetting the people. If you are going to forget the postmen, that is your business; but I am representing the poor, old people who are depending on money from overseas to enable them to get their Christmas dinner.

The policemen are waiting on you, and nothing has been done in the matter; yet we see these large sums of money coming to the House to be passed to light up a place that does not want lighting. For what do you want all of these expensive fittings in the Senate? It does not sit at night. Sometimes we read in the newspapers that the Senate got through its business in half an hour or an hour. What is the meaning of this? You are spending money on these things while other people are suffering. The Union has threatened this Government that it intends to hold up everything for Christmas, if the Government does not give consideration to these postmen. At the same time money is being spent about the place.

Now, I hope the hon. Minister of Communications and Works is listening to me and will be in a position

to tell me how far he has got with the overtime pay for these Inspectors at Highways and Transport - I think the name has been changed to Communications and Works. I can tell him that, up to the time he was in Canada, nothing has been done. Nevertheless, the Government is willing to spend money on the Senate Chamber, while those Inspectors cannot even buy gasoline as they would like.

Sir, I am in favour of the postponement of this item until they can bring into this Chamber an overall Resolution for the renovation of this Chamber, bearing in mind that the time has come when offices should be provided for the Leader of the Opposition, whoever he may be. We should not be voting these large sums for things that could be put aside for a time. You do not want them at all, as far as the Senate is concerned. I do not know why this carpet is needed; I do not know who is going to walk on it; I do not know if it will be carried to Seawall to be spread for the hon. Prime Minister to walk on when he comes back to the Island again; I do not know if the carpet will reach to down here so that the cars can drive on it. Believe me, Sir, I cannot see why you should want a carpet for up there. If you have certain dignitaries coming here, you can take the carpet from here and carry it up there.

Sir, spending money is all right, but there are too many pressing things to be done before we can think about spending money on the Senate. I love to spend money when I can afford it. This is a Senate that works an hour or two every week or every other week, while this Chamber has been here for over three hundred years. We do not have proper acoustics; it is not air-conditioned. I think that we should be more considerate with ourselves this time instead of being considerate with others in the Senate.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: I would not like you to go wrong, Sir. I made a motion which was duly seconded. Then I said, after hearing the Minister, that I would be willing - the Leader of the Opposition also said he would be willing - if the Leader of the House indicated that he would accept postponement of the matter instead of a reduction of the vote. That would be the correct procedure, but the real motion before you now is a reduction of the vote, because we have not heard whether the Government is going to accept a suggestion for postponement.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I have sat and listened to all that has been said. I am in sympathy with the views expressed by the members on the other side and, in the absence of the Leader of the House, I am suggesting or moving a Motion that this Head be taken out of the Resolution and dealt with separately so that we can deal with the remainder of the Resolution today. I, therefore, beg to move that Item 34 be withdrawn from this Resolution.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I cannot understand what is going on. If he is making a motion, it must be seconded obviously. If, on the other hand, the Gov-

ernment is saying it does not propose to go on with that now.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: What I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that we do not propose to go on with Head 34 now, and we will bring it under a separate Resolution when we review the entire needs of the two Chambers. I am moving that Head 34 be deleted from this Resolution.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, it must be with the clear intention of bringing in a comprehensive Resolution.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, with the intention of viewing the entire needs of the Chambers and coming to the House with the needs of the Chambers.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, under those circumstances, I beg to withdraw my motion for the reduction of the amount.

Mr. LYNCH: I beg to second that.

The question that Head 34 be deleted was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 40 - MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Head 40 - Ministry of Health and Community Development - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of this Head - this year is Human Rights Year - I wish to point out that we had a Committee appointed by the Cabinet to deal with this matter; we have gone into it very fully; it is really a full Committee comprised of various sections of the community, etc., and it is felt that provision should be made to enable a grant of \$2,400 for a Scholarship for a Barbadian in Sociology studies and also for pamphlets, etc.
1.35 p.m.

This is the cost of doing that by way of observing Human Rights year and the week will start on 8th December this year.

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, is this all that the Government proposes to do as regards Human Rights week? I would really like to hear something more because considering the importance of the Declaration of Human Rights, considering what is being done throughout the world as regards the celebration of the anniversary of the passing of the Charter, and considering what the Government is asking for for another celebration, this looks rather paltry. This is an appropriate time, I take it, Sir, to tell the House and thereby the public all that the Government proposes to do by way of celebration of

Human Rights Week. What they have said here is admirable as a standing reminder of the Government's participation in this celebration, but surely this is not enough. I would be glad if the hon. member would explain a bit more as to the dissemination of the knowledge of what Human Rights week means. There is nothing said about schools and how you are going to bring this home to the school of all people. I am really asking whether this is all, and if this is not all, whether the Minister will not give us some more information.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, certainly this is not all; this is just one aspect of the observance of Human Rights week. If the hon. member would recall, the Multi-racial Society at Cave Hill is conducting a series of lectures and so on in connection with Human Rights week and the observance of Human Rights year, there is a postage stamp which is being brought out, and there are certain celebrations for children and things of that nature. I would have been able to give you a *verbatim* account of the programme which is here in the box, but unfortunately the key is missing, and until such time as I can get it open, I can only speak from memory. I happened to be the Chairman of the Committee that sat on this Human Rights year celebration. The year chosen by the United Nations seems to be very awkward in that we have had two assassinations this year, that of Dr. Martin Luther King and Senator Robert Kennedy; so the observance of Human Rights in a year like this seems a sort of *non sequitur*, in my view.

Anyhow, the fact is that we are doing our part and we have set aside a certain week to observe it in a full way, and there is a special meeting of the House of Assembly which we will request through the Leader of the House, but it was done in the wrong way during my absence. There are many things which are being done, but this is just to provide us with a little finance in order to accomplish the necessary programme which has been set out and agreed on. We are asking you to co-operate and allow this to go on in order that Human Rights year which will be observed on 8th December this year can be observed in the right way, but it cannot be done without finance.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: All that is excellent, but my objection is on the little that is being done. We would look more than paltry in the eyes of the outside world if this is all we propose to spend, because it does not appear from the notes here that this is only a paltry beginning and that you will be coming back to the House. You should not be doing that; you should not be spending \$3,000 here. I note that for the second anniversary of Independence you propose to spend \$70,000. If you have the money, it may not be too much, but put that by the side of what we are doing and what all the nations of the world who belong to the United Nations and all those who have signed the Charter are doing. All Member States of the United Nations are celebrating Human Rights; and Human Rights to a people like ourselves - I do not want to just talk politics across the Table following the doubtful example of the Minister of Communica-

tions and Works, just throwing something at the Government for political purposes, but all nations and especially the young under-developed Independent nations now have to safeguard Human Rights more so even than in the days of Colonialism when they had to do in effect what the Colonial Office told them to do until they began to get a little liberty. My point is that this is paltry if it is intended to be all, and if it is not intended to be all, it should not have come down by itself for \$3,000. I realise the position which the hon. member is or seems to be in now, but what the hon. member has mentioned about Cave Hill and so on should be one comprehensive Resolution. We should be told - and through us, the public - how we intend to celebrate Human Rights week and it will cost so much. To my way of thinking, if the hon. member comes down for \$30,000, it seems to me that that would be more appropriate if you are going to put over what the contribution of Barbados should be. If, on the other hand, the hon. member means that this is only a beginning, it does not appear in the notes, and therefore he should specifically give the House the assurance that the Cabinet will give more attention to the celebration of Human Rights week, and will come down with a comprehensive scheme of what Barbados proposes to do. How are we going to look when you compare what we can afford when, as is more than likely to happen from one or two things I have read, some places with less than our revenue are going to have more of a splash, if I may put it that way, than this note would suggest Barbados is going to have. In short, Sir, I ask the Hon. Minister in simple language to assure us that this is only part of the celebrations.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this whole year, as I understand it, has been Human Rights year, and there are other celebrations and other incidents which will mark Human Rights year that had been carried on by the Government. For example, there was to have been last week an issue of postage stamps, but without any announcement I gather that the issue has been postponed and in due course we will get an issue of stamps to mark Human Rights year. There have also been activities carried on by other Associations dealing with Human Rights year, and I am going to speak, Mr. Chairman, on what happened to me personally in connection with the Government's Human Rights year celebrations.

Earlier this year I received an invitation from the Barbados Union of Teachers to take part in a television programme on Human Rights. I understood that the Attorney General, Mr. Smith, and other persons were also going to take part in this programme. This invitation was sent to me at a time when I gather that the Minister responsible for broadcasting was Senator Sandiford. Come the day when Senator Sandiford and the Prime Minister fell out because Senator Sandiford would not have Mr. Gale as General Manager of the Corporation.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I will ask the hon. member to withdraw those remarks. I have never fallen out with any of my Ministers on any point, and I think that the pri-

vilage of Parliament is being grossly abused throughout this Session by the Opposition making statements which they neither have the courage nor the plain, unadulterated guts - being spineless, most of them - to make even outside the precincts of this Chamber, at the head of the stairs far less outside in public, and I think the hon. member ought to be made to withdraw the remarks because it is grossly unfair to make imputations like that even against the Minister or myself.

1.45 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. senior member for St. Thomas withdraw the remarks about the Prime Minister falling out? (*ASIDES*) Let me make my point first. The hon. member has said in his discussion that Senator Sandiford fell out with the Prime Minister. (Hon. E. W. BARROW: You do not have to tell him what he said.)

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I did not say that, but apart from that, without taking advice from the Prime Minister, would you tell me what imputation there is in saying that one Minister fell out with another? What is wrong with two people falling out? What is the imputation that you are asking me to withdraw? If the Prime Minister thinks that I would not say this outside, let me tell him that I have said it outside on political platforms. I will give him a flying statement as to what I said and let him put me in the Courts, if he believes that it is libellous.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I have taken objection. Is the hon. member going to withdraw that imputation against two Ministers of Government. It is blatantly untrue, a dastardly lie, it is unparliamentary and irrelevant, and it is an aspersion on the character of the two Ministers involved, of which I happen to be one. You do not have to remind the hon. member of what he said because he added insult to injury by saying that he has said it already on the platform outside. I am very glad to get confirmation from him, but I would like him to come outside and tell me that now. I am asking the hon. member to withdraw the remarks.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: What imputation is there in saying that two Ministers have fallen out? Is the Prime Minister saying that he has never quarrelled with anybody in his life? What imputation is there outside our Rules? Let him say what Rule I have offended.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I have quarrelled with every single person in the Barbados Labour Party because I do not agree with the characters or policy or what they are trying to do to this Island. That is not the allegation; the allegation is not that I have quarrelled with anybody, which is also untrue, but that I fell out with a Minister because I would not do something or because he would not do something. That is an imputation on our characters as Ministers. Again and finally I am asking you, Mr. Chairman, to ask the hon. member to withdraw the remarks. All you have to do is to tell him to withdraw the remarks.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: What imputation of character is it that one Minister falls out with another? What lunacy? The Prime Minister just got up and said that it was a dastardly lie and why did you not make him withdraw that? I know that he is not in command of himself. He is a damned lunatic himself; so I do not worry with him.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member please make his remarks without using such criticisms?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Why do you not tell the Prime Minister not to say that I was telling a dastardly lie? I want to know what Rule of the House I have offended by saying that one Minister fell out with another. I cannot withdraw the remarks unless I see the Rule. I have made up my mind that I will not come in here and make any remarks outside the Rules unless I withdraw it, but the depths to which the Prime Minister has sunk have never been as deep as those to which he has sunk today. He is calling for a withdrawal, but there is no imputation against a man's character to say that he has fallen out with somebody else.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I have made my objection, Mr. Chairman. Are you going to sit down and listen to the hon. member telling you what is his interpretation of it or not? It is either an imputation against an hon. member or it is not an imputation.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, Does it not appear strange to you that the Prime Minister has not taken objection to being called a lunatic by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I withdraw that.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I have never heard the hon. member call me a lunatic (*ASIDES*) but I know that he could not be accepted in any Party that I was the Leader of; and if that is what is biting him, I could not go to the public and tell them that he is a fit and proper person to represent decent people in this Island.

Mr. HINDS: He has found it impossible to tell the public of his own father who was near the Almshouse; that is the trouble. I have had to help feed his father to keep him out of the Almshouse, begging bread about the street. The Prime Minister of this country met his own father in Broad Street and would not even speak to him and would not even give him a lift.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, are you going to allow this debate to degenerate.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Two hon. members are on their feet. Will the hon. member please take his seat? (*ASIDES*) May I remind the Hon. Prime Minister that the hon. senior member for St. Thomas has withdrawn the remarks and he may now proceed?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Are you withdrawing the remarks of the hon. member? Why could he not have done that a long time ago and save the public of Barbados..... (*ASIDES*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: May I remind hon. members that this House is in session and I am in charge as Chairman? I said, Mr. Prime Minister, that I heard the hon. senior member for St. Thomas to withdraw the remarks. He said that he has withdrawn them. I heard him say so.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The remark I withdrew is the remark I made that the Prime Minister is a damned lunatic.

Mr. HINDS: The Prime Minister has not taken objection to being called a lunatic.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, if I may continue, soon after Mr. Gale was appointed General Manager of C.B.C. against the objections, as we are informed, of the then Minister, the strenuous objections of the then Minister, the Prime Minister took over the responsibility for Broadcasting. I was then informed that I would not be allowed to go on television because the Minister objected to any politician being on the air. Mr. Smith, like the baby who had to go out with the bath water, was thrown out as well. I am yet to hear that the Barbados Union of Teachers is in any way under the jurisdiction of the Prime Minister. Nevertheless, apparently the stick was shaken at them and they were told that they could not have a television programme at all if Tom Adams was on it. And this is for Human Rights week, and this is the right of free speech.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member care to state who gave him that information? He is making a statement about his being denied the right of freedom of speech, as well as the Attorney General of Barbados. Would he care to indicate to you and to other hon. members who gave him that information so that we could ask the person to verify it? There is no point in making statements like that. I know that it was the same hon. member who prevented, in my presence, the senior member for the City from speaking on the B.B.C. in London. I invited the hon. member to leave because I could not stand and see the Hon. Leader of the Opposition of Barbados insulted by somebody looking like him or of his origin.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, we have heard the whole story now. The Prime Minister felt that when I was a B.B.C. producer, I would not put what he wanted on the air, and he wanted tit for tat and said that I was not to go on the air either. This is what I have said on a platform once and he can have that in writing too.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has made a statement. I am making a statement of fact which the hon. senior member for the City can verify and which everybody in Barbados knows. He said that he invited the hon. senior member for the City to have a free drink on the B.B.C. and not to talk on the air. I do not have to fight the senior member for the City's battle for him; he can fight his own battles; but I am asking the hon. senior member for St. Thomas to indicate who gave

him the information, which is misinformation, that I said that he is not to speak on the radio or on television in Barbados because it is untrue.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If that is untrue, the Secretary and the President of the Barbados Union of Teachers are obviously acting on false information and the Government Information Officer is obviously disseminating it. The Prime Minister has his answer. Mr. Chairman, when you see on this occasion who has been substituted, we are told that no politicians must appear on television and the person who appeared in the politician's place was Dr. Keith Hunte, the Chairman of the Democratic Labour Election meeting down there, a man who addresses D.L.P. Branch meetings as a D.L.P. member, an open politician if there was ever one - we see the hypocrisy involved in a decision which said that the Attorney General and the senior member for St. Thomas could not appear on a television programme because they are politicians; but Dr. Keith Hunte can appear on it. This is Human Rights week, and the Minister responsible for the dissemination of information, that is his attitude towards Human Rights week. The Prime Minister said that he never said that Tom Adams could not go on the air, I do not want to misquote him, but I want to make it clear, if he is going to get up and make any reply, that it was not he who said that the senior member for St. Thomas and the Attorney General could not appear on the air. 1.55 p.m.

If the Prime Minister is saying that it was not his hand who struck us down, I want him to get up and say so in specific terms. Since he has questioned me, let me ask him who, in that case, instructed the Government Information Officer to tell me and to tell the Barbados Union of Teachers, and on enquiring afterwards to confirm to me, that I was not to be allowed to take part in a programme which I had been written to some months before to participate in and had replied accordingly? If the Prime Minister says it was not he, then I put a question to him: Who was it then?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: It is one of the unfortunate things, Sir - I have an Overseas call - that in a democracy one has to be exposed to this kind of chicanery that goes on in this country. (*ASIDES*) I am saying that one has to be exposed to this kind of chicanery that goes on in this country. When the standards of people should be uplifted, you get people coming in here talking about feeding somebody's father. The person who has to be grateful is the person who is fed, not the person who is feeding or anybody else.

The hon. member uses an occasion on a debate on Human Rights to get up and accuse me of striking him down, as if he is Julius Caesar and I am Brutus. All I can say here is that I have asked the hon. member a question; I have never spoken to either the President, Vice-President, Secretary or Treasurer, of the Barbados Union of Teachers; I do not even know who they are. I am not saying that I may not have waved at them knowing them as school teachers,

but I do not even know who the officers are; I am not interested in who the officers are, and I certainly have very little communication with the Government Information Officer. One day I asked a high official from a foreign country what he thought about our Information Services, and he said he did not know that we had an Information Service in Barbados; so that is the answer I have to give the hon. member.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir. I asked the Prime Minister to deny specifically that he told the Government Information Officer that I was not to take part in the programme.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not even see the Government Information Officer, and neither would he have the temerity to telephone me. My Permanent Secretary speaks to him, and I have never given my Permanent Secretary any such instructions. The Prime Minister does not mess around with B.L.P. Information Officers.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: In accordance with Standing Orders, this sitting now stands suspended to 2.30 o'clock p.m.

On resumption:

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time. Certain Questions were held over last meeting by my instructions as the hon. and learned senior member for St. Thomas was indisposed and unable to attend his duties in this Chamber that day. The hon. Member, I am happy to observe, has recovered and he may now proceed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, before the hon. Member proceeds, I would like to say what Replies I have here: Nos. 169, 170, 172, 233, 238, 241, 242, 244, 245, 247, 251, 256 and 268.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank the Hon. Leader of the House. No. 169 standing in the name of the hon. and learned member for St. Thomas, page 8, left hand column.

THE HILTON HOTEL

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

1. With what company has the Hilton Hotel been insured against fire since its completion?
2. If the insurance or insurances were placed through a local agency in Barbados, will the Prime Minister state the name of the agency?
3. Is the Chairman or any other member of the Development Board connected with the agency, if any, referred to in paragraph 2 above?

4. What is the Government's policy with regard to conflicts of interest which may arise between members of a Statutory Corporation who do business with or related to the Corporation or to Government property owned or controlled by the Corporation?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the replies are as follows:

1. The Hilton Hotel has been insured against fire with the Barbados Fire Association comprising forty companies registered and paying taxes in Barbados.

2. The insurance was not placed through a local agency.

3. The question does not arise.

4. Government's policy has always been that a member of a statutory board should disclose his interest in any matter that comes before that statutory board for a decision. He should absent himself when such matter is being discussed and should take no part whatsoever either directly or indirectly in the consideration of the matter in which he may be interested.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister saying that the Barbados Fire Association has insured the Hilton throughout its existence?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes, this is how I am so informed.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister agree that the Barbados Fire Association is not a company, and that it is an Association of Insurance Companies? It has no assets, in other words.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes, it is an Association made up of 40 companies.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister say whether or not one of those companies operate in Barbados through the medium of the Standard Agency Barbados Company?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: This I do not know, Mr. Speaker, but I would imagine that all of the companies that deal with insurance may well be members of the Barbados Fire Association.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister give us the names of the 40 companies?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I am afraid I cannot.

Mr. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister assure the House that the Barbados Fire Association is either a company incorporated under the Companies Act, or by statute, with powers to undertake insurance?

2.35 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Obviously I could not give the hon. member that assurance, because I would be giving him an assurance about a matter which would have to be a matter of fact and perhaps of law; but what I am saying is that the Barbados Fire Association is made up of forty companies all of whom are registered and of course pay taxes in Barbados. This is what I have already said.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Will the Minister say what company paid the fire damage caused during the fire at the Hilton Hotel?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I think the hon. member should realise that he should give notice of that Question. It could not really arise out of this one.

Mr. SPEAKER: I was about so to state when I re-read the questions.

Mr. ST. JOHN: I heard the Minister say that the insurance was not placed locally. Was it placed from abroad?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: In answer to Question 2 which said "if the insurance or insurances were placed through a local agency in Barbados will the Prime Minister state the name of the agency" the reply was that "the insurance was not placed through a local agency."

Mr. ST. JOHN: Would the hon. member state through whom was the insurance placed?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Not a local one.

Mr. ST. JOHN: Presumably it was placed through some person, either an actual person or a legal person. My question is through whom was it placed? If it is a foreign person, tell us who the person is.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I am afraid I cannot assist the hon. member in that. I have given him the information which arises out of the questions asked.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, was the insurance placed by a company that is operated in Barbados?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The answer is that it was not placed through a local agency.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I did not say "through" an agency, I said "by".

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Surely in that context "by" would be the same as "through".

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Will the Minister say Mr. Speaker, how many of the forty companies of which he is speaking are companies domiciled in Barbados with their assets here, and if any of them are domiciled outside of Barbados? I think the Minister knows the difference between a Fire Insurance Company in England registering here and actually having its business here. If any of them is domiciled and

has its assets outside Barbados, with what local agencies — did it, in dealing with the Hilton, deal through some local insurance agency?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I think I understand the hon. member, but the answer seems to me to be already given that there is a consortium, if that is the word, or association of numerous insurance companies which are registered here in Barbados, and it is this consortium or group between them that has undertaken the underwriting of the insurance for the Hilton. I have no more information. It is not a question that the hon. member is asking me and I am not answering. To the extent that he has asked, I have tried to answer.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, if he has no more information, he has no more, but I am sure the Minister knows quite well that there is possibly only one insurance company carrying on fire insurance business in Barbados that has assets here and all the others have local agencies and do their business through the local agencies. I am sure the Minister must know that all the firms in Bridgetown are agents for

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid I am unable to follow the Question.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Will the Minister say who acted on behalf of the Barbados Fire Association with this insurance? What legal or natural or other person, whether illegal or unnatural, acted on behalf of the Barbados Fire Association in placing the insurance for the Hilton?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I would imagine such agents as it had appointed.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, in placing the insurance for the Hilton Hotel, did any member of a Statutory Board find it necessary to disclose his interest at the time?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Well obviously I could not know this; but if it were so, any such member would be guided by the standing policy of Government that he should disclose his interest, that he should not participate in the voting or debate or anything like this. This is something that we have circulated to all Statutory Boards, and we have to presume that not only do they know it, but that they act upon it.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister tell us then who was the member of a Statutory Board most likely to disclose such interest?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I would have to know the Statutory Board to which the hon. member refers, and even if I did know it, since I myself am not a member, I would not be able to assist the hon. member.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am just going to ask a last supplementary to see if the Min-

ister will give a straight answer to a straight question. Did Senator Ashby negotiate this fire insurance on behalf of the Barbados Fire Association, and was this company one of the forty companies?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: This company may conceivably be one of the forty companies, as it has every right and entitlement to be; but I am not in a position to answer the first part of the question.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Did the Government or any member of the Government not think it his duty to call on Senator Ashby to resign one or the other, either his connection with the Government or his connection with the Company.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: This would have been so if the Government were told or knew or had had it drawn to its attention that Senator Ashby was acting in any way improperly. In the face of evidence to the contrary, I must say "no".

Mr. SPEAKER: I would remind hon. members of Standing Order No. 26(9) which reads as follows:

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am sorry, if I am in order, that Your Honour has referred to that Rule, because is that not one of the Standing Orders which in the House of Commons equally with ourselves is best looked at with the telescope put to the blind eye, because it would stop some debates? I have already drawn attention earlier today when Your Honour was not in the Chair to a direct and strong, or virulent attack even by members of the House of Commons on the House of Lords telling them that if they did not pass a Bill they would get rid of them, and that was on no motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: So far as that and other Standing Orders are concerned, if and when we can get another meeting of the Select Committee on Standing Orders, maybe that matter will receive our consideration.

QUESTION ^{re} FIXTURES AND FITTINGS USED IN CONSTRUCTION OF HILTON HOTEL

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 170 stands in the name of the hon. and learned member for St. Thomas.

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

To enquire of the Prime Minister:-

1. Will the Prime Minister state who supplied the bathroom and plumbing fixtures and the electrical fitting materials used in the construction of the Hilton Hotel?

2. Were these or any other materials used in the construction of the Hilton Hotel imported into Barbados via the local agency of the Standard Agency (Barbados) Company?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the replies are as follows:

1. (a) The plumbing fixtures used in the construction of the Barbados Hilton were supplied by Drake Scull Engineering and Sanitary Engineering Limited;

(b) The electrical fittings were purchased by the contractors, Emtage Electrical Limited and Phoenix Building Services. Some special fittings were ordered direct from manufacturers in New York;

2. No supplies were imported by Standard Agency (B'dos) Company for use at the Hilton Hotel.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Who placed the order for the fittings which were imported direct from the New York manufacturers?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: In a communication sent by the Chief Technical Director to the Director of the Economic Planning Unit, it is stated that electrical fittings etc. were purchased by the contractors Emtage Electrical Ltd. and Phoenix Building Services, and some special fittings were ordered direct from manufacturers in New York and not through any local agents. This is the information which is here on the file, and it has come from the Chief Technical Director's report through the Ministry on the matter.
2.45 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: Did I hear the Minister say in reply to one question that no supplies were ordered by the Standard Agency?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes, I did say that.

Mr. HINDS: Would the Minister's mention of no supplies include, say, the supply of a bill board or bill boards for the Hilton?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I take it that "No" means "No". I do not think that you can qualify the word "No". The information is that no supplies were imported by Standard Agency.

Mr. HINDS: Not even a bill board.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No. That is the information which is here on the file.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I gather that the Minister has not got the name of the New York Suppliers.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No, I have not.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Will the Minister make an investigation as to the names of the New York

Suppliers and ask for such documents as will reveal if any manufacturers' representative's commission was paid by them and to whom, and where was it paid, whether in New York or elsewhere overseas?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The temptation to make that kind of investigation would be strong were it not for the fact that it would be a strange thing for a Government to doubt the word of its own Chief Technical Director.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: He has not given the name and I am asking you to find out the name. That is all.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I take it that if he says that it was not imported through any local agency, he would not either knowingly, certainly not wittingly, deceive his Minister or the Government. I think that we can take it as that. You cannot win all *(Asides)* I think you will find on further investigation that we are correct. It may be that the hon. member may not have asked the proper question; we have no more information than what is here.

PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR BARBADOS

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 172 standing in the name of the same hon. member.

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

1. Is it a fact that a Physical Development Plan for Barbados prepared under the direction of the Town and Country Planning Office has been in existence for some time?

2. When does the Government intend to publish the Plan, if it is in existence?

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

"Yes, Sir."

"Government intends to publish a Plan as soon as study of its implications and of proposed amendments is completed."

Mr. ST. JOHN: Does the Minister consider that Government would be greatly aided by the views of the public on the existing Plan before there are any amendments?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: This is possibly true, but, on the other hand, the hon. member would admit that the Government would be better aided if it studied the implications, and that is what the Government is at the moment doing. It is conceivable, when this study is completed, that proposed amendments may come not only from inside the Government but also from outside. That is conceivable.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: How long has the Plan been in existence? Am I right in saying that it has

been in existence in one form or another for getting on to five years?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Well, certainly four.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Is that not enough time even for this Government to study the implications of a Plan? Will the Government consider publishing a draft Plan so that the members of the public can see it and give their views?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I do not think the Government would consider publishing a draft plan. Obviously, it is to everybody's advantage to have a proper Plan. I think the hon. member would admit that we should study the implication of it.

COLLECTION OF INLAND REVENUE FOR TWO COMPLETED YEARS

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 233 also standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas. That is on page 14, bottom left-hand column.

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

Will the Minister give figures for the last two completed financial years of collection of Inland Revenue broken down into payments made by Companies, by individuals subject to P.A.Y.E. deductions, and by all other individuals and sources of Inland Revenue?

Mr. Speaker, before I sit down, if I can mention Question No. 232 which appears immediately above, that is suggested as a pending Question. I have no further supplementary Question to Question 232. I have mentioned it because it comes to my mind at this point.

Mr. SPEAKER: In that event, I will not allow it to appear on the next Order Paper.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the Reply to the hon. member's Question is as follows. I am to tell the hon. member that I am calling the categories and against each category the figures for 1966-67 and for 1967-68. We start off with Companies.

"The figures for the last two completed financial years of collection of inland revenue broken down into payments made by companies, individuals subject to P.A.Y.E. deductions and by all other individuals and sources of inland revenue are as under:-

Category	Financial year	
	1966/67	1967/68
Companies	\$5,633,848	\$6,249,553
Individuals subject to P.A.Y.E. deductions	\$5,223,587	\$5,949,287
Other individuals	\$3,150,504	\$3,874,376

Estate and Succession		
Duties	\$1,030,468	753,341
Entertainment Tax	75,110	82,968
West Indies Hospital Funds Ltd.,	43,125	108,643
Land Development Duty	565	1,392"

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, if I could mention Question No. 240, that is the subject of a letter to Your Honour which indicates that I may have a certain conflict of interests in the matter. As far as I am concerned, I will not be asking the Question.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the hon. member is asking or implying that he has no objection to its being removed from the Order Paper. That will be done. That is in respect of Question No. 232 and Question No. 240. The Hon. Leader of the House has just answered Question No. 233.
2.55 p.m.

No. 238 also standing in the name of the hon. and learned Member for St. Thomas, page 15, left hand column.

EXPO' 67

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Minister responsible for Development: What residential accommodation was rented by the Government of Barbados and Guyana in connection with Expo' 67; where, for how long; at what rent or rents; for how long was it occupied; by whom; and at what dates?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, the reply is as follows:-

Two apartments were rented by the Governments of Barbados and Guyana in connection with Canadian Expo' 67 as follows:-

1. One at Tupper Street, Montreal, Quebec at a monthly rental of \$250.00 Canadian Currency was occupied at various times from October 1965 to December, 1966 by persons from Barbados and/or Guyana who were directly concerned with the preparations for participation in Expo' 67 by the two Governments. Such persons included the Commissioner General, the Chairman of the Guyana Committee for Expo' 67, members of the Planning Committee of both countries and Specialist Advisers. From January, 1967 until December, 1967 it was occupied by the Deputy Commissioner General and the General Manager.

2. The other at the corner of Fort and Tupper Streets, Montreal, Quebec, for the use of the Police and Musicians during the period 1st April, 1967 to 31st October, 1967 at a monthly rental of \$525 Canadian Currency.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister say how much time Senator Morgan actually spent in the flat?

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not deem that to arise supplementarily.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, he said the Commissioner General was in the flat, and I ask at what times and for how long did he remain?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, while he was there and not otherwise.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister tell us how many wedding receptions were held in that flat?

Mr. SPEAKER: Nor do I regard that as arising supplementarily.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, if the flat has been used for a wedding reception, it is our money — your money and our money that has been used in a flat for a wedding reception.

Mr. SPEAKER: The supplementary question attempted was, how many wedding receptions?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: How many wedding receptions and for whose wedding?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Not to my knowledge.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I would like to ask the Ministers this question: Do not they realise that it is to their benefit and everybody else's not to conceal disreputable things?

Mr. SPEAKER: No. 241 standing also in the name of the hon. and learned Member for St. Thomas, page 15, right hand column.

PARKING SPACES IN THE COURTYARD OF THE LAW COURTS

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

1. Is the Minister aware that since question No. 143, referring to parking spaces in the Courtyard of the Law Courts, was asked in this Honourable House, a number of "No Parking" signs have been painted in the said courtyard?

2. Were these signs placed there by the Minister's direction, and if so why?

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

1. Yes, Sir.

2. No, Sir.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, can I ask the Minister what he has done about these illegal "No Parking" signs being placed there?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Something is being done expeditiously, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Am I right in saying, Mr. Speaker, that some of these "No Parking" signs have been removed since the Question was asked?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I am only the Minister of Highways and Transport and not a cantonnier; I do not work there, so I would not know.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the Minister will regard this as a supplementary.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not what the Minister regards; it is what the Speaker regards as supplementary.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister give us some idea when he will, in fact, answer Question 143, and how his progress is going with the question raised in Question 143? I would also ask the Minister if he would agree that it is a little bit insulting to hon. Members to find that a question is on the Order Paper about parking spaces for Barristers and Solicitors, and the next thing one sees in the Courtyard is a lot of "No Parking" signs? Perhaps the Director of Highways and Transport feels that Barristers and Solicitors are wrong to promote Questions about parking spaces.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: What is No. 143?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Question 241 arises out of Question 143.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Legislation, if I am not mistaken, has been laid last Tuesday to deal with parking spaces in the Law Courts yard.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am obliged to the Minister in that case, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: No 242 also standing in the name of the hon. and learned Member for St. Thomas, page 15, right hand column.

INVITATION TO COMPLAIN AGAINST A ST. THOMAS POSTMAN

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

Will the Prime Minister investigate the circumstances under which, although no complaint was received by any member of the staff of the department concerned, on the initiative of the Minister of Communications and Works, the Acting Postmaster General invited certain members of the public to make complaints against a St. Thomas postman relevant to the performance of his duties, and pursued this course of action even after the members of the public concerned had refused to attend the G.P.O. to make any such complaints?

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

I have investigated the circumstances under which an investigation was carried out by the Postmaster General at the request of the Honourable Minister of Communications and Works.

I am satisfied that the statements made by the Honourable Member in question are without foundation.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I cannot ask the Minister to pursue these matters. Let us take these statements one by one. Is the Minister saying that the members of the public concerned did not refuse to attend the G.P.O. to make the complaints referred to?
3.05 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, take the allegations of fact one by one. Will the Minister state what member of the public concerned complained to a member of the staff of the Post Office?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, any such complaint should not go to a member of the staff. It surely would be to the Postmaster General or in some cases to the Ministry or the Minister himself.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Will the Minister agree that the complaint, if any, went to the Minister of Communications, and not to any member of the Staff? Will the Minister agree that the only complaint initiated by a member of the public went to the Minister of Communications and Works and not to any member of the Post Office Staff?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If I remember rightly Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has himself in this House some two or three months ago made that allegation.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Is it true or not?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If what is true?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I see that the Leader of the House is batting on a sticky wicket. He has come and put a question and said he is satisfied that none of what I alleged is true. There are only four facts alleged in this, and I want to take them one by one and let him tell the House, if he has given a written reply saying that the allegations which I have made are untrue, which of the allegations is untrue? The first allegation is that no complaint was received by any member of the staff of the Post Office. Is that true or untrue?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, what I had better do is to let the House know what observations the Postmaster General has made in a report minuted on 1st August. He says "my observations are as follows: (a) Postman Wiles has adopted the

practice of delivering letters for Evangeline Parris to the Addressee herself when he meets her; to children of the family who run to get the mail when he rings his bell; to Mrs. Parris' mother who lives with her; to Mrs. Parris' sister. (b) This practice was agreeable to the addressee. (c) No objection was voiced nor complaint made to the Post Office. (d) Delivery was always made to a member of the family where the relationships are cordial."

And then he quotes Regulation 1943 Paragraph 10: "They must endeavour as far as possible to deliver letters at the houses to which they are addressed after due enquiry, and not deliver letters to persons in the streets except where they are the actual addressees of the letters and are personally known to them. They are forbidden to give letters to unauthorised persons to deliver for them." Then he continues: "Strictly speaking, Postman Wiles would seem to be acting contrary to this Regulation by delivering Evangeline Parris' mail to her mother or her sister when he meets them on the street." This is as much information as is here.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Now, Mr. Speaker, the answer to the Question says it is satisfied that my complaints are without foundation, but I hope the Minister agrees that he has just read out the Postmaster General's report to the effect that no complaint was made to the Department by any member of the public. I hope the Minister agrees that, therefore, the very first allegation of fact I made in this question is correct. If the Minister does not agree, let him get up and say so; but (d) what he just read out is practically in terms with what is contained in this Question, so my first allegation of fact is correct.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No, I have no such information, and if I had it I would not withhold it from the hon. member. The hon. member's Question says "Will the Prime Minister investigate the circumstances under which, although no complaint was received by any member of the Staff of the Department concerned, on the initiative of the Minister of Communications and Works, the acting Postmaster General invited certain members" I take it he is asking me to substantiate that part of his Question that on the initiative of the Minister certain steps were taken by the acting Postmaster General. I am saying that I see nothing here on the file to indicate that that is so, and I read to the hon. member all the observations which the Postmaster General has made. I am not concealing anything from the hon. member.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the nature of the answer has made a very serious allegation against the character of the person asking the question, because when you say that the allegations made by the questioner are unfounded, you are suggesting there is something in the Question that is false. Part I of the answer which the Minister read out today agreed that action was taken on the initiative of the Minister of Communications and Works. Let him read his own answer again. Now the Postmaster General

agrees with my first allegation. The Minister answering the Question agrees with my second. Let us come to the third allegation as to whether or not the Postmaster General wrote letters to certain members of the public inviting them to make complaints. What does the Minister say about that? Let the Minister deny it if he wants to justify the second part of his answer. I know the Postmaster General wrote those letters.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member let the Minister answer the question? I presume he would prefer it that way.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I do not know that I can assist the hon. member further. It would appear as if the Postmaster General addressed himself almost entirely to the incident arising out of the alleged dissatisfaction of Mrs. Parris and not to the fact or the theory that a complaint was made to him or to the Minister. I have answered the Question as best I can.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that Question Time is concluded for this day's meeting.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: What time is it? That clock is wrong. Hearing the Building Clock chime is not enough.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the Hon. Leader of the Opposition realises that I go by my watch, but my watch does not chime. It cannot be heard by hon. members.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Surely I did not see Your Honour look at Your watch, and that is why I asked the question because I do not go by this clock nor the Public Building clock.

Mr. SPEAKER: Of course lawyers, especially when they are yet in practice, look surreptitiously at their watches and their notes, but may I in the same spirit in which the hon. member has enquired, enquire if there is a desire that Question Time be extended?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I do not think the Opposition has any objection.

Mr. SPEAKER: I gather that it is the feeling of the House at the moment that we should continue Question Time until 3.30 p.m. o'clock. So shall it be!

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister understand that having said that the allegations made by the questioner in this question are unfounded that what I am asking him to do is to say which of the allegations made in the Question is unfounded? Will he agree that it is a reflection on an hon. member to say in a written answer that he has made unfounded allegations, and if they cannot be justified, will the Minister withdraw Part 2 of his answer?

3.15 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Surely, Mr. Speaker, the burden of the hon. member's Question must be that whatever was done by the acting Post Master General was done on the initiative of the Minister of Communications and Works. That, I understand, to be the essential part of his Question and this, it seems to me, has not been denied because the answer says: "I have investigated the circumstances under which an investigation was carried out by the Postmaster General at the request of the Honourable Minister of Communications and Works." The second part of the answer, and this is the part with which he is quarrelling, is this: "I am satisfied that the statements made by the Honourable Member in his Question are without foundation." These statements are not by inference that an investigation had not taken place, but I take it that they refer to the last part of the hon. member's Question, that is, that the Acting Postmaster General invited certain members of the public to make complaints against a St. Thomas Postman relative to the performance of his duties and pursued this course of action even after the members of the public concerned had refused to attend the G.P.O. to make any such complaints. I take it that it is in respect of that last part of the Question that the Ministry deems the statements to be without foundation. That is how I take it.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, no Civil Servant can deem a statement made by a member of this House to be without foundation unless the cloak of authority is lent to it by a Minister answering the Question. What I am asking is if the Minister has no material on this list of allegations — well, he stated what material he has — and if he has none, will he withdraw part 2 of his answer? Because what I am particularly asking is this: "Is it not a fact that the Acting Postmaster General wrote and invited the Parrises to make these complaints? That is No. 1 and No. 2: Is it not a fact that the Parrises refused to go to the G.P.O? If he has not got any material on that, I invite the Minister to withdraw the second part of his answer.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I have already told the hon. member that the basis of this reply is the comments which the Postmaster General has made and submitted and I have read all of them. I have kept nothing back except this, that he said at the very end: "I have instructed the Postman Wiles to deliver Mrs. E. Parris' mail to her house at all times." That is the very last thing in addition to what I have read before. There is nothing else.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, can't the Minister understand that what I am getting at is this? He has said that I have made unfounded statements in a Parliamentary Question. He now says that he has no material in the file to verify or not verify two statements. Will he therefore withdraw what he said about unfounded statements? This is the first time since I have been in this House that I can remember that a Parliamentary answer is given saying that an hon. member has made unfounded state-

ments. He now says that he has nothing in the file to show that the statements are unfounded. Will he therefore withdraw that remark?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: While the Hon. Minister is contemplating whether he will withdraw, as he should do, or not, I would like to ask the hon. member if he remembers that before an hon. member asks a Question, according to Standing Order 12(2) (b) "A question shall not contain statements which the Member who asks the question is not prepared to substantiate." My further supplementary is this: is the Hon. Minister satisfied that the hon. senior member for St. Thomas has substantiated his statement or not?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I really cannot add anything to the reply which has been given. I have tried to satisfy the hon. member on the basis of the information which is before me. I cannot assist the hon. member any more.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If, on the basis of the information before him, he cannot say that the statements are unfounded, will he therefore withdraw that part of the answer? I can substantiate them, Mr. Speaker. The Parrises told Mr. Wiles to open the letters from the Acting Postmaster General in front of Mr. Wiles and I heard when the Postmaster General

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is now making a speech. (Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: He is substantiating his statements). I am afraid that we can get no further with this matter.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, it is said that an hon. member has made unfounded statements. The Minister opens his file and he cannot prove it. Can it be said of any hon. member that he makes unfounded statements without some substance? Every one of these statements has been put down here on sober consideration and investigation of evidence.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is making a speech.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am raising a question of personal privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER: It does not now arise.

USE OF SANITARY CONVENIENCES IN BRIDGETOWN AND ST. MICHAEL

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 244 also standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, is it your ruling that hon. members can come in here and ask Questions and be insulted by the answers?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not my Ruling and it does not appear as Question No. 244 on the Order Paper.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Hon. Minister was going to get up and say something along the lines of unfounded statements.

Mr. SPEAKER: I had no reason to believe that he was going to do so.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I believe that if I said that an hon. member was making unfounded statements, you would make me withdraw that.

Mr. SPEAKER: In proper circumstances.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Minister of Community Development;

For what reason are members of the public sometimes required to give their names before using certain sanitary conveniences in Bridgetown and St. Michael?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the Reply to the hon. member's question is as follows:-

"Section 30(b) of the Bye Laws and Regulations made by the Commissioners of Health and the General Board of Health, 1928, states -

'Any person desiring to use the Public Baths must give his correct name and address to the Caretaker. Any person refusing to do so will not be allowed to enter or use the baths.'

That law is still in force. But it is being amended.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS and Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS rose to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: Two hon. members caught my eyes. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition did so first.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I was merely going to ask the Hon. Minister what happens if a person gives a wrong name.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: You will not be guilty of perjury; you are not sworn to it.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Does that Regulation in fact apply to toilets or only to baths? As to the actual conveniences themselves, sometimes apparently, the lady asks you for your name and she writes it down in a book before you go in. She writes the time on which you came and so on.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The advice which has been tendered the Ministry by the Interim Commissioner who is in charge of these baths and latrines is that this practice has been kept up for the following reasons, for the purpose (a) of statistics; (b) in case of wilful damage to fittings and property, there will be someone who would be held responsible; and (c) in the case of sudden illness and often death, as has happened on numerous occasions amongst users of these conveniences, the police can be notified and re-

latives more easily traced. It is for those reasons down in 1928 that it was thought fit to institute this practice.

3.25 p.m.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Does the Hon. Minister say many deaths, or is that a slip of the tongue? Is it a place where people fall down and die?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: "And in case of death, then"

Mr. SPEAKER: No. 245 also standing in the name of the hon. and learned Member for St. Thomas, page 16, left hand column.

ERADICATION OF RATS

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

1. Are the activities of rats regarded as a problem to agriculturalists in Barbados?

2. Is the Minister aware that Professor James Bond, the eminent ornithologist, has suggested that introduction and release in Barbados of a number of Barn Owls from the Windward Islands would be a boon to the Island agriculture as these birds feed largely on rats?

3. Will the Minister consider this suggestion?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the replies are as follows:-

1. Yes, Sir.

2. No, Sir.

3. All scientific methods of exterminating rats are investigated by the Ministry of Agriculture.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, did the Ministry consider writing Professor Bond at the University of Pennsylvania, I think he is now, and asking for his opinion?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, it was not considered that we should write to Professor Bond. We do not know of Professor Bond; we know of Mr. Bond — perhaps James Bond — but we have been in consultation with the Royal Society of Arts. We have a Journal issued by the Royal Society of Arts where there was a discourse between Sir Selwyn Clarke and Dr. Symmonds who have been discussing the question of the eradication or extermination of rats, or the threat of rats to the economy of the Windward and Leeward Islands and Barbados. We have not been able as yet to determine whether it would be in the interest of the Island to bring in the Barn Owl.

As a matter of fact, Dr. Selwyn Clarke had pointed out that in some countries the Barn Owl was

introduced to get rid of rats. He further pointed out that the Barn Owl has been a threat to other smaller animals, especially chickens, that people keep running around. The hon. senior member for St. Thomas was talking about a small number of chickens, but he can walk through St. Thomas at night and see how many chickens people have living in the trees. They do not build coops for them in the country. Except in large and well organised chicken farms, you will find chickens in every yard in St. Andrew. I know my constituency, and the hon. member should know St. Thomas. In St. Thomas you will find a few chickens knocking around.

Sir, they pointed out that it is likely to create a similar problem to that created when the mongoose was introduced to get rid of the snake. The mongoose is now a more serious problem than the snake.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now 3.30 o'clock p.m.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there are two Questions asked by the Senior Member for St. Thomas and notice of the replies were given last Tuesday when he was absent, I am wondering if it would be agreeable to him to have the replies printed and circulated.

Mr. SPEAKER: Anyhow, Question Time, according to the will of the House, has been completed. May I suggest to the Hon. Minister to have a word with his Whip, who will communicate with the other Whip on the other side, and inform the Clerk of the House who, I trust, will notify me. We have now arrived at Private Members' Business.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Under Private Members' Business, it has been intimated to me, through a Party Whip, that it is the desire of the hon. and learned Member for Christ Church to ask that No. 4 standing in his name be the first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business. The hon. member will correct me if I have been misinformed. If there is no objection, leave will be granted. There being no objection, the hon. Member may proceed to move the Second Reading of a Bill intituled the Manning & Co. Limited (Roads Improvement) Act, 1967.

THE MANNING & CO. LIMITED (ROADS IMPROVEMENT) ACT, 1967

Mr. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, this Bill has been circulated for quite some considerable period of time. The object of the Bill is to seek legislative approval and permission to re-align the roadway at the top of Broad Street, and to reconstruct some pavements around it and improve the drainage. The specification has been approved by the Town and Country Planning Officer, and in the Bill the works must be completed in accordance with and to the satisfaction of the Town and Planning Officer. Copies of the plan have already been supplied, and it is usual and customary that these matters of Private Bills are sent to Committees. I would be willing, at that stage, to

provide additional copies of the plan, and to answer any problem that members may have in their minds. Accordingly, I ask that this Bill be now read the second time.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.
3.35 p.m.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before you put the question, if this is the Bill in connection with Manning and Co., if I am not mistaken, this already came before the Chamber.

Mr. ST. JOHN: It has come before the Chamber and my recollection of the situation is that it was sent to Select Committee, but I have been assured that this is not so.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Is it necessary to send it to Select Committee?

Mr. ST. JOHN: Under the Rules it must go to Select Committee.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The following hon. members have been selected to serve on the Select Committee on this Bill: the hon. senior member for Christ Church; the hon. senior member for St. George; the hon. junior member for St. George; the hon. senior member for Bridgetown; the hon. senior member for St. Philip and the hon. junior member for Christ Church.

RESOLUTION re FINANCIAL STATEMENT AND BUDGETARY PROPOSALS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next item under Private Members' Business is Item No. 1 which stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, and it is 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.

On 13th August, 1968, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph was speaking at 4.30 p.m. when Private Members' Time expired.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I hope you will not take it as being rude, but it was my intention when I got up to speak to ask the Speaker, but as you are there now, I will ask you. I notice that you and the Speaker refer to certain members as "Hon. and Learned". Are the others not learned? Are hon. members whom you do not address as "learned" not learned? I need an explanation.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: In 1948, 1949 and 1950 when the hon. senior member for St. Joseph was then

a member of this Chamber, some members of the House in those days used to be so referred to, and it is regrettable that the hon. member did not make his objection then. What he is complaining of has become so much a practice that I do not think I could uphold any objection even if I wanted to.

Mr. SMITH: I am not objecting, but I am only asking if the ones who are not referred to as "learned" are "unlearned". You referred to 1948, but it is only in the last session or this that I can remember hearing it. Maybe if it was used, it was not so prevalent. (A VOICE: We did not have so many lawyers then.) (A VOICE: You did not have so many nincompoops). Mr. Deputy Speaker, I heard an hon. member say that you did not have so many nincompoops. Do you mean that the lawyers are nincompoops?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, with respect to the Budgetary Proposals I forget the trend I was taking on these. But one point I want to make is relative to the imposition of the tax on small liquor dealers. I made mention of it then, but I did not elaborate on the question of calling on the small licence holder to pay \$100 instead of \$50. I feel it is asking too much of certain liquor sellers especially in the rural areas. One member referred to it as 27 cents per day, and said he would not know how to believe that a liquor dealer could not make more than 27 cents a day. In reply to that particular member, I would say that far from making 27 cents per day in some cases, some of these liquor sellers cannot sell 27 cents a day.
3.45 p.m.

You have some very small liquor dealers, you cannot call them water dealers, although at some-time it is more a question of water than it is alcohol; but you will have to call them liquor dealers. You will not be surprised to know when I tell you — I am going to argue my case. There are some small ones in the country where you go into their shops and there are three or four nip bottles on the shelves. I am interested in nip bottles because I am not able to buy a quart or a pint; but you will be surprised when I tell you that there was a particular shop which was situated near a Church and in that Church there was a funeral service. You know that the boys get thirsty at these funeral services, and in no time the shopkeeper said "I do not have any more." I am sure there were three nip bottles on the counter empty and the shopkeeper had run out of supply! That would mean that he would have to go to town next day to buy or ask a bus driver to buy half-a-dozen bottles of rum for him. One may say that that grade of liquor dealer should not be keeping a shop, and I may be inclined to agree with that person; but you should not try to encourage more unemployment in the country. These people still try to make, and they believe that they are making, a living. In other words, they do not go anywhere else to work. Regardless of how they get along, they try to get along without becoming a pest to the Public Assistance Committees in the various parishes. You should not ask these people to go out of business by way of fleecing them with a heavy licence

fee. If they are trying to get along, let them get along; if they want to live in that way, let them live so.

These licences should be in grades, and that is what I am suggesting to whoever is responsible for these licences. They should be in grades A, B, C and D. When I talk about grades, I know that there are some of these people who can pay more than \$100 and there are those who are not able to pay \$100. If the Government or whoever is responsible for the levying of these taxes, could go into the matter in a fairer way, they would be able to collect the same amount of taxes, and if anything, more taxes if they should go into it by making grades. You would be surprised to know that the ones who are paying the higher tax can pay more yet, according to the turnover of the business. I am sure that returns can be made of every gill of rum which is being sold in this country, and I am also sure that if the Government asked for it they could know how many gallons per year each retailer sells. That can be done and done easily too. If that were to be done, you will see whether "A" is selling 100 gallons, "B" is selling 10 gallons and "C" is only selling 5 gallons per year. You will know that the liquor licence can bring in so much money to the country, the Government should be collecting so much, and if you go about it in that way, you would be in a position to encourage everybody to do business. As I said before, one may be inclined to feel that the small fellow who cannot pay more, or who is not in a position to pay more, should be out of business. As soon as you do that, the Government stands to lose; so if there are two rum shops in a particular district one is selling and is in a position to pay \$100, and the other is not, you call upon the small one by way of levying such a heavy tax on him that he will have to shut down his business. The other one is going to sell more, but still pay the same licence.

Now, Sir, I do not think you can be listening to me and talking at the same time. Can you do that, Sir? All right. "A" will be able to sell a little more, "B" none at all, and "A" is still paying \$100. But who stands to lose? The Government stands to lose, and the small fellow loses out on the whole. He has to look for something else to do. He has to look for another trade and, in some cases, he may suffer by it. In truth and in fact, if he is allowed to carry on paying the same \$50 that he was paying, and if you check on the returns you may find out, possibly, that "A" can pay \$150 and when he pays \$150 and the smaller one pays \$50, the Government will raise \$200. On the other hand, if you should push the small man out completely, due to the lack of proper turnover, the Government will only collect \$100. Therefore, I am saying that the levying of this tax is perfectly wrong. In doing it as they are doing it, they are not being fair to the small liquor dealer. That would need going into and I would advise the Government that, from now on, they should make a perfect check, get a full report of the returns and levy the tax according to the sales. Sir, there are some places where you can get a "snap" for 25¢ and there are other places where you have to pay 60¢ for the same "snap". Therefore, you will see that the per-

son who is selling his stuff for 50¢ or 60¢ is bound to make more money than the small one. In other words, as regards the one for 50¢, you and I will take it. It is not that we are able to do that, but we have to play big. We are M.P.'s and we cannot be seen going into a little one-door shop to "fire" one behind the place for 25¢.

3.55 p.m.

Not that it is not the same, Sir. It is a fact that you can go at Old City Bar and get a small one cheap, but we, as M.P.'s have to live up to the standard. Sometimes we try to live too high and get ourselves in trouble. Anyway, I cannot be seen going into the alley to fire a little one. Mr. Deputy Speaker, you must not listen to the Marshal when I am speaking; you must listen to me, because there is nothing the Marshal can tell you that would be appertaining to the business of the House. If he is bringing a message, I can understand that. I did not see him go too far; he may be asking you to rule wrong, Sir. (Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Me?) Yes, Sir. Anyhow, do not take the time from him. I feel that is what he was told, and not that he knows anything about it.

Sir, we have to think in terms of those people. You have some of them in your constituency and I have some of them in St. Joseph and you will know that they do not make a big turnover. They make a little money at election time, but election takes place every five years. If you are going to increase the licence fee during election year, I think they could pay \$1,000 because the pump will be stroking, very much to our regret. At the moment they are not in a position to pay the increase, and they are called upon to pay too much. It is bound to be passed on to the consumer in some form or other just as the other traders have done it. I refer to the ones who have slipped from nothing to \$500. I think you call them itinerant traders. The \$500 for a licence will also be passed on to the consumer. I do not think the Prime Minister could be so simple as to think that when he calls on those people to pay \$500 that they are going to sell the goods at the same price. Who is going to get the blow? The poor people in the country who are unable to cope with the high cost of living.

Sir, I had an opportunity to fly about forty thousand feet in the air, and I thought I would have caught up with the cost of living up there. I cannot meet it because it is too high. If you want to meet it up there in a jet, you cannot find it. With this burdensome cost of living and only three days' work per week in the country areas, how can a man support his family? I am saying that we must collect taxes in order to get money to run the country, but there are other avenues from which the money could be obtained. It is not my duty to tell the Prime Minister what to do. The Prime Minister would not listen to me if I were to ask him to come to my office and let us discuss ways and means of levying taxes. He would think that I am a mad man.

As you know, Sir, I have said in here already that, inasmuch as it is not a Cabinet or Government Ministry, I have a portfolio up there. If I had asked

him to come to my Ministry and let us discuss ways and means of levying taxes, he would think that I am going mad. I could sit down here now and tell him the avenues which he could touch to raise more money. To begin with, he never informed us how much this particular tax was bringing in before, and how much he expected to get after he had increased it. I refer to the itinerant traders licence which is \$500 now, and the liquor dealers licence which is £50. He must be more considerate and sympathetic. I believe he is going by his advisers, but I do not know if he is in the same frame of mind as when I was arguing a point on the floor of this House for shopkeepers. I am not one now, but I always find myself having to defend them in this House. I used to wear that shoe once. He replied to me by saying that they gave only 14 ounces for a pound. I do not know whether he is still in that same frame of mind and he feels that they will give less than a half-gill for a half-gill and, therefore, he must get some of the profits from the unfair measurements. It looks as though he was right when he said that shopkeepers give 14 ounces for a pound, because when he made that statement two shopkeepers were sitting here and not one of them got up to defend his character. I now have to believe that they were giving 14 ounces for a pound, Sir.

Sir, you are a Barrister-at-law, and if you heard me on the floor of this House making the public to believe that you are dishonest, or that lawyers are dishonest, I do not think you would sit here and allow the public to feel that it was true. You would have to defend yourself and your colleagues, although you may know that there are one or two who are not up-to-date. In this case, I do not know if he is still thinking along those lines, and saying that they are smuggling sufficiently for themselves and the Government should get a little of it. If he is thinking so, that is not the way to do it.

4.05 p.m.

I am saying, Sir, that the licences should be graded differently to add two more grades to the existing two or three, and work on the returns that are made, because every merchant in Bridgetown can tell you the turn-over, as far as rum is concerned, from their bills. Wherever the shopkeeper deals he will get a bill and they would be able to give the necessary returns, and you in turn would be in a position to tax fairly and squarely. You would be surprised to see that the ones who are paying \$500 would be in a position to pay \$1,000, those who are paying \$100 may be able to pay \$300, and the ones to whom I am referring would be scarcely able to pay \$50. I feel that advisers are needed in Government on certain lines of business, because I would not expect a barrister to know the *pros* and *cons* of a small retail shop. You would have to get someone who has that knowledge to tell you what to do.

I can remember that there was a certain Minister of Trade in my Government who always consulted me when it came to certain things, and I would advise him where he could take off half cent somewhere and put on a penny somewhere else. That

Minister would always ring me or come to my place and enquire what to do because he did not know anything about it. The biggest mistake one can make is to have to do something he knows nothing about. A barrister deals with law and a doctor with medicine; so you would have to get business people to advise you when you are about to tax people in this category. Just to show you where something is wrong, do you think the "nay-nay" fee which you have put on barristers and doctors means anything to them? I feel it is an insult, but I never go too far with my doctor or my cook. When you go to a doctor and he examines you, it costs you a bank note. I have just heard a *sotto voce* remark to the effect that the ones who charge a bank note today are the bush doctors. Your humble servant would have to go in the appointment room because I have to live up to the Joneses due to my position as a member of Parliament. We are important people and we have to live that way although most people do not feel so. Only yesterday when I told one of my constituents how much taxes I have to pay, she said she heard that members of the House did not pay taxes. I was nearly imprisoned month before last for tax arrears, but I had to try and "fix-it-right". We have to get taxes and we must spend them wisely. If the Prime Minister would not be afraid to meet me, I would show him where the cost of living could be reduced. With the amount of supplementary Resolutions that are introduced during the year, the Government must look for money which they can only get through taxes; and that is where I feel that some local advice at times could be of assistance to any Government, especially a country like Barbados which is of a very poor nature. As soon as you play big and you are not big, somebody is bound to suffer, because if you are not able to entertain and you try to do it because you see your neighbour entertaining, the bailiff is bound to levy on you. The Government however is not going to levy on themselves to get out of financial difficulties; so they levy on us. As a result we would be getting it both ways, because the bailiff would be levying on us, and the Government would be levying on us; so we would be holding more strain than we should.

I will not say anything more on the Budget because it is all over. Anything more I have to say will be done as soon as I get an opportunity to discuss the Resolution that is before us. The manner in which Money Resolutions are brought on the floor of this House only gives the Minister of Finance all the say, and when the Opposition does get an opportunity to speak, it is too late. If I fight alone, I am going to see that no sooner than the Prime Minister delivers his Budgetary Proposals, the Opposition gets an opportunity to carry on from where he has left off to deal with the matter, and not have it dealt with under Private Members' Business over a period of one or two years. Imagine having a Resolution concerning last year's Budgetary Proposals still on the Order Paper! It is not good enough. We have been elected here by the people, and we are of as much importance as the Government, because a Government

without an Opposition is a serious thing and people cannot be safe financially.

4.15 p.m.

It is not because the Government has the majority that they should always be doing as they like. They must remember that this is a democratic age, and that when we are in here we must be democratic and live up to it, and that one is no more than the other. Mr. Deputy Speaker, in this place you have no more power as a member than I have; you have a little more authority and that is because you are the Head at the moment. A pin has a head. It is from that end that you, as Deputy Speaker, will be a little more than we are; but, Sir, in Parliament on the whole, all of us are the same thing. The Prime Minister can be a god at his official residence or in his office, but when we come in here

Mr. WEEKES: On a point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have noticed that we have not got any quorum and I am asking that the Bell be rung.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON entered the House and took his seat.

Mr. WEEKES: I must apologise to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have a quorum now.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have to thank the hon. Parliamentary Secretary for letting us know that he is not sleeping but you only want a quorum when you want to vote; therefore, the hon. member need not draw your attention to that. I suppose that the members may not want to hear what I am saying, and they may be only behind certain places until when we come to the vote. As long as I am on my feet and I am talking, I can talk; but the hon. member must let us know that he is not sleeping at this time. Sir, as I was saying — I am about to come to a close — not one of us in here is more than the other. The Prime Minister is an ordinary member of this House. No one of us is more than the other. We may try to make ourselves more, but we cannot get in here unless the people of this country vote for us. They do not mark for the Prime Minister with a gold pen and for the Ministers with a gold pen, and for the backbenchers with a lead pencil. All of us have been marked for with a lead pencil and it is an "X". It is reckoned as a vote, and we become members of this House; and when we get in here we should work together as representatives of the people and for the people. That is our duty and we should do it to the best of our ability. You should not be trying to cut me down and I try to cut you down, because we are in here already. You may not feel too good with my presence, but yet I am in here; so you will have to put up with my presence whether I am ugly or good looking or both. The people have sent us here to do their bidding, and, therefore, let us come together and work in the interest of the people and not in the interest of ourselves. I have always said that anybody who thinks about himself first, when he gets in here, will never be a politician. You have to forget yourself completely and do the business of the people. If you are thinking about yourself, if you are a backbencher and you want to become a Minister, if you are a Min-

ister and you want to be a Prime Minister, that cannot work; your duty is to be a representative of the people.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I feel as good here as if I were a Minister, and I suppose I would be rather unhappy if I were a Minister. I want to feel happy in representing my people and trying to get as much as I possibly can for them, and I will do it and be happy. This is no secret; I read in the newspaper that the Pensioners would not have to be drawing up down here and falling down with "bad feelings" and sometimes going back to their homes before they get their little pay cheque. It will be going home to them. You will be surprised to hear this, Sir, but an old fellow brought a newspaper to me and showed it to me because I had not seen it yet. Just as I got to my office he said: "Skipper, look at this!" I felt that I had done something for the people. It is not that I did it directly, but I have drawn the matter to the Government's attention and the Government has to act, because when I bring certain things to their attention and they do not act, it is written in the Lamb's Book of Life for them. If they do not act, it is their business; but I am going to draw it to their attention.

As regards the Resolution in respect of the 1967 Budgetary Proposals on which I was speaking, I asked the Hon. Leader of the Opposition if he cares to go on with it, but I am not going on with the Resolution any more. That can be ruled out as far as I am concerned. But I am asking the Government to consider — I am letting it be known at once — that when the next Budgetary Proposals are coming down, they must bring them down with the understanding that they must be debated right through. As soon as the Prime Minister has finished his speech, we generally do it when all the boys are closed and they will not be able to get around certain things; but, if the Prime Minister finishes his speech this evening, we will be ready for it tomorrow morning and we will deal with it until it is finished. It must not be done in Private Members' time. If you have to amend the rules, then start and think about it in the early; otherwise it will not be the pliers this time; it will be something else. Sir, I do not want to be deemed as a rogue and vagabond politically in here; I do not want to bring any pressure on the Government to do anything, and that is why I am advising them to bear in mind that that is how we, on this side of the House, are expecting the Budgetary Proposals to be brought down next time. I repeat that as soon as the Prime Minister finishes his speech, we should adjourn the House until the next day and let us go through with the debate and spend a day or two and be finished with it, and do not allow it to be dragging on for years and months. If that is not the understanding, then no Budgetary Proposals will be laid at all. Let us get it straight and do it as it should be done, and everything will be all right with me and the members above here.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, inasmuch as I cannot possibly, even if there were no other hon. members who were ready to speak, wind up by half-past four of the clock, I am therefore

suggesting that we revert to Government Business at this stage. I could not finish speaking in five minutes. 4.25 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Does the hon. Member wish to withdraw No. 2 which, I think, deals with the 1967 Budget?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Yes, Sir, I would certainly do that; but as regards No. 1, I was merely saying that if I have to reply to it, I could not do that by half-past four. If I am in order to withdraw No. 2, at this stage, I would accept the suggestion to revert to Government Business.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: You could ask that further consideration of No. 1 be postponed, and then you could ask for leave to withdraw No. 2.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: If the Leader of the House does not object, I move now that further consideration of this Motion be postponed.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

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

FINANCIAL STATEMENT AND BUDGETARY PROPOSALS 1968-69

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, at this stage, I beg to move that leave be given for me to withdraw Order No. 2 standing in my name.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The time being 4.30 p.m., the House now reverts to Government Business.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: When last the House was dealing with Government Business, the House was in Committee of Supply. To that, therefore, we now revert.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. HOPPIN took the chair.

IN COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1968-69 No. 34 (Cont'd)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the Committee last sat, we were discussing Head 40 in Committee of Supply under a Resolution for \$33,618.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I was speaking at that stage on how great a respect the Prime Minister had for human rights. As I said when the Prime Minister was here — it is a pity he is not here now, but an Overseas call is as good an excuse as any — my introduction to the attitude the Government has towards Human Rights Year and the celebration of Human Rights was to be invited to take part in a programme on television for Human Rights week, and then to be told by the Government Information Officer and others that the Prime Minister did not wish politicians to take part.

Mr. Chairman, I do not doubt that if you delete the word "politicians" and for that word you place "the senior member for St. Thomas", the Government Information Officer was inaccurate. If the Prime Minister's remarks to the effect that he never told the Government Information Officer what it was alleged he said — he was very evasive, as hon. Members will recall. As one Minister has pointed out, he never said directly that he did not tell the Government Information Officer that. But, even if he had said so directly, I would not believe him, because the Prime Minister is not such a person whom I would believe in here, in Court, or in anywhere else. I state for his information that, whether the Information Officer is a B. L. P. officer or not, if I had to choose between believing Mr. Gladstone Holder and the hon. senior member for St. John, I would believe Mr. Gladstone Holder. We have had too much experience in here of what the Prime Minister can do to the truth; too many unfounded statements are made by the Prime Minister, Mr. Chairman, without his being able to substantiate them for us to accept what he says.

For myself I am satisfied that, Human Rights year or no Human Rights year, when the Prime Minister heard that Tom Adams was to take part in the Television Programme on the Government Information Service — although it was not run by the Government Information Service it would have been on Government time — he deliberately set out to find some excuse for Tom Adams not to appear on the air. It did not matter that an invitation had been sent out, because the Prime Minister's mind had been made up.

You will have some idea of how the Prime Minister's mind works, when he seeks to enlist the hon. senior Member of the City in his strictures about an occasion at the B.B.C. in London in which it proved impossible to put a programme over the air. I am sorry the Prime Minister is not here now. I do not know what he told hon. Members, or what Mr. Ian Gale sent back in a despatch to the *Advocate* about the incident, but in front of witnesses the next day I asked the Prime Minister, face to face, in Marlborough House if he had any complaint about what had happened the day before at the B.B.C. and, in front of a Jamaican journalist and a very respected Barbadian, he told me "No". I confirmed this by asking one of the permanent officials attending the Conference — I cannot remember his name now, but I know the gentleman quite well — if the Prime Minister had any objection, or was any objection taken to it, and he informed me "No". I then asked the B.B.C. if any

complaint had been made, and they said "No", but somebody who was present had gone to the Director of the Overseas Services and told him — and this person is no friend of mine, I can say that — that the Premier of Barbados and the Leader of the Opposition came into the B.B.C. Studio determined to make trouble for Tom Adams because Grantley Adams was his father.

4.35 p.m.

That was what I was told when I enquired at the B.B.C., and the person went on to say that if the Premier of Barbados is a person who cannot behave himself, he can do without any publicity in the B.B.C., as far as he was concerned. From that day — the Prime Minister can confirm it if he feels like — for nearly two years no B.B.C. reporter ever went to interview the Prime Minister. Let him check his records if he really feels he has some complaint. He has come into the House and said that I was sent away from the B.B.C. Five months before that incident, I gave the B.B.C. six months' notice to leave. I took marriage leave and said I was getting married and leaving to go back to Barbados, and I have in writing a copy of the letter and a copy of the letter from the Personnel Officer in return; yet I heard the Prime Minister with my own ears say in the Fairchild Street Market how I was fired from the B.B.C. I solicited a letter from the Director of the Overseas Service which was headlined in "The Beacon" "Barrow Proved a Liar again." and he could not even sue for libel because he knew it was false. That is the kind of thing, Mr. Chairman, we have to deal with in this world when we deal with the hon. senior member for St. John.

He talked about not falling out. Members of his Cabinet may not feel like using the words "falling out", but there is not a Government Minister who can honestly get up and say that there has never been a quarrel between the Prime Minister and some of his Ministers in Cabinet, that they have never disagreed about policy and falling out about policy, and, with the incident of the appointment of the General Manager of C.B.C., that there was not a deep and profound disagreement in Cabinet. Mr. Chairman, let us use some commonsense. The Cabinet has favourites. There are some in the Cabinet who are Privy Councillors. I was surprised to hear you have some who are not, and it seems that the Government Ministers who are independent, who return to this House on the basis of the votes of the electorate are the very ones who are discriminated against, are the very ones who have to suffer, and the little pets, the little darlings are the ones who cannot stand up on a platform in their own rights and say "Give me a vote". They are the little "scared-in-the-pants" who, when they are invited to run, say that they are not ready for it yet. They are ready for the Ministerial salary, but not ready for the responsibility of recommending themselves to the electorate. They want the Ministerial plums and status in Cabinet; they want to see people who have been in politics for twenty years and upwards fighting all the time; they want to see them placed below the salt while they are exalted to the seats of the mighty, and that is why the Prime Minister made the exhibition of himself that he made today. That is why he

is angry because he does not want to be reminded of a disagreement with one of his own darling boys. He would not mind if you spoke about a disagreement between himself and the Minister of Health. His attitude towards the Minister of Health is an open secret at election time and otherwise, but his attitude towards the Human Rights of members of this Honourable House and of his own Cabinet leaves a great deal to be desired.

Mr. Chairman, I am not asking anybody else to vote against Human Rights Week, but, truthfully, having seen the attitude of the Prime Minister towards what we understand by Human Rights and freedom of the Press, it leaves much to be desired. He attacks the Press every week. If something appears in the Press that the Prime Minister feels does not worship the great god "Dipper" sufficiently, he wants to punish the newspaper as if it is some errant child. Right here, Mr. Chairman, he does not like something a member is saying, and he comes in and tells you that all you have to do is to tell him to withdraw. Clean shaven, deaf evidently — and I have already withdrawn the word "mad"; so I would not repeat it — he comes in and tells the Chairman *pro tem* that all he has to do is to tell a member to withdraw. Mr. Chairman, is that not another way of saying, "jump, boy, jump"? That shows you how much respect he has for the Human Rights involved with the members of this Honourable House.

Mr. Chairman, when you compare the Prime Minister with Hitler, you are in fact inflating the Prime Minister a great deal, because you are blowing up the Prime Minister into a position which he really cannot occupy. In this country the Opposition yet have the love of the people and whatever his wishes may be in this matter of Human Rights politically and otherwise, there are yet a few of us which democracy, which he attacks in here when he talks about the people who get elected and so on, has put in here in sufficient numbers and strength to prevent democracy itself being destroyed in Barbados.

I ask all hon. members since we are talking about Human Rights — and the Minister of Agriculture wants to know what it has to do with this Resolution — whether they would not be observing Human Rights better by making an effort once and for all to shake this incubus off all our backs and get rid of the particular Prime Minister with whom we have to deal today. There is not anybody in here, Mr. Chairman, not the Leader of the House, not the Minister of Health, not even the Minister of Trade who carries loyalty perhaps to an extreme that is actually dangerous in politics, not the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister of Communications and Works or either of the Parliamentary Secretaries who could believe that we were seeing a parliamentary performance of the Prime Minister at midday today suitable for this Honourable Chamber. Nobody could defend his behaviour towards you, Sir, never mind his behaviour towards me, because he is accustomed to cursing me. Nobody could defend his behaviour towards the Rules of the House. There was never a more opportune overseas call than that which took him away.

Mr. Chairman, when we first came into the House, we used to complain that the Prime Minister was not here, because after all the Standing Orders say that all members shall attend the House. Then there was a stage at which, I understand, it was suggested to the Prime Minister that the business of the House would be done expeditiously if he did not attend. That is true too, Mr. Chairman; but the real reason why I think all of us will be glad to see his back is that the business of the House can be done more decorously and more decently when he is not here. The Leader of the House and the Leader of the Opposition quarrel from time to time, but we never have the exhibitions in here that we have when the Prime Minister is in the House, and particularly when the Chairman of Committees is in the Chair. We never have the exhibitions that disgrace this House to quite the same degree when the Prime Minister is absent, and Mr. Chairman, it cannot be all our fault. We know it is not our fault, but I make that statement and I offer that sentence for thought to members on the other side who are all too willing to say that the Opposition does not want them to get through, that we are filibustering and so on. It may well be that we have only passed two and are now three quarters of the way through another Resolution, but we are going to finish the business of the House today, and we have not gone on today in any spirit other than the spirit of getting the people's business done. The only moment when vile rancour entered this House was the little exchange at midday today or in the early afternoon — I have forgotten the exact hour — during the period when the Prime Minister emerged from the recesses of the woodwork and came in here to say that no member must say he has ever fallen out with a fellow Cabinet Minister. 4.45 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to see that a Barbadian student can get a grant of \$2,400 but I would be equally glad if the Minister of Health and Community Development will tell us exactly where this enabling grant will be spent. Is it a grant for some Sociologist student to go to Cave Hill or something like that? Is it a one-year course of study or is it intended to be a permanent thing or just something to mark this particular occasion in 1968, a Human Rights Scholarship or whatever it is?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition did request certain information in connection with this Human Rights year and I think I can give him some information now. As far as the observance of 1968 as being the international year for Human Rights, that was agreed on sometime ago. There were several meetings held in this connection. There was a Committee appointed by the Cabinet, of which I was Chairman, the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Health and Community Development; the Attorney General; our representative the Social Welfare Officer; the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Education; the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of External Affairs; the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Agriculture, Labour and National Insurance; the Chief Labour Officer; the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union;

the President of the Civil Service Association; the Chief Probation Officer; the President of the Y.W.C.A.; the President of the Y.M.C.A.; representatives of Youth Town; representatives of the Centre for Multi-racial Studies and representatives of Christian Social Councils. After about three or four meetings, it was agreed that these proposals should be put up to the Cabinet, which were finally approved. The first was the designation of the week beginning on the 8th December, 1968, as Human Rights week, and the arrangement of a programme of activities during the week as this Government's contribution towards the observance of Human Rights year. The twentieth anniversary of the Declaration of Human Rights will be celebrated on the 10th December, 1968.

The second thing agreed to was the issue of special messages to the local news media by the Head of State and/or the Head of the Government to mark the opening of the week. Thirdly, the issue of special prayers by the Lord Bishop to be used in Churches and schools throughout the Island during Human Rights week; fourthly, the promotion of talks and lectures on the subject of Human Rights at schools and in the Youth Organizations by the Ministry of Education and the Social Welfare Department respectively; (5), an effort on the part of the Ministry of External Affairs to have as many conventions and treaties as were practicable ratified and mention of those ratified to be made in the messages of the Head of State and/or Head of the Government; (6), liaison between the Human Rights Committee and the Independence Celebrations Committee in view of the proximity of the two events; (7), the designation of the Trades Training Centre as the project to commemorate Human Rights; (8), the publicity of the fact that the Centre for Multi-racial Studies was set up in Human Rights year in submission to a request of the Centre to explore the possibility of unveiling the plaque of Martin Luther King during Human Rights week; (9) an Enabling Grant of an amount appropriate and reasonable to celebrate Human Rights of, say, \$2,400 from public funds to a Barbadian student abroad, preferably in the field of Sociology. That is the Resolution with which we are now dealing; (10) the submission of a request from the Hon. Leader of the House to convene a Special Meeting of the House on the 10th December, 1968, which is the 20th anniversary of the Declaration of Human Rights and to pass an appropriate Resolution; (11) the issue of the Human Rights postal stamp already approved by Cabinet, if possible, during Human Rights week; (12) liaison between the Social Welfare Department and the Government Information Service with a view to acquiring information on Human Rights year from the U.S. Information Office and other sources for subsequent circulation to the public through the press, radio and other media by means of pamphlets etc.; (13) the use of short talks or discussions on radio and on TV during Human Rights week and (14) the designation of a Youth Camp Site for the underprivileged youth of Barbados in Commemoration of Human Rights year.

That gives some idea of it. There are many other projects, but the fact remains that we wanted \$3,000 in order to carry out the programme - That amount is very slight and trivial, and with this \$3,000 we will not be able to carry through what we have planned. There are other things which have been agreed to, which will cost money, but this is the main thing that we want at this stage. I am asking, therefore, that this initial amount be granted and approved by the House in order to enable us to get off the ground and get things moving.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I thought that even at this late hour some reference would have been made, especially when the Hon. Minister was reading out the names of the Committee, of the intention of the Government - this is a suggestion I am putting to them - to at least consult the Opposition with regard to some of their proposals. There was a long list called out of a Committee to make recommendations to the Government, but there was no member of the Opposition in it. Hon. members will pardon me if I have a sort of personal feeling, though I am not asking to be on any Committee. I was a delegate to the United Nations at that period - unfortunately, a British and not a West Indian delegate. I know how much was thought of the necessity of having the United Nations as a Body to make a charter of Human Rights. And to think that Barbados is telling the outside world: "We look upon it as a Party affair; we have not asked the Opposition anything" - I say nothing more. I repeat, I do not want to serve on anything. I want you, Sir, even to forget that I reminded you that I was there in the last three months of 1948; but as a Barbadian, I am appealing to you to forget me and let the outside world know that you are looking upon this as a national event and not a Democratic Labour Party event.

The question that Head 40 stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 48 - MINISTRY OF TRADE, TOURISM, CO-OPERATIVES AND FISHERIES

Head 48 - Ministry of Trade, Tourism, Co-operatives and Fisheries was called.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, there are several bays along the coast of the eight parishes bordering the sea which are operating fishing fleets, and in some of these bays there are fish sheds and shelters for the disposal of fish.
4.55 p.m.

At these sheds old fishermen are usually given jobs such as cleaning the place and keeping accounts of the fish coming into the sheds. They have been given what I would term a token payment for these services, but during the period of the wage increase these unfortunate people did not receive any increase. We are now asking for the sum of \$1,200 to increase the payment of those who were getting \$10 to \$20, and those who were getting \$13 to \$25 respectively. These sheds are used during the peak of the fishing season -

from the months of November to June in each year. I now beg to move that Head 48 stand part.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I just want the Minister to realise that the keeping of records at these fish sheds amounts to what is called clerical work, and there is grave dissatisfaction amongst those caretakers at the present moment. I am sure that whilst the Minister is trying to do something to make it appear that he is giving them some sort of increase, it does not attempt to go half-way when we take into consideration the number of hours - at night particularly - that these people have to be on duty. I am asking the Minister to give this matter a second look.

There are eight parishes which, the Minister says, have these fish sheds, and there is definitely grave dissatisfaction amongst those people. Some of them have been to me personally and made complaints from time to time. I am surprised to find that the Minister is just giving them this sort of increase: from \$10 to \$20, and from \$13 to \$25. It is much more that these people are complaining of; their conditions of work ought to be improved, and I am urging upon the Minister to give these matters much more consideration than at the present moment, bearing in mind that we would do nothing at this stage to prevent the caretakers from getting the little increase that is now offered to them. It is not in keeping with the type of work that these people have to do. They have to keep proper records, so to speak, and they are expected to keep proper records; otherwise the scheme would not be worthwhile. If they have to do that type of work, they should be paid for it.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, the people employed in this type of business are usually old people who are practically too old to go fishing. Most of them are net-menders, and they carry out their occupation of knitting or mending nets while they are on the job, and this is just a means of giving people in the area a job. The only other alternative, if you are going to pay a high salary for the job, will be to dispose of them. Nobody wants to dispose of these old people. They have contributed something to the industry, and in their old age we should endeavour to help them.

With regard to the records, nobody in Barbados, regardless of who he may be, can tell me about any true and honest record being kept for fish, because this is a big joke to me. They move from one area into another market and the same records are made, Fish might come in at Paynes Bay and records are made, the hucksters take them to Eagle Hall Market, then they go to the Bridgetown Market, and then the same amount of fish is being checked at three or four markets. As Minister of Fisheries, this is only a joke to me. The main reason why I have asked for this amount is to enable them to have a higher standard of living. If you were to enforce the point where true records had to be kept and tickets had to be passed, then they would be incompetent to do that type of job.

I repeat that these people have done something for the industry, and in their old age I would rather see them earn a small pittance than nothing at all. That is the reason I have asked for an increase from \$10 to \$20, and \$13 to \$25 respectively which I consider to be a reasonable percentage of an increase. The very people who are receiving it are only too glad to get the money. They have asked me about it for quite a while, and the matter has taken some time to be dealt with. I agree that it is a small amount if you look at it from your point of view, but other things have to be taken into consideration. If you make it a clerical job, then it will not fall into the hands of those people. It is nothing strenuous; they knit their nets; get a bit of fish and so on. Some of them might own a boat, and, in any case, if you did not pay them, they would still spend the same hours in the same market.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I am not concerned with whether these men play a game of cards, knit nets and so on. We have seen here that the Minister has found it necessary to give these workers 100% increase. Does that not tell us something? If it is a case where the Minister feels that in these eight parishes where they have these fish sheds there are eight or one dozen fishermen who are not now able to work but have contributed something to the industry, we are willing on this side of the House, if they deserve it, to give them some sort of a gratuity or pension. But the Minister has told us that their keeping of records is a mere joke, and he, as a Minister, has no confidence in the records they keep. Why pay \$20 a month to a person to keep records that the Minister himself has no confidence in? He is making a joke of the whole industry.

Sir, we do not want to deny these persons of anything. The Minister has not denied that they are capable of doing the job, because as proof that they are capable of doing it, he is paying them twice the amount they have been paid in the past. You do not double the salaries of inefficient people! What we are saying is that if records are to be kept - I feel that the Statistical Department depends in some respect on these records.

5.05 p.m.

If the Minister is now saying that he is just obliging a few retired fishermen, but as to the records he has no confidence in them, I am saying that he is making a mockery of the fishing industry, and that is not good enough. If the records are fit to be kept at all, they should be kept by competent people. The present employees of whom the Minister speaks are competent people according to his recommendation here today, and all he is saying is to pay them adequate salaries. He should insist that they keep proper records, because the keeping of records is very valuable to the fishing industry and to many other subsidiary industries as well in Barbados; so do not let us have these false records. Why pay \$25 a month for keeping false records? It would pay you better to give each man \$50 or \$100 and tell him to go home, and pay somebody an adequate salary to keep proper

records which can be of benefit to you as the years go by.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to speak in any way condemnatory of the purpose of this Head, but I would like to draw to the attention of the Minister one or two incidents that have occurred, and such incidents are repeating themselves just too often at the fish markets. Everyone in Barbados today is actually crying out for the high cost of living, and we know that in this country we depend on consumer goods, whether they are things we eat or use otherwise from foreign countries, and we are often reminded that we should appreciate local goods. We are told to buy local food, and indeed when it comes to fresh food, we have to depend on Barbadian crops and, of course, Barbadian fresh fish. As a citizen I too have to pay the increased price of goods, and I am expected to buy local and to appreciate local industries. I realise that this Government and the Government that preceded this one have done a lot to assist the fishing industry, and are doing a lot that the fishing industry must survive. All that I appreciate; but complaints reach me now too often about the treatment the average Barbadian customer receives when he goes to a fish market. Most kinds of fish are scheduled. The ordinary housewife goes to market hoping to buy goods at the scheduled price. The fish are exposed for sale at a public market; yet that housewife has on too many occasions in order to get fish for the home and family to buy this fish from hawkers who sell fish at their particular price, which is in the majority of instances far above the scheduled price.

I am not blaming the Government for this, but I am drawing it to the Government's attention that in order that the ordinary man in Barbados can get this commodity, something should be done. I am not concerned with the Canadian tourist or the big hotel proprietors. The fish is caught in Barbadian waters by fishermen who own boats that are subsidised by Government. It is an enabling industry in which loans are given to fishermen; if that has stopped now, it is news to me; but whether the loans have ceased to operate or not, the fact of the matter is that the Barbadian consumer must be protected from another Barbadian. We are not now fighting against the "Big Six"; we are fighting against some of our own people who are avaricious and greedy; and wherever something goes wrong, if one of our own is responsible for that thing going wrong, we still have to raise our voice in condemnation of that evil, and somebody has got to be bold enough to do it.

I know a man in Speightstown, and I am going to call his name. He is a bus driver by the name of Mr. Rowe. Whenever Mr. Rowe goes to the Speightstown fish market, he cannot buy a fish. Whenever Mr. Rowe goes to the market, he summons a Police on the spot. (A VOICE: Is he a pimp?) Mr. Rowe is no pimp; he is a self-respecting citizen; but whenever he tries to enlist the aid of the Police to try to represent him to see that he is not charged a price above what he should pay according to the Schedule, he is

denied the purchase of fish. Mr. Rowe himself made that report to me, and I understand that in many instances the Police condone such action on the part of the hawkers. These are the in-betweens; they are not fishermen. They buy the fish and right on the market step, under the market roof, they sell at contraband prices. This should stop. What is the use of saying that the big Six mulch us and then the poor fellow must mulch us too? I have my own experiences. I went to buy some turtle, and the turtle seller told me that so many pounds are engaged. I asked him whether he was operating under a seller's licence in a public market, and if as a customer presenting myself he was telling me that all was engaged? I asked him to tell me what was not engaged. I am John Citizen, like anybody else, when I want to buy fish or anything else. I went for a policeman who insisted that the seller tell him how many pounds were engaged, and although some of that turtle was not engaged, that seller refused to sell. This thing has to come to an end. There must be better supervision at the public fish markets; otherwise the Barbadian consumer is not going to get fish that has been caught in waters around this country. I know we get deep sea fish now that are sold in the supermarkets in Speightstown, and I have got a better chance of going to Elmer's and getting fish than Speightstown. This is a case where you get the poor oppressing the poor. A wrong is wrong no matter who commits it, and it is high time that the Government should step in and see to it that the Barbadian public is protected. I am not particularly concerned with the hotel proprietor who is going to feed the tourists, and the tourists must be fed. I have been a tourist and I have been fed — and properly too; but I am saying that the Barbadian public must not be denied the right to buy fish because somebody else higher up and better off than himself can pay a better price. That is what I have to inform the Government about and it is time that steps should be taken about it. If we lament the cost of living, if we cry out against it, we must remember that all of it does not come here to us; some of it we impose ourselves.

5.15 p.m.

Fish is not the only line or commodity which is produced in or around Barbados of which I could make a similar complaint. It is high time that the Government step in and see that there is proper supervision at fish markets and that these scheduled prices are being adhered to. It is said that it is useless calling the Police because they know how to get their contraband fish, and they take no steps to bring the culprits to justice. Somebody has to step in; somebody has to make things right; and I am raising my voice this afternoon in this committee in order that the Government will be well informed that things are not going so well for public buyers at public fish markets. I believe that this happens not only at the Speightstown fish market; I believe that this happens all over the Island of Barbados. The Government is getting blamed for it unjustifiably. Some of the "in between", they do not cart fish; they do not own fishing boats; but they sell fish, and they see to it that they profiteer at the expense of the Barbadian who does not belong to the wealthy class. I know that people who are living

in Church Street Gardens, Sand Street and Queen Street, poor people, cannot go to the Speightstown market and hope to get fish; unless they have a relative who is a fisherman, they cannot get it. Somebody comes down in a motor car, the fish is there and these poor people are told: "Oh, no! These are for Mr. So-and-So." Let us stop this reservation of purchasing; it must be done away with and the police must do the job and not be satisfied that they are being accused of getting their fish through the back door and so they are not taking any steps to remedy this wrong.

Mr. Chairman, I intended to raise my voice against this state of affairs for some time now, and I think that this is the appropriate time to bring it to the attention of the Minister. The Government must see to it that these poor purchasers are defended and that they can buy fish at the scheduled prices. There must be a way to control this thing. It is a bad thing to deprive your own people of a commodity that is found in our waters, brought to our beaches and protected by this Government. The Government spends money on public markets. I understand that there is a beach price and a market price, but I am talking about when the fish comes into the market to be seen and exposed for sale, and yet the public the poor members of the community, are denied the purchase of this item. Mr. Chairman, I hope I have brought this matter forcibly enough to the attention of the appropriate Ministers and that steps will soon be taken to remedy this wrong.

Mr. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, for some time now I have held the view that many people in Barbados really misunderstand the whole situation about the fish industry. The hon. senior member for St. Peter has just spoken of the exploitation of the consumers which exist. I take it that he means that this exploitation comes from a small section of the people who make their living by the fishing trade, and not from the fisherman or the boat owners themselves. This is the only commodity which is on sale in Barbados, which is tied within a schedule and at the same time there is no minimum level below which the prices cannot fall. I am sure, Sir, that if an overall average is taken of the price of fish throughout the year in Barbados, you will find that it is less than the scheduled price. Consumers like to talk about the period of time when they have to pay what they call black market prices for fish; but they do not like to talk about the period between January and May when they stand and wait and say: "We are not paying, the later it gets" They are waiting until the price has dropped to a penny.

This is a situation which one needs to have a careful study of and to have a plan for the whole industry before one can say lightly that the fault lies here or there. As far as the hawkers are concerned, no doubt, they have to make a margin upon what they pay for the commodity: and out of season, I do not care what laws you have, when the fish is scarce, the fishermen in Barbados will charge more than the price set out in the schedule, because when they are in plentiful supply, there is no minimum price below

which they have to sell. That is the problem. In addition to this, people fail to realise that within the last year and this year in particular, the price of paint, the price of fishing tackle and the price of all the things that you need has gone up. The price of paint has gone up, never mind that it is manufactured here. The paint dealers in Barbados are putting up their price because they say that, as a result of devaluation, the price of raw material has gone up for them. It is either that we will have the free play of competition and no price schedule, or we will have a minimum price in periods of glut. At this stage, I would ask the Government to consider — I have been trying to check it and I am not sure what the position is as to whether there is a duty paid on fishing tackle in Barbados or not. There is some doubt about that. (MEMBERS: It is free) It is free, but they still have to pay Package Tax. I feel myself that, in view of the fact that prices have risen and you are not raising the scheduled price — I asked a question about this some time ago and the Government said that, as a matter of policy, they were not going to raise the scheduled price. But, let them consider that the cost of bringing fish to Barbados has risen in the last year in particular, because of the fact that the cost of maintaining the boats has risen.

I agree with my colleague that there is a very small section of so-called hucksters who will exploit the market, whatever the situation is. Out of season they will exploit the consumer; but in season when there is a glut, they do not exploit the consumer; they exploit the fishermen who catch the fish. That is the position.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I spoke specifically about the hucksters, the "in between" men and women who deny the selling of fish to Mr. "A" and will sell them to Mr. "B" because Mr. "B" is paying more for them. Wherever that happens, whenever that happens, however that happens, it is wrong. Nobody could defend that in here or anywhere else. If it is that the scheduled prices are too low, then let the Government investigate that. If it is because there is a glut on the market you can sell too far below the schedule price, let the Government investigate that; but, I say or ask, what is the use of our complaining about imported foods, the prices that are handed down to us for products that are brought here on the labour of people from foreign countries, and right here in your own backyard, you have your own people fleecing your own poor people and discriminating? The discriminatory practice is what I want to talk about and to emphasise. No member of the Barbados public who is going into a public market, whether it be a fish market or otherwise, should be discriminated against in favour of anybody else. The Government should go into that, and that is just what I am emphasizing.

5.25 p.m.

The other matters should be investigated; see what they can find, and make matters right; but this matter has to be made right; otherwise you are going to have some very bad scenes at the fish markets. I am not blaming the fishermen for this; I am talking

about the fish vendors. I am not saying all of them, but if there is a single vendor he should be made to understand that he cannot do this sort of thing in this community. There are more than one.

Mr. HINDS: I want to make one small point, Mr. Chairman, and it arises out of what the Hon. Minister has said with regard to these retired fishermen knitting nets on the job. I would suggest to the Minister that the same \$25 or \$20 a month he intends paying now, he should certainly make use of the retired fishermen by sending them to some of the schools in this Island to teach children the art of knitting nets. There is a definite need for nets. Rather than having them idle, or keeping bad records, he should pay people to keep proper records, and give the fishermen an opportunity to go to the schools and spend two or three hours instructing the boys and girls in the art of knitting these nets. I am sure it will pay off in the long run, because the children could knit nets in their spare time and earn a few extra dollars. I am sure that there is a market for sprat nets and so on.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. senior member for Christ Church has quite a full grasp of the fishing industry in Barbados. One would often wonder, as he has stated, why a commodity that is controlled could drop from the Scheduled price to 1d and possibly 3¢ — I refer to things like flying fish in the peak of the season. It is a matter of supply and demand.

Now, the poor fishermen get the blame for everything that is going on. So long as it is fish, the blame is put on the fishermen. The senior hon. member for St. Peter has stated that something should be done to control the price of fish sold in markets. That is a matter for the Police that we have put in some of these fish markets to check not only on the price of fish, but to see that the people are getting their weights. This is something that is worse than high prices. If you buy four pounds of fish, when you get home if you have three pounds, you are lucky. The Government has put scales in the market to ensure that people get their just weights, but the very people will not give evidence to support the Police when anybody is caught acting dishonestly. Some people say that, if they do not pay for the fish, they will not get any again. That is the position. Some members of the public say that they want fish, and they are not poking their heads out to be scapegoats for anybody else. That is the problem.

Now, I am in a very queer position when I consider the prices of other commodities and compare them with the price of fish. The cost of ship-carpentry today is more than what it was two or three years ago. As the hon. senior Member for Christ Church has stated, the price of gear has gone up, paint has gone up, and the operating cost for boats is practically impossible. It is practically impossible, today, for a boat to operate. This is, actually, no fault of ours, because one of the things that has happened in the industry is that Barbados did not build a fishing industry; it built a very bad boat industry, and this is the

whole problem. It amortised something over a period when the men could not pay back the money.

If I owned a supermarket and was selling to 600 people and thought that I was making money because I had lent X some money and he had paid me back well, and therefore, I turned around and lent Y and Z money to operate within the same area and the population had not increased, then the entire operation would be distributed among X, Y and Z, and that is what is ruining the fishing industry. The exploration between the men has not increased. They have the same area in which to operate as they had in the days of the old sailing boats.

I wrote in 1955 and 1956, because I saw this coming. I wrote an article stating that if a man operated an estate of 100 acres with 50 donkeys at \$10 each, and it was going to take him 5 trucks at \$5,000 each to do the same job, then he might as well stick to the donkeys. This is really what we have inherited — a bad industry. Fishermen today, are competing against themselves at high cost. In one year over 150 boats were built. The true benefits did not accrue to the fishermen themselves in this Island. Look at the records, and you will see that the average fisherman was required to get a boat before he could get an engine. The average fisherman in Bridgetown did not have a boat; therefore, he could not get a loan.

Prospective businessmen then came into the picture, monopolised things and made good in those days when money could be made from fishing. When the unfortunate fishermen came in, they came in groups. Some of them had a piece of land with canes, and they sold the canes and got money to assist them. If you will look at the records of the Government experimental boat, Investigator, you will see where the line was drawn when there was an economical factor of operation, but nobody paid any attention to it.

Sir, I was on the Committee, and I resigned because no advice anybody gave to the Fishery Officer was of any benefit. He was a master in engineering; he was a master in ship construction; he was a master in fishing; he was a Jack-of-all trades; he knew nothing about anything, and he domineered the whole thing; and that is why we are in this unfortunate position today. I make no apology to anybody today for this, but the fisherman must pay for it against everybody else!

Look at the price of pork! Pork had a scheduled price on it of 52¢ per pound. The scheduled price was taken off, and today you cannot buy it at less than 95¢ per pound. Despite the grumbling, fish is still cheap, and I accept the full responsibility and blame for the control price on it. I can say why. A commodity will be scheduled at 40¢ and can bring 70¢; but if you remove the scheduled price the sky would be the limit. Now, who are the people that must pay for this? When there is a scarcity of fish, you go to the fish market and you will see who are the people that pay

the high prices for it. The very poorest of the poor will pay for it. The pattern of fishing in Barbados is that we get a glut or nothing. You get a glut of fish and the price drops to 3¢ a piece.

5.35 p.m.

Those that are better off with refrigerators and other means store up a good supply of fish; therefore when the price increases, he returns to his refrigerator every day and pulls out fish at three cents a piece. The unfortunate man can only get a belly full in the glut period because he has nowhere to store them; so he is the man who must pay fourteen and sixteen cents each for fish. I accept full responsibility for it and I make no apologies to anybody for the schedule price. It is unfortunate that it is the unfortunate people who must pay dearly for it. I would say to anybody that I would resign my Ministry and go back to my profession before I lift the schedule price. What I ask them to do is to try and pay their insurance for the boats, because I would hate to have to come down on the little house of a man who has lost his boat. He should at least pay for it and keep the boat operating, because if a man abandons a boat and puts it on the beach, of course I would sell it, because it would be of no use to him or the public of Barbados, and therefore I would have it sold so that it could operate and contribute something to the community. It is an unfortunate position and there is nobody who would know more about it than I would know, and the hon. senior member for Christ Church can substantiate all I am saying. However, the poorer the man, the more he must pay for his fish because he has no means of storing any; so he can only get a belly full in the glut. When there is a glut you get people buying fish at various periods. For the man who must have his dinner at 5 o'clock, the servant will buy 4 o'clock fish, but after five or six o'clock the price drops because the other fellow does not care what time he gets, and the night fellow who wants to get a couple to roast and fry some for next day goes for his any time in the night, because he is standing by to get them at a penny each.

It is the wealthier man with facilities for storing that derives the greatest benefit; so if you take the schedule off, you are killing the person that needs the protection more than ever. The blame falls on the fishermen, but it is the fish hawkers that supply the hotels which can afford to pay all prices for fish. They are the people who in the hard periods when the fishermen are catching nothing will give him a little tip, a little grog, or something to buy lines; so he is in duty bound to turn over his fish to the people who supply him with lines. They in turn secure them and put them under the counter to go to the hotels. They have their privileged customers; so that is the pattern.

With the hon. junior member for Christ Church, I cannot quite understand where he is.

Mr. HINDS: To which member is the hon. member referring?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I am sorry, I mean the hon. junior member for St. Peter. I cannot understand

his stand in this. In one voice he has told me it is too low, and in another voice he says to give that fellow \$100 and send him home for good. I do not expect him to die within the first two weeks; otherwise he would be gaining something. But if he is to live for any length of time and went home with \$100 and with nothing else to go by, he could only live for four weeks at \$25; so he would be in a bad way.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, I am just inviting the Minister not to perpetuate the keeping of false records.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: With the pattern of the fishing industry in Barbados, you cannot keep any records. I want to be frank about this. This is nothing that I have instigated in Barbados. I can tell you better by guess where fish is being caught and around what parishes, and I can average better what is caught from my own records than any that can be supplied in this country. I know all the bays and I only have to go around and have a chat with the boys, and I would know more of what is going on than can be provided by records, because some fish is sold on the beach, some is sold by the hundred on the beach and never reach the market, and there are beaches where there are no records kept at all. An amount is sold on the wharf, as well as at Browne's Beach that never reach the market, and that is why I am saying it is a joke to talk about records. This is nothing this Government has instituted. This is what we inherited, and it is the same with the people at the little fish sheds. It was not the Democratic Labour Party that instituted this idea. It is a matter that as Minister of Fisheries I feel it is a hardship on these people, and the only thing I can do to relieve them is to seek to give them a little pittance more, and this is what I am doing. I have the greatest sympathy for them because I know what is in the industry.

Mr. Chairman, people ask why the fisherman cannot sell his fish in the same way that the fish seller does to make money. People do not realise that many of these men walk out of the theatre at night and get into their boats and do not come back in until 5 o'clock or 6 o'clock next evening. They do not work eight hours and then get time-and-a-half! The time-and-a-half they get is when they come in with nothing, and with wet shirts and hungry bellies have to go back out and toil for the next day. They can put in twenty hours a day for nothing. Very often after such long period they have not got enough to buy a pack of cigarettes. People do not understand how they operate. When they come in they are only too glad to turn over their catch and try and get home to get a little sleep so that by 10 o'clock or 11 o'clock they can be off again.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the long explanation which the Hon. Minister gave, but I want this to go on record. The Minister has not replied to me. I had no word to say against the fishermen or the boat owner. The burden of my contention was certain discriminatory practices that I brought before this House in relation to the ordinary

purchaser being discriminated against by the fish vendor at the public market. I said that this state of affairs should cease.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I did not accuse the hon. senior member for St. Peter of accusing the fishermen. This is one of the reasons why I said that most of the fish are sold by fish vendors who collect the fish for hotels and various persons, and I say it is unfortunate that the poor fishermen are accused. The public in general throws the blame on the fisherman, but the hon. member has stated that it is the fish seller who would discriminate. What I was drawing forcibly to the hon. member is that if a person calls the Police, he would never be able to get fish again, not only from that particular person, but from any of them. If there are fifty persons in the market and you get a bad name from having notified the Police or created a problem for them, you would have to eat your money; you could not even buy a sprat. The only time you could get something was when fish was plentiful; but as long as the demand is greater than the supply, you were not going to get any. You would be taboo. This is done in all markets.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, am I to understand that the stage is now reached that a certain type of buyer of fish must forever be satisfied to face a situation where he can be discriminated against when he offers to buy fish at the normal scheduled price at a public fish market? Is this state of affairs one that cannot be remedied? Am I to understand from the Minister that the situation is a hopeless one now and for all time? Am I to be given that assurance?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, I have mentioned that this is a matter for the Police or Price Control people when hawkers sell commodities above the scheduled price, and the Government, not only to keep prices under control, but to keep weights under control have installed scales in the fish markets that people can buy and make sure in the presence of the Police or Market Constables that they have their due weight, because the big cry in this country is not only paying high prices, but high prices for short weight.

Mr. HUSBANDS: May I ask if it is a function of the Market Constable to see to it that prospective buyers will not only be safeguarded when it comes to getting their due weight, but also that they would be safeguarded against buying from rash and avaricious vendors at prices far above the schedule?

5.45 p.m.

In other words, could not the Market Constable have greater powers granted to him in order that he may protect the buying public? Is that hopeless? Can we not have a little imagination when it comes to defending our own people? Must we sit supinely by and say that this condition is irremediable, that nothing can be done about it, and give up in despair? I think that we have more brains and imagination than to be-

lieve that this is irrevocable, that we have to sit under it and we can never hope that there will be some improvement. Is the fish vendor such a powerful man in this community that he can hold up the buying public to ransom? Must we be satisfied with that?

The question that Head 48 stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

ANNEXED ESTIMATES - POST OFFICE

Annexed Estimates - Post Office - was called.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Annexed Estimates - Post Office - stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I would like to find out this from the Hon. Minister. In view of the fact that the Post Office has vehicles and I see them with vans too, I would like to ask if it is cheaper to continue to do the country work by contract or if it would not be cheaper for them to own their own vehicles. I could understand if they did not have any vehicles at all, but they have a certain number of vehicles. What is the reason for their keeping a number of vehicles and contracting the other work?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: As far as I know, the Post Office has no vans. The Post Office has one or two trucks, and these are for bringing the mail down here. This is something which has been going on for quite a long time. I have often wondered about it myself, but, on reflection, I think that the set-up might be a better one. The work is done by contract, and the Contractor seems to be doing the job pretty well. It has been done so for quite some time. Of course, this does not mean that the matter cannot be looked into, but, at the moment, I think that the operation of doing the work by contract is much better than if the Government owned these vans themselves.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister on what basis is this amount arrived at. Five years is a long time. Is there any sliding scale? Suppose the contractors or the contractees say that the price of gasoline has gone up and the price of tyres has gone up, wages have gone up and the contract is not paying! Would you pay them more?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: According to the Agreement, there is a Clause which says, just as you have a contract for building - the people say that this contract is for so much and so much according to the price then. If the prices go up, we have to agree to pay accordingly. If the price of machinery that we order from England goes up, we have to pay for it because we want it. The same thing goes with the contract. If the contractor comes in with an unreasonable demand, by all means we say "No", and we go to arbitration. If the contractor can bring specific reasons showing that the price of accessories has gone up, the price of gasoline has gone up, the

Barbados Workers' Union is asking for more wages, and so on, and he has to pay more wages, that is in the Agreement.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I do not wish for a moment to be misunderstood. I am not pleading their cause, far from it. I am strongly objecting to making a contract for five years; it is too far ahead for any Government contract.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, the reason for this is simple. It would be unfair to ask a man to put himself to all of this expense in acquiring all these vehicles, getting people to drive them and just giving him a one-year contract. That is ridiculous. After all, he is not sure that he can recoup his losses. This is something like running a newspaper. There is no newspaper which has ever started off and made money in the first six months. You must start off operating in the red. After six months, you will notice that you are still operating in the red, but the red is becoming pink and, as you go on, you start making money. The same thing happens with these people. I do not think that they really make any money for the first year. It is by having the contract over a period of years that they see where they can cut and pinch here and there. They really do not make this big amount of profit. This is one of these fancy things that people want to ingratiate themselves with the Government, so that later on when something bigger comes up, they can say: "I have been doing so-and-so; I gave my services and therefore I am expecting to get this for so-and-so". That is all it is.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am asking the Minister whether the cost of running such vans as the Post Office has made him feel that they should not continue with that system. After all, what is the good of preaching that you are a Socialist and then go out to private enterprise at every conceivable moment! I am choosing my language very carefully; I am not just making a platform speech or anything of the sort. If it is worthwhile keeping such vans as we have now, is it not worthwhile to get more vans and not give anything out on private contract?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I find that politics really gets one into some funny positions. Here it is, this is something which the Democratic Labour Party came and found being initiated either by the Barbados Labour Party, or the Party which was in power before. This is something which has been going on from the time that we had a Post Office; but the Leader of the Opposition, who was the Leader of the Government for over seventeen years, is now asking me if I do not think that this could be done better. Why did he not think that it could have been done better when he held the Portfolio? Of course, he had the Portfolio, but he did not know what was going on in his Ministry. It is only now that you are getting Ministers who know what is going on in their Ministries. I hear people talking about Permanent Secretaries running the Ministries, but that is a big joke. No Permanent Secretary can run any Ministry for anybody on this side of the Government. All of us run our Ministries; in fact, they say that we run

them with an iron hand, but I do not mind that, as long as I get things done for the people. The point is that this thing has been going on for the last - God in Heaven knows how long. They themselves discovered that it was more economical to do it in this way. I am only carrying on what I came and found, but the Leader of the Opposition, who said that he was representing the people of Barbados for the last twenty years, does not know this until now that I am the Minister of Communications and Works! Do you mean to say that I am the first Minister that Barbados ever had? It is true that I am the first real Minister of Communications and Works, the first real Minister apart from the two hon. members here. With the Barbados Labour Party you did not really have any Minister, because they had two Ministers representing St. Thomas and they did not have any light in Porey Spring, but I went and got light in Porey Spring for the people

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I asked the Hon. Minister a question and I do not think that he has answered me. The Minister is now patting himself on the back and says that the only Minister which the Government had was himself. I wonder how he thinks that that sounds! He is talking about the last Government doing this and he is only carry on where we left off. This is what the Note says: "The Yellow Transport Co., Limited was awarded a contract on 16th March, 1968, for the conveyance of mails between the General Post Office and District Post Offices for a period of five years from 1st April, 1968, to March, 1973, at the rate of \$21,500 per annum.

The provision of \$18,000 will therefore be inadequate to meet expenditure in respect of the conveyance of Inland Mails to the end of the current financial year, and supplementary provision of \$3,600,00 is required to fulfil the conditions of the new contract."

5.55 p.m.

I take it now that this is an increase. They have awarded the contract for more money. That is how I understand it from the Addendum. It would appear that the last contractor did not make money; he gave it up, or he did not want it, or the present one tendered for more and the Tenders Committee gave it to the person who tendered for the most. You are asking now for more money to fulfil the contract. You have awarded a new contract for more money. I would like to know if the last contractor tendered for the contract, if it was taken from him, or if the new contractor got it because he was a nice boy friend or something of the sort. It is now my duty to ask these questions, because you are asking for an increase of \$3,600.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, according to what I have on the file, this was the Tender Notice that went out in the Barbados Advocate and the Daily News:

"Tenders are invited for the conveyance of mail by motor transport, from the District Post Offices to the General Post Office and for a return service

from the General Post Office to the aforesaid District Post Offices. The conveyance of mail will not be required on Sundays and Public Holidays.

2. The successful Tenderer will have to provide suitable vehicles (containing locked Posting Boxes) to the satisfaction of the Post Master General for the exclusive use of the Post Office. The vehicles must be closed and have bodies of the following dimensions - 5ft 10 inches long; 4 ft. wide; 4 ft. 2 inches high (approximately 97 cubic feet in capacity).

3. Four vehicles will normally be in use, but two extra vehicles must be supplied for use in emergencies, or during the Christmas season, or for the conveyance of supplementary mails. The vehicles must be painted with the prescribed Post Office red enamel and suitably lettered in black paint "POST OFFICE MAILS" with the crown immediately after these words."

This is the Tender Notice that went out. Formerly Robert Thom. Ltd., used to do the work, but I do not know what happened. I know that they were not too keen in carrying on; I do not know whether it was due to the fact that they had sold out. Anyway, Yellow Transport Co. Ltd., showed interest and submitted a tender for the work. Their tender was cheaper at the time than what Robert Thom Ltd., had been doing the job for, and that is how Yellow Transport Co. Ltd., got the work.

The hon. member asked whether somebody got the contract because he was somebody's friend, and I want to make things explicitly clear on the floor of this House. When tenders are advertised, such as these have been advertised, the Minister has absolutely no say in the matter until the Tenders Committee makes a decision and submits it to the Minister who would then agree with the decision of the Committee. If he does not agree with it, he has to take the matter to the Cabinet and he must have an extremely good reason why he is going against the decision of the Tenders Committee. Do not let anybody fool himself that a Minister can pass on something to his friend because he can go at his home and drink rum. This is done strictly above-board.

If people want to question the Tenders Committee, that is a matter for them. It has absolutely nothing to do with me or with any Minister for that matter. I do not even know who are the members of the Tenders Committee. I may know some of them. The Tenders Committee makes a decision after going through things with a fine-tooth comb; the matter is then submitted to the Ministry responsible for the Notice; the Permanent Secretary and Assistant Secretary will go through it with another fine-tooth comb to see if there is any discrepancy, and the matter is then submitted to the Minister for acceptance. If the Minister does not want to accept the decision, he must have extremely good reasons to take the matter to the Cabinet. He cannot go to the Cabinet with any tomfoolery, because it would not be accepted.

Do not let anybody in here try to mislead people by saying that a Minister can give a contract to his friend. As a matter of fact, I only knew that the Yellow Transport Co. Ltd. was run by Hunte by the way. I do not know if there is anything else the hon. member wants to know.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, it would appear that the hon. Minister wants to tell me something that I did not ask for. I have not accused any Minister or anybody, because I know how things are being done.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member will give way, I would like to clarify a point. The hon. member said that he wanted to know how this contract was given to the Yellow Transport Co. Ltd., and whether somebody gave the contract to his friend. That is why I got up and made things explicitly clear.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, you have the Tenders Committee. Are you telling me that the members of the Tenders Committee do not have friends? I have not accused the Minister of having a friend or anything of the sort. It is my right to ask questions. Since you do not want me to ask questions, I now want to know what was Robert Thom's tender and what was the Yellow Transport's tender. You should be in a position to tell me the amount each person tendered for. Since you are casting aspersions at me, and you want people to think that I am doubting you, you will have to answer what I want to know. I did not accuse you of giving any friend a particular contract, because I know, if you had it in your power to give out the contract, who would get it, and it would not be Yellow Transport.

Mr. Chairman, I want to know what Robert Thom tendered for the contract; what Yellow Transport tendered for the contract; and what other people tendered for the contract. If I were a Minister and a member of the Opposition asked me for that information, I would have given it to him without getting angry.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is for the conveyance of inland mail. I wonder if the Minister can tell us the reason for a post box at Vauxhall, Christ Church, being marked "U.S. Mail". It tells the hours when it should be cleared like all other post boxes. I went there and saw it with my own eyes.
6.05 p.m.

I went there and saw it myself and I photographed it.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I have warned the hon. member on several occasions about this kind of nonsense. Here it is: he goes to Vauxhall and sees a postbox marked "U.S. Mail". It is his duty to ask me then when I would be able to get the information; but he comes to the House and asks me now. To tell the truth, I do not know why it should be marked "U.S. Mail".

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, I went to Vauxhall, Christ Church, about 11 o'clock one night. Should I have asked him then?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I do not want to know what time he was in Vauxhall or what he was doing up there. Are you sure you were just going to look at the postbox? There are a lot of cart roads in Vauxhall! Why did the hon. member not call me the next day and ask about this? I do not know about a postbox being marked "U.S. Mail" unless some vandal painted that on it.

Mr. HINDS: It is imprinted on the plate.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: The Postmaster General is not in here, but I will find out and tell the hon. member. I do not see why a postbox in Barbados should be marked "U.S. Mail", because, as far as I know, the letter boxes are made specifically in England and that is why they cost so much money, and when they come here they have to be erected under a Post Office Act. Exactly where is this located? And is it M-A-I-L or M-A-L-E? I will have to go and see for myself.

In reply to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph there were two tenders, one from the Courtesy Garage Ltd. for \$24,000 and one from Yellow Transport for \$21,600, and the contract, as I said before, was awarded to Yellow Transport.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, some time ago I asked a question about a ten cent stamp. It seems that the Ministry of Communications, when they see questions coming from the senior member for St. Thomas, even though they know they are well-founded, believe they are pleasing the Minister by submitting for his consideration oblique, evasive or otherwise unsatisfactory answers. The Minister knows quite well, Mr. Chairman, that a ten cent stamp would be a great boon to the commercial public. The Minister's written answer was not exactly what the Minister said. The Minister was very helpful on the occasion when the business of the ten cent stamp came up, so long as he got away from the meaning of the word "frank", which I dare say he will not use again. He recognised that there was a need for a ten cent stamp, but I would be glad to hear when we are getting a new issue of stamps. I think he ought to take the public into his confidence.

In 1950 when Barbados had its first pictorial stamps, the then Colonial Secretary, Mr. Perowne, initiated a search for stamp designs and so on. I know the Stamp Committee is doing very good work. I am glad to hear they are putting the Lion at Gun Hill and other things like that on stamps. You, Mr. Chairman, would be glad to hear that the Lion at Gun Hill is going on Stamps, no doubt to commemorate the duty that he did for the Democratic Labour Party in the 1956 election with the School Meals Service; but that apart, I think that appointing an Advisory Committee is not enough. You must tell the public what you are doing.

The public may conceivably have one or two ideas that the Stamp Advisory Committee may not get. We ought to hear when the new issue of stamps is coming out and whether there will be a ten cent stamp for which there is a very great demand. I estimate that a ten cents stamp would be used more than any other denomination except a three cent or four cent stamp.

I think the Minister should take this opportunity to explain why it is the last two stamp issues promised for Barbados have not come out on the appointed date. Their issue has had to be adjourned for a couple of weeks. Also again, since they say this is the Post Office, why can't they get some proper designs for the stamps? The absurd stamp with the radar antenna on top of a sugar mill looks neither like a mill nor the antenna like an antenna! The Minister is telling us something as well, Mr. Chairman, about the Courtesy Garage and Yellow Transport and their troubles. Personally I have no quarrel with this Resolution. I understand the Yellow Transport tendered quite low.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member, I would say that he did not exactly act fairly. Now he knows as well as I do that when he asked the question about the ten cent stamp that I said we would investigate the possibility of bringing out a ten cent stamp. All these things we were going into, but bringing out a stamp is not anything you do because you can bring it out, and I could not disagree with the hon. member more than when he said that the stamp commemorating the World Meteorological Office with the sugar mill and the antenna was an ugly stamp. To me it is a very beautiful and attractive stamp; it depends on how you look at it. I want the hon. member to understand that if all of us looked through the same eyes, some of us would not be married yet. I do agree, however, that the public needs to be brought in; but we do not keep this stamp business as something secret, playing close to our chest, like somebody playing rummy or poker. As far as I know, we go to the Press and always let the Public know that a stamp issue would be out on such-and-such a date; but what has happened to the stamp issue that we had to postpone is that we have no control over the printers, and sometimes the Crown Agents agree that the printers will get the stamps ready in time. Almost everybody uses La Rue; I think he prints for Harrison's too. He is good and everybody looks for the best. Barbados is a small place. Let us say that we wanted 250,000 stamps and the United States want 250 million; it is evident that he is going to concentrate on the 250 million, because this is big business. Sometimes they give us a date and we expect the stamps at such-and-such a time, and we inform the philatelists that the stamps are coming out, because it is the first day covers that people would be catching at, and then we get a cable saying that we would have to postpone the date, because so-and-so has happened. It may be a strike, or somebody did not get to the shipping agent or the plane in time to send these stamps. These are matters over which we have no control, and we are sorry when these things happen and apologise to the general public.

6.15 p.m.

I know how the general public feel about this, but these are things which we cannot really do anything about at the moment.

The question that Annexed Estimates - Post Office - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I think that in consequence of decision of the Committee earlier today, it now becomes necessary to amend the wording of this Resolution. I therefore beg to move that the figures "26,193" be substituted for the figures "\$33,618". With the Resolution so amended, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1968-69 No.35

A Resolution for the sum of \$29,130 was called.

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS - PURCHASE OF PROPERTY

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, hon. members will see that this provision is only being asked for because it is a re-vote. The Addendum explains that it is in connection with the purchase of a property and of course, for the furnishing and equipment of this property as a residence for the Barbados High Commissioner in Ottawa. The sum of \$15,495 Canadian, remained unspent at the end of the financial year 1967-68, and accordingly lapsed. The Resolution therefore seeks to supplement this as a revote so that the matter may be finalised.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1968-69 No.36

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS - INDEPENDENCE CELEBRATIONS

A Resolution for the sum of \$73,501 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution seeks supplementary provision for a new Item in this year's Estimates, namely, Item 63A - Independence Celebrations. Hon. members will already have seen from the Addendum, first of all, what activities are proposed for the national celebrations this year, and they will also see that certain sums are required to be spent in respect of these activities. There are performances by the Grand African Ballet of Guinea on Friday, 29th November, 1968; the display of decorations and illuminations etc; a special programme for school children at their schools; free dancing at the several Community Centres; a concert by the

United States Navy Steel band at the Speightstown Esplanade; the Prime Minister's reception; a special grant of \$1 in that week to each Old Age Pensioner; the observance of Sunday, 1st December, as a National Thanksgiving day; the provision of special fare to the inmates of the several Government Institutions and, of course, the receptions held by the Overseas Missions.

It is impossible for me to anticipate what questions hon. members will ask; but if they ask any questions, I will do my best to answer them. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I shall endeavour to ask the Hon. Leader of the House questions which he should readily be able to answer. I wish to assure him before I ask any questions that I am not trying to tie him up in any respect, but purely because I consider that these things should be given. How much, for instance, does the performances by this Grand Ballet come to? Presumably we are bringing them from England. Are they there now? I have forgotten where they are supposed to be. How much do these performances cost? Perhaps the hon. member will answer question by question.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes, I can answer this. I take it that the hon. member means the Ballet. This is going to cost \$10,000 B.W.I. and they are giving an afternoon performance lasting approximately one and a half hours to school children, and this performance will be free to Government in consideration of the Government's contribution of \$10,000. Then they are giving an evening performance lasting approximately two and a quarters hours; this will be given to all adults and this will be run commercially by Celebrity Concerts. The point is that apparently, this Ballet Company is regarded in Guinea as Civil Servants, and our understanding is that whenever they appear in countries where the majority of the population is African or of African descent, they are to give a concert, which is an open concert, for school children, students and what not. In other words, they are giving two concerts, and one must be for students and young people, and it must be an open concert. I do not know if this answers the hon. member's question.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I should like to ask the Hon. Leader of the House what are the outstanding commitments in respect of the 1966 celebrations and, naturally, as a sort of supplementary to that, are we to look forward to outstanding commitments to be paid for for this year's coming celebrations? Why has this been held over since 1966?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member will remember that I said last year when we were dealing with this Resolution that there were some unpaid bills, accounts for which even up to that point, had not come in or, in some cases, had not been finalised. This sum of \$8,000 is made up as follows: Outstanding commitments for air fares incurred in connection with the 1966 celebrations,

\$7,409 as well as the money prices and scrolls for the winners of the Anthem and Flag Competitions. That is how this sum is made up.
6.25 p.m.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, in spite of what I said at the beginning, I am going to ask this question now: Is Government seriously considering that in all our circumstances — the answers they give when asked: "Why are you doing so-and-so? Where is the money to come from?" — it is justifiable to spend \$60,000 on anniversary celebrations two years after Independence, and do they propose, if in office, to do the same thing next year — to come to the House for another \$60,000 for celebrations? I take the figure of \$60,000, so as to leave out the outstanding payments for 1966 and 1967.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member will find that we are not at variance with him here. As a matter of fact, in this year in respect of these celebrations we had a long, hard look at the whole exercise, and the Cabinet quite frankly decided that every year was not necessarily the time to make a splash or to do big things from year to year. We thought that, perhaps, every second year, every third year, or every fourth year, or every fifth year, the whole population should be involved in the celebrations to a greater extent than in the intervening years, and wherever possible on the off years, so to speak there should be a cutting down of expenditure.

I will tell the hon. member this. You will notice that we never put this kind of thing in the Estimates, because we feel that Government ought to have an opportunity to pronounce on these matters, and this is why we bring it by way of a supplementary. The point is certainly well taken that it is a large sum, and we have to be more prudent in these matters and not outlay this tremendous expenditure every year.

I may also say this before I sit down on this point. At the end of the last celebrations, I gave instructions that an inventory should be made of the flags, buntings and decorations, which we used which were not damaged and were still in good order so that undamaged equipment could be used again and again. This will give hon. members an indication of how concerned we were about this matter. I take his point, and I am quite sure that next year there will be a great effort to cut down on this.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, on this particular point about decorations, does not the hon. Minister feel that the Government should do every little about that and leave it to the householders to do? Let the money come out of the householders' pockets. Whoever wants to celebrate, let him fly a flag.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with him here. In the case of a National Celebration, it would be expected that the public authorities would decorate streets, would put up a certain amount of buntings, flags and shields on Government

buildings, or semi-Government buildings, and do some flood-lighting. Naturally, we would like to encourage householders to put up more flats. We would like to encourage this, but we cannot say that the householders should do it and the Government do very little or nothing. We have to strike a balance, and we hope that patriotic sentiment would so carry the day that householders will view against one another in putting up flags and bunting on their properties. Something should obviously be done by the Government.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, does the Minister feel that that should apply only to Government buildings? After all, if it were not for the Minister, perhaps not the Minister but his colleagues, would not householders all over the Island tonight be celebrating Guy Fawkes Day out of their own pockets, instead of asking Government to go to the Garrison to do it? My point is, if you are going to celebrate, you will look upon it like Christmas; you will have to spend money that you would not spend otherwise. What I want to stress strongly is this. If you decorated this building, what about the Other Place? That would be Government expenditure, but when it comes to flags and other decorations it should be left to the householder.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, as far as I can remember, both for Independence itself as well as for the anniversary celebrations last year the commercial houses did, on their own, put up decorations and spend their own money, and I expect that they will do this again. Householders did do this to some extent last year on their own. I hope the hon. Member will realise that, although this level of expenditure may conceivably be too high, the Government must, I repeat "must", make some outlay in a matter like this even if it is only \$25,000.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, it does not strictly arise out of this Resolution, Sir, but inasmuch as I mentioned Guy Fawkes Day, would the hon. Minister promise to remove all bans and restrictions on people who want to use a few fireworks tonight?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member should have told me about this before. Inasmuch as I would like to accommodate him in a matter like this where there cannot be strong feelings, giving me less than an hour's notice makes it impossible for me to accommodate him.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, this is a Resolution for \$73,501. I want to say, firstly, that, after almost two years of Independence, there is not enough evidence that the nationalist spirit has caught on in Barbados. That might be partly because of the attitude of the Government in power to the extent of setting up their various Committees to prepare for Independence Celebrations.

Now, I feel on the other point, Mr. Chairman, that Independence Celebrations, this being our second year, could be a one-day affair. That would be

enough. I feel that the Government is doing, or attempting to do, too much in certain respects. One direction in which the Government is not doing enough is in encouraging people to work. I do not suggest for a single moment that they should not be encouraged to spree and to fete, as the case may be, but definitely the Government has not given that incentive, or urge to people to work.

6.35 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would give way, I suppose he realises that the Bank Holiday is only on the Saturday; there is no other public holiday.

Mr. HINDS: Now let us look at it in the light of the Old Age Pensioners, Mr. Chairman. We are going to spend \$73,501 in this instance. Would it not have shown the Government in a very good light if they really wanted to send the spirit of Independence into even the old folk, since this is the second year of Independence and they gave the old age pensioners one dollar last year, to decide to give them two dollars this year? At least, it would have made them feel that they had been living on in the hope of getting something.

Mr. Chairman, I well remember the annual celebrations and our Empire Day Celebrations and the procedures that were adopted then. I remember learning about Britain being the mistress of the seas and the Land of Hope and Glory; but what strikes me most forcibly at this moment is that the Government must be blamed for not in its truest and fullest sense putting it as plainly as it ought to be put before the children that the march to Independence really and truly covered a period of 300 years. Although I do not pretend to know the words of the present National Anthem, I still recall somewhere this reference to three hundred years of this and that. It might be merely for vote-catching reasons that you would hear Government members on their platforms making it appear as if the part played by our ancestors ought to be forgotten.

I remember that it was some time after World War II that Major Cecil Noott came to Barbados. School children previous to that had been encouraged into play-acting and the singing of songs, some of which I have referred to, but I remember that Major Noott did much to encourage what was then called the League of Empire to have our children take part in programme and projects which brought to light both the history and the geography of Barbados. Programmes arranged for Empire Day in those days had an enjoyment value; after Major Noott's coming, the enjoyment value was retained, but it went further and the programme then arranged had a cultural development value added as well. In this programme which has been arranged here, there is not much to tell us or remind us or make us feel that we as a people have a culture. We appreciate very much this Grand African Ballet performance, particularly when we learn of the troupe coming from Guinea. That in itself means something to me, as I feel happy to be part and parcel of any such undertaking; but we have

not during our past two years seen anything to tell us much, except for higher taxation, an increased cost of living, lower moral standards, dictatorship and things of that sort, which often makes us wonder whether in truth and in fact we have rid ourselves from Colonial rule to be under a dictator. These are things we have to ponder from time to time.

As to the Grand African Ballet, I understood the Minister to say that Celebrity Concerts will be responsible. I am to ask whether this Celebrity Concert is comprised of Cyril Shaw and Joe Tudor. I think they operate under such a name.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If the hon. member would give way, we have had dealings only with a Mr. Stephen Hill in this respect.
6.45 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: I would still like the Minister to investigate whether or not Mr. Cyril Shaw is associated with Celebrity Concerts — Mr. Cyril Shaw from Trinidad and Guyana. I warn now that if he is associated with it, you have got to do a lot to let the people of Barbados know that it is not a fake something which is being put on. That is my reason for urging that you investigate that. I wonder what is this special programme for school children at their schools on Friday, 29th November, I wonder if the Government is going to distribute, on this second anniversary of Independence, a type of medal or badge or something to the children, but not a medal or badge bearing the image of the Prime Minister or any of the good-looking faces on that side which is the nearest to duppies. (Laughter).

I see here — I do not understand this and perhaps the Minister would explain it — "Provision of special fare to the inmates of the several Government Institutions." I see also that your Overseas Missions are at it again. I am sure you will agree that the time is swiftly approaching when you must decide to withdraw most of these Overseas Missions and help at least the poor people who want houses through the Housing Loans and such Agencies. I am asking you to go into this matter and make it abundantly clear that if we are spared to be here on the next occasion, there will be no approach to this kind of money to be spent on anything called Independence Celebrations, because in truth and in fact it means absolutely nothing to the people of Barbados. You can go from street corner to street corner, and in the country districts you will see people assembling in groups of three, four, five and six and they are just talking to each other; they do not know how to combat the high cost of living. We are urging on the Government to take all of these things into consideration when it comes to spending \$73,501 on Independence Celebrations. Mr. Chairman, I have been implored to come home and so I do now.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR. Mr. Chairman, let me answer the points which have been raised by the last hon. member. Firstly, about Mr. Cyril Shaw. All our dealings in this matter have been with Mr. Stephen Hill who is the Director of the Celebrity Concerts

Caribbean, whose Headquarters are in Kingston, Jamaica. We have had no dealings with anybody else but him, and in his absence he has been very well represented by Mrs. John Wickham. The special fare for children will take the form of a ceremony devised by the Ministry of Education, and it is designed to bring home to children in a simple but yet direct way, the meaning of the day, its significance for them as young citizens and for the country. (Mr. HINDS: Why would you not give the Old Age Pensioners \$2 instead of \$1 in this second year?) We like to think about that. It is not that we would not do so; it is just that it has not been thought of, and perhaps that should be examined.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of five Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN reported and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to do any more Government Business today. As the Hon. Minister of Finance intimated last week, he would like to take the second reading of the new Income Tax Bill next Tuesday, and I hope that hon. members will be ready to do that. It is an important Bill and, of course, a very long Bill; and if hon. members would consent to do the second reading as intimated, we would not necessarily press the Committee stage on that day, unless, of course, this was the general desire of the House; but we would certainly like to get through with the second reading next Tuesday. This means that there is no Committee of Supply work next week; there are only three other Bills, and it is possible that we could do all three of these short Bills and get them out of the way and then proceed with the second reading of the Income tax Bill. I imagine that we will be on the Income Tax Bill for the whole of Tuesday. As I said, we will not press for the Committee stage on that day unless it is the general desire of the House to finish the Bill on that day, but I hardly think that that will be done.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 12th November, 1968, at 12 o'clock (Noon).

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the Leader of the House — apparently he is still Leader of the House — (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Up to now.) — that we say a thing is short and then we talk and talk. Let us start with the Second Reading of the Income Tax Bill and forget Private Members' Business and everything else. I think that will be the general feeling on this side.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, do I understand that you would like us to do the Income Tax Bill next week? Most likely there may be Questions to answer. If the position remains as I have stated, we could do the Second Reading of the Bill without pressing to go into Committee on that occasion. I

suggest that that could be held over for another convenient season.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, in effect, all I am asking is to forget other things, as far as Government Business is concerned, and just stick to the Income Tax Bill, even if we do not finish it in its entirety. Sometimes you say that this is short, and somebody gets up and says something that you never thought of saying.

The question that this House now stands adjourned until Tuesday of next week at 12 o'clock noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

6.58 p.m.