

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1966 - 71

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

THIRD SESSION OF 1966-71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 10th February, 1970.

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

PRESENT

His Honour Sir J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., F.Z.S., (Speaker); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, J.P., (Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology); Hon. C. E. TALMA, (Minister of Health and Community Development); Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A. C. M. G. (Leader of the House); Mr. J. W. CORBIN, J. P.; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister of Trade and Tourism); Mr. R. ST.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P.; Hon. N. W. BOXILL. (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD, J.P., (Chairman of Committees); Sir G. H. ADAMS, C.M.G., Q.C., B.A., D.C.L. (Hon), (Leader of the Opposition); Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; Mr. C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P.; Mr.

J. B. SPRINGER; Mr. H. B. ST. JOHN, LL.B.

Prayers were read.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have the honour to inform the House; that, in respect of the Chaplain's absence from the last meeting of the House, I have received from him a letter of explanation and apology therefor, which I have accepted.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have also the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of Tuesday, 25th November last year, I understand, have been duly circulated.

I will inform hon. members that since the last meeting I have sent an official communication to the Minister of Government responsible for the Government Printing Office complaining of the delays in respect of the Minutes. I have not yet received a reply. I further directed the Clerk to send a similar letter to the Government Printer! apropos the same subject matter.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY entered the Chamber and took his seat.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of of the Minister of Finance, I am commanded to lay the- Report on the Audit of the Accounts of the Auditor General's Department for the year 1968-69.

Mr. HOLDER entered the Chamber and took his seat. GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of the following -

A Resolution to place the sum of \$375, 944 at the disposal of Government to supplement the Estimates 1969-70 Part 1 - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1969 - 70, No. 63, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

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

A Resolution to place the sum of \$4,000 at the disposal of Government to supplement the Estimates 1969 - 70, Part 1 - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1969-70, No. 64, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Bill to amend the Druggists Act, 1894.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my Intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to deal with the Money Resolutions of which notice has just been given.

PRIVATE MEMBERS1 BUSINESS

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Re solution-

WHEREAS under the National Assistance Act 1969-37 the National Assistance Board has no power over the administration of public assistance funds, which is necessary to effect the smooth running of same;

AND WHEREAS there is great dissatisfaction among the poor through the absence of a Committee to whom they can apply for public assistance;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House request the Government to amend the National Assistance Act in order to give the National Assistance Board full powers over the administration of public assistance.

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

QUESTION

Mr. SMITH:

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

Is the Minister aware of the great hardship and loss of time and money caused to the old retired agricultural workers who do not understand the qualification for assistance from the Provident Fund?

Will the Minister take positive steps to let the people know how and when to make correct applications for same?

SELECT COMMITTEE REPORT

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider and report on the Bill to incorporate the Moravian Church, Barbados Conference. It reads as follows -

"The Select Committee appointed to consider and report on the Bill to incorporate the Moravian Church, Barbados Conference, have the honour to present the following Report:-

1. The Committee met on one occasion at which the following Members were present, namely.-

Hon. K. N. R. Husbands, J.P., M.P. Mr. H. B. St. John, Q.C., LL.B., M.P. Mr. L. E. Smith, J.P., M.P. Mr. W. C. B. Hinds, M.P.

2. Save for the deletion of the figures "1969" appearing at the end of Clause 1, and the substitution therefor of the figures "1970", the Committee recommend the passing of the Bill in its present form.

Dated this 10th February, 1970. Kenmore N. R. Husbands. CHAIRMAN."

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. J. C. TUDOR, a Bill to amend the Druggists Act, 1894, was read a first time. LEAVE TO MAKE PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I crave the indulgence of this House to make a personal explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Such may only take place if there is no controversial matter brought forward, and no debate may arise upon the explanation, if the House gives its indulgence.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

On a point of order, a personal explanation may not involve a member of the House; otherwise the personal explanation may be explaining why I went to sleep all day yesterday, why I drove on the wrong side of the road and so on. 12.25 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has asked leave to make a personal explanation. The appropriate Standing Order says that 'by the indulgence of the House a Member may make a personal explanation although there is no question before the House; but no controversial matter may be brought forward nor may debate arise upon the explanation.' At the last meeting such an indulgence under Standing Order 17 in respect of a personal explanation was granted the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and to the Hon. Leader of the House; so with the indulgence of the House I will grant leave for a personal explanation to be made, and no controversial matter may be brought forward nor may any debate arise.

Mr. SMITH:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker; it is nothing controversial. You may note that I am not in my accustomed seat this morning; that is because I do not want to embarrass either the hon. members who sit on my right or on my left, because they may want to say something in private relative to their respective Parties. I only wanted to let you and this Hon. Chamber know that I have changed my seat, but not my mind. Some very funny things were said, and, thank God, so far I have not yet crossed the floor of this House, and I never will.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The first Order of the day under Government Business 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, as I intimated to hon. members on the adjournment last week, we have quite a lot of business to do and we might have to sit a little later; I therefore propose to move, and I now move, that Standing Orders 5, 14, 16, 18, 19, 40 and 45 be suspended for the remainder of the day's sitting. In doing this, I give the customary assurance that Private Members' Business and Question Time will be taken for their appropriate duration and in their appropriate places.

I understand that some hon. members have not received all the Papers dealing with all the business

before the House today; if when we get to a particular item hon. members would indicate whether or not they are in possession of the Papers, I will be very grateful. I understand that some of the Papers were received late yesterday afternoon.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that. Mr. SPEAKER The question is.....

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the House has intimated that it is the intention of Government that we fit later than usual today. I am not objecting to that in toto; but what I want to draw to Your Honour's Attention is that on occasions such as this in the past when the House was invited to continue with these lengthy sittings, we found ourselves legislating hastily, and, as a result, when Measures were passed by this House and sent to the Other Place, we found that the Other Place was able to examine such legislation more critically than we In the Opposition here had been able to do, I am saying that that is a direct result of the suspension of these Standing Orders, carrying on these lengthy sittings and forcing the hon. members during late hours when they are tired - Government then using their numbers on such occasions to rush these Bills through the House. I am therefore asking you, Mr. Speaker, to protect the minority, the Opposition Party of this House, on an occasion such as this.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that any objection that is raised will certainly be put to the vote, and you are going to find that Government's numbers will win "out; but, Mr. Speaker, you have it within your hands to direct the Leader of the House to desist from having these Standing Orders suspended because of the reasons which I have stated here this morning. I am objecting to the suspension of these Standing Orders for the reasons that I have stated.

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

Mr. SPEAKER:

I will say this - apropos the remarks of the hon. junior member for St. Peter - that in respect of those matters the documentation for which has not been circulated or received by hon. members until yesterday, I entirely agree that these matters be not proceeded with.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, what you have just said might refer to about the last nine items on the

Order Paper under Government Business. If that is the case, the Leader of the House should examine the situation and see if the necessity would arise for the suspension of these Standing Orders. If we are not going to deal with these matters, do not let us suspend these Standing Orders. 12.35 p.m.

Do not let us make a mockery of coming here for the Government to use its numbers in suspending the Standing Orders when the necessity does not arise.

Mr. SPEAKER:

May I point out that that motion has passed, but one cannot always anticipate how even one motion may occupy many hours of important and significant controversy.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, there is a Resolution on the Order Paper which is of paramount importance and urgency, and I am appealing to the Hon. Leader of the House to deal with it today. It stands in the name of the junior member for the City, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution requesting Government to set up a Commission of Enquiry re the increase in the cost of soft aerated beverages. I am asking the Leader of the House, through you, Sir, not to suspend the Standing Orders in such a manner that this Resolution would not be dealt with today.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let the hon. member be assured that the Hon. Leader of the House has signified that Private Members' Business and Question Time will be as usual; but in respect of Private Members' Business, obviously, it is for Private Members to decide amongst themselves which item they want to proceed with first.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, this will be dealt with first, because it is very important.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, since I am bound to be blamed, whether innocent or guilty, I should like to have through you, Sir, a definite statement from the Hon. Leader of the Opposition as to which of the 13 Items the other side does not feel able to proceed with.

Mr. ST. JOHN:

Mr. Speaker, Items 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13. Neither the hon. junior member for the City nor myself received Older Papers until Monday morning around nine o'clock.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, very well; it is five Items and not nine, I take it. The hon. junior member for St. Peter had said that there were nine Items in respect of which documentation had been circulated late.

Mr. HINDS:

I really meant - starting from Item 9, Mr. Speaker

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, we will work from Item 1 to 8. There is really no problem; if the work is done, then the House rises.

Mr. SPEAKER:

What is the first Order of the Day under Government Business?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave for the hon. senior member for St. John, the Prime Minister, to make a Statement.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let the Rt. Hon. and Learned Prime Minister make the Statement.

STATEMENT BY THE RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER re BUS FARES FOR SCHOOLCHILDREN

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, the Government has for some time been concerned over the transportation costs incurred by parents in sending their children to Private and Government Secondary Schools throughout the Island.

Because of the difficulty frequently experienced in securing places at schools in close proximity to their homes, many parents have to incur transportation expenses which other parents whose homes are better located do not have to bear.

The recent award of an increase to concessionaires by the Public Utilities Board has further accentuated this disparity.

The Government therefore proposes to 'postalize' the fare structure for school children by introducing a standard fare of five cents per journey and to pay to the concessionaires who are now voluntarily subsidizing the school bus service the difference between the common fare of five cents applicable to the whole Island and the fare which may be fixed by the Public Utilities Board from time to time.

Since the details of printing, sale and distribution of the new five cents tickets will take some time to work out on a proper basis, it is proposed to introduce the new fare structure in September at the beginning of the new academic year.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER:

Perhaps the Hon. Leader of the House will intimate what will be the first Order of the Day under Government Business.

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. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1969-70 No.57 A Resolution for \$39, 754 was called.

Head 15 - Statistical Services - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, under Head 15, Item 21 - Furniture and Equipment for the Statistical Services, the sum of \$471,00 is required to meet the cost of a duplicator for which provision of \$700 instead of \$925 was inadvertently included, and to provide for the payment of a bill to the I.B.M. Corporation for Control Panels used in the processing of monthly pensions.

I beg to move that Head 15 stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Head 16 - Prime Minister's Office - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I believe hon. members will remember the Civil Establishment (General) Order, 1969, which the House approved some weeks ago, Increasing the establishment of certain Departments of the Prime Minister's Office. This provision is for the Furniture and Equipment for the new staff.

I beg to move that Head 16 stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Head 31 - Printing Office - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, Head 31 deals with the Printing Office. Two items are to be supplemented here one of \$6,000 for Overtime, and the other of \$30,000 for Materials. The note gives some idea of the increased demands on the Printing Department, mostly in connection with the work now taken over and to be done from the former District Councils and Local Government Authorities. The amount meets the estimated cost to the end of the financial year.

I beg to move that Head 31 stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I have on two or more previous occasions drawn to the attention of the Government that the Government Printing Office is undertaking printing work for commercial houses in the City of Bridgetown.

12.45 p.m.

We have got no Report so far resulting from any investigations Government might have carried out in that particular respect, but in the face of this, here is the Minister asking this House to vote \$6,000 to pay overtime. Of this \$6,000 we are asking the Minister to tell us how much is for doing work for Government offices, and how much is to pay for overtime spent on doing work for commercial houses in Bridgetown. This is about the best way we might invite the Minister to start an investigation into this racket that is going on at the Government Printery, because one must examine things as they are put before us. We are asking the Minister to tell us how this amount of \$6,000 was arrived at, how many people and particularly what category of workers is involved in this overtime that is estimated to cost \$6,000. Now, if you are going to spend \$6,000 until the end of the present financial year in overtime work, how much are you preparing to spend for work that is done in normal working hours? It is all right to say that the Government Printery has taken over the work that was formerly done by the District Councils, but I want to say here and now that you, Mr. Chairman, are in a position to bear me out that the Government Printery has only been able to absorb a small portion of the work that was formerly done for the three Councils - the City, the North and the South; and were it not for other Printerles being able to be rushed to the rescue, so to speak, of the various Bodies, I am sure that the transfer from the Local Government system to Central Government would not have been able to go off - I do not want to say 'as smoothly', because it has not gone off smoothly, but with the comparative ease with which it has up to the present.

You will find, Mr. Chairman, that the Note to this Addendum is in itself misleading, and what we are saying is that people who are engaged in the printing business and have had something to do with the printing for the Councils, and who have had an opportunity of knowing what is required and what orders have had to be placed with the Government Printery, know that it is rank dishonesty and robbery on the taxpayers to ask this House to vote \$6,000 to pay overtime. Even now, Mr. Chairman, the various Boards cannot get work from the Government Printery, and I am saying here and now that one of the reasons why the Government cannot get work coming out for the various Boards and Government Departments is because members of the Staff of the Government Printery are taking in work from commercial houses in Bridgetown, and using Government's time, paper and machines to turn out work and draw money from the commercial houses, and the Government is not getting one cent out of it. I do not know if you want a more daring statement than that. I have told the Government on the floor of this House that I have in my possession some of the work done by the Government Printery for commercial houses in Bridgetown. I asked the Government to start an investigation. They have never tried to get the information from me or to see what assistance I could lend. They do not intend doing anything, because part and parcel of the setup of the Government is corruption. I am telling you that in every other Department of Government, if you have an honest worker, he is transferred; but if he is corrupt, dishonest and immoral, he will remain in office until at least this Government goes out of office. They do not want honest people working. Here is a case which I have over and over again drawn to Government's attention, and in the face of this, where I can produce evidence to show that this is going on, they do not try to stop it, but allow the people to carry on and do as they like. Now they are asking us to vote \$6,000 for these people to draw berries during the time they should be doing Government work. They are remaining on Government premises because they have their own private work to do, and nobody is carrying out an investigation of what is going on during these hours.

Mr. Chairman, let it be clearly understood that if one member of this Opposition in the face of what I have said voted for this, I could not be part of the Opposition again. We are not going to vote for this \$6,000 to pay overtime.

As to the question of material, the Government Printery has been employing a system 'where it was thought that other printeries would not be able to get any assistance from the Government Printery. We are being asked to vote \$30,000, but I want to ask the Leader of the House what he means by material. Is it a question of paper, plates, photographic material, or what? My information is that a small amount of money is required for photographic material, and I want to say that other business houses in Bridgetown that are using the offset process are benefiting considerably from the Government's printing equipment. Let them go and investigate these things. We are trying to save the taxpayers the \$30,000 that is wanted for buying materials for the Government Printery and another \$6,000 needed for overtime.

Mr. Chairman, what the Government Printery has done is to borrow material in the past from other printerries that use the same off set process, and when they go to pay back, there has been no proper record kept at the Government Printery to determine how much they had borrowed, and I am to say that they give back more than four times what they had borrowed. Because it is the taxpayers' money, the Government is going wild and encouraging these people to remain up there and do all sorts of things to draw big money. Once you are working for the Government and drawing big money, the Government is yours. 12r55 p.m.

I am telling you, Mr. Chairman, that the Leader of the House ought to know better; he ought to have some pride rather than to come with a Resolution lite this before the House today. He ought to bear in mind the poor taxpayers who cannot come here and stand up on the floor of this House and represent themselves; and when he goes to the districts telling them about the speech he made for them at the United Nations, they don't know anything about that. The Government ought to carry out an investigation immediately, and we are calling on them, before this \$30,000 is voted for material and another \$6,000 to pay overtime at the Government Printery, to institute an investigation this very day before we vote for one cent of this. It is a disgrace, and the Government is encouraging these people in running rackets. The Chairman of the Party is not going to rise, but it is a Government of all racketeers; that is what it really is. You have people placed in all sorts of jobs and they can get as much money as they like to carry home. In their eyes this is a good Government, but this Government is encouraging them to rob the poor taxpayers.

Material that is being used in the photographic process up there is being given to other people, and we are asking the Government not to proceed with this Resolution. Investigate first; I am willing to hand over to the Attorney General today any evidence that I have that the Government Printery is undertaking to do work for commercial houses in Bridgetown, if this Government is going to postpone this Resolution and tell us that there will be an investigation. Let us begin to feel that at least we have turned these corrupt minds from these practices, that we have purified them and put them aright, It is not that the Civil Servants can write any sort of information, sand it here to the Opposition and think that we are going to be fooled by this; we do our home work; we come here armed for the Government on matters of this sort, and we axe not going to let them get away with it. I am asking the Leader of the House to give us the assurance that he is going to investigate, and start his Investigations today, not tomorrow. Let them start their investigations now. Let us go into this matter; we have got to protect the taxpayers not by looking out for our friends and giving them money to carry home, whether they steal it or else. Mr. Chairman, we are asking the Government to let us know at this instant what they intend to do on this matter.

Mr. ST. JOHN:

Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that the Government intends to do nothing, because for a long time we on this side of the House have been saying that coincident with the arrival of the Government in power in

this country, all kinds of moral standards have become debased, and this is just part of a symptom of what exists in Barbados today. Not so long ago, an important point about the principle of the Government's policy in relation to Civil Servants and extra work was raised on the floor of this House; the Hon. Leader of the House said he saw nothing wrong with full time employees participating in private work outside. At that time it was the level of Permanent Secretary; it has now run right through the core of the Government service of this country and today not only do Permanent Secretaries do it, but in the Crown Solicitor's office people do it; the Engineers in the Ministry of Communications and Works do it; so it is no wonder that the people at the lower level of the Civil Service now feel that their job with Government is only a part of their total earnings in the community.

A matter of policy was raised by us on the floor of this House, and we said that the Government should lay down definite guide lines about it; but nothing was said other than by way of condonation on the other side, so that now the taxpayers have got to pay for it. If the big shots in the Civil Service can do it, why not the ordinary people? I do not blame them for doing it because you have tolerated it; you have accepted it; you have set the standard; therefore, you will get it now. This is an indication of utter incompetence, and the standard of degradation we have reached in this country - condoned by the Government. And what are the true facts? The Hon. Minister glibly gets up here and presents this Resolution; does he know that they have voted \$100,000 in this year's Estimates? Look at the Supplementary Estimates for the previous year, \$75,000 - I have the Estimates before me for 1968-69, and for Item 30 - Materials the amount voted is \$75,000. Look at the Notes and explanation: "To meet the estimated requirements of new Departments and increased demands, of others". Those were the Local Government Departments which were tacked on to Central Government. In this year's Estimates you have already provided for them; you anticipated it In 1968-69; Already you have taken Into account the fact that you would have Additional expenditure because of Local Government Department, and now you have the audacity to come before this House and ask for a further \$30,000! A 30% increase; you have already moved it from \$75,000 to \$100,000 and now you are putting it from \$100,000 to \$130,000 - nearly 100% increase within the space of one year. That is the sort of administration you have in this Government! Of course, easy money come, easy money go.

This is a racket, and the Hon. Minister ought to be ashamed of himself to come before this House and present a Supplementary Resolution on such flimsy evidence. Can you yourself, if you have any conscience, if you have any competence, if you know what you are doing - you did not investigate, before coming to this House and presenting this Resolution, the previous year's vote to see how much money was already voted.

Not him; that is not his class of politics. 1.05 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, he indulges in the other class of politics - the lower class of politics. This myth about

the Minister being competent! Competent in what? Competent in trickery. The Hon. Minister did not even know what the vote was for last year! He never checked it; he does not see that between 1968 and 1969 the expenditure moved from \$75,000 to \$130,000. We must sit down and tolerate this sort of thing in this House! Of course, we know that the stinking newspapers in this country would not publish it. It is a matter for them. They are all part of the corruption in this country, too, because they do not understand their duties as the organ of formation of public opinion in this country - such is the debasement that has gone around in Barbados in the last five years.

All you have to do is to kow-tow to the people in power, and you will get your privileges. We are not afraid of that, because basically we know that the ordinary Barbadian is a decent and honest man, irrespective of the efforts made by the Government to corrupt his moral training. What are these new materials? You do not know. Of course, you do not know; you have no tread your papers; you are drawing your money under false pretences, and you do not do your work. That is why you had to be fired from the post of Minister of Education! You had to be fired because of your own incompetence in handling University administration matters. In your catalogue of failure you have presented this matter in the same manner. Nothing at all that is associated with competence can one associate with the Hon. Minister. I challenge him to tell this House what are these materials and what is responsible for the tremendous rise during the past year. I will talk about it the whole day, or until you give us an explanation or an undertaking that there will be an inquiry into what is going on at the Printing Office.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I am really going to astonish the hon. senior member for Christ Church by telling him that I bear no resentment what ever for the attack which he has just made on me. I understand the hon. member's difficulties, but ha cannot resolve that kind of difficulty by attacking me. He is in a Party which ha wants to lead; he does not know how to tell the old man to go home, and therefore he works off his indignation on me. He cannot be so, angry on a matter like this as to abuse me. The hon. member may think that he has a contribution to make to the public life in this Island; we all have thought this way from time to time, but there is a hard way to do it and you cannot do it the easy way. You have to get enough people to support you even within your own Party.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. What is before the House?

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

No point of order. Let the hon. member proceed.

Hon. J. C, TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I was saying that you have to get enough people, within your own Party organisation, to follow your leadership, and then you decide from there where you are going and what you are going to do. You cannot work off your Indignation of what is going on in your own Party on the Government.

Mr. Chairman, we are here discussing a matter which can be discussed on its merits. With all the indignation with all the innuendo against the Government, what boils down from this? The hon. junior member for St. Peter says that he has information to the effect that persons employed in the Government Printery are doing, obviously illegally, commercial work for firms and persons outside of their establishment. Now, we have to assume that the hon. member, when he makes that allegation is speaking as a member of Parliament representing the people. If he has that kind of information, what is the good, except by implication, in attacking the Government and trying to drag the Government, somehow, by association, into a matter like this? If you have this kind of information, then lay it in the proper quarters. (ASIDES.)

Sir, I have heard the hon. junior member for St. Peter say twice before that he can prove it. I have never seen the proof. It may not be my business to see the proof, but there must be authorities in this Island, legal and otherwise, before whom this kind of evidence could be placed. Since the hon. member knows what is going on in Government Printery, he must also know to whom he should make the appropriate complaint. Why worry to work up all of this indignation against the Government, when hon. members have a plain duty as representatives of the people to lay before the appropriate authority all evidence which they may have regarding this kind of thing?

Naturally, If you hate the Government, you will use anything to bring it down. If your own Party is in some disarray and you do not want to quarrel with it, then you can quarrel with the other side; but facts are stubborn things. What we are concerned about today is that we are asking for a supplementary appropriation. We have asked for it in two parts; \$6,000 for overtime - (ASIDES.) The hon. member is talking as if we had never come into this House before to ask for a supplementary appropriation for the Government Printery. If he looks at his records either since ha has been in here - I am speaking now of the hon. Junior member for St. Peter - and before that, ha will find that from time to time we have supplemented the provision under this vote. That is a fact. Obviously, there is nothing mysterious about it.

Mr. Chairman, If the hon. member has information which he says he has which can show and give substance, let him take the information to the appropriate authority; but do not blame the Government if the Government says that this provision is needed for certain purposes which we are prepared to describe and explain. The supplementary for overtime is broken down in two parts. Firts of all, in respect of the additional and unexpected work which the Printery has been called upon to do in this last

financial year: the new Income Tax Forms, Physical Development Plan, Development Plan, and so on; in addition to this, the ordinary work as well as the new work coming in from the Local Government Authorities whose business we have taken over in full.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order. I should like to draw to the attention of the Leader of the House the fact that the \$6,000 asked for is not to pay overtime as shown in Note 4. It deals specifically with what is shown at Note 3. He has not read the Addendum.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to allow the hon. member to get away with this. To say that I have not read it is just nonsense. I am continuing now to say that in respect of the materials, the break-down is as follows.....

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, the Minister said that he was dealing with overtime, and he was breaking it down under two Heads or something like that. Let him give us these two Heads on overtime before he deals with materials.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I have already done that.

Mr. St. JOHN:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. If he has already done it he has done it dishonestly, because Note 3 says

"This amount is required to pay overtime for work done by the staff at the Printing Office during extra hours in order to have certain jobs - Development Plan, Physical Development Plan, completed in time."

The Hon. Minister spoke about Income Tax Forms. What kind of lies is the Minister telling this House?

1.15 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I really do not propose to annoy myself with the hon. member. He has some Party problems, and I would not do him the injustice of believing that he is really annoyed about anything I am saying. Mr. Chairman, I continue. In respect of the provision required for materials, the breakdown is as follows- metal plates, \$3, 610; film, \$1, 314; inks, \$446; chemicals, \$152.72; Varitype carbon ribbons, \$US156; for the Justowriter carbon ribbons, pink tape etc. \$559.92 distilled water, blotting paper, card, paste and other binding materials, \$568.12; and about 19 tons of paper, Croxley Script white, Croxley Script tinted, Abermill Bond, Gambit white and Kings Clear cream, all together making about \$23,000. The hon. member must know the prices. That gives the total breakdown in respect of the materials.

Mr. Chairman, I reiterate: if the hon. junior member for St. Peter or any other hon. member has any information to the effect that persons employed by the Government Printery are using either their time, the Government's time, and materials, provided by Government for the proper work of that Department, to do work for persons or firms or bodies not connected with the Government of Barbados, and it is in written form, we invite the hon. member, or any hon. member who so has, to place that information at the disposal of the appropriate authorities of Government. When that has been so done and it is investigated, then the Government is prepared to make any statement on the matter according to its findings, and to take the appropriate action to punish all who may be found guilty, if proved. Therefore I cannot accept the proposal put by the other side that we should halt discussion or even conclusion of this Resolution pending that kind of investigation. If the hon. member places that information at the disposal of the appropriate authorities, this will be acted upon and dealt with in an expeditious manner.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, the Hon. Leader of the House said about two weeks ago that an investigation was being carried out consequent upon statements I had made about the Government Printery. What is the report?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Of course, I said so, but there is no evidence.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, I told this House that I had the information, and the Minister goes behind my back and carries out an investigation, and he does not get the information from me and act on it! You are

inviting the people at the Government Printery to be as corrupt as all of you over there are.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, we must not allow the indignation of the moment to becloud the real issue. The problem is a simple one. The hon. member in the course of a debate some three weeks ago -or whenever it was - said what he has said today. I said I would have it investigated and we had started to do it, and if the hon. member had not interrupted me, I would have continued to say...

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, why does the Minister not say....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I should like to draw to the attention of the hon. members not addressing the Chair Standing Order No. 29(6).

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, does the Leader of the House expect anybody in this House to believe, if he had carried out investigations as he is trying to make us believe, that when we started to debate this matter today he would not have risen and asked hon. members on this side not to do or say anything that might prejudice the chances of the investigations? He is as dishonest in the remarks he has just used as any member of the Government Printery.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member must withdraw that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I intended to ask the hon. member to withdraw it.

Mr. HINDS:

I withdraw that, but he is not acting as honestly as one would have him to act.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Again I am asking the hon. junior member for St. Peter to withdraw that.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

On a point of order...

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I am not having any point of order at this stage.

Mr. HINDS:

What are you asking me to withdraw?

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I am asking you to withdraw the words that he is not acting as honestly as other members want him to.

Mr. HINDS:

If you ask me to withdraw that, I will withdraw it.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

On a point of order, is the interpretation of asking hon. members to withdraw remarks based on what the Chairman might think, or on an objection by the member against whom something may be said? That is common practice. I have seen the Speaker of the House of Commons look into the air when one Minister who was attacking the....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I rule that not to be a point of order. I should like to warn hon. members that Standing Order No. 29 has not disappeared, neither has Standing Order No. 36(1), (2) and (3).

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to allow the Government's case to go by default. The hon. member asked me whether I believed something or the other. I will tell him what I believe. I believe that if the hon. member had the evidence of the kind that could even remotely connect us that what he alleges is going on, ha would be the first person to bring it in hare.

1.25 p.m.

What I really believe is that, although he may have evidence to substantiate his claim, ha does not have the kind of evidence that could really bring us into the matter; otherwise he would produce it.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I have evidence that any honest man carrying out an investigation arising from what I said - remember, Sir, the investigation that the Leader of the House wants us to believe is being conducted arose out of what I said In this Hon. House - I am saying now that any honest man initiating such an investigation would go to his source to see what information is available and start the going there.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

But, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is a member of Parliament; he rose in Parliament and made certain allegations; so is it not incumbent on him, if he does not choose to put it at the disposal of a member of the Cabinet over here, to go to the Police, if he thinks it is a criminal matter, or go to the appropriate authority? The hon. member comes in today...

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I am sure the hon. member would give way. I want to give the hon. member a little idea of what has been my own experience following the type of advice he is now giving. In my capacity as a newspaper man I received a letter one day by registered post; that letter gave me Information that a motor lorry by a particular number was going to move material belonging to the Housing Authority.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I am afraid that this has nothing to do with the Resolution under discussion.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the House gave me advice on how I should proceed with assisting with the investigation, and I am giving my experience. I want to show the Minister that I have already travelled along that road and to what - extent I have suffered.....I took the letter, had a photostat copy made and kept it, and took the original as I received it and handed it to the Commissioner of Police himself. During the very afternoon on my way home I passed Deacons Road, and one of the people whose names had been mentioned in the very letter that I handed to the Commissioner of Police, started wrongfully to abuse me as I reached Bayswater Corner. The persons that were involved in the crime the very day, instead of the Police setting a trap to catch them, the Police had conveyed to them the Information that I had laid an information to the Commissioner of Police, and on my way home I was abused. That has been my experience. Quite recently I had some Information of a West Coast hotel taking some nude pictures of one of their maids, and I told the Attorney General I was willing to hand them over to him, but I had absolutely no confidence in handing it over to the Commissioner of Police. The truth If that the Minister knows he is not speaking the truth when he is talking about carrying out an investigation. He knows it.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, again I tell the hon. member, no matter how much irrelevance he draws into this debate; the fact that he may have had a contrary experience does not affect what we are now discussing, because he is claiming that he now has documentary evidence to show that work is being done in the Government Printery for outside businesses and firms; the hon. member has not produced it yet.

Mr. HINDS:

Have you conveyed it to the Director of Public Prosecutions?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

A rumour that Mr. Hinds says something?

Mr. HINDS:

A statement I made on the floor of this House you call a rumour? What do you think it is? When you get up talking about a rumour, the more the monkey climbs, the more he shows his tail; here is the Minister telling us that they are investigating a rumour; it is rumour, but he is still telling us that they are investigating a rumour! Nonsense; what kind of machinery are you going to set up to investigate a rumour? The Minister is wilfully misleading the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I will ask the hon. junior member to withdraw that statement. I want the hon. junior member for St.

Joseph to understand that he is not the Chairman of this Committee and that he has no right to interrupt so many times when the Rules are quoted. I want the hon. junior member for St. Peter to withdraw the statement that the Minister is misleading the House.

Mr. HINDS:

What did you ask me to withdraw?

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

That the Minister is misleading the House.

Mr. HINDS:

I said that he is wilfully misleading the House. If the Chairman is asking me to withdraw that the Minister is misleading the House I will withdraw that, but that is not what I said, and what I said remains.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I am asking the hon. junior member to withdraw the word 'wilfully'. In fact I will ask him to withdraw the statement that the Minister is wilfully misleading the House.

Mr. HINDS:

Do you mean that the Leader of the House is wilfully misleading the House? Yes, I will withdraw those words; I have withdrawn them.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. member may proceed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I do not know. If the hon. member will produce either now or sometime today the evidence which he claims he has.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Hon. members not addressing the Chair - I am repeatedly reminding them of Standing Order No. 29(6).

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is throwing all sorts of accusations at me and at the Government, and I am now asking him if he is willing to produce the evidence before the House now.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, the Minister is asking me to produce the evidence before the House now, but this is unreasonable. I have told this House that I am willing to produce the evidence to the Attorney General; can I do more? It is only a dishonest person who would ask me to produce it here now and let them carry it to the Government Printery and let the officers hide it by the time the investigation starts. Adjourn the House now and let us see that the Government means to be honest, and I will go to my office for the evidence, return here and accompany all hon. members to the Government Printery and let us unearth what they have up there. 1.35 p.m.

Adjourn the House now and let us go up there. Mr. ST. JOHN: I am willing to go.

Mr. HINDS:

If you are an honest Government, then let us go to the Government Printery now; turn up the place, and see what we will find.

Mr. St. JOHN:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I invite the Hon. Leader of the House to bring along the Commissioner of Police and let us impound the very plates. (ASIDES.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

This House has not been suspended.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, they are now going to telephone the Printing Office and tell them to hide the plates.

Have a policeman posted at the door of the Printing Office so that nothing will be moved out, and let us get down to business, if you are an honest Government.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Will the Leader of the House ask the Chairman to send the Marshal to see whom Mr. Maxwell is telephoning?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, let us separate the hysteria from the reality of the matter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

There are two hon. members on their feet. On what has the hon. member risen?

Mr. HINDS took his seat.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member was so determined that nothing said or done here should be known up there, why does he not present the evidence?

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, let us cool down a bit. This is a sure indication that it is wrong to have Ministers in the Senate. This is not his portfolio, and the Leader of the House is trying to defend a position on which he has not been properly briefed. (ASIDES.) I am not prepared to say that he is misleading the House. This is Sandiford's portfolio.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

No, it is not.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, this is Greaves' portfolio. (Mr. HINDS Let us go to the Government Printery.) I am not

going to any Government Printery in the sun. I do not agree with the Hon. Leader of the House. It must be assumed that if an hon. member of this House makes a strong statement it will be a responsible one, and you should not expect him to get on the floor of the House, with the Gallery as it is, to give you the evidence which he has. If he makes a responsible statement, then it is the duty of the Government to institute an investigation into the matter. It is not a matter for the Attorney General and the Police it is a matter for the Ministry concerned. The hon. member can take witnesses with him; he can take along members of his Party who are trained lawyers, and the Attorney General might even be there to institute investigations. You cannot say that the statement as well as the challenge he has made does not indicate that there is something fishy which should be investigated. (Hon. J. C. TUODR I am not denying that.) It is for you to institute the investigations.

You will agree with me, Sir, that the Explanatory Notes to the Addendum are not properly written, and we have been complaining about this matter for some time. Where Notes are not properly explained to the Opposition and the House, then there must be some quarrel about the matter. I used to be in the Opposition with the Hon. Leader of the House, and if this sort of thing had come before him and the present Prime Minister when he was in the Opposition, it could not go through at all. The Leader of the House knows that. You must come to the conclusion that the hon. junior member for St. Peter is a responsible member of this House. You cannot ask him to give evidence on the floor of this House. That is not the way things are done.

Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the House has made statements on the floor of this House, and nobody ever asked him to give evidence here. If the Government Printery is doing work for private people - and we have no reason to doubt that the hon. member has proof of it - then it is for the Government to institute an inquiry into the matter. How do you institute an inquiry? You go to the Attorney General or to the Cabinet and say: "The junior member for St. Peter has made a very strong statement on the floor of the House. I think this statement should be gone into." The Government will then say "Mr. Attorney General, I think you should ask some of your Crown Law Officers to go into the matter and, if necessary, call in the Police and so on". That is a simple way of doing it; but you should not ask the hon. member to give evidence on the floor of the House. The hon. member says that he has documentary evidence and proof of these things. You are the Leader of this House and you should take the matter to the Cabinet. In the same way that you will take back a Resolution or a Bill which was not properly put before this House, in this case you can also take the matter to the Cabinet. The hon. member has made this statement in this House before, and you made him a promise that you would have gone into the matter. You should have gone to the Cabinet and said that the junior member for St. Peter had made the statement.

Do you know how the hon. junior member for St. Peter would feel, if you had investigated the matter and returned to the House and said that he had made a reckless and irresponsible statement in this House? That is what I would have done if I were the Leader of the House. The general public would want to know why you promised to have an Investigation into the matter and why you did not have the

matter investigated; they must come to the conclusion that there is something fishy about the the matter, or that the Government is trying to hide somebody's business while it may not be so at all.

Mr. Chairman, all the Leader of the House has to do is to say that he will take the matter back to the Cabinet, arrange for it to be investigated, and call in the hon. junior member for St. Peter to give evidence.

1.45 p.m.

It is very simple. There is no sense going any further with that.

Mr. ST. JOHN:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has replied for a long period of time, and I will reply to all the points he raised. The first point he raised was about my difficulty with my Party. I have no difficulty because everybody knows I am a man of courage and character. The same thing cannot be said about the hon. member. Secondly, I have sufficient courage and character to prevent myself from being taken in by the blandishments offered to me in that drawing room by the hon. member. It is obvious that the Hon. Minister did not know what he was saying. He said at one stage that he was going to break down the overtime into two items. He said that one of the reasons for overtime was printing the new Income Tax forms. That is a statement in direct contradiction to the Notes as presented to this House. One of the two statements is a lie. We know the hon. member we know his reputation and we would have absolutely no doubt that the statement is correct. Thirdly, he cannot reply at all to the second point that was raised from this side. How is it that in a Government Department in this country you estimated in the last year to spend \$75,000, in this year's Estimates you upped your projected expenditure by \$25,000 to make it \$100,000, and then within half of the financial year you are now coming back to ask for another \$30,000, so that between last year's Estimates and this year's you are asking for a 100% Increase in materials? Of course, that sort of thing would suggest to anybody of competence that there is something fundamentally wrong, and a proper explanation would have to be given. But, of course, the Hon. Minister feels that he can come in here and give his inconsistent statements.

Mr. Chairman, I want to go further because morality in this country has reached such a low ebb that I do not care if I antagonise the greatest personal friend I have in the interest of rooting it out. Could you expect the Ministry of Home Affairs to carry out an investigation into corruption? Are you a lunatic or something? Where are you living? Are you living at Bathsheba or somewhere else? Would you expect the Ministry of Home Affairs to carry out an investigation into whether Civil Servants are doing outside work? How could you, when you yourself have put the seal of approval on the highest Civil Servant in that Ministry doing the same thing? Be consistent! Do you expect the Crown Solicitor's Office to carry out such an investigation? They are doing the work now of Erskine Rogers, the Solicitor. Do you expect

Mr. Wason to do it? He is supervising buildings privately all over the country. I am not asking for an investigation into them because the Government has approved of it and they are not doing wrong. The Government has approved of the Crown Solicitor's office doing work; they have approved of the Permanent Secretary being a Director of Sandy Lane. They have approved of Mr. Wason doing outside work. None of the three gentlemen is doing wrong; so how could you say that the Government Printery is doing wrong when it is using the Government's equipment for printing work for outsiders? Don't these people use the Government's car? Do you think that when they go and supervise and do outside work they do not use the typewriter in the office? Don't you think that the Crown Solicitor's Office does not use the typewriter when they are doing other work? Don't you think that when Mr. Harrison is supervising for Barclays Bank he does not go into the office and get reports? You are crazy if you think not. None of these gentlemen is doing wrong, and I warn the newspaper not to publish the truth because they would get hit for libel. I say that Wason, the Chief Technical Director is not doing wrong, the Permanent Secretary is not doing wrong, the Crown Solicitor's Office is not doing wrong, Mr. Harrison is not doing wrong, and I say that the Government Printery according to the low standards of Government is not doing wrong, because the Government has sat and tolerated it because they themselves are doing wrong. The Civil Servants know the truth about what is going on in this country and they are in a blackmailing position with the Government.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

I am appealing both to the hon. junior member for St. Peter and the Leader of the House. These statements will put some people in gaol, and I personally intend to see that the Attorney General and the Director of Public Prosecutions do their duty. They have to give proper legal advice. After hearing these statements, is the Leader of the House prepared to let more and more be disclosed of the corruption that has existed and is in existence? Some of these other Islands say that Bajans think everything about themselves and think themselves better than anybody else. Until this Government got into power, we were better than most people in the West Indies. Our standard of morality in Government was extraordinarily high. You used to say of this or that Island that a man can always line his pocket if he is in Government. You never used to be able to say that about Barbados, and that is no idle boast. After hearing what the hon. junior member for St. Peter has said, is the Leader of the House prepared to go on? Is he prepared to insist on bringing evidence? Does he want the hon. member to bring in the lorries to show the member, or to bring in the portion of building that material was taken to? How can that evidence be given on the floor of this House? What more can a man do than go to the Police? I appeal to the Leader of the House in his own interest to stop this. I may have a lot more to say later on. If the hon. member is not prepared to show that he is not going to join in any corruption or dishonesty, I have something later on to say.

Mr. ST. JOHN:

Mr. Chairman, I want to know whether the Government is going to accept the reasonable challenge of the hon. junior member for St. Peter and go to the Government Printery now. It is obvious that if you go there now with the Police you will be able to impound the documents if you know anything about investigations. The first thing the Police do in a fraud inquiry is to impound books and put them into safe-keeping. The hon. member said that he would go to his office and bring the evidence; go to the

Printery and point out the plates and ask the Police to impound the documents; then we will know there shall be no more excuses. Are you going to sit and condone it? Are you going to be honest or sit there and wallow in it? I challenge you to accept the challenge and deny it. Deny it today and we will know that you are part and parcel of it.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

Mr. Chairman, again I appeal to the Hon. Leader of the House although I should not be doing it. I am really giving the hon. member advice that would save his Party from a superlative blow at any election. Doesn't he see that if somebody comes and tells you that "a thief has carried stolen goods into your house; let me go in and search;" and you say "no, you are not going into my house", that the whole world would feel you are joining in pinching the stolen goods? Doesn't the hon. member see that in his own interest I should not be telling him this? It is in his own interest to tell the world that he had nothing to hide. I am making an appeal not out of consideration for the hon. member for whom in the last 48 hours I have lost any semblance of respect. I would not sit down at a lunch table with the Hon. Leader of the House now.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to speak at length on this debate, but the Hon. Leader of the House made two remarks earlier. In one he said that an Inquiry had started and they did not have any evidence, then he came back later and asked whether the Government was to carry out an inquiry based on rumour.

1.55 p.m.

I would like the Leader of the House to clarify this and state now whether an inquiry has been started.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I think that query posed by the hon. junior member for the City deserves an answer, and I give it. I said both things—one in respect to a question asked by the hon. junior member for St. Peter, in respect of a comment made by him to the effect that you should either go to the Attorney General or to the Director of Public Prosecutions, and I said 'on the basis of a rumour, no'. The other one arose out of remarks made by the hon. senior member for Christ Church when in reply to him I said, "Yes, investigations have been started" the hon. member sprang back up to give me my blessing which he probably feels I need. But I would like him to know that there is nothing he could say to me that would hurt me because I know that he does not mean to curse me. He could not; I have never offended him; but in answer to him I said that an investigation had started, but I was not allowed to continue because he swung back up. What I was going to say was that when the hon. member raised the matter here I drew it to the attention of the Minister of Home Affairs, and the Minister did cause inquiries to be

made; but you must appreciate this. I had nothing to put before the Minister except to say that it arose out of a statement in this House that Mr. Hinds claimed to have had the documentary evidence. It was no part of the Minister's duty to send for the evidence. I say it because there is a lot of inconsistency and talk in this Island, particularly by that side; on the one hand we talk about your not observing certain proprieties, and on the other you are saying we should do this, that and the other.

The point is this: it is no part of the Minister's duty to send to an hon. member and say that the Leader of the House has reported to him that that member has evidence and may he have it. The junior member for St. Peter would be well within his rights to refuse to send any evidence to the Minister of Home Affairs, and there is no authority which the Minister can have to demand that or any kind of evidence from a private citizen; therefore the burden cannot rest on us for refusing to ask the hon. member for it. The burden, such as it is, must rest on the hon. member; if he thinks that the evidence he has would show or would prove the allegation that he made, he should take it to the Director of Public Prosecutions.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

No.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Yes.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, does the Minis-tar mean that if I received information that a motor lorry is going to be loaded with stones from the Housing Authority I should lift the lorry on my shoulders and carry it to the Ministry? What nonsense is he talking?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

It does not mean that because we are not talking about a motor lorry; we are talking about documents which purport to show that people are doing what they should not do. Those documents should be put at the disposal of the Director of Public Prosecutions. You cannot have it both ways; either the hon. member is acting in his capacity as a member of Parliament or he is not. If he makes a statement saying that this and that happened and he has the proof, why cannot he go and take that proof to the appropriate authorities? Why, on the other hand, are you going to say that Ministers should have no authority to do this, that and the other? The Minister of Home Affairs, in my opinion - and if the hon. member for Christ Church does not want to be partisan in a matter like this - in my opinion the Minister of Home Affairs would be acting with the greatest impropriety if he were to call on the hon. junior member for St.

Peter and ask him to give evidence which would show this, that and the other.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, if I were asked to produce evidence such as I have in my possession to the Leader of the House, I would not do so because I believe he would destroy it before it got into the hands of the Police.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

On a point of order, that is an opinion which the hon. member has of me that need not be true.

Mr. St. JOHN:

I agree that the Minister is not to carry out this inquiry himself, but he has the power to cause the inquiry to be carried out. The Minister must not sit in judgment and do the investigation himself, but he has his staff available to him - the machinery to set it up - and he has the Commissions of Enquiry Act; but the whole point of this case everybody is missing; and that is that the Government would not carry out a serious inquiry because the Government has condoned the practice of Civil Servants working part time outside of their official duties.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

If the hon. member would give way, the two things are not on all fours. I know the hon. member is now referring to the statement which I made in this House that we saw nothing wrong in allowing the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Home Affairs to be a Director of Sandy Lane. There was a time when the people like us could not get the opportunity in big business houses; and if we can get it now, let us get it now. I do feel that the whole nature of Government is going to change in the next 10 or 15 years, and you will not be getting full-time Civil Servants, and all this talk that you hear today about getting a Civil Servant to do your work and nobody else's is not going to happen. I want to say this, however, that then is all the difference in the world - the hon. senior member for Christ Church gave us a lawyer's point of view and it is much appreciated; but it is fallacious there is all the difference in the world between Mr. X who is a Permanent Secretary being a Director, and Mr. Y who is an Engineer allegedly doing consultant practice on the one hand, aid somebody taking up Government materials in Government time to do work which is not for Government. say what you like; Mr. Symmonds does not leave in office hours to go down to Sandy land to a Board meeting, nor does Mr. X leave off building a school.....

Mr. HINDS:

But he does the commentary at cricket in Government time.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

That is a national pastime.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

That is not true.

Mr. HINDS:

I know he gets casual leave.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Why say that then? 2.05 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

The point is that hon. members on the other side are treating this matter with the seriousness which it deserves - I say this for them - but they are wasting more indignation on it than what it deserves. There are still two issues. If the hon. member claims that the reason we have to supplement the Printing Office vote is due to the disclosures he has made, this may well be true, but you will still have to supplement the vote. Even if they had carried away the materials and wasted things by illegally doing other people's jobs, the fact remains that they were working in a Government Department doing overtime, and they will still have to be paid. Even if any of this is true.... (ASIDES.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Members not addressing the Chair!

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, that is not what I am saying. I am not arguing, as the hon. senior member for Christ Church seems to suggest, that nothing should be done to stop or to punish the people who have done wrong. There is no division between both sides of the House on that matter. All I am saying is that if it turns out that all that has been alleged is true, you will still have to supplement the vote. Whatever are the reasons for not having all the materials, you do not have them now; the Printery wants the materials to do its work, and it is necessary to have them. Whatever are the reasons for paying overtime, you will

still have to pay it, because the people are ostensibly working in a Government Department. Let us separate the two issues. The Committee should, therefore, make the appropriation as is requested. I will give the hon. member the undertaking that I will ask the Minister of Home Affairs to get from the hon. junior member for St. Peter the evidence which he says he has. (ASIDES.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Hon. members not addressing the Chair!

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

Mr. Chairman, do not interrupt.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph has no authority to tell the Chairman not to interrupt, and I hope he will desist from this. Let the hon. member proceed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask the Hon. Minister of Home Affairs to get the evidence which the hon. junior member for St. Peter is willing to place at the disposal of the proper authority. I am inviting the hon. member to co-operate in this respect, as he says he will. After all of this is done and the investigation is started, then hon. members of this Chamber will know the results of the investigation. I cannot say more. I cannot say that the Police will prosecute, because I do not know the nature of the evidence. I do not know whether it will turn out to be the sort of case that warrants Police notice or not. I do think that an investigation will be made on this basis of the evidence supplied by the hon. member; therefore, there is no reason not to appropriate the sum required by this Resolution.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I kept out of the debate, and I only want to ask the Leader of the House those questions. When the Leader of the House can adopt the attitude that, even if they do private work in Government's time, they must still be paid - (ASIDES.) I do not think the Leader of the House should adopt that attitude, because it shows that the Government is really the sort of Government my hon. and learned friend, the senior member for Christ Church alleges it to be. Only a Government that is going to condone corruption would make such remarks. Only a Minister who is going to condone corruption would agree to that. You should stop paying the people until a proper investigation has been carried out. You should stop paying overtime until a proper investigation has been carried out. It is obvious that if work is being done, it is more likely to be done during overtime.

Mr. Chairman, I do not understand the undertaking the Leader of the House is giving to this House. He says he is going to speak to a Minister and ask him to send to Mr. Hinds for evidence. This is what he alleges he has done already, Sir.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I never said that.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

You said that you told the Minister the junior member for St. Peter had evidence. If you told him that, is it not reasonable to believe that if the Minister wanted to prevent corruption he would have taken action in the matter? Do you now have to go and tell the Minister of Home Affairs again that the junior member for St. Peter has evidence and he must send for it? Are you now going to dictate to the Minister of Home Affairs to get him to do this? Is this the type of Cabinet to which you belong? Is the Cabinet a place where one man can dictate to another like that? Where a member of Parliament makes certain allegations regarding a Government Department, nobody expects the Minister to call up the junior member for St. Peter and carry out the investigations himself. The Minister has a Permanent Secretary and a whole staff of Civil Servants to assist him. (ASIDES.) I know that it can be done, but why has it not been done?

Mr. Chairman, you cannot have it two ways. The Leader of the House said that he reported to the Minister and investigations were started. I should like to know who started the investigations, and what stage have the investigations reached. Who started the investigations? How many people were interviewed in connection with the matter? One thing is quite clear, and it is that absolutely no investigations have been started, (Interruption from the Gallery.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Put him outside immediately.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Sir, you are interrupting me now, with all due respect to you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I am not interrupting you; I am observing the behaviour in this Chamber.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, the proper way to do that is to.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I am not to be told by any hon. member.... (ASIDES) I am not to be told by any hon. member the way I must conduct this Committee.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

On a point of order. Would it be in order, for the sake of decorum and respect, for Your Honour to resign now?

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I deem that not to be a point of order. Let the hon. junior member for the City proceed.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, if you intend to interrupt and to have somebody in the Gallery put out of the House, as a matter of decency and decorum and to maintain the dignity of the House, all you had to do was to ask the junior member for the City to take his seat in order that you may have somebody put out of the House. 2.15 p.m.

As a matter of decency, you should not interrupt me like that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I expect all hon. members to observe the Standing Orders of this Chamber. If the Rules are observed by hon. members, it would prevent me from interrupting any hon. member. Let the hon. junior member for Bridgetown proceed.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

With all due respect to you, and in fairness to hon. members, there was an hon. member who was interrupting me at times.

I want to deal now with the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Home Affairs. You say there is nothing wrong with him being a member of the Sandy Lane Board as he does not have to attend Board meetings, but a little commonsense will show you that one of the reasons why he was appointed to that Board is because Sandy Lane is one of the hotels which from your list last week has never yet appointed a local manager, a local chef or anything like that, and they are always asking for work permits to bring in foreigners. The Permanent Secretary is in a position where his interests must conflict, and that is why I say it is wrong.

There is a feeling in this country which is being nurtured by the Government that the Permanent Secretaries are a special grade of people. They can be more dishonest than anybody else and the Government would tolerate that. It is all right for the Permanent Secretaries to blackmail the Government. That is what the Prime Minister said. As the hon. senior member for Christ Church has said, the Permanent Secretaries are aware of the dishonesty in Government, and that is why they can use that to blackmail Government and ask the Government for various things. If the Government had courage they would stand up to the Permanent Secretaries instead of coming in here every week like weaklings.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, there is only one thing I want to say. I drew to the attention of the Leader of the House that when a statement is made on the floor of this House by an hon. member it should be taken seriously by the Government. The Hon. Minister must know this, as I doubt very many new members know it; I came to this House when I was in the Opposition and braced up a man called Crowe who was at the Housing Authority. The now Leader of the Opposition got up and defended him, as it is the duty of every Minister to defend a Civil Servant, but the statement I made was so strong that the Leader of the Opposition had to start an inquiry, and he came back to the House and said that if he knew then what he knew about Crowe, he would not have made that statement about Crowe in this House. I made a statement, but nobody asked me to go and give evidence to say what happened at Wilkinson and Haynes and Challenor, or to say what this Englishman was doing. What the hon. junior member for St. Peter has said in here today should not go unnoticed. What I think you should do is to pass the Resolution, deleting the overtime amount. I intend to vote for that solution only on the grounds that the Leader of the House tells me that he is going to have an investigation. Don't fool me that only the Ministers are going to have an investigation. What is the point in the hon. member for St. Peter showing him documents when everybody knows that by the time he is finished, the Minister is going to be in the Printery? You must give us the undertaking today that you are going to see that an inquiry is instituted and this matter gone into thoroughly. I am not accusing the Government of anything. If the hon. junior member for St. Peter says that he has evidence, it is not for him to walk up to the Minister with hat in hand and say that he has it. It is for the Minister to appoint three or four people and cause an investigation into the matter and let it be advertised, just as you advertised the Fire Inquiry so that

people can come and make statements, and then you would be able to charge people for committing perjury. The hon. junior member for St. Peter can go before them and give his evidence, and other people can do so also, and you will remember the saying "once bitten, twice shy". The hon. member said that he once put evidence before the Commissioner of Police, and by the time he got to Deacons Road, the very people against whom he complained were accusing him of it.

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

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I beg to second that.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 3.30 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

2.25 p.m.

On Resumption:-

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, no Replies have been tabled to Questions. I teg to move that Private Members' Business be now taken for an hour and a quarter.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER:

It was intimated earlier today that the hon. and learned member for Bridgetown is seeking to proceed with No. 14 standing in his name.

Mr. CRAIG:

It might have been intimated to you, Sir, but I think I still have the right to carry on with No. 1 on the Order Paper.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is entirely in order.

RESOLUTION re MINIMUM WAGE FOR AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, I have to really ask another postponement for this Resolution which sets out quite clearly to provide for the agricultural workers a minimum wage of \$5.00 per week more. You may recall that last Tuesday the Hon. Minister of Labour jumped up and threw out a challenge that he would produce today documentary evidence to the effect that the Resolution which I gave notice of in here was already being dealt with before 4th November. I am under the impression that if there is one person I expected to be in here at noon today and who would have refused to go out until the lights went off, it would be the Hon. Minister because he made his point abundantly clear. This is the Minister who should

know - the Minister of Labour; otherwise I can only conclude that again he is attempting to misdirect the House. I have no more to say at this present moment, and, if it takes me from now till Election Day, I will tell the Minister that wherever there is Private Members' Business he should leave town; he cannot come in here, because he is wrong, and if he cannot provide this Assembly with the facts, then I say he is a misfit in the Cabinet of this country.

It is alright to get up in here and talk for the Gallery; the only Gallery I know is going to St. James and putting my Party's case if the Party wants me to. I am not concerned with these butterflies, with these misfits in Cabinet; I am concerned with just a little contribution I am setting out to make in my own little way. I am convinced this evening that the Minister is somewhere inside here sitting down and afraid to come in here; I therefore beg to move that further consideration be postponed -

(a) pending the Hon. Minister's arrival; and

(b) pending the Minister's documentary evidence to convince this House and this country that I gave notice of a Resolution long after there were discussions held between the Union and the Sugar Producers' Association; or

(c) as my hon. colleague has just advised me, let him bow out gracefully.

I do not talk about bowing out gracefully, because I like to beat to a pulp and I am confident that I would hate to fight a weakling.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, I have not intervened particularly in this debate so far, and I want to remind the hon. member that there is a set machinery to deal with all these problems. It could well be that he has something to speak on, and politically, and by virtue of an election which is presumably near, it may well be that these are electioneering speeches; but, be that as it may...

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am afraid that is not a point of order.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

There is a Worker's Union, Whitley Council, and a lot of machinery setup to deal with these problems.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order; let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. CRAIG:

I warn the Minister not to allow the Deputy Prime Minister to put in the same award position in which he lie placed Minister of Labour; you are too experience politician - never allow that. Sir, I beg to move further consideration be postponed pending the Minister's documentary evidence.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER:

If my understanding is correct the hon. and learned member for the City will seek to proceed with No. 14.

RESOLUTION re COMMISSION OF INQUIRY . INTO COST OF AERATED BEVERAGES

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Yes, Sir. Mr. Speaker, the word "soft" ought to be omitted. I am moving this Resolution because I think this is the time and stage in our development when large business interests seem to get together and have no regard whatsoever for the consumer in respect of, in this case, the price of sweet drinks, and in some cases the price of various services provided by those companies. I believe that the increases are all well-known because these prices appeared in a full-page advertisement in the only daily newspaper we have in this country. An examination of these prices will show that there has been an increase of

between 25% and 33% on the wholesale and retail cost of sweet drinks. 3.40 p.m.

That in itself is an indication of how unjustified and unfair the supposed Increases are. The manufacturers of the soft drinks are alleging that the increase in the price of soft drinks is due to the cost of raw materials, parts for the machines, wage increases, and so on. If this House does not prevent the manufacturers from passing on to the consumers every single increase that is gained in wages, then we will be falling in our responsibility to the citizens of this country.

Not so long ago when the salaries of Civil Servants were increased, the Prime Minister stated that the increase in wages and the increase in prices were playing a leapfrog game. What he has never made any attempt to do is to remedy this situation. No sooner than there was an increase in wages at the Transport Board, the bus fares went up. The Union negotiated an increase in wages at the Purity Bakery, and immediately afterwards the price of bread went up. It is up to the Government to protect the consumer from the manufacturers' passing on to him every single increase in wages.

Mr. Chairman, it cannot be satisfactory for the manufacturers merely to come and say that prices have gone up; raw materials have gone up; machine-parts have gone up and, therefore, they want an increase. I think what is needed is an examination of the earnings of the manufacturing companies to see what returns they are making on their investments and arrive at whether the increase they suggest is justified. It is particularly bad in this case, because it amounts to a monopoly. When you put aside Crown Mineral, Martineau, etc., you are left with a monopoly on the part of the Coca-Cola Company, of the Ju-C Company, and Bim Beverages.

Anyone who read the advertisement in the newspaper will recall that all three of the Companies -not even one - got together and decided that the people of this country must pay more for sweet drinks without any regard to the consumers in this country. They went even further; they were so bold as to suggest to retailers the price at which their drinks should be sold. In actual fact, if you were to go into a shop today to buy a Coke, you will have to pay about 18 or 20 for it if you do not have a bottle. Not only have they increased the price of the drink itself, but they have increased the deposit on the bottle. It has not been suggested that they are losing money because of the high percentage of breakage of the bottles, which would justify that. When a person buys a case of Cokes initially, because the deposit on the bottles has been increased from 3 to 6, it means there and then the Company is going to receive more money and have a greater turnover, and for this the consumers must pay. In order to investigate this sort of conduct, we are asking the Government to set up this Commission of Inquiry. Mr. Speaker, I think that there must be a Commission of Inquiry to see what returns the Companies are making on their capital investments. After this is done, we will then be able to see whether this increase in the price of soft drinks is justified.

Mr. Speaker, one has only to look at the recent Telephone Inquiry. Had not other people campaigned throughout the length and breadth of this country at their own expense and allowed it to be known publicly that they were going to object to the increased telephone rates, I have no doubt in my mind whatsoever that the Government of Barbados would have sat down and done absolutely nothing in the matter.

Now, Sir, it has been some ten days since the increase in the price of soft drinks has been announced. I understand that the Government - I have no doubt that when I am finished the Minister is going to get up and tell us something about the matter - has called in the soft-drinks people today. I think what we want is a Public Inquiry to let the people in this country know the sort of individuals who are running the commercial interests in Barbados. The members of the public must be protected,

Mr. Speaker, I would hate to know that because Sam Ashby is Chairman of one of these Companies, and because the same Sam Ashby is known for his position in the Democratic Labour Party and who Appears publicly at political meetings -I would hate to know that in this particular case, purely because he it involved, the Government would sit idly by and refuse to have a Commission of Inquiry to go into this matter. This is something that affects every family in this country.

Sir, I am not talking about the Ministers and members of the House who draw fixed salaries. I am talking about the agricultural worker and the domestic servant who may have three or four children to send to school each day and a re, perhaps, earning \$15.00 or \$20.00 a week or less. For such people to pay an Increase of about 15 a day for a whole week will certainly create a hardship. That may not seem much to us, but to them it means quite a bit. It is to protect those people that I am asking the Government to S5t up a Commission of Inquiry to examine and make recommendations with respect to the recent increase in the cost of aerated beverages.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, you will observe that I was out of my seat like a flash of lightning to second this Resolution. My colleague here -(INTERRUPTION.) Mr. Speaker, I am hearing noises, and I am seeing strangers in the Gallery. I am asking you to draw to the attention of those in the Gallery that they are here on sufferance and at Mr. Speaker's discretion. 3.50 p.m.

I am not prepared, nor are my colleague son the other side when one gets up in here to address you, to hear some God-given idiot sucking his teeth and interrupting any hon. member of this august Assembly.

I am asking you, Mr. Speaker, to use whatever powers there are at your disposal. I have no axe to grind. I know my position well enough, and therefore while I am here I must have your protection.

Mr. SPEAKER:

If my attention is particularly drawn to the presence of strangers, I can order everyone to leave; but at the moment I am trying to attract the attention of either the Clerk or the Deputy Marshal to investigate and take immediate action. If that is impractical, of course the Gallery will be cleared.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, in support of my colleagues Resolution, I would like to say something and I believe that I do this sincerely and out of feeling for the masses of this country who find themselves in a very difficult position to purchase a soft drink at these high prices, and, furthermore, to leave six cents on the bottles. Let us assume that a child has 25 cents for lunch and goes into a restaurant or shop to purchase a soft drink. He has to pay 14 cents for the drink. That is the suggested price by these three big firms of one of which Mr. Sam Ashby, that black-Jewish money-shark, that unscrupulous wicked black-Jew, is a Director. It is people like Sam Ashby whose sole ambition in life is to run with the hares and hunt with the hounds... there is no need for you to look for the Standing Orders, because I am not talking about Samuel Victor Ashby, the Senator; I am talking about Sam Ashby, the nuisance; so do not look up your Rules, Let us bat on A good wicket.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No one has any control over the Chair, if the Chair elects to refer to Standing Orders or Rules.

Mr. CRAIG:

Anyhow, do not let us get into any tangle this evening. Mr. Speaker, it is people like Sam Ashby who are prepared to crush the poor people to the ground because they all drink Coke, Bim or Ju-C or some Crown Mineral drink. Sam Ashby today can afford to pay 50 or 60 cents for them since the present Government is in power. It is no wonder that the Government can collect \$56,000 from the Jewish community in this town, who are automatically going to take over, because you will notice carefully that in the 1966 Manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party they said they now have a country. Three years after the Prime Minister, the person in the driver's seat, said that soon we would not have a country. Let us note carefully some of the people. You have the Trident's Secretary Mrs. Karp, and Leon Bernstein, a Jewish nuisance who was fired from the Crown Life Insurance Company for stealing.

Mr. Speaker, these are the people who are in industry in this country who are depriving people like myself of the opportunity of helping the more unfortunate people by suddenly introducing the price of

\$2.30 on a case of beverages. Sir, I do my little thing at a place just before you get to Seawell Airport. I get some of my colleagues from the other side to drop in, but I hate to see them because they do not do their thing, and occasionally I get colleagues from my side who would do. When I saw this advertisement, Mr. Speaker, I telephoned the Coca Cola and Ju-C people - not the Bim people because I have nothing to do with Sam Ashby - and told them not to bring any more drinks. I called the Crown Mineral people and asked them to supply the restaurant with soft drinks, provided the prices were the same as before and they brought them at \$1.84 a case. This morning they came and said that they are now selling at \$2.30 a case. The person who is suffering is the child with 25 cents for lunch in spite of the hot school meal. He has to pay 14 cents for the drink and six cents on the bottle because he is not going to bring a bottle from home to school. What is he going to do with the five cents remaining? You know that a salt bread alone is a man; what then if you are going to put cheese in it! It is people like Senator Ashby's children who can afford to pay this six cents, while people like Sam Ashby can crush these poor people. No wonder the Prime Minister made it clear that we soon would not have a country. Who is to blame? It is the Prime Minister. When credit is due to him, it must be given, and when he has to be discredited, it will also be done. After eight years he has the gumption to say that soon Barbadians would not have their own country.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to see somebody come down to "Valencia" and tell you that it does not concern you any longer. Of course they cannot approach you because you are all right; but It is the unfortunate people who worked BO hard over the years and owned their lands who axe now being eaten up by these unscrupulous businessmen. Here you have a classic example In which my colleague is asking Government to set up an inquiry into this. My colleague should never have been doing this. From the time Government saw this, they should have said it could not happen; and do not believe that Government cannot do it, because Government reigns supreme. This office is the highest office of the land and nobody can touch you. You are like the Untouchables; you are Eliot Ness. I am supporting my colleague, not only because of these beverages, but because of the entire cost of living in this country. People work for \$25 a week at International Scientific Ltd. You have girls working for \$11 a week, and to make \$16 a week they have to work overtime; but if you go down to Silver Sands, you will see the flats that the Deputy Managers and the Directors live in, and they bathe their faces with whiskey while they drink champagne to quench their thirst, and the people at ISL are providing these people with these sort of drinks.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that Barbadians are really quiet, and I believe the Church is responsible for this. If they were like the people in Jamaica they would come and cut off the Prime Minister's big toe or cut off the hand of my colleague. Barbadians are prepared to accept everything; they are prepared to pay 140 for a Coke. I am not advocating violence, but you must make people understand that they cannot continue in this vein all the time. 4.00 p.m.

You must make people understand that they cannot continue to do these things all the time. I was looking up a review of the situation during the disturbance in Barbados in 1937 and it was stated there

that an agricultural worker from St. Thomas said, in 1937, that he could only "make out" if they gave him \$4.00 a week to provide for himself flour, sugar, clothes, shelter - the basic things of life; and in 1970 there are girls in Swan Street earning \$8 and \$9 a week, despite the repeated cries of this side of the House calling on a dominant Trade Union, and all you can hear is that they have the numbers. When people are hungry they are dangerous, and I am not prepared to sit down here or be around and see my fellowmen, my own blood, strangled by the industrialists of this country. In more recent years - it is more evident now because all along you were hearing about Wilkinson, Challenor, DaCosta, Manning, Bryden and all these big firms that were doing the squeezing. The Prime Minister himself said he was freeing himself of all the Colonial ties; now he is taking up the Jews - all the people that Hitler did not want - and setting them up as industrialists in this country.

Look around at the various industries - the Knitting Mills and all the others, and you will see all these Jewish namely difficult for the persons who work with them to pronounce, Leon Bernstein, who is some Pope in the Barbados Development Bank, with no knowledge of finance at all; I believe, as my colleague here once said, the only knowledge of finance he has is how to carry it away, make it disappear. Not one young black or white person in this country has been given a job as important as that - to head an industrial Development Bank where millions of dollars must be spent; but they brought a man called Leon Bernstein from Trinidad and set him up to be the Chairman. I warned my colleagues over and over again, and I used to warn the Chairman of my Party about something and he would not listen - I was a young upstart, and I would not like to quote what he told me one night - "Move, you are looking for trouble; let us get peace and unity". Now the left foot, after 25 years of unbroken service, the left foot is in his temple. But I say this; there is still the boy on the burning deck; I must have a chance of pulling out that colleague's toenail. When I made reference in here to this individual and called him Averill Harriman, he was so dumb that he came and asked me who was Harriman.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I would like to remind the hon. member of the subject matter of the Resolution.

Mr. CRAIG:

I am happy to support this Resolution with an overall picture of the structure of the economy of the country. I am no economist, but I remember Frank Walcott making reference to the Prime Minister saying that he was a self-styled economist, and today the Prime Minister is a Doctor of Economics as far as that Senator is concerned. Again, this type of politics is unfamiliar to me, but I am not that experienced yet to understand what is going on. I am a good listener and I am eager to learn; I am sure it would not take me 19 years to learn. Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult for this country to be saddled with or to be pushed around by a handful of Jews, In particular, when the people of this country have been fighting to bear the burden of the economy of this country for so long a time. The Indians own Swan Street; Mr. N. E. Wilson might think he is in Broad Street, but he barely escaped from among them in Swan Street; when you look at Broad Street there is Fogarty, Altmans, Pillersdorf and all the other Jews who own this street, while the Indians control Swan Street. Do you see then that there is no place in the

shopping centre for my people? You are fortunate; you are out of the sun already; you cannot catch a cold. It is my children whom I am trying to prevent from catching a cold; and if Government continues with this policy of attracting foreign sharks to exploit the people of this country, I am prepared to give some of my blood for them. My great-grandfather and my grandfathers gave their blood for me, and there is nothing wrong with my giving my blood for somebody because it cannot continue on this road; it is not good enough.

When one examines the average income of an agricultural worker which is \$1,020 per annum, and a Minister cannot see his way to spend \$1,000 a month, you will understand what the plight of the agricultural worker in. There is no supermarket in Bridgetown which caters to the masses alone, and another to the classes; even the Marshal of this House has a supermarket in Roebuck Street and he cannot say to the agricultural worker that he will sell him a drink at a certain price. He has to sell him at the same price as it is sold at Simpson's Supermarket; but Simpson's Supermarket caters to all the big shots in that area. The structure has not been changed; and all that I can see, if I look at it carefully, is that the rich have become richer and the poor have become poorer. I beg to second my colleague's Resolution. 4.10 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I have risen to move that further consideration of this matter be postponed. I think the mover of the motion made a contribution to the matter, but we have not been similarly helped by the seconder; he did not assist us and, therefore, it is not on the merits of that I am dealing. I am dealing with the merits of the mover's speech. I understand from the Minister that this morning he received a delegation from the Soft Drinks Manufacturers, I believe, at his own request. I do not know the outcome of that meeting, whether it is to continue or whether it is concluded and, if concluded, what decisions were taken. In the light, therefore, of the Minister's activity and in the absence on the part of myself of any information on the matter, I beg to move that further consideration be now postponed.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ST. JOHN:

Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious matter, because it is now at least two weeks that this de facto monopoly got together and conspired to increase the cost of a popularly used brand of goods in this country. Had it not been for the vigilance of the junior member for the City, the Government would never have called in the Soft Drink Manufacturers today. Why postpone it? You had two weeks to look at it already! Do you mean that the Hon. Minister is not going to treat this House with the courtesy of coming here to make a Statement on the matter, and he is leaving it to another Minister who says he does not know what is the position? This is scandalous; it is absolute nonsense.

Mr. Speaker, if there was any machinery in the Ministry of Trade, immediately as this was announced in the newspaper on Sunday, on the Monday morning the Planning Unit, or the relevant Department in the Ministry, would have investigated the matter. The first thing that makes anyone suspicious is the fact that all three manufacturers have agreed to an increase in the price of soft drinks. They have between them some 80 per cent of the market. Obviously, striking you full in the face, what they have done is to agree to pitch the price up to an agreed level so that all of them, no matter how inefficient they are, will survive.

Mr. Speaker, we have been saying all along that this is a sick, tired, worn-out, incompetent Government, and it is proving itself to be so every day in here. They do not know what they are doing over there; they have to be pushed and pulled and jockeyed all the time into every position; their brains are not functioning; the Prime Minister is exhausted: He came in here today to read a Statement, and he does not even have the physical energy to read a Statement. He is physically exhausted and mentally bankrupt now. All that is left over there is the Leader of the House with his usual style and intrigue.

Mr. Speaker, nowhere else in the world in any Government that has any kind of respect for parliamentary democracy would a Minister come into this House today - he knew that Private Members' Business was coming up for discussion at 3.30 p.m.; he heard the senior member for the City mention the fact that this matter was coming up for discussion...

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, lest the House should take the hon. member's remarks to mean that the Minister of Trade has been discourteous to the House, I should like to say that the Minister's absence is due to the fact that he is attending a family funeral and, therefore, cannot be here at this moment.

Mr. ST. JOHN:

I hear that the Hon. Minister is attending a family funeral. I express my sympathy with him. (Mr. HINDS He has a family funeral and the other Ministers are here?) He has a misfortune today, but that does not mean he would not have known this morning that he had to attend the funeral this evening. He could have come here and briefed another Minister. Is there no trust and confidence over there that he cannot tell you what to do? The point is that it was pressure from this side that forced the Government to take action. Just as in the Telephone Inquiry, it was pressure from the Opposition that caused the Government to take action.

Mr. Speaker, I am saying that this matter is becoming very serious in this country. I said here during the last debate on the Financial Statement that the Prime Minister of this country allowed the banks and the big capitalists in this country to dominate him. Well, the industrialists and others are now dominating the Minister of Trade, too. There is no Ministry on the other side with the guts to stand face to face with these matters.

In the last five years, even among the Conservative Governments in any part of the world, Governments have been concerned with the problem of inflation and the problem of fixing the prices- and -incomes policy. This has not been done merely by Communist Governments, but even Capitalist Governments In the United States of America. You will remember how President Kennedy halted the steel prices in the United States of America. But this so-called Socialist Government, with the bogus Economist at their head, does not have the courage to take the necessary action even when they see an announcement of this nature. The very next morning they should have held a Cabinet meeting, and made a public statement that the Cabinet was concerned over the impact of the cost of living upon the people of Barbados and, therefore, requested the Soft Drink Manufacturers not to bring into force the the Increased price of drinks until after there was a meeting between the Manufacturers and the Government. Of course, you are not that kind of Government. You do not understand the niceties of Government; you do not understand the niceties of persuasion; you do not understand your powers; you are nonexistent, bankrupt, because the people abroad have read you well. They know your propensity for corruption; they know that the way to deal with you is to play on your vanity and your weaknesses because you put forward front-men.

Mr. Speaker, never before in the history of any country have people been awarded Directorships not because of ability, but purely on account of contact with the right people. (Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Name them.) You were bought for \$1,000; keep quiet!

Mr. SPEAKER:

Is the hon. member still addressing the Chair?

Mr. ST. JOHN:

Mr. Speaker, the position is that in Barbados today by having contact men, when Charles in Trinidad wanted to come here with Bim Beverages - a market which has been investigated repeatedly in this country and proven that it could not stand three Soft Drink Manufacturers - the contact of the Chairman of the Development Board with the Government in power was such that the Chairman of the Development Board was given a number of shares for floating the public company in Barbados. 4.20 p.m.

The contact, I repeat, of the Chairman of the Development Board with the Government in power was such that the Chairman of the Development Board was given a number of shares for floating the public company in Barbados; but so shocking has been the running of the company under the Managing Directorship of this contact man that the Secretary, another D.L.P. tout, a former Senator White, resigned as Secretary. Such has been the going along at Lodge Hill. All the racketeering that has been going on, all the utilisation of power and influence - this American system of corruption and of nepotism is not confined to Guyana. You hear Jagan talking in Guyana about the nepotism and corruption that is going on in his country and about disrespect for the constitutional rights. We fought the battle hereabout constitutional rights, and it is one thing that the other side is convinced of and it is that they know they cannot tamper with the Constitution, because they know that from this side we have sufficient public support that understands the implications of that, and they would knock off their heads if they started talking about tampering with the Constitution. But they have tampered with morality in this Island. What sort of example is the Chairman of the Industrial Board setting? This is the viciousness about it. Three manufacturers - 80% to 90% combination - and no public reason is given, and you never had the foresight to have looked at it suspiciously, immediately you saw the announcement. Have you never heard of the Monopolies Mergers Commission Act in England? Have you never heard of the Prices and Incomes Board? Have you never heard of the Retail Prices Maintenance, and all the dangers of an economy being strangled by a few manufacturers of a particular commodity in general use? Have you never heard anything about all these things? I do not believe it, I believe you heard of them, but I believe you are weak; I believe you have been tampered with. You do not want to offend the Senator. You have got to prove this increase to the hilt.

Mr. Speaker, it is nothing but hypocrisy to attempt to postpone this Resolution. Why didn't you come up and say that the Government is concerned with it? You are not concerned with it at all. Do you mean to say that this Resolution was here for one week, you had a Cabinet meeting on Thursday and you are going to tell me that you did not discuss this at Cabinet meeting on Thursday? I know what happened. A vast conspiracy took place in this country. The Prime Minister came down here with a Statement today. He knows that this soft drinks increase attacks the heart of the school children and the parent's pockets in this country, and he comes down here and attempts to salve their consciences and to hoodwink them by telling them that the Government is going to subsidise bus fares. What he is saying is that this increase will go ahead, but the taxpayers of this country will subsidise it to that extent, and so therefore the Government would have done something for them. Whereas before both bus fares and soft drinks would have gone up, now only soft drinks will go up and not bus fares, but the taxpayers have got to pay for them.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support any postponement of this, because it is hypocritical to postpone it. You had plenty of time, and if you were interested you would have done an investigation already. You would have had sufficient preliminary data to adopt a posture on it. You are not adopting a posture on it; you are running away from it,

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, the question of postponing a Resolution as important as this cannot find any support from this side of the House for the simple reason that it is very well known that Barbados had already reached saturation point, where the consumption of aerated beverages was concerned, before Bim Beverages came on the scene. What amuses me in very great measure is that there is the Leader of the House sitting and hearing the charges of corruption by association levelled against the Government, and he is not in a position to get to his feet and defend his own Government against such charges. In the absence of the Minister rising to defend the Government against such charges, we are now left to come to the conclusion that the Minister himself is conscious of all that has gone on.

Here is a case, Mr. Speaker, where you find three manufacturers of these soft drink beverages. Competition is now so keen that these big heavy trucks are now doing what you- call door-to-door sales to private houses. Who is going to bear the cost of this? We must bear in mind that if a manufacturer can use six motor lorries to despatch to wholesalers or to retailers as in the case of shops and end there, he would not have the overhead that would be entailed in having to buy twelve or eighteen trucks if he is going to cover the Island, because what he is doing is stocking the shops and then going next door to the shops and stocking up the private homes as well. They are putting them on the shelves of the shops and then trying their best to prevent the shops from selling to make their own profits by going next door to the shops and stocking up private homes as well. Competition is so keen that these firms have had to engage in a lot of overhead expenses. We are not against the suppliers of motor vehicles doing their business. When these people buy motor lorries, by all means - and this is what is going to be advanced - they are finding work for people, regardless of what the occupation is; but at the same time they should not try to find work for twenty-five or thirty people and saddle the whole population, because we must bear in mind, Sir, that these soft drinks are consumed by almost everybody. The home that does not take Ju-C will take Coke or Bim Beverages or whatever it may be; so however you look at it you will find that there is a demand, but there must be a limit to that demand. The manufacturers have now found themselves in a position of being able to meet the demand, but the overhead expenses that have been already engaged in are so great that they have now conspired, as the hon. senior member for Christ Church has said, to rape the nation.

What we are concerned with on this side of the House is that only this morning when the Government very well knew that a Resolution of this sort had been tabled on the 3rd February, and knowing the urgency and importance - of it and that we on this side would be moved to debate it today, now you are hearing this lame excuse about the Minister now attending a family funeral, and it is such a close family funeral that all the other Government Ministers are saddled in their seats and do not care about the Minister and his family, and are not even sympathising with him in any form or fashion. 4.30 p.m.

I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that it is a disgrace on the part of the Government to have waited until today

for us to hear that the Government only this morning had some sort of discussion; and then you are going to find that they had this discussion, and with the absence of one Minister at this present moment there is not another Minister of the same Government who can tell you whether the discussion is ended, whether it is to be continued, or what conclusions have been arrived at; nothing of the kind. That shows quite plainly that even the other Ministers here present today have no Interest in this matter - absolutely no interest whatever in whether the sweet drinks are sold at 14, 15, 16 or 17 cents because they drink whiskey and they know how they can get it. What we are saying is that this is a matter of prime importance. And think of it! The Government has not up to this moment employed any sort of machinery to cause these manufacturers to suspend the bringing into operation of these increases; nothing whatsoever has been done by Government to stop that and they can carry on to make as much profit as they possibly can during these three or four weeks or however long it will take, or until the Minister is not attending funerals, till he gets a berry or whatever the case might be; so we feel that the Government must find itself placed alongside of these manufacturers in trying to carry out this raid on the poor people of this country. The Government then is guilty by association in an exercise of this sort.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the junior member for St. Peter. But not only is the Government guilty by association; the Government is guilty by itself in the conduct of this matter. I would accept the motion for postponement on the undertaking by the Leader of the House that the Government will call in the Soft Drink people tomorrow, and until such time as the Government has investigated this matter they ask the Soft Drink companies to suspend the increases until such time as the Government has carried out a proper investigation. If the Leader of the House is genuine in his remarks, I ask him to give the House that undertaking, because the Government has power at the moment to control the price until such time as they carry out a proper investigation. If the Leader of the House is willing to show how genuine he is, and to show the Government's bona fides in this matter, he should give this House the undertaking that he will call in the Soft Drink Manufacturers and ask them to suspend the increase until such time as the Government can go into the matter. This is not too difficult an undertaking to give. What has happened is this; to show the dishonesty of the merchants of this country you had the advertisement appearing in the newspaper of 1st February, and on the 2nd February, irrespective of whatever price they had paid for the soft drinks, the retailers sold them at the increased price, and the Government did nothing at all about that. There are a lot of merchants today who would have bought stocks of, say, small cases of Cokes at \$1.40 a case and sold them as though they had bought them at \$1.90. If the Leader of the House is prepared to give the House the undertaking that he will write to the Soft Drink companies and ask them to come in and discuss the matter and that they should not carry out the increase until such time as the Government has carried out an investigation - and if they are unwilling to do that, let the Government put a price control on them at the existing prices until such an investigation takes place. Those of us who followed the Telephone Inquiry would know that there was a period of time and the Inquiry was adjourned until the Public Utilities Board had the opportunity of considering the matter carefully, and the Telephone Company was not allowed to impose their increases until the Board had decided. Any inquiry must say whether there is need for an increase. You do not allow the increase to go on and then carry out an investigation to see if the increase is necessary; you prevent the people from putting on the increased price to see whether the increase is justified, If the Leader of the House is prepared to give us this undertaking, I will be prepared to accept the postponement.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I cannot give this undertaking for a very simple reason. I have already said that the Minister has been in contact this morning - I do not know whether it was at his request or at theirs.....

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, there must be some standards maintained in this House; you cannot have a Minister getting up one time saying they were in contact at the Minister's request and now saying that he does not know at whose request it was.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Point made.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to get something straight. I well understand that on the other side there is a certain amount of tension, and I am perfectly prepared, if I am to be used as the scape goat and I am to be abused in order for them to unwind. I am a member of Parliament and as long as you are here, you must take what is going; so it is alright with me; you are not going to ruffle me or get me off-balance. 4.40 p.m.

Mr. ST. JOHN:

On a point of order, Sir. What we want is truth from the hon. member.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

If you want truth, you will have to get it from the person on your right. You will have to get it from there.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, all we are concerned with is truth from the Leader of the House, and not from anybody else. Let him attempt for once to tell us the truth.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is no point of order.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. If the Leader of the House is telling the senior member for Christ Church that if he wants truth he must get it from the hon. member on his right, are we then to understand that the Leader of the House is saying that we cannot expect to get truth from him at all? If we want to get truth, we have to get it from over here!

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is no point of order.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I am saying that you can get it on your right, and not necessarily on your left.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The most damnable lie told on the floor of this House was told last Tuesday when the hon. member said that because of something that went wrong with his Despatch Box a letter that was to be sent to me was not sent, but he has sent it since. The Policeman who handed me the letter brought it from the Ministry of Home Affairs, and not from the Leader of the House. It came from Mr. Philip Greaves, and not from the Leader of the House. If the hon. member was standing on his dead mother's grave and swore on the New Testament, I would not believe him.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is not a point of order.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

I would not believe the hon. member on oath.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, luckily the contingency of my dead mother's grave has not yet arisen; so he cannot put

that to the test, thank God.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

He asked me for the truth and I gave him the truth.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, listening to the Minister, one has little doubt that Ananias and Sapphira would take second place to him.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, I heard the Minister say that it was at Government's request.

Mr. SPEAKER:

On what is the hon. member speaking?

Mr. CRAIG:

On a point of order. I am, therefore, asking to get the Shorthand Reporter to let us know exactly what the Minister did say. I am asking for the Official Report to know exactly what was said.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is no point of order. Mr. CRAIG It is a request, Sir,

Mr. SPEAKER:

The time for Private Members' Business has now expired. Before the sitting was suspended, the House was in Committee of Supply and to that it will now revert.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, before the House proceeds, I should like to say that I have been in contact with the Minister of Home Affairs and, as a result of our conversation, I am prepared to move the postponement of further consideration of this Head of the Resolution.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, it is nice for the Minister to get up and say that he has spoken to the Minister of Home Affairs and further consideration of the Head of the Resolution will be postponed. What we would like to know from the Minister is on what did he speak to the Minister of Home Affairs. Did he speak about the carrying out of an investigation?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Must I tell you what I spoke about?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I do not want to know the details of your conversation. If you are going to ask the House to postpone the matter, then we are entitled to know why.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

You yourselves asked for it.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Are you postponing it to carry out an investigation?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

No, for the sake of postponing it.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I do not doubt you, because you do not want any more licks in here this afternoon. You have the sort of mentality that you would postpone it for that reason. I want to know why you are postponing the matter. If you do not answer, then this cannot go through.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the House was at pains, whilst we were discussing this Resolution, to point out the necessity for passing it because the people had to be paid the overtime.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

You said that you did not want it that way.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the House is now moving the postponement of the Resolution. In other words, he does not now see the necessity to pay this overtime money as quickly as he saw it this morning. If the Resolution is postponed, what are you going to do about paying the people the overtime? What is really the reason for postponing the Resolution? (ASIDES.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

The conduct of members not addressing the Chair!

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, it is not members; it is only one member not addressing the Chair. This is a Resolution of Resolutions, if I may put it that way. This Resolution brought to light many things that evidently goaded the Minister into making contact, as he said, with the Minister of Home Affairs. Honest to goodness I do not believe that he got in touch with the Minister of Home Affairs. We were asking the Minister to postpone consideration of the Resolution, but to do something else. Let us go to the Government Printery and lay hands on the culprits. That is what we were asking the Minister to do. Let us go to the Government Printery; let me produce the evidence that I have, and see if we can get anywhere from there. Is he now asking that the matter be postponed for the same reason? (An Hon.

Member Question.)

Mr. Chairman, you cannot put any question; he is either going to get up and reply, or we will talk until tomorrow. This is a Resolution asking for the payment of overtime to people. 4.50 p.m.

You are asking for overtime money to pay people for producing the Physical Development Plan and you are asking for it because you want these people to complete it in time, according to the Note. You have here that the Development Plan for the year 1969-70 was not laid on the Table of the House until 13th January 1970. You come now and ask the House to vote \$6,000 to pay people for working overtime on it to produce it, but this Development Plan concerns the years 1969-72. That is the type of behaviour we are to expect from a Minister such as the Leader of the House. You pay people to work overtime to produce something on time, but what is 'on time' for him? That you produce a Development Plan for 1969 in 1970 and everything is all right! The Development Plan was so late that the Prime Minister came in here and apologised for its lateness. If the Government Printery has a job of work which in normal time would take two weeks, working overtime it should not take the same two weeks; it should take less; so what nonsense is the Minister trying to get on with? Let the Minister tell us if his reason for asking for a postponement is exactly the same as ours. We want to be told.

Mr. ST. JOHN:

We are talking on this debate because it has exposed a number of matters about the philosophy of Government. I heard the Minister say that in ten or twelve years' time Civil Servants will be part-time. That is so now and the Government should know that. You cannot discipline Civil Servants in the lower grades if you are going to have exceptions in the higher grades. It is time that you make a declaration, because the people in the upper grades are not doing anything wrong because you have specifically told them that they are permitted to do it. Do not let us get the hypocrisy of coming here and saying that you have to come for an increase because of the fact that you cannot attract them. You should have the guts and courage to tell them that they cannot eat their cake and have it still. If they are only doing part-time work with the Government, part-time work anywhere in the world carries less remuneration than full-time work; so let us have a complete review of this whole matter. We have that bogus economic policy being produced over here; but taxation in this country is higher per head in the Income tax rates than anywhere in the world, and the Government is allowing more and more consumption tax on the general class of food every minute of the day; so do not say you do not increase the tax rates. Inflation has taken hold. The Minister of Finance of this country who is in control of the destiny of the finances of the country admits in a public interview that one morning we will wake up and find that inflation has taken over in Barbados, and now you come in here and say that in ten to twelve years' time Civil Servants will be part-time. A little self-criticism is good at times. Why don't you critically examine the situation and see? You will hound down people in the Public Works Department and all around and say they do not do a proper day's work, when nobody in Government does a proper day's work- not even the Minister who introduced this Resolution, because if he had introduced the Resolution properly, in the course of these four hours of debate today he would not have had to make the inconsistent statements he has

made. Why didn't you have an inquiry before? You are not having an inquiry; this is only an excuse to let them go up there and carry away the plates because you believe the hon. member is serious. You will go there and give the people a little insight as to what is happening and let them get rid of the evidence. This is advance notice. You want to postpone it for that reason.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I am at a loss when you have a Minister who comes in here whose basic standards are double. When I suggested earlier this morning not to pay these people any overtime, he said we could not do it because we have to pay them anyhow. The Minister must realise that Government is not a Government of secrecy; this is not a Masoiic Lodge. I am not asking for any detailed conversation he had with the Minister of Home Affairs, but I think this Committee is entitled to have a full statement and be treated with some sort of respect. If he has no respect for the members of the Government and the backbenchers, if it is their policy to come and say they want something done and it is done, they should have some respect for this Party and know that we do not believe in doing things that way. If the Leader of the House wants to have the Resolution postponed, let him tell the House why. All we are asking is that you give the reason why you want the Resolution postponed. Is it to carry out an investigation into this matter? Is it to have the investigation already started continued? At onetime the Minister said that an investigation had already been started; then he asked how could we expect the Minister to start an investigation. What I want to find out from the Minister is whether he is asking for a postponement of this Resolution because he wants to have time to continue the investigation that has already been started, or whether the Minister of Home Affairs wants time to start an investigation.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that as members of this Committee we are entitled to know this. We cannot be called upon to vote just for the sake of voting. If that is what the people in the Democratic Labour Party are entitled to, let them continue, but we want to be treated with some respect; we demand more respect. We make it quite clear that if the Minister is not prepared to reply, we are prepared to let the debate go on. We will talk and talk. We want to know whether you are asking for a postponement to have an Inquiry carried on or to continue the inquiry that has already been started.

While I am on my feet, let me say this: I think it is disgraceful that from Tuesday to Tuesday we come here and Government produces notices of the work to be done for the following week, and we in the Opposition, as far as the Government Printery is concerned, are not important. It is all right if the Government Printery sends out our Papers late on Saturday afternoon or on Monday morning. That is the sort of respect that the Government would like Civil Servants to treat us with. We object to that. I think it is disgraceful that you lay things in here on Tuesdays, and the members of this House cannot get them before Saturday or Sunday. This is all right for the Government. A lot' of them, even including the Ministers, really do not make any contribution to the debate in here, and it is all right for them to come in, pick up a file from a Permanent Secretary and read what is on it. It is evident that some of them do not read the files before coming here. One only had to listen to the conduct of the Resolution by the Leader of the House and see that the first time he saw the Resolution is today. 5.00 p.m.

Mr. HOPPIN:

Mr. Chairman, this debate has been going for some time, and I think the Opposition have run out of points and are repeating themselves; at least that is my opinion. I have heard the Leader of the House remark that he has got in contact with the Ministry of Home Affairs, and as we know in here there is no one from the Ministry of Home Affairs in this House. I cannot see why the Opposition cannot entertain the words of the Leader of the House. He said that they are going to investigate this matter, and I am sure that is what the Leader of the House means; but you cannot bully people to get things out of them as you are trying to do. I feel that you have made some points that the Government has taken into consideration, but do not use these bullying tactics. The Minister has stated quite clearly that he spoke with the Minister of Home Affairs, and it is my feeling that the points raised here by the junior member for St. Peter need investigating, and I feel they will be investigated because they were well put. I feel he knows what he was saying; if not, he would not be coming in and making these statements. This is not the first time I have heard him make statements like those he made today; so therefore I would ask that the Members of the Opposition accept the statement from the Leader of the House and let us have this Head postponed for further consideration.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

With all due respect, Sir, I have heard rumours to the effect that the junior member for St. George was getting a Ministry, but this is the first time I know that he has been given a Ministry and speaking on behalf of the Government. The Minister cannot see fit to get up, but the junior member must get up and make conclusions on behalf of the Government by inference. Is the Minister too ashamed to get up and say that the Minister of Home Affairs will carry out an investigation? If he says that, it means that he was lying earlier when he said that an investigation had already been started.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with this matter perhaps from an entirely different manner than other hon. members. We had asked the Minister for a breakdown of the \$30,000 to be spent on materials, and I think the Minister from his notes told us that \$3,600 was going to be spent on metal plates. I would like the Minister to refer to his notes again because I do not want to misquote him at all.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Is the member now speaking on the postponement? There is a motion before the House for the postponement which has been duly seconded.

Mr. HINDS:

What I am saying is that the Minister told us that \$3,600 would be spent on metal plates, and I said that I did not wish to misquote him; as a matter of fact, I believe that I am not misquoting him, that I took down correctly what the Minister said. I want the Minister as from this day not to allow himself to be made a fool of by anybody at the Government Printery by any Civil Servant or anyone else.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I would still like to know if the hon. member is speaking as to why this Resolution should not be postponed.

Mr. HINDS:

Do I have to tell you that? If you want to hear, yes. If that will put sense into your head, yes. What I am saying is that there is no such thing as metal plates imported or bought by the Government Printery; what you will find is that if you have information there that \$3,600 is to be spent on these metal plates, it is incorrect, the reason being this. The Government Printery would have to buy sheeting and cut their own plates. They do not buy plates; they might borrow a plate, but they do not buy plates as such. In the same way, this amount of \$30,000 for materials; the Minister ought to be told that it is not a question of buying newsprint; you are not buying newsprint so that you are going to buy all the paper at the same weight, the same quality, so to speak; but you particularly told us that you were buying Croxley. It is not every job that the Government Printery is going to turn out that calls for paper of the same weight; so if the Minister is telling us that he is buying this 19 tons for something like \$23,000, what we want to know from the Minister is exactly how much, what are the different sizes; and my reason for asking the sizes is that we would be better able to determine the weight and the quality of what is bought, whether it is 49 g.s.m., 73 g.s.m. or whatever it might be. 5.10 p.m.

These are things, Mr. Chairman, that might not convey much to the layman; but in a matter where you find that a Minister has to tell you about \$23,000 being spent on about 19 tons of paper, we are entitled to ask for an explanation. In other words, we are entitled to ask for as much information as possible. I should like to hear what the Minister has to say in answer to the points I have raised. If it were a case where other hon. members might have raised a point at.....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I should like to know what is before the House. A motion was moved for the postponement of the Resolution, and the hon. member is now debating the Resolution. A motion has been moved, and I expect you to rule. The hon. member cannot carry on a debate on the Resolution.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, there is a motion for the postponement of further consideration of the Resolution. What I am saying is that we are opposing this motion because the Minister has given us bogus figures; he picked them up around the corner; somebody put them in his hands and told him to come here and read them. Those figures could not have come out of any Ministry. Nobody over there seems to know what is happening, and that is our reason for not supporting the postponement. The Minister has advanced no reason for the postponement.

Mr. Chairman, if the Minister had put concrete reasons before this House, we on this side, in the interest of the taxpayers' money would have considered the matter. When the Minister says that they are going to buy plates with this amount of money, when he is badly advised, must we on this side of the House not point out to the Minister where he has been badly advised? We feel that he is asking for a postponement of this Resolution as a result of the bad advice he received with reference to these figures. All of these things have the Minister confused. Nobody wants to debate the merits of the Resolution. What we are particularly concerned with is that the Minister is trying to get out of something, because he told the House things that were not true when he tried to explain how the money should be spent in relation to overtime.

Mr. Chairman, he caused us to believe that the people were so poor that if the Resolution were not passed today, the Government Printery would have broken down. In the face of the information which the Minister proffered this morning, are we not now to query in all seriousness what has driven the Minister to ask us to concur with him in postponing further consideration of this Resolution? This is a Resolution with much more serious importance than catches the naked eye. It is a Resolution which has shown the Government to be immoral. and corrupt; it has shown that the Government is even bankrupt of ideas as to how it should proceed when it is given information on the floor of this House in relation to where it is losing money and what should be done in the matter.

Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with the taxpayers' money, and it is time that the Government realises that the taxpayers of today are becoming more and more aware and concerned with the high taxation that is strangling them. The taxpayers have to foot this bill; \$36,000 is involved. Some people are receiving two tax bills for one at the same time. We, therefore, have to find out from the Leader of the House what is his reason for seeking a postponement of the Resolution. That is what we want to know.

Mr. Chairman, you will agree with me that every point raised by us is a point that is worthy of a reply from the Leader of the House. We do not know whether the Leader of the House has run out of words, which is most unlikely, or whether he does not now have the debating strength and energy to battle with the young brigade on this side. (Laughter.) At least, Mr. Chairman, I have extracted laughter from the Leader of the House, and I am very glad about that. Since it is the taxpayers' money that is involved, we

would like to hear from the Leader of the House his reason for seeking the postponement of the Resolution.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Chairman.....

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. senior member for St. Peter caught my eye.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

I will give way. Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY I will give way, too. Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS Proceed.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I was not here when the Leader of the House moved the postponement of the Resolution. In my way of thinking and with my experience, when the Opposition get the Government to postpone a Resolution on the arguments adduced at their request, then you cannot bring it back to the House unless something is changed. I feel that the Opposition have triumphed in some way or other. (Hon. N. W. BOXILL We do not think so.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Hon. members not addressing the Chair.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

That is nonsense. 5.20 p.m.

I am trying to save the Opposition by trying to get the Government to listen.... (ASIDES.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Is the hon. senior member for Bridgetown still addressing the Chair?

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

I am, Sir. Having agreed to postpone the Resolution, the Government must have been convinced by some of the arguments used, and that is why I would vote for the postponement. On the other hand, you said you have contacted the Minister of Home Affairs and have discussed it with him. Are you therefore postponing for the reason of giving further information and/or having an inquiry into the allegations made? (ASIDES.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Let the hon. senior member for Bridgetown proceed. I would like to appeal to hon. members who are not addressing the Chair to observe Standing Order No. 29(6).

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

As I was saying, Sir, it seems to me that the only point now is whether the Minister will tell the House that he is postponing for the reason of giving further information and/or recommending to the Cabinet an inquiry into the allegations made by a responsible member. I take it that all members elected here are responsible members of the House. In those circumstances I do not think there is any point in either side being stubborn. The Leader of the House is quite capable of finding words. Far be it from me to put words in his mouth, but to avoid any further arguments, would the hon. member just say that he will postpone on the arguments put up by the Opposition and that it is his Intention to have an Inquiry into the matter? (Hon. J. C. TUDOR At their request.) There are two reasons given. One section of the Opposition is saying that they want further information on this matter. The hon. junior member for St. Peter has made certain allegations; he said he has told you this before and that you said you would have an inquiry, and this has not been done. Are you prepared to have an inquiry after postponing it? It is very simple to get on with the business of the House. This is all that is really necessary.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, certain allegations have been made which appear to bear some sort of substance and which should be investigated. On these grounds the Leader of the House has seen fit to confer with his colleague who is the Minister responsible for these matters, and we are asking that some little time be given to us at this stage so that proper investigation can take place.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I respect the hon. member for the courage to get up and say so. I have no respect for the Leader of the House who sat down and allowed the debate to go on for forty-five minutes because he is afraid to get up and say so.

The question that further consideration of the Resolution be now postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Chairman, before you proceed further with the business of the House, I should like to read Standing Order No. 27 on page 26.

"The mover of a motion may re ply after all the other Members present have had an opportunity of addressing the House and before the question is put, and after such reply no other Member may speak, except as provided in paragraph 2 of this Order.

A Minister may conclude a debate on any motion' which is critical of the Government.... "(Mr. HINDS: This is Committee.)

You cannot tell me this is Committee; I know it is. Do you think I am an idiot like you that I do not know that?

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Hon. members will observe that this House has not yet been suspended. (ASIDES.)

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

I am not trying one bit. You do not understand what is going on.

Mr. ST. JOHN:

On a point of order, the hon. member cannot speak on anything because there is nothing before the

House.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

I am putting something before the House. This affects the whole House because it is the Rules of the House. None of your Christian tricks can get away in here. You can do that with the idiots over there, not over here.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

At this stage I deem this not to be a point of order.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

I did not rise on a point of order. I got up to speak.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

The motion was carried; therefore there is nothing before the House.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Who is speaking to you? You should be seen and not heard.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

This House has not yet been suspended. I am awaiting the Leader of the House to see what other business there is to be done.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLE Y:

On a point of order....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

There is nothing before the House to promote a point of order.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Well, call on the hon. member to sit down. If he does not sit, I will not sit.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

There are two hon. members on their feet. Let us have a little better behaviour, please.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1969-70 No.58 Head 10 - Accountant General - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, under Head 10, we are supplementing.....

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, the Marshal cannot order a citizen to leave unless he is behaving badly. You have to so order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I ask hon. members to behave. I have already ordered today, through the bad behaviour of that gentleman that he be sent outside for the day's sitting.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

On a point of order, I think it is fair to the Committee, and therefore to the House, to give some indication under what Rule either Mr. Speaker or the Chairman of Committees can order a member of the public to leave the room for the whole day. You might just as well say for a week. It is just like a drunken driver of a motor car being suspended from the right to drive for a month. I did not notice what happened; I did not notice that anybody was told to go out; but the point is that if a person misbehaves, and if he is in such a condition that he is bound to continue to misbehave, I can understand suspending him for a whole day, but because a person may make an exclamation or something of the sort, you order him to be put out; but if he comes back in and sits and behaves properly, how can you stop him unless you are sending every member of the public out? With great respect, I am sure that Your Honour.....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, there is a gentleman in the Gallery now called Loyd Gort whom the Barbados Labour Party, when they were in power, used to put out of the House every day. They never gave him a chance; so do not let the Leader of the Opposition get away with any murder saying that you cannot put out people.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I have already ruled on that matter. I have asked that the gentleman be not allowed to return here today to disrupt the Committee's work. 5.30 p.m.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

I raised the question because I did not know that you had ordered to put him out.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, in respect of Head 10 which we are now asked to supplement, there are three National Cash Register accounting machines in use at the Treasury; two of these have not been working satisfactorily for some time, largely because they are 12 and 13 years old respectively. The Accountant General has therefore reported on them that their mechanism is in a worn condition, and it is now proposed to take advantage of an offer made by Geddes Grant Ltd., I think it is, to purchase two machines which they are holding for the Government. I may also add that we have been advised to take these two machines because it takes between 10 and 12 months for the order for these machines to be supplied; therefore we are asking for this \$14, 750 to purchase these two machines and \$2,500 to restore the other one, or to recondition it to bring it to a working state. I beg to move that Head 10 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister to tell us if money has been spent on reconditioning all three of the Cash Registers that are in this Department. The Minister says that two of them are between 12 and 13 years old; I am challenging the Minister on that point as to the age of the two Cash Registers that he is asking us to replace. Further, rather than merely putting aside these two Cash Registers, should the Government not have Surveyors to examine these machines? The Government has never worked in this particular field; they should have their own technicians trained; -it is very easy for Geddes Grant to send two or three workmen up there -I have had experience in this thing already in my own business. A big engineering firm sends six and seven workmen down to your plant - people who have been in the business 13 and 14 years and know nothing about what they are doing, but they remain on the premises,

and a little boy who just started to work three years ago comes in and in less than an hour can show these people who have been there for three or four days what was really wrong with the machine. The engineering firm will still send you a bill for the time that these people have been there. The thing is that Geddes Grant have been sending in these people, the Government does not have a technician of its own to standby and see what is being done, or to check on these people; so you will find that every time you have machines to repair you have to spend a lot of money on these repairs. Now they have two machines holding for Government, but how is it that it is at the very time you are going to put down two of yours? You have not ordered them because you have no permission to order them, but at the same time they are holding two for you now that you are ready to get rid of two of yours. I am asking you to check your files and see when these machines were purchased, what guarantee you had on them, and I am telling you that they are not 12 and 13 years old.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I stick to what I said, that the machines are 13 and 12 years old respectively. It is true that they have been inspected by Messrs. Geddes Grant who have reported that their mechanisms are in a worn condition.....

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order. They have been inspected by Geddes Grant - the same people who have new ones to sell.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

You have to believe somebody; so if you do not want to believe me, believe Geddes Grant because they are the people who sell and service these machines; are you going to blame them because they have two to sell? In addition to what I have said, I think I ought to state that the Accountant General's Department did enquire into the cost of putting them into service again, and the estimate for carrying out that kind of work was \$2, 456 for each machine.

Mr. HINDS:

Did you get that information from Geddes Grant?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Yes.

Mr. HINDS:

Did you not get an estimate from A. S. Bryden or any of the other people in the same business?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I have already answered the hon. member; he probably did not hear me. I said that Geddes Grant examined them, gave an estimate of what it would cost to repair them, and there is no evidence that anybody else was called in; but the people in the Accountant General's Department - and we have no reason to suspect them about anything. You can say what you like about all the politicians on this side, whether it is true or not - and most of it is not true - but the Accountant General is satisfied that they cannot use these machines. 5.40 p.m.

That is what the Government is prepared to do; there is no mystery about this.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I should just like to say that time and again the Prime Minister has referred to the Tenders Committee, and the hon. junior member for St. Peter hag also referred to the Tenders Committee. There are four or five people who supply these machines. The Prime Minister was saying that when these things were required, the Tenders Committee should ask Geddes Grant, Rogers and so on to submit tenders. We want to know whether tenders were sent out for these machines.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the house tells us that there are three Cash Registers. He also tells us that Geddes Grant has two holding for the Government, but the Addendum states that we are buying only one. The Minister is telling us that of these two machines one is 12 years and the other is 13 years. I challenge him on that. The Note tells us that they are going to repair one and buy a new one. Is the Note giving us the truth, or is the Minister giving us an untruth? This is the position we have reached.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is trying in vain to confuse me, and I do not know if he is confusing himself. Let us go over the matter step by step again. There are three Accounting Machines in the Treasury Department; two of them have not been working satisfactorily due to the fact that one is 12 years and the other is 13 years - or, if this will please you better, one is 13 years and the other is 12 years. Geddes Grant has two new machines which it is holding. The Government is going to buy one of those machines.....

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. We either have to get the truth out of this Ministry, or get him out of here. That is straight talk. He cannot tell us with one corner of his mouth that he is going to buy two machines when the Note says that the Department is buying one machine. I made notes of what the Minister said. With a view to helping us in this situation, we can get the notes from the Reporter.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

No, Mr. Chairman. Let us put it this way. Why do we not wait until the time come for electioneering and do it properly? We cannot do it is here. As for getting me out of the House, this is something that you ought to attempt. (ASIDES.) YOU are with a Party that would not swing and cannot sing.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. He can take all the dead weight.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

That is not a point of order.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, at the risk of being repetitious, I am going to say the same thing for the third time. There are three machines; two of them are not working satisfactorily because one is 12 years and one is 13 years, or one is 13 years and the other is 12 years. Geddes Grant has been holding two; we are going to buy one and recondition one.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. You are not reading straight; you have missed a point there where you said that the Accountant General had reported thereon.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

And so he has.

Mr. HINDS:

If you are going step by step, you have missed out that.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I left you to put in that.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I believe that some time ago some money was voted to provide equipment and a room for the Leader of the Opposition. From time to time and almost every week we come here.....(ASIDES.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I am sure the hon. member is aware of the appropriate Standing Order, which says that a member should not be irrelevant.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

But you have not yet heard what I have to say to decide that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

You said that you were not talking about.....(ASIDES.) Let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

If you do not let me talk about it now, I will talk about it before the day is out.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

It is not irrelevant. There are four or five people who sell these machines. Is that so or not? The Prime Minister said in here that the Tenders Committee was not doing its work, and every cent spent on anything for the Government should go before the Tenders Committee. You are now saying that somebody is holding something for you and the same person is selling you something. What about the Tenders Committee? Have you asked other firms who sell these things to submit figures? This is important.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I did not do so, for the reason which I think the hon. member will appreciate. This kind of machine which is used in the Treasury is only supplied, so far as I see, by these people.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Is the Minister serious?

Mr. HINDS:

Have you ever tried to find out if somebody else can supply them? Did you call for tenders? Do not get up and make these foolish state-merits. Something is wrong with your head today.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

It is not a foolish statement. Nothing is wrong with my head; something is wrong with your Party,

Mr. ST. JOHN:

Is the Minister saying that Sweda Cash Registers cannot make the same equipment as N.C.R. and the others? What you do is to advertise for a machine to do a certain number of manipulations or a certain type of work, and then the firms will tell you. whether they have a machine to do the job.

The question that Head 10 stand part was put and and resolved in the affirmative without division.

5.50 p.m.

Head 11 - pensions - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of this Head for \$62, 545, apart from the Note which is set out in the Addendum, I should like to remind the Committee that the provisions of Section 36 of the Anglican Church Act, 1969-5 have repealed the above Regulations, and in accordance with Section 10 (l) of the Act, the payment of these pensions - I am speaking in respect of the people who are entitled to benefits under the Anglican Church Act - falls on the Government, and it comes out of the Consolidated

Fund. There are a number of people involved. As far as the City of Bridgetown is concerned, there are two; one organist and one bell ringer. There are eleven in the Northern District and seven in the Southern District. These people have been waiting for their money for quite some time, and we are very anxious to see that they are not held up. In most cases they are old people, and they are anxious to get their little donation, whether it is a reduced pension and gratuity. Although hon. members are entitled to ask all the questions they normally ask, I am hoping that, in the case of pension rights where we are at least trying to help these poor people who have been waiting for this money for so long, there will not be a long drawnout prorogation.

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

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if provision is being made for grave-diggers. Do they fall within the ambit of Church Officers?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, grave diggers by virtue of their type of employment dig per square foot and it does not seem as though they are included. It may well be that the hon. member may be able to make a motion, and if there are grave -diggers to be considered, I suppose they will benefit. "What I have before me is for organists, bell-ringers and sextons. Grave-diggers are not really provided for in this; but if they have a case and a clear case is made out, I think the grave-digger as such should also be considered in these days, because he has done his work and he could probably benefit as others have benefitted over the years.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I think I am right in saying that in the Northern District there are grave-diggers who received in the past a fixed sum of, maybe, \$18 or \$20 per month from the Local Government, and then they got so much per square foot for digging the graves in the various churchyards or cemeteries. I am sure that in the case of St. Peter a grave-digger has been to me on more than one occasion to find out if he would be included in this. I do not think that it should now be left to grave-diggers to make out that they have a case for consideration. Grave-diggers are Church Officers, and in the case where a grave-digger was paid a fixed sum, small though it may be, by the Council, and then a percentage on the square-foot basis for digging the grave, I think it is Government's responsibility at this stage not to make

provision for sextons, bell-ringers and organists, and leave out grave-diggers.

Mr. Chairman, I want the Minister to understand that when grave-diggers find that this is the sort of thing that is happening to them he would be inviting them to go on strike. If grave-diggers go on strike, what is the position? I heard the hon. junior member for St. Andrew saying something, but I am sure that if grave-diggers in St. Andrew were to go on strike, the hon. member is not going to do anything to relieve the situation. I feel it is a case of neglect. I do not want to deny the people who are provided for here, but, after all, at a church there is the sexton, the bell-ringer, the organist and in some cases two grave-diggers. It does leave a bad taste in the mouth to find that provision is made to look after the pension rights and retiring benefits of some of these people, and to leave out grave-diggers where they are entitled. I feel this is a matter for Government, and the information can easily be ascertained, because a letter to the Rector of either of the churches would certainly bring in the necessary information about the number of years that a particular grave-digger has been serving a particular church, and then Government could go into it and see whether or not these people are entitled to something. If it is a case where grave-diggers was receiving a stipend from the Local Government, you cannot just dismiss him like that. By all means he is entitled to something because it might have come on from the days of the Vestry. The Local Government system inherited what the Vestries had created and now that the Central Government has taken over, the grave-diggers should not now be struck off like the stick off a hoe. I want some consideration to be given to grave-diggers in cases where they should have that consideration.

Mr. CORBIN:

Mr. Chairman, I will try to give the hon. junior member for St. Peter a clear explanation. Now, the grave-diggers attached to cemeteries are paid by the month by the Rectors or Ministers in charge; but at churches that do not have cemeteries, the grave -diggers make their own price. Sometimes a grave-digger gets as high as \$40 or \$45 according to the size of the grave, and they do not get any gratuity or pension because they are on their own and you have to pay them whatever they charge. 6.00 p.m.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Chairman, I cannot speak very broadly on this matter, but I think the particular reference made to one grave-digger by the junior member for St. Peter I am well aware of. This particular individual is making some sort of complaint and he would like to know what is his true position. As a matter of fact, he .is not only concerned about his wages or wage rates as a grave-digger, but apparently he is being called upon to do the cleaning of the St. Peter's Cemetery at Road View, and he does not yet know under whose particular charge his responsibility is at the moment, whether it is at the Rector of the parish or it is any officer of the Government, the Ministry of Health. That, I think, needs clarification. As I understand it, grave-diggers at public cemeteries - and St. Peter is a cemetery which is still divided as far as the congregation is concerned; there is one part of the cemetery which seems to be run by the Church of England, and the rest seems to be run by the Ministry of Health.

I think this grave-digger is paid so much a month - a very small wage - when he digs paupers' graves. I understand that when they dig a grave that is not a pauper's grave they are paid according to a charge they made with the undertaker - which is more or less a private contract; but I think it is the cleaning of the cemetery he wants to know about, whether he is to clean the entire cemetery or that part that does not concern the Anglican Church, because he got no increase and apparently he does not know if the Rector is in charge of it. He wants really clarification; as I understand it, these grave-diggers charge under private contract for graves other than paupers' graves, but there is a monthly remuneration of \$18 or \$19 a month which is paid to him by the Rector. I think that is where the confusion begins, but I do not think that that money comes from the Church; so he would like clarification by the Ministry of Health as to how he really stands, I think that is what the hon. junior member for St. Peter was speaking; about some time ago,

Mr. HOPPIN:

Mr. Chairman, in respect of what the last member was speaking about the grave-digger in St. Peter, as the Chairman of the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board, this is under consideration and we do know about it, and the Committee has met to regularise the salaries of all of these grave-diggers as well as the prices charged. But I am not speaking on that issue now; it is really in connection with the 42 Church Officers that are to get pensions. I think this is really an answer to a prayer. Having been in the Church for so long, some of these Church Officers were getting a bit anxious to know what would be their fate, and the Government has shown that these people should be protected by giving them a pension. As we know, some of them were lowly paid, and sometimes not well-treated, and by giving them pensions now, this is a means of removing this anxiety of some of them who are in some respects too old to get jobs otherwise; so I think in granting these 42 Officers a pension it is a move in the right direction, and removes the great anxiety that has been building up amongst them.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, Sir.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. junior member for St. James caught my eye first.

Mr. HOLDER:

Mr. Chairman, speaking on this Resolution, I am taking a point which I was crossed on by the hon. junior member for St. George. With regard to the grave-diggers, St. James really does not come under that category that there will be any money directly awarded. In the parish of St. James is one cemetery and three churchyards; you can only be buried in the Parish churchyard by law, as far as I know, and

there are very few people who are buried there now; they have to be old livers who have got their graves there that can go there, so that for one of those funerals I am not too sure what the Rector would do. At St. Silas no graves are opened, and at St. John the Baptist, I think you may have to get permission. The last person to have been buried there in many years was a lady by the name of Miss Hinds.

Going back to the Cemetery, I have heard some figures used here this afternoon, and I hope the changeover will not hurt the grave-digger at the St. James' Cemetery. I know that the Vestry had it in hand at one time, then it went on to the first Local Government, and then it went to the present Government, and the grave-digger there was paid a salary per month; I am not sure what it was raised to, but I do feel there is no direct question of his pay. I do hope that now that the Cemetery is in the hands or under the Chairmanship of the Supervisor at the Westbury Cemetery, if he can get some money, he will try to keep a good hand on it. That Cemetery has been near and dear to me for a long time when the wall around it that protects it - when I was a boy it had no wall and I knew the one who fought and enclosed it. I do hope that now it is under the hand of the Chief Supervisor of the Westbury Cemetery, once he can get the money, he will make the walks clean and keep it in a clean condition and make it a happy garden to go to. It is the last resting place and a pleasure to the people or to anyone at all when you take time off and go to your cemetery and see the graves all fresh and clean, and you can take a quiet hour there with the departed ones; so I do hope that they will pay strict attention to it.

I notice that they have put some people to work, and I am very glad for that, so that they will keep it in a clean manner; but the Supervisor at the Cemetery cannot keep that Cemetery up to date unless the money is granted.

With regard to the other Church Officers, I do hope this afternoon that this Resolution will not be held up; those Church Officers have worked hard and long at their different churches, and the salaries were, very low. Each Vestry had its own way of laying its rates; that was the trouble of old; and I do hope on behalf of those Officers that this Resolution will not be held up. I totally agree with the Chairman of the Board, the member for St. George. Those people have been serving in the different churches for very long on their small salaries, and I do hope that this Resolution may stand in good stead of being passed this afternoon.

6.10 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I am very heartened to hear the sentiments expressed by hon. members who have spoken and, without any further ado, I should like to say that 42 people are involved and are in need of the money, whether gratuity or a pension. We are hereto serve the people, and I am asking you, Sir, to put the question that the Resolution do now pass.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, I notice that we are about to vote money for Church Officers, Now, I think you know my stand as far as the Church is concerned. I heard one member refer to the grave-diggers. I am not talking about the grave-diggers who work at Westbury Cemetery or the cemeteries in the North. You will be surprised to know that, since the disestablishment of the Church a year or so ago, a grave which one paid \$10.00 for before is now costing \$40.00. Last week I paid \$25.00 for a grave on Tuesday; and on Thursday I had to pay the grave digger \$30.00 for the same type of grave in the same cemetery. Almost every time one turns up at the Church, the grave-digger is increasing the fee.

Sir, a grave-digger is a very important man, because you cannot get everybody to dig a grave. Anyway, I feel that the grave-diggers should be more reasonable with the people who have to pay for these graves. I also feel that the graves should be fixed at a standard price, whether it is a round-shoulder or square-shoulder grave, and the money should be paid to the incumbent to pay the grave-diggers. Sometimes after a corpse is covered up, one can find an undertaker and a grave-digger quarrelling like people in a fish market over the money. I repeat that there should be a standard price for digging a grave.

Sir, you will notice that inasmuch as they have disestablished the Church, money is still being paid to the churches. I think that for eight years after, \$1,200,000 will have to be contributed to the Church by the taxpayers, and we should have some control over the matter. We should be able to call on His Lordship the Bishop and ask him to go into the matter with a view to finding out why the churches are charging this extra money. Some of them are getting along better than they ever have before. Money is being paid to provide for them. For what are the churches charging this extra amount of money?

Mr. Chairman, some, churches have charged as high as \$70.00; some have charged \$30.00. There certainly should be a uniform rate. If they are going to charge, then let it be a uniform rate. I took up the matter with the Bishop. He told me that he knew nothing about the matter at the time, and that the Synod would soon be meeting to decide what the churches should charge for burials. I do not see why the Rectors should be allowed to charge this extra money when they are not pressed for money at the moment. If the Government is paying them money over a period of eight years, then it is not necessary to make these Increased charges at the moment. Let them wait until they need money before they take this sort of action.

Sir, I know that there was a church charging \$5.00 before the disestablishment, but nowadays it is charging \$7.00. If this chap goes on to charge \$7.00 for each funeral, then within eight years you will know how much money he is collecting. I do not know what agreement was made between the Church

and the Government. I hope the Hon. Minister in charge will tell us something about this matter. The Government is granting these people \$213,000 per year, and this is a handsome sum of money. I hope the Minister will be able to tell us whether that amount will offset all the expenses of the churches for a year. If the amount will offset all the expenses of the churches, then for what are these boys charging this big money? I know that they will have to put aside some money for investment in order to get interest to keep things rolling. I know that sort of thing will happen, but we should know exactly what is going on. We are paying the piper and we should be able to call the tune. We cannot let the Rector sit in his church and do as he likes. He should not be able to tell a man that he has to pay him so much money. We are here to represent everybody: Church, Rector and so on. In this case we are giving them the money without looking to see what is going on.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Government will look into this matter. As soon as you want to leave poor people to other people, I know what can happen. The people are already saying that the Government disestablished the Church. I never was in favour of it. I said: "Hands off the Church", because I love my church. We had no right to interfere with the Church, I never heard one elector say that the Church was costing too much money. I never heard a taxpayer say that the Church was costing too much money.

6.20 p.m.

If this Government wants to appear ungodly and care nothing about the Church, that is their business; but I have to care about the people, I feel that the Minister in charge should call upon the Bishop to find out what is going on with these churches, because I do not think the Bishop has any control over these boys. If you have disestablished, we should have some control until we stop paying them; but they do not care anything about us. It is disestablished now and they can do as they like, but it is the taxpayers' money that is still paying them. I dare suppose this will be one of the planks of my platform where the time comes, because I will rake from Bengal to Riley. As soon as you interfere with poor people, you interfere with me, and, thank God, I am in a position to lash both sides now, right and left. I am now going to get into my father's blood. Do not tell me that you are going to sit back and allow there Rectors to fleece the people. I know of one who charged \$30 for the use of the church, and if it is a Sunday they do not want to do anything at all. They want you to keep the corpse until Monday, no matter how poor you are. Do you think they are acting nicely? If the Government does nothing about it, I will come here with a Resolution and let the people know how I feel about it, because we are still paying them. I had to tell one some time ago that we are still paying him and if he did not do as I expected him to do, I would come and lock up the church. I do not believe that he knows I have some power. He told me I must think twice when I am coming to him about a Sunday funeral. We want some power over them as long as we are paying out this money. When we have finished paying out the money, then we have no more control. As long as they are drawing the taxpayer' money like anybody else, we should control them, and this Government is wrong to disestablish the Church without holding some part of the reins, if not all. We should still be holding some part of the reins because the Rectors are fleecing the people by charging all sorts of money, and I would like to know what these charges are for. I would like to know from the Minister if this sum of \$213,000 per year is more than will offset the year's expenses, and how they

arrived at it, so that I would be able to tell the people in this country.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I do not like the reckless generality of weaving in all Rectors as the same. I think every hon. member in this Chamber knows who is the villain of the piece, in so far as these Rectors are concerned, and I am sure the Hon. Leader of the House and others will agree with me that you cannot attribute this attitude to all Rectors. I think hon. members who have studied the Anglican Church Act, in so far as it applied to Barbados with its tradition and custom, will know that with the division of the Island into eleven parishes, the Anglican Churches were also divided into parishes, and when the Church was established and endowed, it was incumbent upon the Rector or Clergyman who was in charge of a church to perform marriages for persons living in that district, and he also had to bury people from that district. The Cathedral, of course, was for the Island when it became a cathedral, and not the parish church of St. Michael.

Now before I touch on grave-diggers, I should just like to say that the Government was frightfully reckless as soon as disestablishment and disendowment came into being, and I will deal with two cases I know of. For instance, the Act said that a person holding the Bishop's licence - who could be a lay-reader - should be appointed at the Westbury Cemetery, a cemetery which took people from all over the Island, and it would surprise this Chamber to note that at the end of August there was a Chaplain at the Cemetery who had been appointed for something like 16 years, and all he was told when he went for his salary was that they did not need his services any longer. They did not have the decency of sending him a letter. I do not know if it is the Permanent Secretary who is responsible for this. There was the Reverend Oliver Haynes who was appointed Chaplain of St. Michael's Cemetery, a place where other people like Roman Catholics could go and hold services in the Chapel, and he too was told that they did not require his services any longer. I do not think that is right because this House has defended even domestic servants and said that you cannot do that sort of thing. I have drawn this to the attention of the Minister, but I have not heard anything more about it. Not being a lawyer, I advised both of them to go on doing the work every day and then put somebody in Court, because the Council under the law took over the Vestries who appointed them, the Commissioner of Local Government took over the Council's duties, and the Government took over the duties of the Local Government Commissioner, and therefore it follows as night follows day.

As far as pensions for grave-diggers are concerned, this is something which I am very proud of myself, because I instituted this many years ago when I instituted clothing and boots and so on for grave-diggers. I know that grave-diggers have been frightfully reckless in over-charging. There was an instance of a man at Station Hill whose mother died, and when the grave-digger said he wanted \$40, the man decided that he could not work for \$40 in a day and he was going to dig the grave himself, and he went and dug his mother's grave. As far as cemeteries are concerned, there are cemeteries attached and belonging to the various churches or chapels. There are cemeteries owned by the Government in the sense that they were bought by the Vestries or Local Government and so on. I think everybody knows

about that. - At these cemeteries, you appointed a Chaplain. This is what the Chairman of the Board should hear. It is incumbent upon the Health Authorities in this country, if a person is found dead in the street, no matter who he is, to find some place to bury him. If some person is found dead in the Harbour and an undertaker takes him to the Cemetery, what is this new-fangled idea that he must pay for a grave and then beg you back for the money? I would advise anybody to carry the body and leave it in the Cemetery, because they say they are not burying it unless the undertaker pays for the grave. The custom has always been that if you want to buy a grave, you buy it. The dearest land ever sold in this country until recently was the land at the Cemetery. Even if the person was an atheist and said you could bury him anywhere, you had to find a grave for him. Today you are finding no grave, and I do not know what are the reasons. 6.30 p.m.

As far as the bell-ringers and grave-diggers are concerned, all of the parishes with the exception of St. Michael - and none of the churches in St. Michael, except the Cathedral - paid the organist or bell-ringers; those persons were paid by the Vestry. When the Council came into being, I well remember that some of the Officers at the Cathedral resigned, drew a pension because they had in time and then they could be appointed to go on; they could not now be entitled to draw pension. The other churches - St. Lucy, St. Swithin's, St. Clement's, St. Albans - all of these churches the Vestry made a contribution to and paid the salaries of these Officers; these are the Officers we are now asked to pay their pensions, and quite rightly so. As far as the grave-diggers are concerned, they were people who carried out their duties, but the prices used to be fixed by the Board where there was a central Board like St. James or Bushy Park, St. Philip; but now a days, I am at a loss to hear - and I hear it from a very responsible person - that a grave-digger charged \$101 for digging a grave.

I am supporting the idea of the Resolution for paying these Officers- the bell-ringers, sextons and organists - a pension. I can well remember the days when you had to come to this House of Assembly to get permission to give these Officers their pensions, and I remember when the ex-member for St. Philip, Mr. Crawford, came in here nearly 10 years after Mr. Spencer had retired from being an organist at St. Martins Church and got the House with much persuasion to vote money to make him a pension. I am not going to pat myself on the back, but every Officer in the Church owes me a debt today in that I got passed in this House - and I was not in this House at the time because I got it through the Vestry - a Parochial Pension Bill, and they were all included and were automatically pensioned. In those days I was able to persuade quite a number of persons in this House that it was absolutely necessary for such a Bill to be passed. Even the Sanitary Inspectors were appointed at the beginning of every year; this was bad policy, and after the Act came into being they were also being looked after.

Further, while I support this, there is no sense in our crying over spilt milk; it was the duty of the Rector of every parish to bury and to marry people, and the publishing of banns within his parish was also his duty. By "parish", I mean the parish which was circumscribed to the particular church. A few days ago I mentioned in here that when the Rector . of St. Thomas, Rev. Curry, even before the Church was disestablished, told people at Assistant Commissioner Bourne's mother's funeral after he was

finished that they could not sing one of the Brethren hymns, I started the hymn and asked him to get to hell out of the place. The Rev. Curry, I understand, is charging \$75 to bury people up there, but the difficulty of this sort of thing is that if a man is so mercenary he is not fit to wear a collar turned back, and the junior member for St. Thomas is very friendly with the Rev. Curry.....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

He is one of my constituents.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

He should be able to discuss this matter with him and explain to him that it is wrong. I do not want to say anything more on this matter, but I want to draw to the attention of the Chairman of the Board that this should not be allowed to continue; it is absolute nonsense. I am going to a funeral tomorrow evening of a man who has not got one single dime to bury him, and are you saying that for a man as poor as that, his widow or any of his family who are all poor, should be asked to pay a grave-digger? It is the duty of the Health Officer to see that places are provided for the burial of the dead, and stop talking this nonsense about telling people that they must pay if they are poor. I hope the Minister is taking this note carefully, and that he will call up his Cemeteries Board and have it stopped, because they are doing this all over the island. What they are saying is that you must pay for the land; it does not matter whether you are poor or not.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, I had forgotten to raise this point, and I am glad that the Chairman of the Board is here. All of us know that the Government has taken over all the responsibilities from the Local Government; I think the hon. senior member for the City will help me in this matter. I do not know who used to pay the Chaplain at the Cemetery. He says the Vestry, but since they have disestablished the Church, the Board refused to pay the Chaplains, and the person or persons whose corpse is being interred have to pay \$5.00 for the Chaplain. That is not fair; the Government must be prepared to pay the Chaplains as usual because the Vestry used to do it, and the Council did it. If they are big enough to take over and they take over one thing, they must take over all. 6.40 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, there are people who are unable to pay for the funeral, and yet you are going to fleece them by asking them to pay a Priest \$5.00 to bury a dead! I hope the Government will make up its mind to pay a Chaplain to bury people. You are only encouraging the people to charge in the country, because you are paying money down here. I hope that the Government will go into this matter.

Mr. HOPPIN:

Mr. Chairman, some remarks have been made here which are incorrect with regard to the Cemeteries. As the Chairman of the Cemeteries Board, I know that we are doing everything possible to help the people. It is known that the dead must be buried. We are not telling the people anything such as the statement made by the senior member for the City. It is definitely not so. We are providing graves and the people will be buried. The paupers, because of their financial conditions, will have to be buried. The grave-diggers are being paid for opening graves the same as usual. The exorbitant prices that have been asked by grave-diggers, we have not accepted in the Government Cemeteries such as Westbury, St. Philip and other places. It has been brought to our notice that in the Northern District especially, some very exorbitant price shave been asked, and the grave-diggers at Westbury Cemetery started to get a little itchy in the hope that the Board would increase their pay for these graves. We have decided not to do that, and we are sticking to the standard price that we found when we took over from the Local Government Council.

As far as providing a Chaplain at the Cemetery-is concerned, it has been brought to our notice that some people prefer to have their own Priest to bury them. We have decided that the pittance that wag paid by the Local Government should be increased, and that is where the senior member for St. Joseph is referring to the \$5.00 paid for burial. We say that the undertaker can get in contact with the people who have the funeral and decide who should bury the dead. There are many Priests available, and the Government has not appointed a Chaplain at any of these places. In St. Philip the Rev. Pembertonis still carrying on. We have found out at Westbury that many people prefer to have their own Priest. We have decided to leave it to the undertakers to consult the families, find out the particular Chaplain they desire for the interment, and we will pay the price. Our intention is that the dead must be buried; we are providing graves for them, and we are trying to control this matter.

Mr. Chairman, there is one other point I should like to raise. The grave-diggers, especially at Westbury, are beginning to complain that especially on Sundays they find it rather difficult to cope with the amount of work because people sre trying to hold back funerals until Sundays. Sometimes you have ten or twelve funerals there and the people have to be burled. I am mentioning this matte mow so that some people will realise that the grave-diggers are also men. Because somebody wants a gathering of 300 cars and so on, he should not hold back a funeral until a Sunday. The people should be buried as quickly as possible and the quicker the better, because we have not yet started to cremate bodies. These grave-diggers must be considered. When we have 12 funerals down there the Chaplain has to run here, there and everywhere and we have trouble with the parking facilities.

Mr. Chairman, the Board is doing its best to cope with this situation. The members of the Board are hoping that everyone will be satisfied with the provisions we are making.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I said that if the relative of a poor person got an undertaker to bury him, he would always get a free burial. What they are telling undertakers today - I phoned the Clerk to find out if it was true - is to pay us \$30,00 or \$40.00 for the grave; put in an application for the amount, and the Board will repay you. That is nonsense. This is true because the Clerk told me so himself.

Mr. HOPPIN:

Mr. Chairman, I do not know anything about that, and I have not given any such instructions from my Board.

Mr. WEEKES:

Mr. Chairman, I have listened attentively to the various speakers, and I should like to associate myself with certain remarks made by the hon. senior member for the City. In the parish which I have the honour to represent, I can state unequivocally that the Anglican Ministers are doing their utmost for the people of the parish of St. Philip. We have no complaints about Ministers charging this exorbitant amount for the burial of the dead in that parish.

I am happy to report that conditions in that parish are very, very good, and things are going on there as before the Church was disendowed and disestablished. We have certain Anglican Ministers up there who will go out of their way to assist the people in the parish. As an ardent, faithful and conscientious church-goer, I can vouch that the Anglican Church is doing a wonderful job in my parish.

Mr. ST. JOHN:

Mr. Chairman, there are a few points I should like clarified. It is obvious that this matter is causing a considerable amount of concern. As far as I understand the situation, the position is that now you have the National Cemeteries and the Scavenging and Cemeteries Board, there are available in all of the former Local Government Areas public burial grounds. That is the first point we have to get clear. There is no obligation on nobody at all to go and bury his relatives in St. Thomas where the charges are exorbitant, because there is a burial ground in St. James; there is a burial ground available in Westbury Cemetery, although it is extremely difficult to find space at the present moment, but space is still available there. In the Southern Area at Christ Church there is a burial ground which used to belong to the parish and not the Church. At one time that was a very High Church area, and Ministers did not like to bury people of a different faith there. At St. Philip there is a burial ground. 6.50 p.m.

The Board has done the logical thing already; it has called for all the former survey plots of all the lands that were owned by the Vestry in respect of burial grounds. I do not know where that information is. Nobody has been able to find it. Perhaps the Interim Commissioner has it locked up somewhere.

However this is the position so that you will know exactly what is the area and be able to plan the thing properly.

Secondly, a decision was taken, as far as my memory goes, that for a religious service only they would ask for a fee of \$5.00, and an arrangement had been made with a number of Priests, who were willing at any of these various places to bury any person who came forward, for a fee of \$5.00. I believe the undertakers would have got this information from the Secretary of the Board. As far as the burial of paupers is concerned, a decision has already been taken on that. In so far as they are paupers who are on National Assistance, we regard them as an appropriate charge on National Assistance, and we regard those persons in the Institutions as such for the purpose of proper accounting, because it is the same Government Department that the payment should be made from - either the Social Welfare Department, the National Assistance Board or whichever it is -and this would be reflected as a credit as it is financed in exactly the same place. As far as the other people are concerned, no application has been made in respect of them. The problem that was raised here today never came before the Board at any time. If it is a problem, it is up now, but it must be remembered that this is as a result of splitting two parts of the Public Health which you had before, in which the Public Health Act set out the provisions dealing with your obligation to bury everybody. Nowadays that part of the functions is taken over by the Ministry of Health generally, and in any event the Board cannot charge anything unless the charges are authorised by the Ministry. These are not executive Boards; these Boards can only do what the Ministry wants them to do. The Boards have no power to impose any charge. All they can do is to recommend to the Ministry and the Ministry can pass the regulation charging; so that this problem about people dying in the road and there is nobody to look after them is a Ministry of Health problem. Our function at the Board is only to provide the burial ground and the grave-digging.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to see that these organists, bell-ringers and sextons who were formerly under the employ of the Local Government Commissioner are among the last to be looked after. I wonder what the Minister would tell us as regards Old Age Pension Enquiry Officers. They have not been dismissed. They are not receiving a salary, and I should like to know what is their position.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, it is a very good thing to clear the air and, at least, to have heard members of the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board reply on behalf of the Board, of the Government, and of the Ministry in particular. To the Chairman and Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I am very grateful, and it is perhaps an overstatement to delay and hold this up any longer. You have listened to some of our probably qualified lay-readers and others who might have served as lay-readers in the past, but we are dealing now specifically with pensions and gratuities for Church Officers who were long awaiting these little benefits which will be coming their way. It is very heartening to know that grave-diggers should be considered, but they worked on a contractual basis, and like that it is no fault of the Government or Ministry, or the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board.

In so far as future arrangements are concerned, we are moving to provide a National Cemetery and Crematorium. We have visited many spots over the last two years, but at long last I think a site has been actually selected and negotiations are taking place between the Crown Solicitor, the Minister of Home Affairs and the rightful owners of the land. It is near to the Tobacco Factory at Warrens. We had looked at several areas, but the stone and rock formation was such that it was not possible to carry it through, and we are now going ahead fast with our plans. We are fully aware of the fact that the graves at the West-bury Cemetery are running out, and as long as I happen to be In the Ministry, I will not be found guilty of re-opening graves and committing any error along these lines, despite bad advice. We are dealing now essentially with pensions and gratuities for people who have worked.

With respect to the question raised by the hon. Junior member for St. Peter about Old Age Pension Enquiry Officers, they have been reduce din number; but as far as their basic pension rights and gratuities are concerned, information is being collated and they will be paid very shortly. Just as we are doing with these, we are doing in like manner with them. It takes a little time to get all the information together, but their claim has been duly established! and there will be a Resolution very soon to see that they are paid a gratuity and pension. We are trying to make sure that the younger ones arc given Jobs, because young men should be given an opportunity to work, I know the hon. member has in mind one of his Enquiry Officers in St. Peter, in Road View. Of him we are fully aware and in his case special consideration will be granted.

The question that Head 11 - Pensions - stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move . that the Resolution for the sum of \$79, 795 do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

7.00 p.m.

On resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER:

When the sitting was suspended, the House was in Committee of Supply, and to that it will now revert.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1969-70, No. 59 Head 3 - Parliament - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, this provision of \$2,500 under Item 33B arises out of the decision of the Debates Committee to engage the services of two persons to index the backlog of debates of Parliament. I think that the debates for the 1948-51 session was the last time this work was done. For this purpose, this sum is required to meet the expenses involved to the end of the financial year. The Committee has offered appointments to two persons at salaries of \$600 and \$500 a month respectively. I beg to move that Head 3 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Head 16 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, in respect of Head 16, I think hon. members know that the present holder of the post of Chief Establishments Officer has been designated Head of the Civil Service, and he receives in that capacity a special allowance of \$80 a month which is payable under this Head. The revised salary of the post of Financial Secretary is \$15,600 whilst that of the Chief Establishments Officer is \$14,400; therefore in accordance with a decision of the Cabinet it has been necessary to adjust the allowance paid to the Head of the Civil Service by an extra \$20 a month with effect from the 1st April, 1969. No new principle is therefore involved; the Financial Secretary at one time was Head of the Civil Service. I beg to move that Head 16 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Head 27 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 27 stand part. If there are any questions I will answer them.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

I wonder if the Leader of the House can tell us if a Deputy Chief Fire Officer has yet been appointed.

Hon. J. C. TUODR:

Not to my knowledge, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HINDS:

I will say that Major Bradford never had all this stress and strain. He was a far more experienced officer, and he had a Deputy Chief Fire Officer; why would you not appoint a Deputy Chief Fire Officer to assist the Chief Fire Officer? Do you not have qualified men in the Fire Service that you can appoint as Deputy Chief? Have you advertised for a Deputy Chief Fire Officer? Do you not see the excitement which the present Chief has got to undergo - the stress and strain under which he has to stand up Why have you not appointed one?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Because the Fire Service Commission appoints.

Mr. HINDS:

We appreciate the fact that the Fire Service Commission makes the appointments, but is it not for you to call?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, as far as the Establishment is concerned, the Prime Minister is the person to whose attention this should be drawn. As you have raised it, I think it is our duty to notify him that the Assembly wants the post filled, especially at the time that the crop season is on. He is the person who can say something on this. Ministers as such have no say on this.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, it is a Personnel matter, and the Prime Minister is the person responsible. This is not the first time that I have asked about the appointment of a Deputy Chief Fire Officer; the thing is that when mention was first made, was it communicated to the Prime Minister that the House wanted the post filled? If not, why not? How many times do you have to make mention of things like this for them to be brought to the attention of the Prime Minister? We are satisfied that the volume of work of the Fire Service and the responsibility is definitely too much, and it calls most urgently for the appointment of a Deputy Chief Fire Officer. All the posts in that Department should be filled; there is no reason why we should have any lapse in this Department.

The question that, Head 27 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1961-70 No. 61

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, during discussion on the Estimates which have to come before the House soon, in respect of the Customs Department, the Estimates Committee agreed to the inclusion of two National Cash accounting registers for use in that Department. The estimated cost of these two units is \$30, 340.

7.55 p.m.

Messrs. Geddes Grant Limited, the same people we were talking about this afternoon, the local agents for these machines, have pointed out that, since the delivery date is usually a year or more after the order is placed, a firm request should be made as early as possible so that these machines could be supplied during the financial year. It is, therefore, recommended by the Ministry of Finance that a token supplementary provision in the sum of \$1.00 should be sought under this Head so that an order for the purchase of these two machines can be placed to ensure delivery in the next financial year.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass. Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, if the Minister knows that these two machines cost \$15,000 each, why is it that the House is not being asked today to vote that amount of money? Now, the Minister has told us the cost of these two machines. Is it C.I.F., or F.O.B.? Is there not a report in the Customs to the effect that the new machines have been found to be breaking down more often than the old ones? I am asking the Minister if a report to that effect is not be found in the Customs. Further, Geddes Grant have recommended the purchase of two new machines because they cannot get qualified mechanics to service the machines. In other words, even the two new machines that you want installed now, Geddes Grant are telling you that the material from which they are made is not as long-lasting as the old machines and that you will have to spend more on the upkeep of the new ones. Geddes Grant also told you that they cannot get qualified people to service these machines. In the face of that, are you still asking for a token of \$1.00? Are you still going to purchase these two new machines from Geddes Grant?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, we are very grateful to the hon. member for this information. I do not, of course, have that information here. Let me answer the first part of the point raised - that is if we know the cost of these two machines, why do we not ask for the full amount now. The reason is that if you ask for the full

amount and place the order now, then the money would lapse because you would not have to pay for them for several months - they would not be here.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, is the Minister going to tell us that Geddes Grant have one of these machines ready for installation immediately?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

No. The hon. member may probably be referring to the two machines we spoke about for another Department.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I am not referring to any two machines. Geddes Grant now have a machine that they intend to install at Seawell so that they can handle all the air freight cargo rather than having to send things to Bridgetown; they want to bring the Airport up to date. I know what I am talking about. Get your facts, or I am going to give you a lot of trouble on this.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

You could not possibly give trouble on a matter like this. How could you? This is a simple matter. You are saying that the machines have been ordered for Seawell. This may conceivably be the case, because Customs work goes on at Seawell as well as at the Port; so I do not think the hon. member is making any point. The big point would be if he could prove that in ordering these machines the Government is spending money badly. You have not proved that.

Mr. HINDS:

As people often say, you are spending the money 'worse than bad enough. In the face of the information Geddes Grant supplied that they cannot service these machines when they are installed because they cannot find qualified machan-ics to service them, are you still going to buy these machines at \$15,000 each? Are you not spending money badly?

Mr. ST. JOHN:

Mr. Chairman, there is grave dissatisfaction at Seawell Airport amongst the Customs Officers, because in the Customs Service in Barbados there is not a sufficient hierarchy which will take into account the fact that the most efficient in the Customs Service are people who have been in the Customs

Department for a sufficiently long period of time to be a u fait with the Rules and Regulations of the Customs Department. After you have officers in there who are familiar with the system and procedure, you then have to transfer them because there is no opportunity for promotion.

Sir, repeated requests have been made to the Establishments Division to recognise that the collection of Customs Duties, like the collection of Income Tax, is a specialised field and you must expand opportunities for promotion in that Department, because of the fact that it is expensive to train a Customs Officer to that standard and then have to transfer him. This is certainly causing a lot of dissatisfaction in the Customs Department.

The second point is the payment of overtime money at Seawell. On reliable information certain officers have not been paid since October last year. Of course, the payment of overtime as well as the system of overtime gives trouble when it comes to Teachers and so on. For some reason or other the machinery for making payments for overtime in some Government Departments is so slow that it causes a considerable amount of frustration to the people involved.

8.05 p.m.

We know that the crisis is there. I do not want to repeat myself, but all the Departments are the same. They are like the Government.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1969-70 No. 62

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, hon. members will have to carry their memories back, I believe, to the current Estimates. An amount of \$3/4 million was provided in the current Capital Estimates under Head 106 - Industrial Estates. At the time this provision was made, the Ministry of Finance advised the then Development Board to seek a loan from a commercial bank to meet the difference between the amount provided in the current Estimates and the sum of \$1, 347, 692, which was the estimated Capital funds required by the Corporation for 1969 - 70. Now hon. members will have to take some figures here. The details of the Capital expenditure and the supplement requested axe as follows-Estimated Capital

expenditure \$1, 309,000; repayment to the Barbados Development Bank \$265, 292; less estimated rent receipts \$226,600. You should get a sub-total before that of \$1, 574, 292, then you take away \$226,600 from it.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, if the Minister would give way for a minute, this places the Opposition at a disadvantage. When you look at the Addendum to this Resolution, all you see is that this amount is required to enable the Industrial Development Corporation to repay the sum of \$265, 292 to the Barbados Development Bank and to carry out its Capital programme for 1969-70. It cannot be right for the Minister to get up now with all these figures. This Addendum cannot be fair to members of the Opposition. You cannot ask us to vote the taxpayers' money just like this.

Hon. J. C. JTUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, isn't what I am trying to do now an attempt to satisfy hon. mem-bers? Don't they want a breakdown then? I was saying that the Capital expenditure on the industrial estates is \$1, 309,000; repayment to the Development Bank is \$265, 292. That gives you \$1, 574, 292. You take away from that the rent receipts of \$226,600 and the provision in the Approved Estimates of \$750,000, and you get the difference which is the supplementary provision which is now required.

Hon. members would like, I think, to know in some detail the estimated expenditure, to 31st March, 1970, of all the operations, First is the Harbour Industrial site. Coopers (Barbados) Limited: \$150,000. This Company will manufacture sporting goods and protective equipment for sport. One hundred persons will be employed in the initial stage. (Asides.) You really cannot please some people 1 One hundred persons will be employed in the initial stage increasing to 200 persons in approximately one year. Supreme Industries Limited \$50,000, This Company will manufacture metal ware, metal baking ware, metal pressure cookers and metal gift ware, and will employ 55 persons increasing to 128 persons. Koves extension \$75,000. This is to be built to assist in their expansion. At present they employ 260 persons and they expect to employ a staff of approximately 600 on completion of the extension. The next one is Dupont Research operation \$60,000. They are going to manufacture electronic components, tape recorders, etc., and propose to employ 26 persons increasing to 452 In a single year. 8.15 p.m.

The next one is the Barbados Children's Wear - nil of these at the Harbour "- and they propose to construct an extension to the present factory. At present 150 persons are employed, and with this extension it is proposed to find work for an additional 1,000 smockers. \$75,000 is being allocated for this. The next out is for \$15,000 to complete the construction of the industrial workshops at the Harbour Park.

We now come to St. Lucy Manufacturing Company. There is going to be an extension to the present factory there which will cost \$154,000. Hie Company manufactures Ladies' under-garments, and the present .employment is 200; on the completion of the extension it is expected that a further 500 will be employed.

At Newton, \$41,000 for the Multi-User factory. This'sum is required to complete the Multi-User factory there, and after that, in the same estate, \$60,000 for the new Cluster factory. The number of people employed there is not given.-I have already mentioned the repayment of the \$265, 292....

Mr. HINDS:

Tell us about Ben-Earl.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Is there something wrong with it? This does not come under the scope of this; let us get on with the Resolution. Now, general information. Repayment to the Barbados Development Bank. I have spoken on this already; the sum mentioned is \$265, 292. I have a figure of \$204,400 which is for the maintenance of all the Industrial Estates, then there is a figure of \$75,000 required to repay an instalment and interest due on a Barclay's Bank loan which was acquired by the Barbados Development Board; then a figure of \$23,000 for miscellaneous expenses required to erect mezzanine floors at Grazettes, extension to roads to Pelican Park, and maintenance of the new factories at Grazettes.

If hon. members have been following me carefully, they would see that these figures all total \$1, 347, 692. When you take away from that total what: has already been provided by Parliament - the \$750,000 - the additional funds now required are \$597, 692. The total immediately employed is likely to be about 800 persons, rising over a two to three year period to 2,000 persons with these new industries.

I just want to say this. Very often I notice that whenever we have to discuss the Industrial Development Corporation, there is a tendency on the part of hon. members to make personal attacks on Mr. Sam Ashby. I do not know, Mr. Chairman, why they do this, and I must say that, listening to them, it often occurs to me that there is much more in the nature of the attacks than merely a desire to see the industries of this country work properly, or even that the Government does its work properly. There is always a tinge of bitterness not warranted by the matters under discussion.

I only want to say this. It was the Barbados Labour Party who appointed Mr. Ashby to the Development Board way back; they appointed Senator Morgan; and both of these persons in our view are making contributions to the development of this country, and we have no quarrel with them whatever. If hon. members wish to confine themselves to the matter under discussion. I am quite able, I think, to answer them and to give them any information they want. I cannot undertake to follow them in their quarrels and vendettas against individual persons, because I just do not think that this would be the purpose of our discussion on these matters. If there is additional information which is required, I am perfectly willing to give it; otherwise, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ST. JOHN:

Mr. Chairman, we have listened with interest to the explanations of the Hon. Minister in the Introduction of this Resolution. It would have been better had the information which the Hon. Minister read out been added to the Addendum, but the contempt with which the Civil Servants who prepare the Addenda for Parliament treats Parliament is self-evident because, although it took the Hon. Minister some three or four minutes at least - possibly much longer - to read the information as to how the sum of \$597, 692, which was the amount Parliament was asked to appropriate for the current year was made up, the Civil Servant who prepared the Addendum thinks that Parliament is only deserving of the following three lines

"This amount is required to enable the Industrial-Development Corporation to repay the sum of \$265, 292 to the Barbados Development Bank and to carry out its capital programme for 1969-70." 8.25 p.m.

It is really shocking, Sir. One of these days one of the Ministers on the other side will take the opportunity to send it back to the Department and say: "I treat that with the same contempt as you want to treat Parliament."

There is an Industrial Estate in the constituency which I represent. My understanding is that one of the reasons for creating Industrial Estates in the various parts of the Island was to try as far as possible to permit local people living in heavy residential areas, in the suburbs in particular and in other parts of the country, to have employment opportunities in the new industries. The new industries are coming basically because of the cheap labour rates that exist in Barbados; they do not require any particular amount of skill, and to a large extent they only require a site and numbers of people. Where those industries need proximity to a Port, they are specially selected for the Harbour Industrial Park.

Now, I went through the Industrial Estate only three days ago before I received the Order Paper on this, because a large number of young girls in my constituency have been telephoning me complaining bitterly of the fact that they have not been able to secure employment at the Newton Industrial Estate, with the exception of one Industry. (ASIDES.) I am referring to the West Indian Handbags Industry, I like to give Jack his jacket; he does not belong to my Party; he belongs to the other side, but I have found him to be a decent and cultured gentleman - Mr. Richards. He has made an attempt to use the local labour available, because it is very obvious that you put the Industrial Park there, and if you read the Reports of the Development Board you will see that they say that one of the objectives of putting them there is to tap the potential labour market existing arising from the Housing schemes and from your trend of bus routes in St. Philip and from your proximity to the St. George Valley where there is a large population.

Of course, so far as co-ordination is concerned, this whole thing is really fantastic. I cannot see how you can get this thing to work properly unless you decentralise the Labour Department in this country. If I wanted to get a job there, very often I would be told that they are only recruiting through the Labour Department; so I would have to leave St. Philip and go to Fontabelle to put my name on the roster and then return. The whole system of planning in this country is so confused, so myopic, that you are going to put an Industrial Park up there and they bring labour from Bridgetown up there - not labour with a special skill, but ordinary labour for in-service training of people with the same background, whether they come from Bridgetown or up there. All of your bus services are going to be confused. Every morning you will have to put on additional buses and you have not been putting them on.

Sir, the whole concept of planning where you have to relate all these various factors which cause movement and pressure on land have to be taken into consideration. Nobody is hearing about these things from the other side. No Town Planning has ever been done in Barbados; you have a little development control, but there is no proper Town Planning in relation to all of your requirements of a City and the interaction and the inter-relationship. None of that has ever been done.

Naturally, when you have a big village like Lodge Road and the other areas up there and the people see an Industrial Park, the hostility up there is something terrific. They cannot understand why people should come out of a bus on mornings, stop at the bottom of Oistn Hill and walk two miles up the road to work. They get to work late. I understand that some of these people have to change buses in order to get to work.

When there was a suggestion in here about a cross-country bus service, I thought it would work

perfectly in relation to these people working at Newton Industrial Park. I thought that people from St. George would have mini-buses coming across to carry school children to Lodge School and so on. There is no Labour Officer up there, and people will have to come to Town to the Labour Office. I say that that is criminal; it is criminal and bad.

Last week I had to go to the Development Board to get an appointment to see how these problems could be ironed out.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is making some important points and I do not want to miss any. I take it that there are two things. First of all, the local people in the area are not getting employment at the Industrial Estates; and, secondly, the recruiting for work is done too far away to help them. Is that the position?

Mr. ST. JOHN:

Mr. Chairman, that is my understanding from the investigation which I carried out, and that is why I wanted to go to the source. When the industrialists come here, they get into the habit of recruiting people through the Labour Office, because one of the functions - perhaps the most important function the Labour Office performs here is that of an Employment Agency. They will have to go down to the Labour Office until they have some experience like the gentleman who makes West Indian handbags, because he moved from Grazettes. He moved to Newton because he could not get labour at Grazettes. At Grazettes there is a lot of labour-stealing. The moment you have a girl who can stitch properly, the man next door will take her from you, because he is capitalising on your training programme.

Mr. Chairman, I am not arguing only for the people in Christ Church, but it is wrong when you look across St. George Valley, when you look across the border of St. Phillip, and see what is taking place. The people are complaining about it. I say that you should decentralise certain aspects of the Labour Department in the country. There ought to be Government Sub-Centres: one in Christ Church for the Southern Area, and one in St. James or in St. Peter for the Northern Area. From there your Inspectorate should be able to move out and see the conditions under which the workers are working; see what wages they are getting and whether there is any exploitation and so on. They should see whether people living in the proximity of the Industrial Estates are getting work. There is a lot of bad feeling in connection with this matter. I know that some people feel that others do not have certain rights on the Industrial Estates.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to leave International Scientific Limited and go down to the Labour

Department when I am fired, because they like to fire you without paying anything at all. Although the industrial relations have improved up there since they been to Court so many times, you must still have your Inspectorate in general contact between the Central Government and what is going on at the various Centres so long as you have Industrial Estates. People hate to go to Fontabelle now; even the building looks awful.

Something else seems to have gone wrong, because two of the factories at Newton Industrial Estates have closed down. When you ask the reason why they have closed down, you are told that they cannot get labour and the people find it is too far to travel by bus. 8.35 p.m.

All of what is going on at your Industrial Estates, particularly your attempt to move them out into large centres of population, needs investigation to see what is the reason which is causing this problem of lack of labour and dissatisfaction from labour in the immediate vicinity not being able to get on to jobs in the factory.

We also have a general stricture on the Development Board, and this is a stricture which we intend to put on all the Statutory Boards, because we are voting over \$1 million and the last account we had is for 1967-68. This is 1970; the end of the financial year was March, 1969 and we are nearly in March, 1970, and for some reason or other, members of the House have not had any circulation to them of the latest Development Board's report. We have only just got the 1967-68 one. How can you intelligently think of what is going on and see whether performance is keeping up with the promise? I see these big-shot industries that will employ all these thousands of people; but when you go through this list, you must really have improved. You have Will Pharmaceutical Ltd. with twelve persons employed. This was the projection then, but since then it has closed down. Forest Laboratories, two persons. Do you mean you are giving pioneer status to somebody who would employ two people? That is nonsense. Tropical Flavours Ltd., six persons. I want to see whether what you tell us is true as projections, and whether in fact you meet your projections or not.

Mr. Chairman, it is a serious thing about this Development Board not sending in Reports. How can anybody tolerate a system of accounting in the country in which two years are going to pass and you cannot get your Financial Report? The last one we got is for two years ago. That is unpardonable. The reason why a lot of these things are said is because of the fact that in any attempt to get information from any of these Departments, you receive a blockage just as if you are up against a blank wall. You do not respect the Opposition. We will see that when we start to run them we will run them all around, because nobody can tell me that the Minister of Finance can be satisfied, unless he is condoning it. How can you come before Parliament and say that you want money for 1970 and you cannot give the accounts for March, 1969? We will have to adopt the same attitude that we adopted previously. There is one stop-gap whenever these come up. We had to do it with the Transport Board and they produced the

Report. We have to be consistent and do it now. We are not giving any more appropriations until they bring their accounts up to date.

I notice in the circulated Auditors Report that there is no indication when the Auditors signed the Report. I know that one thing the Auditors Insist on is putting the date when the Report was signed. These Auditors have a responsibility not only to the Board, but to the House and the public, because these bodies are bodies which are financed to a large degree from public funds, and they tell you the date so that we will see where the hold-up is. I was looking to see whether the hold-up was at the Auditors, Touche, Ross . Bovell and Skeete, but the way it is printed does not give you the date.

Now, Sir, the final point I want to make is this. I wish that the people who designed the estate at Newton had had consultation with some of the other Ministries, because what has happened now is that you have created Newton at the top of Lodge Road, and a large number of people have to walk all the way down Lodge Road. They have just repaired the road and there are two big gutters on the side. I thought the Ministry of Communications and Works Would have filled in the gutters so as to expand the road, because there is no sidewalk for these girls to walk on. Try and go there between the hours of 7 o'clock and 8 o'clock, because there is an industry there called Terrell and Company which apparently works a twenty-four hour cycle, and there are two or three shifts. I cannot get in because I have to arrange to go in through the Development Board even as a representative of the parish. They cannot tell me that I cannot go in, but I will go through all the procedures they feel should be gone through. You see people walking up and down there nearly in the centre of the road. Nobody thought that as a result of creating an Industrial Estate there, you were going to create more pressure on Lodge Hill and that the traffic and number of pedestrians would be greater by its very nature. One Department of Government creates an Industrial Estate at Newton; there is no planning, and you have a situation in which it is a positive danger both to the motorists and to pedestrians. All hours of the night now you see people streaming up and down there because you have these factories with this cycle. You see it along Seawell Road too. If you pass Seawell around 10.30 or 11 o'clock at night you will see girls coming out from International Scientific Limited. If there was a Labour Officer up there, one would be able to go there and make complaints instead of raising them on the floor of the House and he would be able to suggest that you get in touch with the owners and see whether they could arrange for a mini-bus to come at a particular time for them, or get in touch with the Ministry of Communications and see whether extra street-lights could be installed, and instead of repairing the road, you could put some boulders at the two edges. The people would give you the land up there.

Mr. Chairman, you cannot sit down and say it is a nice thing to extend Industrial Estates to other parts of the country without taking into account all the factors. You thought you could get a vote out of putting the Industrial Estate at Newton. The Prime Minister bragged and said that I got away last time, but this time they will stop me with the Industrial Estate. He has given me more votes by putting the Industrial Estate there than I thought I ever had before, because it has been run in such a manner that it is of no benefit to you.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I do not know why the Hon. Leader of the House, when he introduced this Resolution, seemed to have gone completely on the defensive at the end of his remarks and wanted to know why it is that from time to time we on this side of the House find it necessary to attack Sam Ashby. I would have thought after a debate which took place in this House, I think, in November that the least the Government could do would have been to be bold and honest enough to have called upon Sam Ashby to resign from the job which he now holds, because if there is one thing that is quite clear and stands out above everything else in this country, it is that all is not well with the industrial development in this country. 8.45 p.m.

For this there are two persons to blame, the Prime Minister of this country and Sam Ashby; the two of them are to blame for the position of Industrial development in this country. Now, what do you find? The Minister in introducing this Resolution - and I have no doubt that it was only done for two purposes, one for propaganda purposes to say how many jobs he is bringing in, and the second to justify the amount of money that the Government is asking us to vote tonight - but who could honestly believe or accept any of these figures given for employment in this country? I would like the Minister to get up and tell me at the moment how many of these firms that he called out employ over 100 people. How many firms working . under industrial incentive legislation at the moment employ over 100 people?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

The St. Lucy Manufacturing Company.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Tell us about the ones at the Harbour site; tell us about the ones at Newton and the ones at Grazettes. Are these employing over 100 people? I go further. Ever so often one sees in the newspaper that the Prime Minister is opening some new factory - a big splash; this company intends to bring some new management; they are/ bringing everything new to Barbados except new and proper wages for the people of this country. They bring new management; they bring new techniques; but yet they are bringing the same low wages.

I want to deal specifically with a firm called Ben-Earl because I think it was in December last year, or earlier this year, this company was opened. I do not mind that Asquith Phillips is the Chairman of the company; I understand how he became Chairman. I understand why people find it necessary when they come to this country to go to the lawyers who belong to the Democratic Labour Party; I understand all of that. I even understand, as I said, why Asquith Phillips was appointed Chairman. But what I cannot

understand is how a man like Asquith Phillips or the Government could allow Ben-Earl to come in here and employ people for over four weeks and pay them \$9.00 on the condition that for four weeks he is training them. I can vouch for this because last week a lady came into my office to put her husband in Court for support; when I asked her where she was working she said she was working at Ben-Earl, and I asked her how much money she was getting and she said she worked four weeks and got \$9.00 a week. That is the sort of thing you could allow in this country, and I am surprised to see that a man like Asquith Phillips could allow his name to be associated with a company that is perpetrating that sort of dishonesty on the people of this country. But I have no doubt that Sam Ashby is involved in it, and I am sorry to say I am firmly of the opinion that nothing that Sam Ashby has anything to do with, or Captain Morgan has anything to do with - do you know who Captain Morgan is? In St. John's Churchyard there is the tomb of a man called Fernando Paleologus who was a descendant of the last line of the Roman Emperors; the chap called Morgan is a descendant from the long line of Captain Morgan. It is interesting to note that almost every day you pick up the newspaper you find that the tourist trade in Barbados is on the downward trend; let me see how long you are going to keep Captain Morgan as Chairman of the Tourist Board; let me see if you have 'ho regard for the welfare of this country and if you will keep Morgan in that position when the tourist trade in this country is going downhill. They moved a man like Earl Smith from Blue Waters Hotel, a man who is well respected in this community, and they moved him off the Tourist Board for the simple reason that he used to get up and tell Morgan he was talking nonsense.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Is he to be there for ever?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

But Morgan must be there for ever.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Not that type of debate; hon. members should observe the relevant Standing Orders.

Mr. ST. JOHN:

On a point of order, we put him there and we had to get rid of him because we found that he was advertising his hotel abroad Instead of advertising Barbados.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Now do you are the example set by this side? We put him there, we realised that he was no good and we had the courage to move him, but you do not have the courage to do the same thing. As for Sam

Ashby, you would prefer to lose the Government so long as Sam Ashby remains in power than to kick out Sam Ashby.

Mr. CRAIG:

On a point of order, I know the Hon. Leader of the House is only encouraging my colleague on this side to abuse Senator Morgan and Sam Ashby because we know there is no love lost in each other's heartl

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

No point of order.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

But true, Sir, nevertheless. As I was saying, I do not tell lies like you, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I wish all hon. members will observe the relative Standing Orders.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

When you hear the Minister come and say he is spending \$75,000 more for extension to Koves and that they are employing 260 people, and that by the time the extension is finished they will be employing 600 people, this sounds nice and fancy; but will you employ 600 people at \$10 a week? I would like the Minister to get up and tell me, at this stage, what is the average wage being paid to people in the garment Industry in this country. Let the Minister of Labour come out here and answer that; he knows for a fact that the average wage being paid to people in the garment industry of this country is now below the wage that has been agreed to between the Sugar Producers Association and the Barbados Workers Union for three days a week.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

On a point of order, the Minister of Labour knows that he will soon be introducing in this Chamber a Minimum Wage Bill for all categories of workers.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I am delighted to hear that, after the debate on those Resolutions, particularly the one on the Shop Wages Act, the Government has now seen fit to bring in that legislation.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, it is established policy - not yesterday, not today, but it is the established policy of the Government ever since 1966 when a Resolution was passed in this House, tabled by the now Senator Walcott who was then senior member for St. Peter - a Resolution was passed in this House, supported by the Government and opposed by the Labour Party, not by "Smitty", opposed by the Labour Party at the time, calling.....

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Not 1966; I cannot let that go unnoticed. On a point of order, the hon. member said this Resolution was introduced by the now Senator Walcott and opposed by the Labour Party who was in the Opposition; this is not true. Look, when you hear people talking, get under the cellar and keep quiet.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Is the hon. senior member for the City still addressing the Chair?

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

No, Sir, I was only drawing to my friend's attention.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I am continuing on my point of order, Mr. Chairman. The Democratic Labour Party supported a Resolution tabled in this Chamber in 1966 calling on the Government to enact legislation for a minimum wage for all categories of workers. 8.55 p.m.

I gave a Press Release a few days ago stating that a Committee is being appointed to advise the Government as to ways and means of implementing this bit of legislation. I said further that the legislation will be introduced in this Chamber during this very year. That is the established policy of the Government.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I know the Minister is here on my left, and, from what he has just said, I am sure he has documentary evidence on him.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, the more the Minister of Labour talks, the more he puts his foot into his mouth. A Resolution was passed In 1966 obviously before the General Election, and it was moved by Mr. Frank Walcott. The Democratic Labour Party has been in power since 1966 and it has taken the Government almost four years to introduce a Minimum Wage Bill. (ASIDES.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Members not addressing the Chair!

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, , I do not mind the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, because it is well known that from his head up is pure bones. As I was saying, Sir, it has taken Government four years since 1966 to Introduce legislation for minimum wages. It is now necessary to appoint a Committee to go into the matter. It is quite clear that it is only since the debate in November last year, when we mentioned the low wages that are being paid in the garment industry as well as in all of the new industries coming into Barbados, that the Government is now taking steps to bring legislation in connection with the matter. We welcome it. Sir. We do not care if the Government brings the legislation before it loses power. I say that it is even more disgraceful that Frank Walcott, when he was a member of the House of Assembly....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. It is disrespectful when you are talking about a Senator to address him as Frank Walcott. You do not address the Governor-General or the Queen in that manner. You have to respect them and you should also respect a Senator. On a further point of order, Mr. Chairman. Does he mean that high wages only came into operation since the Democratic Labour Party was in power? The Barbados Labour Party was in power for 17 years. What happened about the wages then?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, my Party may have been in power for 17 years, but he must remember that out of my Party has grown his Party.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Are you coming over, too? (ASIDES.)

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Where do you think the Leader of the House came from? I do not think you know very much about politics, anyhow.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

I know more about politics than you and your father.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I am appealing to both members to let us get on with the Resolution.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, it is even more disgraceful that Frank Walcott, General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union, in 1966 could have seen it fit to introduce a Resolution in this House regarding low wages, and he has remained as General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union and allowed a situation to develop in Barbados during the last four years where people have to work for extremely low wages. It is only now that it is being brought home to the Government that they have decided, and rightly so, to introduce the minimum wage for the various industries.

Mr. Chairman, going back to the Industrial Development Board, I want to say that from time to time various allegations have been made against the Chairman of the Board and the Permanent Secretaries who deal with the Board. I know for a fact that a man came here to Invest money in this country, and he was told by a Permanent Secretary: "If you want to get pioneer status In this country, you must go and give Mr. A and Mr. B shares." Mr. A and Mr. B were well-known persons in the Democratic Labour Party. That is the so it of dishonesty that is going on along with industrial development in this coutry.

I will go further. It is alleged that a lady went to the Development Board to borrow money to extend some flats, and she was told that the Chairman agreed to a loan of \$200,000. However, there was a condition that she would have to give some interest in the flats to a member of the Board. That cannot be right in the interest of this country. That is not the only place where this type of thing goes on. We know for a fact that it happens to almost every person who comes to this country. Those who do not give shares directly to members of the Democratic Labour Party pay money into the Democratic Labour Party. We know this is a fact. 9.05 p.m.

With this in mind, Sir, we have got to be very careful how we vote money to be spent on these Industrial Estates. I agree with the point made by the hon. senior member for Christ Church. In most of the legislation relating to these Statutory Corporations, the accounts must be audited and presented to the House of Assembly. Sir, I do not think it is fair to ask the House to keep on voting money and then we do not have these accounts. For that matter, I do not know how the Government can ever arrive at the Estimates for 1970-71. Are they working by guess? Is this the reason why they put in a nominal figure and come back for supplementary provisions? I think the Government should discourage this practice in view of the opinion given by the Attorney General about Supplementary Resolutions. I think the practice of coming back to the House with Supplementary Resolutions should be discouraged, and it means that most of these Boards would have to bring their accounts up to date in order that the Government would be able to know how to provide an adequate amount to meet Capital expenditure when they are making such provision.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I know of certain companies which are enjoying this Incentive legislation. If this is not too big a word, I should like to clarify it for some hon. members, especially my friend, the hon. junior member for St. Thomas. There are people who have had factories built for them who have had tax holidays up to five or seven years. I know for a fact - and I hope the Leader of the House would not want to question me on this - that some of these firms, now that the time is running out, are offering these businesses for sale with the hope that it can be interpreted that the new owners would get the same incentive legislation. The present Government was in the Opposition when the Barbados Labour Party introduced this incentive legislation and offered tax holidays to get people here. It is true that they could have done it before when my Party fought for it, but I agree with it. The practices of a lot of these business people coming in and saying that they are training people reminds me of what used to happen in Swan Street in the old days. I was told of a man who had a business in Swan Street and he would take on a person to train for two months, at the end of which time he would say the person did not suit, and he would take on another girl, and he went on to say that until eventually at the end of the year he had to pay. The Minister was present when I heard Sam Ashby dogmatically proclaiming in French that there was a factory hiring a thousand people and paying \$25 a week. A shout which came from youngsters in the corner was "You lie; tell them about those who are only getting \$6 a week." I am not saying that a few people are not picked out and put into jobs where they get so much per week as is done by L.S.L. where somebody appears in the paper every week; but the rank and file are working for less money than they would get as a domestic in the household of any member of this House. This matter is the responsibility of the Minister of Trade and the Minister of Labour.

When I read that a Company was coming in with half a million dollars in machinery to set up at the Deep Water Harbour, I personally went out of my way to investigate this matter and was told by someone who went to the opening that it was second-hand machinery that had come from America, had been in Puerto Rico and then to Trinidad before coming here, and it was not even \$100,000 in

machinery in that building. You read that there is \$500,000 in machinery and you know the interest on this money and the capital and so on, but they do not pay the people they employ by the week; they work on the Jew system that exists in the United States of paying by the piece. I lived in the United States of America when people had to go to work at 7 o'clock, and they had to work until possibly 6 p.m. to make \$25 a week. They bring the same practice to Barbados and some of these girls are unable to go at this speed, but they will put someone at the top to work for \$25 or \$30 a week. When the Minister of Labour says he is coming in with a Minimum Wage Bill, I hope it will include provision for piece work, because he knows as well as I do that some of these girls are only getting \$8.60 a week and something should be done about it.

Mr. Chairman, what I have against Senator Ashby is his dishonesty. When I was in hospital in the United States, a friend of mine brought the New York Times to me and I read it. This man is Deputy Principal of a High School. He was born and went to school here. He pointed out to me an article which he said he did not like, and he had been to the Barbados Consul about it. This article advertised cheap labour. I referred to it on the floor of the House, and Ashby, masquerading as this super-industrialist and super-honest man said that I made this statement in here and I was representing people who had been getting people to work for nothing all the years. What have I got to do with them? Somebody started to ask me about slavery, but I am in here now. I knew when we could only come up the steps to this Chamber. 9.15 p.m.

To be quite serious about this, I want to say this. The public of Barbados is not happy about the fact that Senator Ashby is Chairman. I will tell you something that you do not know; the election was fought in 1961 when I helped to put out the Labour Party. Sam Ashby was raising hell all the time, abusing everybody in Bridgetown for the Labour Party. Ashby actually said at the time that there was no room for two Labour Parties. The Labour Party had put Ashby there on the Board - I am absolutely certain about that - and Ashby was saying then that there was no room for two Labour Parties and he was giving hell to the Democratic Labour Party; now Ashby is the only honest man in Barbados! Then Ashby wrote to the Press and called a Press Conference and attacked me, but suddenly you will find Ashby branching out. I know that when people call you in to ask you to do something to float a company, you do not put any money into it, but you have enough influence and you are granted shares. This is Ashby's position, and he is using his position as Chairman of the Industrial Development Corporation; he used it with the Managing Director at Bim when he had the drinks poisoning people.

It is strange enough that suddenly a man who in 1966 was cursing the Democratic Labour Party is Managing Director of a two-million-dollar company, the Accra Beach Hotel. The man is using his Influence. I have been called in several times when you could go and talk to people and you could be given your shares; he is kingpin of this Hilton Hotel. The Hilton foundation for nearly half a million dollars was put down and then taken back up, and thrown away. I challenge anybody in the Government to say this is not true; the foundation was put down and when the contractors came they did not have the courage, integrity and honesty to come in here and tell us this. Then you hear Senator Ashby, the

evening when Conrad Hilton was here -I wonder if the Hon. Leader of the House heard him making his speech; I do not think he felt very happy, with that big audience - is it not strange that the same man who was cursing the Democratic Labour Party - he cannot deny this, I heard him with my own ears. The Minister of Trade knows that he was told this country only wanted one Labour Party, and now Ashby is a Pope, Lord, everything! He knows what I am saying is true. Ashby is the boss at the Hilton; Ashby is king of the cyclamate thing they were giving people cancer with, and now you come in here with a Resolution for money - I do not know how the hon. senior member for Christ Church feels about it. they have come with a Resolution for money without giving us the expenditure for the year before. I am telling you something now, Mr. Chairman; the Leader of the House was In here when I was in the Opposition, and if the Labour Party had come in here with this without giving an account of the money spent the year before, it would bring 6 o'clock in the morning. It is true the chaps were younger; the Leader of the House was young; the hon. junior member for Christ Church was much younger; the senior member for St. Joseph would be in the Chair and he would be sleeping, and all of a sudden he would get up and ask if you thought he was an animal as he had to go outside too.

These people are accustomed to walking about with white pumps, white suit, white cork hat and white mouth, and all of a sudden they come along as industrialists and you can hear them telling everybody in Barbados about industry! I came in here and spoke on the manner in which girls were working at International Scientific Ltd. and drew to their attention that I thought the Government should do something to protect the people. This is what I said, because it was drawn to my attention by a very eminent Public Health physician that after a certain period of working there with their eyes fixed on these things they could be injured, and that their eyes would go bad on them. The Leader of the House promised me he would go into the matter, but all I saw was that the owner of the place - the management - went to Fitzwilliam, Stone and Alcazar to bring a case against me for what I said in here. They put something in the paper and said that what I said was not true. Up to now the Government has not done anything, but you put Rudolph Hinds up there as Personnel Officer. He is my personal friend, and the same Sam Ashby criticised me for raising that question. The Leader of the House promised he would do something about it, but there was not a proper investigation carried out. There are men in this country who are Ear, Nose, Throat and Eye Specialists who have courage enough, who are not going to be bought over by this company and who will come out and say what the position is; but nothing has been done. As long as the Opposition raises anything, you will find it being said that it is only a lot of talk, and that is the end of it.

I think that to ask us to vote for the Resolution without telling us more is definitely wrong; you see, there is such a cloud of suspicion when you have a Chairman who must be like Caesar's wife, and as long as you are on a Board you will find people saying things about you, I have never blamed any Minister or anybody trying to get work for any of their constituents, because I feel that this is the normal thing to do. 9.25 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that if you have a cloud of suspicion over certain people on the Board, and the

general public and the Opposition are hammering on it, then the Government should do something about the matter. A lot has been said about Senator Morgan. I know that the Goddards invest every cent they have made in Barbados - in Windsor Hotel and so on, but I have not seen them on the Tourist Board. As far as I am concerned, if I were to begin to tell you what really happened in Barbados, a lot of people would get in trouble. The 1967 Expo' was the greatest racket I have ever seen. What it will cost us nobody will ever know. I would not tell you what happened up there, because certain people would get into trouble. I think the Minister can give us some more information.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Chairman, I observe that when members on this side were discussing this Resolution there was a sort of lackadaisical approach to it, but it is not so with me. When this country is called upon to put out \$1/2 million and put it in the hands of the Ashbies and that crowd, I always take a very dim view of the matter. Let us be very serious about this. I am giving notice that I am not supporting it until you bring the Report in here.

I heard the Minister, while introducing this Resolution, as my colleague said, ending up on the defence and begging us not to curse the Chairman. Nobody is cursing Senator Ashby or Senator Morgan; the members on this side are exposing them and showing the corruption to the Government. While introducing this Resolution, the Leader of the House mentioned that 800 people are going to be employed this year, and over a period of three years 3,000 will be employed. Let me say this. You are doing a good job; you are hopeful; it is wishful thinking,

Mr. Chairman, I am going to point out that in the 1967-68 Report 329 persons were employed in 22 industries. One industry alone employed 110 persons - International Systems. Am I to sit here and allow the taxpayers' money to be placed at the disposal of these foreign investors who come here; (a) capitalise on the money at their disposal; (b) exploit the local labour market; and in a couple of years they pull out just like the man at the Industrial Construction place? It is advertised abroad that it is easy to train the labour force. While you are training them you are paying them \$3.00 a week. You have Hansen down there selling bread-and-fish at these places, and the poor people cannot buy a Coke now. They may have to chase it with some sea water.

Mr. Chairman, this is the position now with International Scientific Limited, and I am going to prove to you beyond a shadow of a doubt how they are exploiting the labour force in Barbados. Look at these salaries and allowances.

The General Manager, . \$2,000 a month.

International Scientific Limited.

do Housing Allowance 800

do A motor car do Entertainment Allowance The whole thing works out at \$4,500 a month.

The Accountant, a

Barbadian, \$1,200 a month,

Personnel Officer \$ 850 a month,

Look at where the exploitation comes in. They axe employing the professional men in a capacity to carry out their business. If they are paying a man \$1,200 a month they know he is worth \$2,000.

The Floor Manager \$ 350 a month.

He is a responsible man in charge of all the operations at International Scientific Limited; without him the General Manager cannot get his \$4,500 a month; but he is only paid \$350 a month.

Now, there are two Section Managers who have to report to the Floor Manager.

The Senior Section

Mananger \$ 210 a month.

That looks like big money, but a pound of tomatoes cost \$1.75.

The Assistant Section

Manager \$ 180 a month.

Senior Supervisor \$ 120 a month.

Assistant Supervisor \$ 110 a month.

The average income of the girls who work at I.S.L. is \$11.29 a week, and they earn an extra \$16 to \$19 when they work overtime. They cannot join a Union; if they attempt to join a Union they will be fired. How can you talk about Senator Frank Walcott when these conditions still exist? How can I sit here and talk about \$1 million coming here, there and so on?

(ASIDES.).

Mr. Chairman, the hon. junior member for St. Thomas says that we were in power for several years. It was our imagination that provided you with this so-called, muzzle-faced, dead-leg, Socialist Government headed by a half-baked economist. I am not dealing with the Morgans yet. We provided that for this Government to encourage the foreign investors to exploit the people in this country. When people talk of the cost of living being high, it is really higher because the people who are earning \$4,500 a month are those who can afford to eat bacon and eggs on mornings. 9"35 p.m.

These people are getting a house for \$500 tax free; house allowance and car allowance tax free as well as entertainment. Their salary of \$2,000 a month is taxable, and they put on four or five children whom they say is some uncle's grandson who is here on vacation.

Mr. Chairman, let me say again to the Government that the standard of things manufactured in Barbados is way below the manufacturing standards in many other countries; so the hon. member need not talk about having 600 people employed at one place. I do not believe that the Leader of the House is satisfied that this is a fair thing to do. You are using the Ashbys, the Procope sand the Charles. to strangle these people, and when you meet Senator Ashby, he takes you through the V.I.P. lounge into his office, fixes you up and takes you to the Bank and from the Bank straight to his office where he fixes the Insurance and spreads it around. I heard hon. members on the other side talk about K. R. Hunte, but I will say that Roberts Manufacturing Company employs more people In Barbados than any industry the present Government has brought in, and they have never had a wage dispute. These are the same people that I heard members from the other side asking to get rid of. I feel better with the K. R. Hunte who are white than I do with the black Ashbys on your side. The Minister of Trade is comfortably sitting back. The Minister of Labour should be eager about this, but I know he is afraid to get up in here tonight because he has some evidence in his pocket for me since last week, and I know that evidence will choke him because I am not withdrawing my Resolution unless that evidence is produced. If it shows that negotiations started at midnight on 3rd November, I will withdraw it.

Mr. Chairman, on page 9 of this out-dated Report it is stated; "The Board continued to be responsible for expenditure incurred in connection with the Barbados Hilton Hotel which was opened in November, 1966". Nowhere in this Report do they tell you how much expenditure. There is nothing in this that you can prove, and yet it is claimed by the Prime Minister that the Hilton Hotel cost \$10 million. I believe this is a very modest figure. Look at the tourist trade pricing itself out of the market. I saw a cartoon in the newspapers some time last week by a man called Brathwaite. It is the best I have seen for a long time. In it there is a man with a bag of sugar above his head, and behind him is a man with the tourist industry in his hands, and the man with the bag of sugar asked the other, "Are your legs getting tired already"? The people who are controlling the tourist industry in this country have run stale. Rather than aim at the middle-income tourist, they are aiming at the top level tourists who can pay \$US 105 per week. I am convinced that all the hotels on the West Coast can absorb all the wealthy North Americans and Europeans that come here. You have the Holiday Inn and the Hilton Hotel, and then you "go through the South Coast where Lord Thomson owns almost the whole of St. Lawrence Gap and Peter Morgan the other piece. The people you must think about most are the people of this country. If you look at the brochures, all you see is blackboys serving white girls on the beach. If you go to the hotels, you see a white boy and a white girl cooling out, the sea is blue and the sun is shining, and they have a big stiff-skinned black man serving them. He gets \$15 to \$20 a week and he has to depend on tips at the end of the tourist season. On the other hand, you can see the hotels adding twelve or fourteen more apartments and 25 cottages, but the hotel worker cannot even buy a tyre to put on his bicycle.

Mr. Chairman, the standard of living has been rising since the last Government came into power. I heard the Prime Minister say that only people with patches in their pants and bare-footed people voted for the Barbados Labour Party. I am still privileged to see in 1970 children going to school bare-footed in Christ Church. In their Manifesto of 1961, the Government was to bring in a shoe factory and the Ministers were going to wear the shoes so as to entourage others to wear them at a cost of six shillings per pair. You would not see this when Ball shoes are selling in Bridgetown. Up to now the shoe factory has not come; you can bluff some of the time, but not all the time. I believe you have just made a good bluff. Do you see that chair on my left? Senator Frank Walcott used to sit in it. It is a terrible chair, and a colleague of mine was occupying it earlier today. When the Minister of Labour was pitched from the other side, he sat in it, I have nothing to do with that chair, and I advise the hon. senior member for Bridgetown to get up, because whenever you axe in that chair you can afford to kiss Parliament goodbye. I have no doubt in my mind that one of my colleagues in here is going to kiss Parliament goodbye and he is forming eights at the Bank now instead of fours. You have a Government with all the economic brains at its disposal and with a Planning Unit which the Barbados Labour Party did not have in those days simply because it could not turn out people fast enough to meet the challenge. We started off by giving five Scholarships, and as soon as that was done the members of the present Government said it was done so as to get one for Tom. I believe that Tom Adams would be able to get a Scholarship anywhere, and I have no brief holding for Tom. They later told the country that they were going to provide hot school meals. I am selling a drink at the "Flash'n" for fifteen cents.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I must remind the hon. member to stick as closely as possible to the Resolution.

Mr. CRAIG:

Sir, you know I always like to take your advice, but this deals with industry, and on any Money Resolution dealing with industry in Barbados, I can talk all over my face. So do not let us be too technical, and besides, it is too late to have any sort of wars. I bow to you on this occasion, and you gave me a good tip off today with the lady; so let us forget that. I had a conversation with a man who owned Bonnie Dundee called Errol Steele; it was not a private conversation because it was said in the company of more than one, and I do not betray people's private conversations. I was on the beach in swim trunks like anybody else; I was a beachcomber then. He said openly that he had made his money out of the Barbados Government and he was now selling the place, and whoever was interested in taking it would have to carry the mortgage. He said he had one son in Houston and a daughter somewhere else, and he could go up at South Ridge and cool out. 9.45 p.m.

Now he is only a classic example of many of these foreign investors who set about to exploit the labour force in this country, and the Government is aware of this. I imagine, if the Government was on the other side, and we were in their position they would criticise us, because they can tell lies very well.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to move that this Resolution be postponed, not that I am here to retard the progress of Parliament, not that I am here to stop the Industrial Development Corporation from getting money for the purpose of assisting these industries whereby you can employ people, but how can I sit down here and support this when I have not got an idea of what has happened between 1968 and 1969? I thought the figures which he read out would have been circulated, but he folded them up neatly again and put them away; I beg to move that this Resolution be postponed until the Government can lay on the Table of Parliament a Report for 1968-69.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

I have been seeing these Reports for a long time, and I notice that they used to put the number of applicants and the number of people who owe the money. It cannot be any secret if you are borrowing Government's money.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

These figures will come out in the first Bank Report.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Well, keep this back until then.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Sir, I have noticed that the other Reports published by the Development Board contained a list of people who owe money; the one for 1967-68 does not contain this, and I would like to know how much money has been lent out by the Development Board. We would like to know how much money was spent on the Cardboard Factory, how much money you lost on that; the one with Cottell and Reeves Hansen, how much money did the Government lose in that? Again Sir, I do not know whether it is because the names of certain members of the Democratic Labour Party appear prominently in those figures as owing the Development Board a lot of money, but I think it is only right that if we are to vote the taxpayers' money we should have full and frank disclosure of these matters. This is not a Government of secrecy; and if the backbenchers of the Democratic Labour Party are accustomed to having somebody coming and telling them this is it and they agree to it, we are not agreeing to that. We would like to know why it is that in the Accounts of the year 1967 - 68 the persons who owe money to the Development Board are not listed as in previous years.

Secondly, I hate to dwell on Sam Ashby, but can you imagine that two years ago there was an advertisement in the newspaper for some jobs, a number of persons applied for them, a number of graduates - and the Cabinet knows this for a fact - imagine Sam Ashby looked at the now Manager of the

Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation, Mr. Ian Gale, a graduate of Cambridge and a Barrister-at-law, and told him if he wants the job he applied for he would have to write an essay! Ian Gale asked him to let him have back his application. A man who walked about this country for years with a tennis racket in his hand, now overnight projected into prominence in this country by the Democratic Labour Party!

I go further. On the same issue Sam Ashby went so far as to show his deliberate spite when a graduate of New York University applied for a job there, just because they did not want to give him - and he was the only person with a degree and experience in public relations that applied for the job - and they wanted to give it to Massey Green from the Advocate, who is now Secretary of the Democratic Labour Party.....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL; On A point of order, Mr. Chairman, I would like the hon. member to tell me who if this person with all this competence who applied for the Job, and whether he has got a Job since.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

He did not get another job because the vindictive and spiteful Government! when he was acting at Foundation, gave instructions to take away his job, and the one man that will regret it is the Leader of the House.

Hon. N. Y/. BOXILL rose.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Two hon. members are on their feet.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

No, Mr. Chairman, one hon. member.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Yes, I know that you are not honourable. As I was saying, that shows the sort of vindictive and spiteful man Sam Ashby is, when people can come in this country and apply for jobs, as graduates, for a man like Sam Ashby to tell them they have to write essays and not give them jobs! Sam Ashby is not even known as a good tennis player, much less an economist or industrialist. (ASIDES.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

The behaviour of members not addressing the Chair.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

On the last occasion when there was a debate on a subject matter such as this, I spoke.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I can hardly hear the junior member for the City through noises made by other hon. members. 9.55 p.m.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Sir, in November when we were debating a Resolution such as this, I had occasion to talk on the question of Roman Apartments at Enterprise. There is a leaflet put out, I believe, by the Industrial Development Board that appears at Seawell Airport, and under the section dealing with Education in schools in this country they tell you that the leading schools are Harrison College; Lodge; Presentation College, and Mapp's College. They do not refer to Combermere School and Foundation School. That has been done by the Development Board and not by private enterprise. This is the sort of respect they have for Combermere School and Foundation School. Why refer to Presentation College and Mapp's College and omit the schools like Combermere and Foundation? When it comes to the Girls' School it is even worse, because the only Government School they recognise is Queen's College. What about St. Winifred's High School and so on? This sort of thing should not be done by the Development Board. (ASIDES.)

Mr. Chairman, it is well known that nobody in the Democratic Labour Party can touch Sam Ashby. The only way Ashby can be moved is if the Prime Minister got up one morning and decide to remove him. If he does that at all, Ashby will start talking. The Prime Minister has put a man there who, since his tenure of office, has become very rich out of using Information which he has gathered in that position. That cannot be right. If I belonged to a political Party and they did that sort of thing, I would tell them that they were wrong and come into this House and talk about it. In spite of all the allegations that have been made in this House against Ashby and Morgan, not one single member on that side would get on his feet and defend them. Not one of them would get on his feet and say that we were talking nonsense about Morgan or Ashby, because they know that what we are saying is true. (ASIDES.) You do not have the courage of your conviction; you are glad that the Opposition is attacking them. You do not have the courage to get up and tell the Prime Minister that Morgan and Ashby should go. (ASIDES.) You know for a fact that they should go. If you cared enough for the people of this country,

any slight check would show you that Morgan and Ashby should go. (ASIDES.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Is the hon. junior member for the City still addressing the Chair?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, there is too much noise.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Will all hon. members observe the Rules!

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, in any country other than Barbados if you had a man at the head of the Tourist Board, a man working in Industrial Development like Morgan, and anybody could come from overseas and publish a Review of the Hotels in Barbados and say that the St. Lawrence Hotel that Morgan was the owner of is the worst Hotel he has ever entered in the world - Did the Leader of the House read about it? Did he read what Jimmy Cozier wrote in the newspaper? It is only in Barbados that that sort of statement could be made about a man who is on the Tourist Board and the man was still allowed to remain there. If he cannot run a proper hotel, do you expect him to run a proper tourist industry in this country? The man said that it was the worst hotel he had ever seen; the Government is aware of it; the statement appeared in the newspaper, and yet the Government can see it fit to keep Morgan. It is only in Barbados where the Government is shortsighted, concerned with its friends and not with the people, that that sort of thing could happen.

Now, Sir, the senior member for the City has already said In this House of Assembly that he saw an advertisement in the New York Times with the Barbados Development Board advertising Barbados and saying that there was cheap, black labour. The Leader of the House said that he knew about it, and I think he said he would do something about it. However, the Tourist Development Board gave out a Press Release to the effect that it was not true. Whom must I believe, Sir? On this occasion I prefer to believe the Leader of the House. He knows it is true, and yet the Government can allow a man to remain in power who has seen fit to advertise the labour in Barbados abroad in a derogatory sense by referring to it as cheap, black labour. Look at the members of this Government; they have no pride whatsoever. If they had one ounce of pride, they could not belong to a Party that allowed a man to do that. (ASIDES.) Yes, the rats are leaving the ship and coming to you. You are full of rats I You are not only guilty by association. Everybody knows that you are guilty by association. That is the sort of Party you want; a Party of rats; people who have no pride whatsoever; people who are prepared to sit down and allow

Senator Morgan and Senator Ashby to do as they like in this country. You must bear this in mind; the same licks that you are getting in here you are going to get on political platforms, and we are going to let the people throughout the length and breadth of this country know that you are condoning corruption.

Mr. Chairman, it is disgraceful that the Development Board can build a hotel which is supposed to cost originally \$4 million and it ended up costing \$12 million! It is more than a coincidence that a fire took place and burnt all of the books! Whom do you think you can fool? It is obvious that it was done deliberately. I do not know why there was not a Fire Inquiry into the burning of the books. Why is it that the contract for the Hilton Hotel was never laid in the House of Assembly? You merely took up \$12 million of the taxpayers' money. That means nothing to you; I do not believe that you pay any tax anyhow. I beg to second the motion for postponing further consideration of this Resolution, 10.05 p.m.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I wish I could lend a word to assist in the burial of Senator Sam Ashby. The Minister of Trade ought to know that C. F. Harrison and Company Limited has an agency from a distributing agency working on a commission basis for distributing a commodity that is manufactured at the Harbour site. Now the Standard Agency, not Mr. Sam Ashby, has the agency for all the goods manufactured at this factory and exported. In other words, all the overseas distribution must be done through Sam Ashby's Standard Agency. The Minister of Trade ought to know that Sam Ashby occupies such a powerful position in Barbados that he is demanding of C. F. Harrison and Company a triplicate copy. They must no longer use an original and a duplicate; they must have a triplicate which must be handed over to Sam Ashby's Agency; so the factory will eventually have to pay Sam Ashby a commission on what is distributed in Barbados through C. F. Harrison and Company Limited, as well as what is distributed through the Standard Agency in the CARIFTA area. Tills is a case where this man is definitely using his position. He is corrupting commerce in this country because you will understand how the Goddards, the C. F. Harrison and Company people look at this whole set-up. They are not at all satisfied with the situation, and must get the feeling that each and every Minister of Government and every person associated with Government must know something about this because they are so closely linked and connected up with Senator Sam Ashby.

In the Grazettes Estates now, I am challenging the Leader of the House to deny that Sam Ashby has been receiving a commission from the manufacturers of bedding in this country. They are paying these commissions because the Government has built these factories and has offered all the incentives, but the manufacturers are not satisfied with that part of the deal where Sam Ashby must receive from here and there. The reason why he has to get commission from the bedding people was because the Standard Agency was not swift enough. These people came here and knew what they were going to do and arranged their own agency business before they were approached by Sam Ashby.

There is one thing at International Scientific Limited. This House will remember that I tabled a Question in here soon after I came to the House with respect to the treatment that was meted out to workers at I.S.L. I remember the Minister of Labour coming down here and referring me to some I.L.O. Convention in some sort of reply which he did not understand, but which some of the Crown Law Officers or some Civil Servant wrote and gave him to read. That however answered the case at the time so as to protect I.S.L. But what has gone on at I.S.L. since then? It is nothing that the Development Board does not know, because how can you take taxpayers' money to set up a factory here to encourage industrialists to come here and rob poor people?

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Marshal, will you ask hon. members to be a little more silent in the Clerk's Office?

Mr. HINDS:

You will find that a worker cannot refuse to work overtime on Saturdays at International Scientific Limited, but they are not paid overtime. The workers write letters to my office week after week complaining about these things, because they are not at all satisfied with what is going on, and many of them are afraid to speak out because they do not want to lose their jobs. Mr. Chairman, you must appreciate that we are asked this evening to vote this sum of money for the Industrial Development Corporation to do everything except what the Leader of the House has told us is going to be done with the money. The Addendum tells us one thing and the Leader of the House tells us something else. The Minister tells us that in St. Lucy, his own constituency, the manufacturing company is presently employing 200 workers. I am willing to sit and hear the Minister say that they are employing 200 at the present moment. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR Yes.) Will the Minister deny that the Fairfield Factory is employing 128 people? 10.15 p.m.

Even when they have rush orders they try and call in more girls and the most that they call in at any one time is 26, and they have never reached the 200 mark that you are now saying that they are employing; so these figures you have given this House are misleading. As a Minister you ought to know that you should check on all these things before coming to the House with them. The Minister knows that he cannot expect to go on misleading this House and getting these Resolutions passed; the days of those things are over. We are prepared to challenge him on every point because we are going to do our homework; we are coming armed, and I am saying here and now that this factory employs 128 people. They have never employed 200 at any one time, and the Minister knows that; if he does not know, it shows exactly what interest he is taking in his own constituency in this one Industrial Estate up there. It is a definite attempt at misleading this House by repeating that there are 200 people employed at that factory; it has never employed 200 people at any one time.

As regards wages, there is still on these Industrial Estates the system of operating these training .

schemes, taking young women, keeping them in training for six and eight weeks, and while they are being trained some factories pay \$12 a week; but for some of these people to reach the Industrial Estate they have to pay two bus fares, and with the increase as it is today, one can very well picture those people; they are receiving the \$12.00 in one hand and just turning out and making right with the pick-up owner or with some other person who is operating a car service, because that is now being used. At some of these factories you will find one person has a car, and he has got to take up as many of the workers as he possibly can with a view to helping the people and at the same time helping to keep gasoline in the vehicle so as to get these people to and from their work on time and from one thing to another; so we are faced with the situation that we are being asked to vote money, but for what? Are we asked to vote money to encourage these industrialists to come here? It is the question of the type of people, these low-down people, that we are inviting to come to Barbados to set up businesses here; that is the trouble.

You will understand that Senator Sam Ashby is finding it possible to make love to the type of people who can give him shares for promoting their businesses and from one thing to the other. That is not what we want; we want to see people like Sam Ashby going back smelling the Devil he was smelling about here for years in the past. He has suddenly grown rich overnight; but at these Estates, here at the Industrial Park at the Harbour you have girls there working at a place called Allied Metals Limited where they employ a Nurse so that when the girls get their fingers burst she can doctor up these fingers. If they have suffered all of these injuries - they are not insured - no insurance coverage that they can be compensated for these injuries - none of that goes on - and if a girl gets a finger burst and attempts to ask about compensation by way of insurance, she is apparently looking for trouble for the company; so she has to look for a job somewhere else. All I am saying is at the end of the week these people get a pay envelope of \$9.05, and what happens is this. The first week that they work they are not paid for that at all; it is at the end of the second week - because some of these people have an idea of telling you that they close their books on some days. We even had it here in the sugar industry last week when the estates had to close their books on Monday or Tuesday and make loans to some of these sugar workers of \$10 only. I must say that I allowed it to pass because I felt that in the following week, according to the arrangements they had, things would have been smoothed out; so we thought that it was best, especially where the sugar industry was involved, that we should not whip any type of undue unrest amongst the workers. After the start of the crop all they received was \$10 on loan, but the situation was corrected the following week.

In the Industrial Estates it is not enough for us to hear that at this particular factory \$150,000 was spent, 100 persons employed; at Supreme Industry \$50,000, 55 workers; at Koves \$75,000, 60 workers and they expect to employ 600. That question of the amount of workers that are to be employed and that are being employed is what is being used to gloss over; that is what the Government is doing, hoping that by advancing these figures they will be able to gloss over and get over with the Resolution. We on this side will feel that if work is to be found for X number of people, we will support the Resolution quite readily; but that is not so at all. What we find is that these people always say they are going to employ these vast numbers, but in truth and in fact it is after working a number of years that they never even reach that, and then our chief concern is that the workers receive a mere \$8.06 or \$9.05 at the end of

a week's work. I am to wonder why it is that the Leader of the House does not now come into the House, seeing the high cost living, with his butter tot and lard oil bottle, to see how \$8.05 can do for a young woman who has got to pay the increased bus fares, and has got to make herself tidy on the job, and from one thing to another. I would really like to see what the Minister would end up with when he has spent the \$8.05. 10.25 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, if a young woman comes into Town from the country district, even if she starves herself, she has to spend 750 in order to get a cheap lunch. In some places, I do not believe she can get a meal for less than \$1.00. If she is working for five days a week, then she will merely be working to provide lunch and bus fares. Is the Government going to continue spending money to set up industrialists; to allow them to come here, have their goods manufactured and exported; make all the profits, and the workers get absolutely nothing from the money spent?

I wonder how the Leader of the House feels when he hears it repeated so often that a girl from St. Lucy, his own constituency, has to board a pickup on mornings to go to the Industrial Park at Grazettes or to Newton to work, and at the end of the week she gets less than \$10.00 as a week's pay? We believe, Mr. Chairman, that we have advanced enough reasons to indicate why further consideration of this Resolution ought to be postponed. We feel, and the Leader of the House should by now be convinced, that we cannot be expected to support A Resolution of this sort in the absence of a Statement of Account! from the Industrial Development Corporation for last year.

Sir, there are private companies in Bridgetown that, within three months from the end of their financial year or less than that, can produce their Audited Statement of Accounts for the benefit of their Directors, their shareholders and everybody else. What is wrong with the Government? Is this attitude taken merely because it is the taxpayers' money? Is it merely because the taxpayers are milch cows and the Government can get what money they want whenever they want it? We feel that it is time to cry halt to this wasteful spending of money and being unable to give a proper account of it, as we have seen here year after year. I am wondering whether the Leader of the House is inclined to agree that it should be postponed. I should like some indication from him as to how he feels about the matter.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I am ready to report progress. I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of four Resolutions in Committee of Supply and ask for leave to sit again.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Mr. 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 four Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I think we have reached our limit for this part of the sitting, and I am suggesting that we should meet at ten o'clock on Friday morning to continue our work. To this end I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until ten o'clock on Friday morning.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the House accordingly. 10.31 p.m.

On Resumption:-

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

When this sitting was suspended last Tuesday, the House was in Committee of Supply and to that it now reverts.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I am hoping to lay in about an hour's time the 1968-69 accounts of the Industrial Development Corporation. They are not quite ready yet; 00 I will report progress and we will come back into Committee when I receive them. I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS; I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave to take Item 12 be the next Order of the Day.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The next Item is Item No. 12 and it stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Cinematograph Film Censorship Act, 1940.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think hon. members know that the authority which was vested in the Film Censorship Board was delegated to the Minister of Education when Film Censorship was included in his Portfolio in 1963. Recently there has been a re-allocation of subjects under various portfolios; hence Film Censorship is now the responsibility of the Ministry of Home Affairs. The Attorney General has recommended that it is necessary to amend the law in consequence of the change of responsibility; this what the Bill is all about. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there ought to be very good reasons for amending any law in this land. Now we have heard here that consequent upon the re-apportioning of Ministerial responsibilities, Film Censorship no longer come sunder or within the Portfolio of the Minister of Education as it was in 1963, and it is my belief that this Hon. House would wish to express the horror, the shock, the shame and disgust that is experienced in the many homes of this Island which are equipped with television receiving sets. The films that are shown by C.B.C. Television are to my mind the cheapest; most of them must have come from places worse than Greenwich Village in the United States of America. There is hardly a picture that is shown on television which does not show our young people how to use guns and a lot of things that we need not have in this Island. I do feel that the decision of Government to remove Film Censorship from the portfolio of Education was a sufficient indication to the general public that Government does not feel that radio and television should be a means of educating the people in this country, because it is surprising that when we are about to embark on educating children through television - by placing television receiving sets in schools - at the same time we are saying that what is to be shown to those children will not be the responsibility of the Minister of Education, but the responsibility of the Minister of Home Affairs. Is it then that the Ministry of Home Affairs and the Ministry of Education are becoming Integrated? You will understand, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this attempt here today shows the lack of planning ability in Government circles; what can we find that can be advanced by the Government to suggest for a single moment that the television Instructions to be given in schools will not be the responsibility of the Minister Education? Are we going to find an overlapping of the Ministerial responsibilities where education is concerned? 1010 p.m.

Already we have an example. It is very well known that when Mr. Ian Gale was to be appointed Manager of C.B.C., it did not find the favour of the Minister of Education under whose portfolio the Caribbean Broadcasting Station fell, and we saw how suddenly the Prime Minister -I am not in a position to say whether it was for personal reasons or reasons in the best interest of the public, but we saw that responsibility for education EC that time was being shared by the Prime Minister on the one hand, as far as C.B.C. was concerned? and on the other hand the Minister of Education was responsible for going around and telling us how many schools were overcrowded - things that we knew. That was done when the Leader of the House was Minister of Education.

You will see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, how necessary it is to do things the proper way. Ministerial responsibility is nothing to be shovelled or hackneyed about. We should not be asked here today to amend this Act to accommodate the type of situation to which I have just drawn your attention. No good reasons have been advanced, and no good reasons can be advanced. Why? At the very moment we are about to embark on T.V. education and are thinking of directing it into our schools, we find that Film Censorship is no longer to be the responsibility of the Minister of Education. Taking all things in their stride, we feel that the Minister of Education ought to be the Minister of Culture. That being so, the

responsibility entailed in Film Censorship borders very heavily towards the cultural uplift of our people so that we may see to what extent our cultures may be retrogressing.

I should like to warn the Leader of the House to weigh the matters carefully and see how we can equate the two/You are going to use television as a means of education In schools, and at the same time you are saying that the Minister of Education will not have the responsibility for censoring what will be shown in schools on television. That is what it amounts to. We have seen too many gangster films shown by C.B.C.on television. Here again it brings us to the point where taxpayers' money is being spent badly, and to the fact that the showing of these films is having a demoralising effect on our population.

I do not see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, how I could be asked or could be expected to support an amendment to this Bill merely for the reasons advanced by the Leader of the House. To my mind there is very much more behind this than what the Leader of the House has told us. We are willing to hear what he has to say. We can say that in a very considerable measure the future of our boys and girls very much depends on this. We must think of the number of young men and women, boys and girls who frequent the cinema houses and the type of films that are shown there. We must also think of the type of films that C.B.C. puts over. All of this has some cultural effect upon our people, and it is our duty to see that the cultural life of the nation does not suffer from the inability of the Prime Minister, or the Leader of the House, or both, because I feel that they shared jointly in the matter of apportioning the Ministries. I feel that it is definitely not good enough to remove Film Censorship from the hands of the Minister of Education on the eve of your launching into educating the nation by television. Something would have to be wrong about this matter.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Clause 1 was called and passed. 10.20 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, Clause 2 is asking that we delete the words "Governor-General" and "Minister responsible for Education" wherever they appear therein and substitute therefor the words "Minister responsible for Film Censorship". I must ask, Mr. Chairman, why is it not being suggested that we delete the words "Minister responsible for Education" and substitute the words "Minister responsible for Home Affairs"? We have just been told by the Leader of the House that the Minister of Home Affairs is going to be responsible. Paragraph 2 tells us much more than this. It leads us to feel that today the Minister of Education can be responsible for Film Censorship, and tomorrow the Minister of Agriculture can be. In other words, there is no fixed policy by Government. It is based a bit too casually on the fact that it merely states "Minister responsible for Film Censorship". Are you going to set up a Ministry of Film Censorship? As long as you know that the Minister for Home Affairs is going to be the Minister, why can't you say so here? As long as we are asked to amend the Act by substituting "Minister responsible for Film Censorship", it is an open suggestion to this Committee that it is not yet known who is going to be the Minister responsible, or it means that the person responsible for it today might not necessarily be responsible for it the day after. In legislating we do not feel that we should leave ourselves exposed in a manner such as this. Legislation should be specific wherever the occasion permits, and I am sure that hon. members on that side would bear me out that if it is known with any degree of certainty that the Minister of Home Affairs is going to be responsible for Film Censorship, we should insert here "Minister responsible for Home Affairs" in place of "Minister responsible for Education." I would like to hear what the Leader of the House has to say on that point because if, as the Leader of the House said, the Minister of Home Affairs is going to be the Minister responsible for Film Censorship, it should be embodied in this amendment.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I must say that when the hon. member is finished with a point it is very difficult to

know how to answer because it becomes more complicated than it is originally. First of all, the allocation of Ministerial portfolios is not vested in Parliament. It is vested in the Prime Minister, recommending to the Governor on such matters. Secondly, as far as this matter is concerned, all this amendment does is to make it possible to vest the responsibility for appointments to this Board in the Minister of Home Affairs because I disclosed that, but the form in which the amendment is couched is the proper form. The hon. member, I believe, quite sensibly sees this point and I accept the point that it could be transferred back to the Minister of Education at some other time or indeed to another Minister; so the proper way to set out is to say "the Minister responsible" so that when a Minister receives an Instrument of Appointment or an Instrument of a Changed Appointment, the subjects allocated to him can be set down; and if it says in his Instrument of Appointment, no matter what his substantive Ministry is, "also responsible for such departments or such subjects as Film Censorship", he is then designated the Minister responsible for Film Censorship. If you put in "the Minister responsible for Home Affairs" and it was thought necessary to re-allocate major portfolios in another Government, even if not in this one, you would still have to come back here. What this does is not to tie the hands even of this Government or succeeding Governments because they can then re-allocate the subject of Film Censorship to whichever Ministry they deem fit.

We are dealing here really with Cinematograph films. For some reason or other, Television films do not come under the heading of Cinematograph films. I do not know all the legal arguments, but there is a distinction between the two, so that as far as educational television is concerned, the Minister of Education will have full control over what is presented on E.T.V. because these are not deemed under law to be films in the sense in which Cinematograph films are; so that responsibility here is only confined to Cinematograph films, and not general films. I do not know if this satisfies the hon. member. I have answered the two points. I cannot remember if there is a third one.

Mr. HINDS:

Now the Minister has said that the censorship of Television films does not come under this head. There is no provision for the censorship of Television films. Now that you have some experience in what allowing uncensored films shown on television can do for you, I think it is about time that with your interest in the nation....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I should like to remind the hon. member at this stage that all Clause 2 seeks to do is to substitute the words "Minister responsible for Film Censorship" for the words "Governor-General" and "Minister responsible for Education". I would like him to deal with this because the principle of the Bill cannot be discussed in Clause 2. 10.30 p.m.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I will proceed. What I am saying is this. The Leader of the House has said that there is no law requiring the censorship of Television films.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. And I am saying that it has nothing to do with the transfer of responsibility from one Minister to another.

Mr. HINDS:

Why did you not stop the Minister?

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

The Minister was then replying to the hon. junior member for St. Peter.

Mr. HINDS:

And who is the junior member for St. Peter replying to? This is no one-sided affair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

When the second reading of a Bill is being discussed all this can be done then; it has already been passed.

Mr. HINDS:

Why, when people do not understand things, do they not leave them to those who do? This Bill deals with Film Censorship, and I should have the opportunity - and I do have the opportunity - to discuss what films are being censored and what films are not being censored,

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

On the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, this section seeks to transfer the responsibility for Film Censorship from the Minister of Education to anybody else. What I am maintaining is this. Coming from the mouth of the Leader of

the House that Film Censorship is a major Portfolio and as such it is not to be treated lightly, not to be shifted here and shifted there, that is why you find so many people tending to suffer as a result.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Chairman, on a point-of order, you have pointed out repeatedly to the member on the opposite side that he has already made a second leading speech, and that when the House goes into Committee and we are dealing with Clauses, the member can only speak on those Clauses. If he persists in this, I will have no alternative than to ask that the question be put.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, he is going to ask that the question be put, but that would not move me.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

You are wasting time.

Mr. HINDS:

You just feel that nobody should talk on anything, that is all. Nobody has ever suggested that the appointment of Ministers is vested in anybody other than the Prime Minister; we know that; but what we are saying is that it is not good enough merely to ask us to transfer the responsibility for Film Censorship to anybody, so to speak.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

That in my opinion is a repetition of what the hon. member has said once, twice and thrice, and I would like to draw to the hon. member's attention Rule 36(1) "The Speaker or the Chairman, after having called the attention of the House or of the Committee to the conduct of a Member who persists in irrelevance or tedious repetition either of his own arguments or of the arguments used by other Members in debate, may direct him to discontinue his speech." Let the hon. member proceed to deal with Clause 2.

Mr. HINDS:

If, Mr. Chairman, you read a Rule to me about discontinuing my speech; why tell me to proceed?

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I said proceed with Clause 2.

Mr. HINDS:

You accuse me of repetition, you read the Rule telling me about repetition, and your authority is to cause me to discontinue my speech; and yet you are telling me to proceed. Proceed with what?

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of one Bill In Committee.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill is of far too much importance to the people of this country for us to be told by the Leader of the House that Government has no fixed policy with regard to the placing of responsibility for Film Censorship. 10.40 a.m.

It is, Mr. Deputy Speaker, clear to each and every one of us that Government is not fully aware of what is involved in the matter of Film Censorship to be seeking to divorce it from the educational portfolio. It is clear to us that we on this side of the House have a clearer grasp of the situation. We appreciate the fact that the Leader of the House was sent here, so to speak, to get this amendment through, but I would like to tell Mm that he has a far greater responsibility to the people of St. Lucy. His first responsibility is to the people of St. Lucy, because were it not for them the charge would not now be his for getting this amendment through.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what we are saying is that the Leader of the House has told us that there is no law, at present requiring the censorship of T.V. films, and it is my duty to draw to the attention of this Hon. House now how very necessary it is, after having had about five years of experience with the demoralising effect certain films have had on our people. I am urging on the Leader of the House that he could find no more necessary occupation this morning than to seek to establish legislative provisions whereby the films shown by C. B.C. T.V. are censored before they are shown to our people. I am worried as to the reasons for the Government seeking to remove totally the responsibility for Film Censorship from the Minister of Education.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

May I draw to the attention of the hon. junior member for St. Peter what is written in the Seventeenth Edition of Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice at page 571. It states

The procedure on the third reading of a bill is similar to that described in relation to the second reading, but the debate is more restricted at the later stage, being limited to the matters contained in the bill. If the question "That the bill be now read the third time" is negative, such a vote is not necessarily fatal to the further progress of the bill. The more usual method of objection is therefore to move an amendment."

I hope the hon. junior member for St. Peter will restrict his remarks to matters contained in the Bill.

Mr. HINDS:

I will, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Now, let us look at the silliness in Government's action on this matter. It does not suggest that we should have in the future a Minister responsible for Education or any other Minister. It does not say that. There is a very special reason for removing or deleting the words "Minister responsible for Education." Are we to understand that every other Minister....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL rose-

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The hon. junior member for St. Thomas has risen on a point of order.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. You have just read something to the hon. member, and he is still going on saying things over and over again. He has already made his contribution to the debate, and I am asking that the question be put.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I was about to make that remark when the hon. junior member for St. Thomas rose.

Mr. HINDS:

I did not hear your last remark, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Am I to understand, Mr. Deputy Speaker.....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I ask that the question be put.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The debate by the hon. junior member for St. Peter, up at this stage, raises no new points; it is simply a repetition of what he has been saying. A motion has been moved that the question be put, and I put the question that this Bill be now read a third time. Those in favour will please say "Aye", and those against will please say "No". I am afraid the "Ayes" have it.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Divide. The House divided and voted as follows

AYES:

Mr. YEARWOOD, Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS; Hon. N. W. BOXILL; Mr. LOWE; Mr. CORBIN; Mr. WE EKES and Mr. SMITH -11.

NOES:

Mr. HINDS; Mr. CRAIG and Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLE Y - 3.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The Clerk has informed me that 11 hon. members voted "Aye" and 3 hon. members voted "No"; therefore, the question is resolved in the affirmative, 10.50 a.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, before we continue, I am asking leave of the House to lay a document,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to lay a document, and unless there is any objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted.

DOCUMENT LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Financial Statement of the Barbados Development Board for the year ended 31st March, 1969. Copies of this Statement, I believe, are ready.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not know what is the position.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

On what has the hon. member risen? I cannot hear the hon. member who is standing unless he is on some point. Please take your seat.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 7 be the next Order of the Day.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

THE MOTOR VEHICLES AND ROAD TRAFFIC (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1970

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Order No. 7 stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works, and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937. Hon. N. W. BOXILL Mr. Deputy Speaker, this amendment arose chiefly because everything in the world seems to

be getting bigger. For instance, about 40 years ago when a car had 6 h.p. or 10 h.p., this was considered a big thing, because it went at a rapid speed of 30 miles an hour. As time went on, the engineers discovered that the more horse power you could put under a bonnet, the better the machine will perform. Vehicles were also built to carry more weight and so on. The laws of Barbados were geared more to the roads, and a bus had to be of a specific length. This is an amendment to the Motor Vehicles and Koad Traffic Act, 1937-16 and the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Regulations 1952. Previously the maximum gross weight of a vehicle used to be nine tons - since the amendment in 1952. I am now asking the House to approve this amendment to make the maximum weight eleven tons.

Years ago it was a common practice in Barbados that lorries would carry materials by the cubic yard; today this has gone by the wayside. As I said before, trucks are becoming bigger and more expensive and with more horse power, and they now carry load by the ton. There are a lot of lorries capable of carrying up to 15 and 16 tons, but because the maximum gross weight is only nine tons, they were harrassed by the Police, and rightly so, I do not know if our roads are geared for this kind of thing, but since we cannot turn back the clock or keep back progress, we have to try to meet the situation. I am therefore asking the House to approve this amendment.

Secondly, I am asking that the rate payable in respect of special licences should be as follows: exceeding 11 tons but not exceeding 19 tons.....

Mr. Chairman, if hon. members have this information, it would not be necessary for me to hold up the House. (Mr. ST. JOHN: We have it.)

I should like to mention here that the overall length of a motor omnibus to be used on public roads may be extended from 25 feet to 30 feet, and that the following areas surrounding the Queen Elizabeth Hospital be designated as a Silent Zone: Martindales Road; River Road from its junction with Nelson Street; the road which runs eastward from the Constitution Bus Stand to its junction with Constitution Road opposite the Governor-General's Gate, and Constitution Road from its junction with the road opposite the Governor-General's gate to its junction with Martindales Road; that the Commissioner of Police be empowered to take legal action against persons who fail to observe the regulations regarding the fitting of silencers to motor vehicles.

This is a good point because there are a lot of people with motor cycles who are nuisances on the road. Not only do they ride these things at excessive speeds darting through here, there and everywhere, but they have something on the cycles which makes you pull up on the side of the road, because you think it is the Fire Brigade coming up behind you. This is an offence and I should like to warn motor cyclists

that it is illegal, and they should really desist from it since it is really annoying. 11.00 a.m.

This is another important point - that the sizes of digits for use on number plate son mo tor vehicles other than motor cycles should be either -

(i) 3 1/2" high x 2 1/2" broad with 5/8" broad lettering; or

(ii) 3 1/4" high x 2 1/4" broad with 9/16" broad lettering but that a combination of two sizes of digits on the number plates of any one vehicle should be prohibited.

Why we put in (i) and (ii) is that there are two types of digits being used around here; there is one type which cannot be seen very well at night. Sometime ago we gave the Barbados Rally Club Association permission to have these trails on the road, and the Barbados Amateur Athletic Association also asked for permission so that they could be able to have road races. They have, however, to notify the Commissioner of Police first so that he can warn the general public of the roads which will be used for bicycle riding. I do not think there is any more I should add, and I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill does not need any speech from this side as far as I am concerned. I am very glad to hear the Minister bring in a Bill for the purpose of having a place like Martindales Road a silent zone; but he should also legislate that wherever there is a Hospital or Nursing Home, the roads within these areas should be also made silent zones. I was unfortunate to be a patient at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. That strip of road there is good and the motor cyclists pride themselves at night to ride along this road without any mufflers at all, and this is not in the best interest of ill persons.

There is another thing which I would like to draw to his attention, and that is that there are a lot of these Mini-Coopers around here where the drivers "soop" up their engines and then challenge the motor cycles on the road - especially along Maxwell and that stretch of road to the Airport. I would like to see

a fine of \$500 imposed on these drivers, and I believe this would control this. Another thing is that it is dangerous for many of these people working in the roads who put up signs saying: "Men working ahead" and when you get to the sign it means that the men are working right there on that spot. It is a very dangerous thing, and sometimes you see them with a piece of yellow flag stuck all across the road and you cannot have this sort of thing with such a lot of traffic on the streets. The Mitchell Construction people have done a better job in letting the motorist know that there are people working on the street rather than sticking up these pieces of red cloth and other things. Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is all I want to draw to the Minister's attention,

Mr. ST. JOHN:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the principle and reasons for the amendment of the Bill were explained by the Hon. Minister. I am very glad to see that the Hon. Minister appreciates the fact that some of the lorries today do cause some damage to the road surface, probably arising because of the fact that the nature of the surface was such that in the past that it was not envisaged that the weight now being carried on the roads would be carried. A good example of this is the road along Maxwell Coast, because I think three apartment projects were completed around there this year. If one passes around there now, the whole of the surface of the road, particularly opposite the apartment projects, is gone and will have to be resurfaced, and perhaps in the charges for the use of these vehicles the increase in charges will reflect the increased expenditure which will result from permitting the vehicles to carry greater loads.

The amendment to permit a greater length in buses, I hope, will help to ease the situation in the areas from Silver Sands to Speightstown which I believe is probably the most extensively used road-and I am not quite sure whether the regulations governing the number of passengers have been amended; I remember there was talk of amending them to permit a greater number of people to stand in buses, because I am sure that will help to ease the problems one gets at peak hours. Some amendment had come here which permitted the Minister to specify the amount of space a person in a seat could take up, but I have not yet seen the specification by the Minister. For some time now, in taking up the problem of lack of adequate facilities in my constituency with the Transport Board, I have been told that an amendment permitting a greater number of people in a bus would ease the situation because these buses were designed to carry a greater number of people. I know the law was amended by the Minister, but I have not seen the law. 11.10 a.m.

I have already given notice to the other side about this, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I am going to move an amendment, in the Committee stage of this Bill, which seeks to amend Section 34 of the principal Act where it specifies that for driving a goods vehicle 21 years of age is the period of time for a licence to be granted. I intend to move an amendment by substituting the words "eighteen years" for "twenty-one-years". All over the world increasing responsibility is being put upon people at a much earlier age. This is recognised here in Barbados by the fact that this Government was the Government that permitted 18-year-olds to vote. I feel that the Government has not carried through to the logical conclusion this concept that the 18-year-old is a fully responsible person. I should like to see a general law which would

remove the disabilities which hitherto operated against a person under the age of 21, and that the majority age would now become the age of 18. I know that similar legislation has just been passed in the United Kingdom, and it would be a logical consequence of your saying that you recognise an 18-year-old as the age for attaining one's majority.

Sir, the reason for this amendment is, I have been reliably informed, that there are a number of jobs available in the agricultural industry, particularly for tractor drivers and so on, both in and out of crop season, which cannot be filled because of the fact that 21 years is the period at which one can get a licence to drive a goods vehicle. Very often tractors bring to Bridgetown a trailer for feed, and it is then classified as a goods vehicle; therefore, you have to be 21 years of age in order to get a licence to drive it. The interesting thing is that at long last the people in charge of the sugar industry in this country are beginning to realise that they can only compete with labour on roughly equal terms as to conditions of employment. Therefore, if they want to attract young men to stay in the industry, not only have they got to pay higher wages, but there must be better conditions of employment for them.

Sir, the position is that if the young people can get a licence at 18 - at 17 you can get a licence to drive a motor car - they can come to town and get a job driving a car or working as a mechanic and be able to earn more money. If they can do that, they are not going to remain in the country for three extra years before they become 21 years, because in the meantime they would be able to earn a better wage in town.

Sir, the type of person they want to drive tractors are responsible people - people who have had apprentice training with diesel engines or as motor mechanics. The wages they would be willing to pay would be competitive, but they are operating at a great disadvantage. A person does not want to throw \$30,000 or \$40,000 in equipment into the hands of a man who has no training and is not responsible. We are, in effect, preventing many young people from earning at an early age a bigger wage because of this disability of 21 years. Members need not have any fear of this, because the condition under which you can drive a goods vehicle is that you must be the holder of a licence in respect of a motor vehicle other than a motor cycle for 12 months prior. You will have to be driving a motor car for a year before, because the 12-month previous experience with a motor cycle does not count.

Sir, all we are doing is being logical with this amendment. I believe it will have a good effect; it will help many people to increase their earnings; it will be helpful to the agricultural industry and the distributive industry. One of the few jobs that you can see advertised in Barbados regularly is for a Van Driver/Salesman. People are also advertising for tractor drivers. Of course, there will be consequential amendments, because some of the sections in the Bill will have to be re-numbered.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am very glad to hear the speech made by the hon. senior member for Christ Church. I do not know if he was in the House at the time when I introduced a similar Resolution asking the Government to do the same thing. I am very glad that the hon. member has seen the wisdom in that Resolution. He may remember that I introduced it and put up all the necessary arguments possible. I cited a case where one of my boys was convicted, and I had to pay the fine for him because I was at fault. He was driving a jeep, and it was rated as a goods vehicle. He could drive a private car with the Governor-General in it and it would be okay, but he was penalised for driving a jeep. Unfortunately, he could not get a licence to drive a jeep until he had reached the age of 21, and at the time he was convicted he was only 18 years of age.

When I spoke on my Resolution in this House, the hon. senior member for Christ Church did not press the matter as he pressed it today. He was able to put it in a better way than I did. Of course, he is trained to do that. I do not know whether he was in the House at the time, but I had to fight the Minister on the issue. The Minister said that he could not put a bus laden with passengers, or a taxi filled with people, in the hands of a person at that age. I hope he has changed his mind now when he sees that the young boys are prevented from holding good jobs. My colleague has said that there are tractors and other vehicles that these boys can drive better than some of the old chaps, and they are prevented from doing so by the Act. He has seized a very good opportunity to get in his amendment; so my Resolution will fall through. My Resolution was on the Order Paper for the last Session; it was put back on, and now the time has run out on it.

11.20 p.m.

I am not trying to pat myself on the back or play that I was the first person to deal with it, because I am nothing to do with who deals with anything that is for the people so long as it is done for the people. I would be only too glad if every member of this House did not give me an opportunity to say anything for the people, but succeeded in getting something done for them. It is not a question of catching a vote; it is a question of righting the wrongs in the right direction, and that is to help those who cannot help themselves. I would be only too glad to second the amendment when it comes so that these people will be able to drive. Although the boys at my garage are able to repair and fix a vehicle, they cannot test it on the highway if it is a goods vehicle or bus or taxi; this is unfair to them because after they have repaired a vehicle they should be the persons to test it on the road and observe the symptoms. If a person complains that this vehicle is doing so-and-so and a boy fixes it, he would know if the fault has been corrected by testing it, and through this he becomes a qualified mechanic. As the Act stands, he would never know if he fixed-it-right or-wrong, because if the person who tries it finds some thing wrong while he is testing it, he may fix it on the road and the boy as the garage would know nothing about it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I drew this to the Minister's attention at that time and pointed out the hardship, and he promised that he would raise the matter at Cabinet. Nothing was done. In otherwords, he got

fixed right before he got the opportunity to fix-it-right; and that is why if any member of this Chamber raises a point and the Minister promises to have it done, he should not say so if he does not mean it because this can cause a lot of trouble and embarrassment; it can be felt that the Minister wanted to get along with his Bill or Resolution, make a promise to have something done, but he forgets, the member forgets also and then you get people running into trouble. I am very glad that the hon. senior member for Christ Church has been fit to put this amendment into the Bill. I think he has something on the Order Paper, but he can now use this medium and see how the Minister takes this particular amendment.

Mr. ST. JOHN:

On a point of explanation, I handed the amendment to the Minister to get him to get it studied by his Department and so forth. I did give notice before hand that I was going to move this amendment.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if there is one bit of legislation on the Statute Book that is in dire need of amendment, it is certainly the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act. Perhaps I should change my phrase. It is not in dire need of amendment at all, because what is needed is a completely new Motor Vehicle sand Road Traffic Act, and it is a pity that we are going on from time to time with piecemeal amendments. We had an amendment not so long ago to allow a person who was suspended for a period of time to apply back for his licence; then there was a further amendment dealing with people who were driving under permit. I have no doubt that you, along with Mr. Speaker if he were here, would agree with me that there is need for a completely new Road Traffic Act. I do not know If the Minister is aware of the situation that exists at the moment. I think that if he were to consult with the Attorney General or his Department, he would appreciate the anomalous situation which exists in regard to offences such as dangerous driving and without due care and attention. Under the present Act when a person is convicted of driving in a manner dangerous to the public, the fine which is imposed on him is \$48 under Section 48, 1 think, of the Road Traffic Act, 1937, whereas if that person is convicted of speeding, he can be fined \$240 or \$250. Again if he is charged for driving without Third Party Insurance, he can be fined \$240.

In England during the 1950s it was realised that juries were bloth to convict people who were charged for motoring manslaughter, and therefore it was necessary under the Road Traffic Act of 1956 to have a new offence created, that is, causing death by dangerous driving. Today, Sir, the position in Barbados is somewhat similar to what it was in Britain in the 1950s, and juries, because of the very punishment and the very nature of the charge of manslaughter, are loth to convict people of motoring manslaughter. As a result, when they are tried before a jury, the jury brings back a verdict on the alternative count of dangerous driving. The punishment there is only \$48, and this is not at all adequate. In the case of driving without due care and consideration, the fine is \$48 also. These are not all the Inadequacies of the Road Traffic Act.

I believe the Minister may be aware of the position with Third Party Insurance, because if there is another piece of legislation that really works havoc in this country, it is the limitation placed on Third Party claims. In 1952 when the Act was passed it was considered necessary then to place what is known as a mere Act policy, that is, where a person is called upon under the Act to insure against injury to a third person - and it was then decided that the liability of the insurance company should be limited to \$4,800. Now, Sir, this was some 18 years ago. If the Minister would check with the Attorney General's Department, a survey of the damages awarded in personal injuries cases throughout the West Indies would show that the sum of \$4,800 is not really adequate in this day and age because if a person has a broken foot with any sort of complications, this is all that is paid. I do not like to mention personal experiences, but I think I must in this case. I have had a case where a girl had a broken jaw and a broken wrist, and was awarded \$6,600 by the Courts. The insurance company gladly paid the \$4,800 and washed its hands of the claim because they said that was the limit of their liability under the policy. The girl must suffer. In that same accident the brother of the girl had severe injuries; he had a broken arm and a broken foot, and although the amount of damages have not yet been awarded, the insurance company has allowed me to know that it is willing to pay over the \$4,800 damages - the limit of their liability under Third Party Insurance. I have been advised along with senior Counsel who is doing the case with me that the Courts will award in the vicinity of \$15,000. What you will find is that this boy of sixteen years is going to receive only \$4,800 from the insurance company, and that over \$10,000 will remain unsatisfied because the owner of the car and the driver do not have the money with which they can satisfy the balance of the judgment. 11.30 a.m.

I think that the time has come when Government must look seriously at the Third Party Insurance policies; and two things are required. I think this idea of asking people to insure only for the injury to a third person should be removed and that it should be compulsory on the users of all motor cars, not only to insure against personal injury to a third person but also to the property of a third person, and that what is now known as the Full Third Party should be the compulsory Third Party that every user of a motor car should be made to insure against - injury to the person of the third party and to the property of the third party. Today every motor car over a Cortina, I believe, is worth more than \$4,800; even a Cortina is worth that, and it would be hard to think that you buy a car for \$5,000 or \$6,000 and when you put it on the road and somebody destroys it, you only get half the amount for it.

One other point is that under the Insurance legislation as it stands now, you are only required to insure in the case of a motor car that is being used for hire or reward, compulsorily as regards passengers. This again is wrong because the practice of the insurance companies at this stage is to duck out wherever possible from paying any money in respect of personal injury.

I think that it is time that the limit on Third Party claims be raised to at least \$15,000. I grant you that the premiums may go up, but it is a necessary evil to tell any person who is injured as a result of the negligence of somebody else on the highway. I am Secretary of the Bar Association, and for some two

years we have been calling on the Government to bring in a new Road Traffic Bill. The Regulations made under the Road Traffic Bill are in even a more ridiculous state because there are very few Courts which possess a complete set of those Regulations, and we would like the Minister as a matter of urgency to have a complete set of Road Traffic legislation incorporating Third Party legislation, and also to insure that, under the new Third Party Act, the limit of liability placed on the Insurance company be raised from \$4,800 to something like \$15,000, and the final limit in respect of any one claim which now stands at \$24,000 should be increased to something like \$50,000.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the junior member for the City was pushing an open door with some of the remarks he made, but what I do not fully understand was the need for making an election speech at the moment. He said on the floor of the House sometime before that as soon as I cannot answer a question I become abusive. It would be a very sad day if I could not have a very quick retort to any nonsense that is said to me in here or any place, but what I do not like about the junior member for the City is that every time he opens his mouth he wants to make the public think that this Government is vindictive, vicious and a diabolical one, and yet still the people elected us twice in two successive terms. Either he is wrong or the people are wrong.

He talked about the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Regulations and that we need a new Act; but everybody in Barbados, including the last baby he had, knows this. It is not that I have the amendments at my home and would not bring them to the House. Some of the Acts are antiquated and need to be revised; but I am not a lawyer. He is a lawyer, but we could not trust him to do this because he is a junior and we need experience. There is a Law Library in the Courts which, I believe, is one of the best Law Libraries in the West Indies, though not the biggest; let him go into it and see the amount of books there. Do you think we could do this in one week?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, I thought I made a speech without any sort of rancour or accusation at all; if he wants to accuse me of this sort of thing, it is a lot of nonsense. I know the Bar Association has made representation to the Government for a very long time on this aspect of it, and we were told over two years now that a Bill has been drafted by Superintendent Forde and that it has to go to the Ministry and to these places. Two years ago; but it has not come down here yet.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

I have rancour and you should know this, but I was only trying to put the record straight for the benefit of the junior member. The junior member for St. Andrew accused me of laughing too much; but if I hear something funny I must laugh; so do not come in and give me the impression that we are not doing anything.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I am awfully sorry about that, but I did not make a speech that anybody was not doing anything; the whole purpose of my speech was that I wanted to bring to the Minister these points.

11.40 a.m.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

I fully appreciate this, Mr. Deputy Speaker. As I pointed out to him, even his last baby is aware that the Road Traffic Regulations should be repealed and replaced by new Regulations. We have to bring in these amendments from time to time, and have all of them embodied in the new Regulations at a later stage. You must not give the impression that the Minister is running about doing nothing in the matter. (Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY I never said that.) Mr. Deputy Speaker, he must understand that he speaks English and so do I. (Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY You cannot understand it.) As I said in my opening remarks, the hon. member is knocking at an open door.

It is fashionable in Barbados nowadays, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for people to have a telephone, a refrigerator and a motor car. These things are no longer luxuries. You do not have to go into a small house to know if it has a telephone or a refrigerator. You can see people looking through a window and talking to the telephone, and almost everybody has a refrigerator and a motor car.

With regard to insurance, I remember when the hon. senior member for Christ Church was in the other Place he brought in a Resolution dealing with a similar point. We went into this matter very carefully. What we have to be careful with is in asking a man to carry up the amount of money that is to be paid to the persons who get hurt, because the Insurance companies may increase the premiums so high that the small man may not be able to pay them. This is a quid pro quo matter. We have amended certain parts of the Bill, and we are not sleeping. I do not know what is going on in your Chambers, and you do not know what is going on in mine, I know more about what is going on in yours, because you have to take yours to the Court for a decision.

Now, we discussed the matter with the people concerned, and we looked at all aspects of it. Legislation is something that you should not draft on your feet, because when you think you are helping somebody you might be hurting him. Very seldom a taxi knocks down anybody; it is mostly private cars that knock down people. As you grow old - you are still young - you will learn that these things cannot be done in a day, I know how the members of the Opposition feel. It is the duty of the Opposition to keep the Government on its toes, but it is not the duty of the Opposition to come in here and raise

frivolous points, and think that I am going to sit here and let them get away with them.

Now, the junior member for the City spoke about piecemeal legislation. You will have to do things piecemeal, because these are things that are necessary at the moment.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

On a point of order. I wonder if the Minister can give the House some idea as to how soon he will be able to get this legislation before the House,

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I cannot tell him when the legislation will be brought before the House. The Crown Law Officers are dealing with the matter, and we want to make sure that when we bring it here everything will be covered. We do not want to rush through a Bill and then have to make several amendments to it. Of course, there is no Bill that can be drafted in such a manner that it will not be necessary to make amendments to it eventually.

There are two salient points which I would like to raise. The senior member for Christ Church brought in an amendment today; he warned me about the amendment, and I agreed with it. However, the senior member for St. Joseph already had a Resolution tabled in this House, and I had objected to it being passed when the matter was debated. I will tell you why I had objected. I want to say that I am one of those people who do not believe in waiting until Britain does something before we do it. I feel that we should lead. We can make mistakes like anybody else. You can only make mistakes when you have tried to do something, and then you try to avoid making the same mistakes again. I objected at the time because they were having the same problem in England and they were not happy about it. The fact is that there were one or two youngsters and a few old ones, too who were contributing to their downfall. I pointed out to the senior member for St. Joseph at the time that I would look into the matter.

Now, Sir. I did not want to accept the amendment on the floor of the House, but since an amendment to a Bill takes precedence over a Private Member's motion, I had to accept it. I do not want to steal any thunder from the senior member for St. Joseph, because this is really his Resolution. I am very sorry that he should think that I would refuse to adhere to the Resolution which he brought in, and then adhere to the amendment brought in by the senior member for Christ Church because he is a lawyer. The senior member for Christ Church knows how I can lick lawyers and lick them good, too. It was not a question of love, but a question of common sense. When you look at the Air Force in any part of the world you will find that the pilots are 18-year-olds, and an aeroplane will cost more than a motor vehicle. If you can put a fighter plane or a bomber in the hands of an 18-year-old, then I do not see why we should not

accept this amendment. I accepted the amendment.

Sir, despite what the Opposition may say about how bad we are and how many thieves are on this side, the first time in the history of Barbados I have ever seen a sign marked "Men Wanted For Work" is when I went on Mitchell's site. This means that the economy is moving forward; it also means that a lot of the 18-year-olds have left the country and gone abroad to improve their condition. I would be phlegmatic and downright stupid if I were to get on the floor of this House and do like the ostrich, and pretend that because I did not see the problem it is not there. It would mean that I am only keeping back progress, which I have no intention of doing. 11.50 a.m.

I must make an apology to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph for delaying on this matter and causing his thunder to be stolen, and I say for the record that he did bring a Resolution on the floor of this House asking that this amendment be made. I can also go further and say that his Party did not support it. I do not know if they would have done so when they saw the light even if they did not feel the heat, because they did not realise the heat was coining as it was. Now that they feel the heat they would do anything. I do not want the hon. senior member for St. Joseph to get it into his head that out of malice aforethought or otherwise I tried to prevent him from getting the thunder that belongs to him. I do not at the same time want him to think that I am agreeing to this because I am afraid, because I have fought him in two elections and won, and I am prepared to fight him again in the third. I want him to understand that this is a matter of bare commonsense.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, before I sit down, there is a final point I want to make. The hon. senior member for St. James referred to areas around Hospitals and Nursing Homes being silent zones, I was going outside for my licence - because I have an old one - in which he will see that the whole of Bridgetown and as far as Belleville is a silent zone, but I do not know why this was never enforced. Since people would know that an area is a silent zone and would still blow their horns, we intend to put up signs and ask the Police to be more vigilant in these areas with Nursing Homes and in residential areas, because sometimes you are trying to get a rest after a hard day - maybe your wife is giving you a lot of trouble too - and somebody zooms through the neighbourhood with a motor cycle, going no place, but is travelling at about 100 miles an hour to stop 50 yards along. This is really stupid.

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

On motion of Hon. N. W. BOXILL, seconded by Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. YEARWOOD in the

Chair.

Clause 1, 2 and 3 were called and passed,

Clause 4 was called.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 4 stand part.

Hon. K. N, R- HUSBANDS:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ST. JOHN:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that a new Clause 4 be inserted in the form circulated to hon. members' It reads as follows

"Section 34 of the principal Act is hereby amended by deleting the words "twenty-one years" appearing In the third line thereof and substituting the woros "eighteen years".

Hon. N. W. BOX1LL:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to withdraw the original Clause 4 and to accept the amendment to Clause 4 moved by the hon. member, which I also beg to second.

The question that Clause 4 as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 4 as printed be renumbered Clause 5 and stand part.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 5 as printed be renumbered Clause 6 and stand part.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 6 as printed be renumbered Clause 7 and stand part.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Hon. N. W. BOXILL, seconded by Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill with amendments in Committee, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. N. W. BOXILL, seconded by Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

12.00 noon

RESOLUTION TO SUPPLEMENT PORT ESTIMATES - \$169, 620

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The Hon. Minister of Communications and Works has asked leave to deal with Item 10 which is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the expenditure of the sum of \$169, 620 which is shown in the Annexed Estimates Part I - Current, Port Department. If there are no objections leave will be granted; there being no objections leave is granted.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as the Addendum sets out, the sum of \$169, 620 is required to supplement various items of expenditure under Annexed Estimates - Port Department in the 1969-70 Estimates of Expenditure as follows -

Item 35 - Marine Services

It has been necessary to undertake an extraordinary amount of maintenance to bring the Harbour Craft up to a satisfactory condition. A supplement of \$41, 767 is required to meet expenditure to the end of the Financial Year.

Item 36 - Motor Transport

It was necessary to replace the tyres of the Port Department's Motor Tractor due to unexpected tyre failure. No provision was made for the purchase of tyres in the 1969-70 Estimates and a supplement of \$1, 659 is required to meet the cost of the tyres and the additional cost of maintenance of the Department's vehicles due to the recent revision of salaries.

Item 38 - Navigational Aids

It has been necessary to undertake extensive repairs to the Needhams and Fairway Buoys and a supplement of \$2, 294 is required to meet expenditure under this item to the end of the Financial Year.

Items 25, 27, 39, 52, 60, 64

It is necessary to supplement these items to meet the cost of increased wages and labour costs consequent on the revision salaries of Government employees with effect from 1st April, 1969.

I beg to move that this Resolution for \$169, 620 do now pass.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

I beg to second that.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, only quite recently I realised that at the Port there is quite a bit of congestion in the sheds. I had the experience of ordering a rear lamp for my car in September; I called the garages over and over, and they told me that they have been landed but cannot be found in the sheds. Apparently there is no method for handling the cargo. I am just speaking from the little experience I have had, but I am wondering if the Minister could not tell us something about what plans they have for the purpose of relieving this congestion. The agents have their stuff in the Port; I believe they have to pay more duty on it the longer it remains in there, and naturally I believe they are going to pass this on to the consumer. I speak under correction, but the inconvenience of the people who are bringing in goods who are then told that the goods were brought in September, but that goods which were brought in in February have been put on them is not good enough, and I believe that Government should set out to build a few more sheds or find some proper method for the people handling the cargo at the Port. I would like to hear what the Minister has to say as far as this is concerned in his reply.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

What the hon. member has just said, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is somewhat true, but not all true; not that he is misleading the House or anything like this, but he does not have all the facts. I myself do not have all the facts, but I have a lot more of them than he has. The Bridgetown Port was built to handle 150,000 tons of cargo. In 1961 this was a big thing; but in the short period of eight years the Bridgetown Harbour is now handling something like over 350,000 tons of cargo. I am not blaming anybody for this. I only know of two things which in my opinion the people had the foresight to build for expansion purposes - the World and the Panama Canal. Strangely enough, the Panama Canal was finished in 1915 and up to now a ship of 55,000 tons could still pass through; but even our roads were built for donkey carts, and now I am getting a lot of lashes because we have big buses.

Mr. CRAIG:

On a point of order, what I would like to state is that at the time when the Deep Water Harbour was built they were only handling about

90,000 tons, and the Opposition had a lot of foresight to build it to handle 160,000 tons. The Government had eight years to foresee the increase in cargo, and should have immediately built more sheds to cope with this.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

I like the kind of effervescence that is being maintained on both sides of the House. As I said before, I am not here to castigate anybody on this. The main point is that the Harbour is completely overloaded - as a matter of fact, last month I was a bit worried because a number of ships had to remain outside. We have plans for the Deep Water Harbour that will be a palliative; it will stop some of the congestion, but it will not solve the overall problem. What I plan to do right now as an immediate measure is to extend Shed No. 1 going eastward, and Shed No. 3 will be extended going Westward; so you will at least get a little more space which will give us about 51,000 square feet. This will not solve the problem, but it would help to alleviate the congestion at the Port. 12.10 p.m.

Sir, what really happens is that you have five days grace to take away things coming into the Harbour. A lot of these merchants have Customs Clerks who are sent down to the Customs Department to get warrants cleared. The youngster goes there; he sees a line of people and decides that he could go to his girl friend and spend a few minutes before the Customs Officer would reach his position in the line. When he gets to his girl friend he forgets his mission, and when he returns to the Customs Office it is closed. He then goes back to his office and says that he spent the whole day at the Customs Office and could not get the warrants passed. We have introduced a new method in dealing with warrants.

Another thing is that some of the consignees do not get their Bills of Lading in time, but it usually happens that the agents of the ships notify the people that goods have arrived by a certain ship and they should take them out of the Customs. The ships have been coming to Barbados so fast that.....

Mr.. HINDS:

On a point of order. I should like to let the Minister know that it is not the responsibility of the ships' agents to notify the consignees that shipments of cargo have arrived.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

I have never heard anything more stupid.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have been involved in matters of this sort, and repeatedly the ships' agents have told me that it is not their responsibility to notify me, as a consignee, that a ship arrived on such-and-such a day bringing something for me. It is definitely not their responsibility, and they are only doing me a favour.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not know what is the point he is trying to make. He says that he has been involved in this matter. I want him to understand that I spent over twenty years at sea, and I was not running about with any plate in my hand, as they believe. Even if I were, I am one of those people who like to know something about everything which surrounds me. It is not the downright duty of the agent, but it is the practice in Barbados that the agents always call these people, especially if the Bill of Lading does not come. They usually notify the consignees that they have goods at the Port. This is how we know that we should not refund the extra charges at some times. We always look back to see whether the consignees were notified. Even if the invoices are not here, you can go and swear to a warrant to get the goods out.

Mr. HINDS:

He means a Bill of Sight.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I hope the hon. member will stop interrupting me. Because I mentioned something about a warrant he starts thinking the wrong side. You have a Warrant Officer. Do you think

he is a piece of blue paper? I am talking about a warrant to get goods out of the Customs. Do not waste time talking about a point of order! You must wait until you catch me outside and tell me that it is not so. You do not understand what is going on. Why did you interfere with this matter? I am going to pass a law to prevent him from coming in here; he should come here only to eat food and go back home. (ASIDES.) Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member is interrupting me.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Is it in order for a member, who habitually sits in his seat and interrupts, to complain of being interrupted?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have to accept that for what it is worth. To me it is very humorous. I will proceed if the hon. member will keep quite. I was saying that some of these people leave the goods in the Customs on the pretext that they could not get them out. The senior member for St. James spoke about a rear lamp for his car. I wanted a steering belt for my car. I went to the garage and was told that they had steering belts at the Port and would get them immediately. I told them not to leave the steering belts at the Port too long, because if they remained in the Port too long and they had to pay excess tax, I was not going to rescind it. I went to Trinidad, refused to buy the steering belt there, returned to my garage and was told that they never had any steering belts down there at all. Perhaps that might have happened to him, too. Some people want to use the Port as their bond house; so when they complain that the Minister is not doing anything to alleviate hardships, that is not true. We realise that there is congestion and we are not going to deny that. You will get congestion because the economy is moving forward.

As I have pointed out to the members on the opposite side, we intend to extend Shed No. 1 and Shed No. 3, and we believe that this will help the situation until we can extend the entire Port.

I beg to move that this Resolution - Did I move this already?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

You do not even know what you are doing.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

You were only replying. Yes.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The question is that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I am sorry.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was not listening just now, but I gather that the hon. Minister said.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Have you risen on a point of order ? The Minister has replied -

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

Do not interrupt.

Mr. SMITH:

How can I be on a point of order when the Minister admits that he has just moved the second reading?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

No. He has replied.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I heard the hon. Minister ask if he had put it already.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

This is a Resolution, and there can be no second reading of this. The Minister moved that the Resolution do now pass.

Mr. SMITH:

Then I am not in order to speak!

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Before the Hon. Minister spoke, he asked if any other members on the other side were desirous of speaking. No one rose. The hon. senior member for Christ Church told the hon. Minister that he wanted to hear him on the point raised by the hon. senior member for St. James, and the Minister then replied When he was about to take his seat, he asked if he had already moved that the Resolution do now pass, and the Leader of the House said "Yes". The hon. senior member for St Joseph cannot be heard at this stage except by the leave of the House.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking for the indulgence of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The hon. senior member for St. Joseph is asking leave to speak at this late stage. If there are no objections leave will be granted. There being no objections, leave is granted.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I thank you very much. There is one point I want to raise before I touch on the main point. All of us in here are members.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

On a point of order. As the House has indulged in giving the hon. member permission to speak after I have spoken, I am asking....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

That is not a point of order.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

I am not challenging the the Ruling of the House. I only want to know if I will have the right to reply to the hon. member if he raises a point of importance which should be answered.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Of course. 12.20 p.m.

Mr. SMITH:

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is only one point. I hope you will not rule me out of order, but there is one thing that has been operating in my mind all the time. Whenever the Chair, not the Chairman of Committees, is referring to a member, he refers to some as "the hon. and learned", and when it comes to others he says "the hon. member". Does it mean that we are not learned? I want to know this because this is Parliament and not the Law Courts. (Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS This has been going on for 300 years.) I agree that this has been so for 300 years, but this is in the Law Court, not in the House of Assembly. Just as you cannot refer to me as Mr. Smith in Parliament, you have to refer to the learned member in Court. This makes me feel that I am not learned, and some people believe that, so long as you do not reach the height, you really are not learned. We go on to the other point now.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, if the hon. junior member for St. Thomas is at all worried, we can always pass a Resolution to refer to him as "learned".

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

On a point of order, can this continue? For 300 years people in the House of Commons, in the House of Assembly in Barbados and in every British Assembly have been following the practice of saying "learned" because you happen to be called to the Bar. You may be one of the most, foolish people on earth, but you are entitled to that, just as you call everybody sitting around here "honourable" and a lot of them sit down here very often and have not that much honour in them.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

It is interesting to see this unusually nice and harmonious atmosphere today. I hope it will prevail

throughout the whole of today's sitting.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I seek your permission to speak. I am supporting the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. For 300 years we have made the distinction of only agreeing to call the hon. gentlemen of the Cloth, of the Long Robe, "learned". Today professions are increasing; Chairs at Universities are increasing year after year. If a man scarcely scrapes through his law examination and becomes elected as a member of this Parliament, he is "honourable and learned". If the most brilliant Ph.D in medicine or any other profession comes in here, he is just "honourable". What is it in law that is so profound that deserves the respect of hon. members of any Parliament-or in the world, for that matter? The House of Commons is in Great Britain, and we have copied lock, stock and barrel their customs for 300 years, and there is no reason why we should continue. We should include all the professions and call them "learned", or none. Tomorrow morning I would move any motion in this House to have that rescinded. It is pure, old-time snobbishness. Don't be in a hurry to get up. We do not understand why hon. members of the Long Robe would be constantly advocating this.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

May I draw to the hon. member's attention that he has risen on a point of order, and he has got to put his point in making a point of order. He is not allowed to make a speech.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

Either we should bring in all the professions or we leave out all. It is pure snobbishness to continue.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The point has been made.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

On a point of order, the hon. member sat in that Chair as Speaker for a long time. Why did it never occur to him? I agree with everything. What doesn't matter? There are some lawyers who know less than an obeah woman, but if the habit is to call him "learned", it is purely the practice in here, and you can bring in a Resolution to abolish it. The British people came here 300 years ago and brought all their customs, and we have followed them all this time. If you think they are outdated, say so.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The hon. member is going on to make a speech. He has already made his point of order.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, as a lawyer I do not care what they call me, so long as my clients call me. However, I should like to draw to the attention of hon. members a passage which reads "In the House, dealing with members of the House, he is referred to as the honourable, or the right honourable if he is a Privy Councillor, the honourable and learned member if he is a barrister, and the honourable and gallant member if he is a commissioned officer in any of the Armed Services".

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Where did the hon. member read from?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

"Introduction to the House of Commons" by Robert Rhodes James.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Thank you very much indeed. Point made.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that should be the property of the House if it is not already its property. (Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS What is wrong with his quoting that?) Mr. Deputy Speaker, whom must I address?

Now, Sir, I only got up to ask you one question, but I did not know it would generate so much heat. I sat in the Chair as Speaker and as Chairman of Committees at a time when I heard two lawyers, and neither of them ever said "the honourable and learned member", and when in this House it happens again, I am going to get up and draw to attention that two lawyers speaking to each other are not "learned".

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The hon. senior member for St. Joseph was given leave to speak on the Resolution.

Mr. SMITH:

Yes, Sir, and I am speaking and will speak.

Now, the Hon. Minister said there are certain importers who use the Shed at the Fbrt as a bond house. I am sure the Minister does not know what goes on, and I am appealing to Ministers, when they do not know anything, not to get up and try to make excuses, because they will find themselves in trouble. Firstly goods arrive at the Port and there are no documents. The importers, as I do with every order that is made, ask the people overseas to make sure and send the documents even before they ship the goods, but we cannot get that adhered to at all. The goods come and there are no documents. Now if you do not get any documents, how will you know that the goods have arrived? There are documents from which you know the ship and then you can look in the newspaper and see when it is arriving. In a case where no documents come, how will the importer know?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

On a point of order, I hate to interrupt the hon. member, but he is saying exactly what I said and still he is criticising me.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

That is no a point of order; that is a point of explanation. I have already told the Minister that he will have an opportunity to reply.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

I did not mean to interrupt the hon. member, but what I said is that many times the goods come without the Bill of Lading, but the agents of the ship notify the consignee, and the hon. member got up and said this does not happen. 12.30 p.m.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, is he prepared to swear that every agent notifies the importer? He may be told that, but it is not always the case. The fact is that they are giving too small a period of time to clear these goods - only five days, and when you send the warrants down there they are pushed into a box and you have to be sending continually and asking if they are ready. Years ago the warrants used to be passed at the same time they were presented; sometimes you would have your Clerks going down there the whole day and not getting them passed, but the next day you would be able to get these warrants out and get your goods. Do not blame the importer; he would have to blame his people. I know that you cannot

always employ the staff to suit the situation, but you have to more up your minds to increase the staff because a lot more ships are now coming into the Harbour and at a faster rate. The goods get here before the documents, and when the documents come you have to wait another three or four days before you get them passed, and the Government has a very nice way of collecting revenue for goods which are left in these Sheds over a certain period of time. Why would it profit an importer to use the Shed as a bond when he is paying for every day the goods are there, according to the weight? There is a gentleman down there called Mr. Parker, and in some cases he used to relieve me of some of these charges if I would show some extraordinary circumstance which prevented me from clearing them before, but I cannot expect him to do this all the time. The Government must increase the staff, even if it means employing part-time staff. There are a lot of resigned people who would be able to come in when the ships are in Port to help clear the goods, and when things are light they can be laid off; but we are taking advantage of the importers.

The Government does not lose by this because they are collecting too much money as excess duty; sometimes the excess duty is so high that you are tempted to tell them keep the goods. It is not a question of money; it is that you cannot get the job done, and I am appealing to the Minister to see to it that they get staff. It has just been drawn to my attention that the Workers' Union said that they should get rid of the old men, but you can bring them in to increase the staff.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not want to prolong this any longer, but I am glad that I allowed the senior member for St. Joseph to speak.

He has just brought up something which is very pertinent as far as I am concerned, The hon. member has said that he could get some relief on charges made at the Port by a Mr. Parker, and I wait it made expressly clear.....

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I said if you showed the documents, and he can see that is no fault of yours he would sympathise with you; but you have to show him in an extraordinary case that it is not your fault.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

I do not know why he is generating so much heat. What I want to point out to this House is that whether it is Mr. Parker or anybody for that matter nobody, not even the Prime Minister, has the authority to give anybody any rebate or allow them to take out goods over the time limit without paying for them, except the Minister of Communications and Works. This is a matter that must have the

approval of the Minister of Communications and Works; so now I will have to carry out an investigation into this. This is the law; I did not write it; all this is embodied in the Barbados Harbours' Act, 1960 and the Regulations, 1961 and I am going to find this information and give it to the House. This should never take place.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what the senior member for St. Joseph has said has been going on at the Port for more than five to six years. I do know that if a package remains in the Port for a period over five days and there is a Ministry charge on it, you are told to go to Mr. Parker; that has been going on for more than five years, I can say that.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

I am not going to pursue this matter on the floor of the House because I do not want to embarrass anybody.

I pointed out the reason why the Harbour was overcrowded. Sometimes the excess tax is more than the cost of the item, and the person concerned decides to leave it there. That is not the fault of the Government. If the manufacturers do not send down the Bill of Lading, the Government is not responsible for that. What the consignee has to do is to make representations to the Port, and the Port in turn will make representations to me, asking that the excess tax be rescinded. The hon. member must understand that he is not the only person who has to pay the extra charges. I have taken these extra charges from almost all of the Ministries already. We want to clear the Port and they will have to abide with the law. I cannot allow the Government to get away with it. Do not say that I am going to do this to X and Y and not the Government. The Government gets hit hard, too.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have known on more than one occasion where an officer went to the Port for something for the Government, and he was told about the excess storage charge. The officer went back to the Ministry without reporting the matter. When another officer found out what had taken place, there were thousands of dollars involved. I was asked what should be done. I said that it was the Government, but there was a principle involved. If we were charging the other people, then we would also have to charge the Government. There was a big noise, but the Government had to pay the amount. Anyway, he would never have excess storage charge, as far as I know. (ASIDES.) I said as far as I know; I do not know your business.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister has lost sight of the point I have made. I said that after the

documents arrive here you have to wait at the Customs a very long time. When the documents arrive they are put into a box, and you have to wait until you can get them.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Point of explanation made.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Deputy Speaker he is mixing up things. There is no document that ever remains at the Customs longer than 48 hours. The Government is not responsible for shipping agents 'not sending out documents. It is like nature. If a child takes up fire, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it would burn the child in the same way as if you, an experienced man, took it up. I hope you will not take up fire, Sir. (ASIDES.) Nature has no respect for ignorance. If an ordinary man commits an offence through ignorance, the Judge may be in sympathy with him, but he would be dealt with in accordance with the law.

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

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 3 be the next Order of the Day, and that I be allowed to take charge of it since it is really my Resolution. There seems to be a misprint.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Communications and Works is asking leave to deal with Order No. 3 which stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House. If there is no objection, leave will be granted. There being no objection, leave is granted to the Minister of Communications and Works to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) (No.2) Regulations, 1969.

RESOLUTION re MOTOR VEHICLES AND ROAD TRAFFIC (AMENDMENT) (No.2)
REGULATIONS, 1969

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have spoken on this already. I beg to move that a Resolution to approve the

Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) (No.2) Regulations, 1969, do now pass.

Mr. LOWE:

I beg to second that.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think we can conveniently break off here. I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until two o'clock.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the same thing happened on Tuesday. I did not know until I telephoned here and found out that we were supposed to be meeting at half-past ten this morning. (An hon. Member Ten.) I was told half-past ten. I had to put off all sorts of appointments in order to get here. I am asking the Leader of the House - I am not saying this in any abusive way - to have the common decency to ask people on the other side of the House if such-and-such an hour suits them. I had to put off people who came from the United States of America to meet me. Three distinct sets of people I met this morning and I could not get here earlier. The Hon. Leader of the House made the motion for adjournment last Tuesday without saying a word to any of us on this side.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are four active Barristers who might not have found it possible to come here this morning. He did not ask any of us on this side whether the time would suit us. That is bad manners. When he was a little boy on his mother's knee, he was told to ask somebody if it would suit him to do something. Only now I have discovered that I should have been here at ten o'clock. When I telephoned the Clerk's Office this morning, I was told by one of the attendants that the meeting was half-

past ten. I tried my best to get here at half-past ten, but I could not get here until half-past eleven, because of these appointments. If he does not want to talk to me he can talk to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the hon. senior member for Christ Church.

Sir, if he gets annoyed about what I told him about his truthfulness, he can forget me. Let him speak to the hon. senior member for Christ Church. It is bad to fix the time without consulting us. Even a yard boy you have to ask whether it suits him to come in tomorrow morning at six o'clock or seven o'clock.

The question that the sitting be now suspended until 2 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly. 12.50 p.m.

On Resumption:-

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave to lay a Message from His Excellency the Governor-General.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to lay a document from His Excellency the Governor-General, and unless there is any objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted to the hon. member.

DOCUMENT LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is Message No. 2/1970 from His Excellency the Governor-General, signed with his own hand, of today's date.

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL

TO THE HONOURABLE THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

His Excellency the Governor-General has the honour to inform the Honourable House of Assembly that he has been advised that the practice of inviting the Honourable Senate to concur in Resolutions to grant sums of money from the Consolidated Fund and to place those sums at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, and of seeking the Governor-General's assent thereto, is not in accordance with the provisions of section 109, and is contrary to the provisions of section 54, of the Constitution. The advice has been supported by the provisions of section 6 of the Financial Administration and Audit Act, 1964.

His Excellency the Governor-General has the honour further to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that, in view of the advice tendered, the practice referred to above will be discontinued immediately.

A. Winston Scott. GOVERNOR-GENERAL.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

Barbados.

13th February, 1970.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

On a point of privilege, the Governor-General cannot send a Message to us. Would the Leader of the House be so kind as to read the last few lines again?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

"His Excellency the Governor-General has the honour to further inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that, in view of the advice tendered, the practice referred to above will be discontinued immediately."

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

On a point of privilege.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Before the hon. member speaks on a point of privilege, I would like to make it clear that there can be no question of a debate on any document laid.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I am not debating any document. I am debating a question of privilege.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The correct course would be to bring a motion.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I am on a question of privilege of this House. I do not think it is right - and it is in breach of the privileges of this House - to have people outside of this House dictate to the House on the conduct of this House. This is a very serious thing. Originally a letter was sent, I believe, to the Leader of the Opposition stating that in future the Government did not propose to bring Resolutions to this House because the Attorney General had advised them to this effect. Not once has the Government, the Governor-General or the Attorney General had the decency to come to this House and ask us to concur in any Resolution saying they were going to change the practice of this House. People cannot get outside of this House and dictate to this House what the practice of this House is going to be. It is a breach of the privileges of this House for anybody, be he Governor-General or anybody....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

May I draw to the attention of the hon. and learned member.....

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Hon. member, not 'learned'; they object to calling me 'learned'.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I do not see how the hon. member can object when he himself drew to my attention only this morning the practice as laid down by an authority which he cited.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

From the expressions of the House this morning, the House does not want that to continue. Be that as it may, what I am dealing with is that people cannot get outside of this Honourable House....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Standing Order No. 26(9) says "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."

I am not hearing the hon. member any further.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

On a point of privilege may I draw your attention to Standing Order No. 68(2) which says "If during the sitting of the House a matter suddenly arises which appears to involve the privileges of the House and which calls for the immediate intervention of the House, the proceedings may be interrupted, save during the progress of a division, by a motion based on such matter."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I have already said that I am not hearing the hon. member any more. I am au fait with Standing Order No. 68, but in view of Standing Order No. 26(9) and the hon. member is rising to speak on a point of privilege re a document from the Governor-General, I do not intend to entertain any discussion at all whether on a point of order, point of explanation or point of privilege. I think the correct course is to bring a substantive motion.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I have already ruled and I said I am not hearing anyone on this document.

Mr. HINDS:

What document have I mentioned? Do you mean that an hon. member is not entitled to indicate to the House....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

On what has the hon. member risen?

Mr. HINDS:

That is what Your Honour should have enquired first.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

there is nothing before the House.

Mr. HINDS:

There is always the privilege of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

You have to inform me on what point you have risen.

Mr. HINDS:

But before attempting to find out, you started censoring me to deny me....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I have never addressed the hon. junior member for St. Peter. I was addressing the hon. junior member for Bridgetown.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you say you did not address me, I have to accept your words because you are in the Chair - not otherwise.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am going to make the necessary motion that we put as the first Order of the day, or now if hon. members want it, that as a matter of privilege.... (Asides.)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Let me tell all hon. members on both sides of the House that it is for me to decide whether it is a point of privilege or not.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

I should just like to put this to. Your Honour. I say it in no boastful way, but I knew the procedure of Parliament before some of these hon. members were born, and the last thing I would want to do is to say something on which somebody could get up and contradict me and prove me wrong. The last thing I would like to have said is that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph misled me, because he said so-and-so and it is not true. I am too old, even physically, to reach that stage, and I say something that I never said in public before. There are two things in life that nobody can correct me on - one is parliamentary procedure and the other is the law of Libel and Slander. All my life I have soaked myself in these two things, and I say that without boasting. There is nobody in Parliament in this Island - may be the whole of the West Indies - who can say, if I say such-and-such..... I sit down at night and read my May's, just as when I was a practising barrister I used to sit down at night and read the laws of Libel and Slander. I say that again though it may sound like boasting. If an hon. member or any barrister in this Island can attack me and prove me wrong, let him do it. I say again with regard to this matter that it may be that the proper parliamentary procedure is to have a Resolution to deal with the Governor-General's Message, but it is impossible to say that a Message can come down with such strong statements and that we have no means of dealing with it. What is the House of Commons for? What is the House of Assembly for? I therefore make the motion that the first Order of the day today be consideration of the Message from the Governor-General which has just been read to us. If we cannot do that, we cannot do anything. It is nonsense. The House of Assembly can do anything. Something happens in Viet Nam and somebody gets up in the House of Commons and moves that they discuss it. Viet Nam has nothing to do with Great Britain; it is an American affair, but they deal with it. That is happening now. It is nonsense to say that -

and when I say that, it is no reflection on Youth Honour by any means, because I wish to Heaven Your Honour was always sitting in the Chair. There, again, I mean no reflection on His Honour the Speaker who has been appointed Speaker. We would all feel very comfortable with Your Honour in the Chair.

2.10 p.m.

I have made the motion that it be the next Order of the Day; we intend to discuss it. I have spent hours and hours - I got out of bed this morning after 2 o'clock and worked on this, and I am not at all satisfied with the Attorney General's opinion. All that the Attorney General's opinion amounts to is that the sun shines by day and that the ABC is the alphabet: that the House is the only authority for voting money; that is all. From the time the English settlers came out here, they did in Barbados what they used to do in England that is, to put to the Upper House these votes. But what they are attempting to do now is, without reference to us, to curtail our privilege, our right to send or not to send, to tell us whether or not we can send them. Can anything be more insulting than that? They did not appoint a Committee to discuss it; they merely asked the Attorney General for his opinion. Can anything be more precipitous? You are told that the House of Assembly cannot send up something that they have passed to the Upper House; can anything be more disgraceful? Have we not got any self-respect that we allow the Senate to tell us what we can send to them and what we cannot? Can you want a greater breach of privilege than that?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The hon. junior member for St. Thomas cannot now have risen on a point of order because there is no business before the House. The Hon/Leader of the Opposition addressed me on a point of privilege.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what I am saying is that in a matter of affecting the privilege of the House, the privilege being the rights to send Bills, Resolutions etc. to the Other Place, the Other Place is telling us that we no longer have the right of sending things to them; could there be a greater breach of privileges? The Other Place is telling us how to run our business, that that is a breach of privilege because we have the right to send these Money Resolutions up to them.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

If I may interrupt the hon. and learned junior member for St. Joseph, I have already ruled on that

point. I am now checking on whether this is a breach, and whether a substantive motion can be given priority over any other business.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

I am really drawing your attention to the manner in which the Senate wishes to conduct our business. In other words, they are saying that the practice referred to must be discontinued immediately. "You boys are accustomed sending up Bills to us; you have got to stop it."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Your point of privilege has been made.

Mr. CRAIG:

In seconding the hon. member's motion.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

This question raised by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is not as easy as it appears. Looking at the Standing Orders of this House, the point is not clear; looking at May's it would take some time and much research for me to make a decision as to whether this is a breach of privilege, and therefore a matter which a member, by way of a substantive motion may make, thereby over-riding all other business. Reading from the latest edition of May's, page 296 "A substantive motion is a self-contained proposal submitted for the approval of the House and drafted in such a way as to be capable of expressing a decision of the House." In my quick research, that is about the most I have found, but there is quite a lot dealing with this point. I would prefer not to err.

Mr. CRAIG rose.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member please sit? I am addressing the House.

Mr. CRAIG:

I am going to sit.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

If you do not sit immediately, I will suspend you for the remainder of today's sitting.

Mr. CRAIG:

I am going to sit, but you should be on your feet for me to sit.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

On page 378 of the 16th Edition - and I read "A matter which is postponed to suit the convenience of the House or to secure the attendance of a Member implicated, or to give the Speaker an opportunity to consider it fully does not forfeit priority when eventually raised; and in recent years it has become the regular practice for the Speaker to defer to the next sitting day a ruling on whether a *prima facie* case of breach of privilege has been made out". On the strength of this, I rule that at the next sitting of this Chamber I will give my Ruling as to whether this breach of privilege has been committed.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

On a point of privilege, Sir; this is an elementary point....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I am not hearing anyone on this point; I have already said it will take some time and some research for me to give a Ruling on whether or not it is a breach of privilege. 2.20 p.m.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to deal with the privilege of this House where people outside of this House are trying to tell this House how to conduct its business.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

That point has already been made by the same hon. member when he spoke on a point of privilege, and it was fully made, too.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

A glance at page 59 of May's and you will see.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I have already ruled.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

As far as my understanding goes.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I have already ruled, and I do not intend to hear any hon. member from either side.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of explanation. (ASIDES.)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I will not tolerate this sort of behaviour in this Honourable House.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of privilege. Am I to understand that you are hearing no one on any point on this Message, even if he is saying that the Governor-General has no authority to send down such a Message?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I have already given my Ruling on that point. The question posed was was this a breach of privilege? I have said that I have to do some research on it, and I will give my Ruling at the next sitting.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave that Item No. 2 be taken as the next Order of the Day, and that the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works be given leave to deal with it.

RESOLUTION re ACQUISITION OF LAND AT TWEEDSIDE ROAD, FOR ROAD IMPROVEMENT

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The next Order of the Day is Item No. 2 which stands in the name of the Hon. Prime Minister, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at the junction of Tweedside Road and Halls Road, St. Michael, for Highway Improvement.

The Hon. Leader of the House is asking for leave for the Hon. Minister of Works and Communications to deal with this Resolution in the absence of the Hon. and learned Prime Minister. If there are no objections leave will be granted. There being no objections, leave is granted.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I thank the House for that, but there is a mistake here. I am the person who gave notice of this Resolution and it should have been under my name. This is about the third time this has happened, but I am not accusing anybody for the mistake. (ASIDES.) Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am sorry if I am interrupting the gentlemen on the other side. (Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY That cannot be funny.) If it does not smell funny, it is all right. (Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY It cannot smell funny; it can smell stink.) Well, you will know who smells stink before now. Have you had your Christmas bath?....Mr. Clerk, do not tell me to go ahead. You do not do it to Grantley Adams; you do not do it to any of the learned gentlemen in here; so do not do it to me. I am a member of this House.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you cannot hear.....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

I am not speaking to you.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Is the Hon. Minister still addressing the Chair?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

No, of course not. I am addressing an idiot, and the Choir could never be an idiot. (Asides from Sir Grantley Adams.) You would always know about hogs, because your grand father specialised in keeping hogs.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what applies to one member-is it the same thing as regards another member? Cannot you hear over there?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Resolution reads as follows

"BE IT RESOLVED that the House of Assembly approve of the compulsory acquisition by the Crown of the parcel of land described in the Schedule hereto for the following purpose, namely:- For the purpose of Highway improvement, and that the Senate be invited to concur herein, and if concurred in,

RESOLVED that....."

"All that certain piece of parcel of land situate in the parish of Saint Michael containing by admeasurement 3, 100 square feet or thereabouts Abutting and Bounding on lands of one Simon Jordan, on a public road known as Halls Road and on a public road known as Tweedside Road or however else the same may abut and bound.".....

"In accordance with the provisions of Section 5 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1949, the approval of Parliament is sought for the compulsory acquisition of the parcel of land described above in the Schedule."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not objection to the Resolution, but I want to draw to the attention of the House that in the Schedule it is not stated whether the land is in this Island or in any other Island. My point need not be taken seriously, but if we were to pass this Resolution as it stands without complying with the requirements of Section 5 of the Land Acquisition Act which states that the land should be described with precision - if you have land and you do not state whether it is in St. Lucia, Dominica and so on, then it is not with precision.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member is really talking nonsense, because the Schedule says All that certain piece or parcel of land situate in the parish of Saint Michael containing by admeasurement 3, 100 square feet. Do you think Saint Michael is in the U. S. A, ? It goes on to say

"on the public road known as Halls Road and on a public road known as Tweedside Road or however else the same may abut and bound."

Do you know of one in St. Lucia? I do not. This is enough. As far as I am concerned, the Schedule has pointed out exactly where the land is. This is the Barbados House of Assembly, and not the House of Assembly of the World. We are not dealing with the United Nations. Do not let people come in here with a lot of spurious arguments and think they can get away with it.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY rose-Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The Minister has already replied.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

With all due respect to you, Sir. I got on my feet and nobody said anything. I will talk with the indulgence of the House.

2.30 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I will not out-rule myself. If the hon. junior member for Bridgetown wants to speak on this Resolution, he may do so now with leave of the House.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I want to know if the House will give me leave.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The hon. junior member for Bridgetown is seeking leave to speak on this Resolution, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted.

Hon. K.N.R. HUSBANDS:

I object. .

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I knew the hon. member would object. I am not the hon. senior member for St. Joseph who was allowed to speak today and they did not object.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

There were no objections, and I grant the hon. member leave to speak.

Hon. K.N.R. HUSBANDS:

On a point of order, Your Honour, I rose and intimated my objection to you.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I paused, looked left and right, and there were no objections.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not want to challenge your Ruling, but when you said "if there is no objection", the hon. senior member for St. Peter got up and objected. I am objecting also.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Let me make my stand in this Chair quite clear. When I rule, I rule. I am addressing the House. Will the hon. member please sit? Any hon. member who is dissatisfied with any Ruling of mine has his rights in the Standing Orders of this House. He may bring a substantive motion against me at anytime. I said I am hearing the hon. member for Bridgetown.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

May 1 appeal . . .

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

On what has the hon junior member for St. Joseph risen?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

On a point of order, may I appeal to the House? I have been in this House except for the time I was in the Federation of the West Indies, for about forty years. May I congratulate Your Honour on reaching the decision..... (ASIDES.)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I will not have these asides in such loud tones.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

I appeal to hon. members on this side of the House equally with the Government side. Your Honour could hardly deserve more respect. I have been in here, apart from the Federation, getting on to 40 years, and I have never seen anybody more impartial and straightforward in keeping to his point, and we should accept, whether it is against or not against us, everything Your Honour says. I am making that appeal to the House. Let us keep decorum and respect. I could not respect the Chair more than I respect the present occupant, and I cannot say that about everybody who sits in that Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Point of order made. I am willing to hear the hon. junior member for Bridgetown.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

There is nobody more disrespectful than the hon. member who has just sat down. I rise on a point of order. There is nobody in this Chamber who has been more disrespectful to the Chair whether it be you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Speaker or the Chairman of Committees; and there is nobody who has more censure motions against...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

That is no point of order.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

But it is a pertinent point.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

It is a point which can be made during a debate. I have already said that any member who is dissatisfied with any Ruling I make has his rights.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I must object to the manner in which the Schedule is set out, because I think it is only right, if we are being asked to approve the purchase of land, that we should see where the land is being bought. There is nothing in the Schedule other than saying that the land abuts on lands of one Simon Jordan on Halls Road etc. I would like the Minister to tell us the name of the person from whom the land is being bought.

Hon. N.W. BOXILL:

On a point of order, when I read the Schedule to this Resolution, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I said it was "All that certain piece and parcel of land situate in the parish of St. Michael containing by admeasurement" so much, "on lands of one Simon Jordan". (ASIDES.)

On a further point of explanation

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The hon. member is speaking on a point of elucidation.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

I cannot reply again unless the House grants leave.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I said before that I will not over-rule myself. This morning I gave the hon. member for St. Joseph an opportunity to speak with leave of the House; I also allowed the Minister to reply again, and this I will do this afternoon.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

As I was saying, we would like to know who is the owner of the land. The Schedule should have who is the owner of the land. We are tired of saying in this Assembly that we are not going to continue to accept this sort of treatment from Civil Servants running the Ministries up there. I would like to find out from the Minister if the reason why we are going to compulsory acquisition is because they could not agree on the amount of money, or it is merely to effect a good title for the Crown. In the event the price is agreed, I would like to know how much you are paying for the land. We have asked the Government over and over, when they are coming here for compulsory acquisition of land, to let us have some plans so that we can know what they are buying. If the Minister is so stupid and does not know any better.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Although the remarks of the hon. member are not unparliamentary, I would prefer that type of language not to be used this afternoon.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

If the Minister is not zealous enough, if he is not interested enough to find out whether there are plans for these things, I am quite certain that no Minister with any sort of intelligence would sit down in a Ministry and allow people to come, to him and say they want to buy this land without giving him a plan for the land. When a Minister goes to Cabinet and says he wants to buy a piece of land, he treats Cabinet with enough respect as to produce a plot for them to see exactly the parcel of land he is buying. There cannot be one set of treatment for his colleagues, and then he comes in here and tries to treat the Opposition with a lot of disrespect. We are objecting to it. If the Minister has the plan, I would like to

see it. The trouble with the Minister is that he has this thing about lawyers and he is trying to be his own lawyer. He has never heard that a man who has himself as a lawyer has a fool for a client. He would not understand that. I would like to see the plan before I sit because I cannot talk again.

This is no laughing matter; you came in here to spend the taxpayers' money and we will have to see how you are going to spend it.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

On a point of order, Sir. Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY rose.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Two hon. members are their feet. The hon. junior member for St. Thomas rose on a point of order.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

I have here the laws of Barbados 1949, Vol. VI Part V, (ASIDES.)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I will not have this cross-talk.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Clause 3 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1949-56 says "Whenever it appears to the Governor-in-Executive Committee", now the Cabinet "that any land is likely to be required for any purposes for which the Governor-in-Executive Committee is authorised by any Act to acquire land or for any purposes which, in the opinion of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, are public purposes, a notification to that effect shall be published in three successive issues of the Official Gazette and of a daily newspaper in this Island under the land of the Colonial Secretary" - now the Minister-"and thereupon it shall be lawful for the Colonial Engineer to do all or any of the following things, that is to say-

(a) to enter upon and survey and take levels of any land in any locality to which the public purposes relate;

(b) to dig or bore into the sub-soil of such land;

(c) to do all other acts necessary to ascertain whether the land is adapted to such purposes;

(d) to set out the boundaries of the land intended to be taken, and the intended line of the work, if any, proposed to be done thereon;

(e) to mark levels, boundaries, and lines by placing marks and cutting trenches;

(f) where otherwise the survey cannot be

completed, the levels taken or the boundaries or line of the work marked, to cut down and clear away any standing crop, fence, tree, or bush;

(g) to set up and maintain gauges in any stream or watercourse, and have access to the same from time to time for purposes of observation;

(h) to do all such other acts as may be incidental to or necessary for any of the purposes aforesaid:....."

Clause 5 of the same Act says: "Whenever the Governor-in-Executive Committee has decided, with the approval of both Houses of Legislature, to acquire any land it shall be lawful for the Governor, whether all or any of the powers conferred by section three of this Act have been exercised or not, by notification published in the Official Gazette and in a daily newspaper in this Island to declare the land to have been acquired for any of the purposes mentioned in section three of this Act.

(2) A notification published in the Official Gazette under the preceding sub-section shall describe the

land with precision, either in words or by reference to a map or plan which shall be kept at the office of the Colonial Engineer and shall be open to inspection by the public and shall be conclusive evidence that the land is required for the public purposes stated therein and upon the publication of the notice as aforesaid, the land shall vest absolutely in the Executive Committee free from all estates, liens and encumbrances, "; so when the hon. member says he is not sitting down till I show him a plan he will stand for the whole day.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Point of order made.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

What the junior member for the City said is correct. You are going to acquire land by compulsory acquisition; this is a House of Assembly; and if you are acquiring compulsorily and you do not tell us if negotiations have broken down and that is the reason for compulsorily acquiring this land; whether the owner is out of the Island or not -none of these things you have told us.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Point of order made.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

With great respect, the hon. member made a point. Do not come in here wasting time if you can settle a point amicably; just do not compulsorily acquire because the Act is there. If somebody in America is not sure whom the land belongs to and he has to....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

May I draw to the attention of the hon. and learned junior member for St. Joseph that he is not now entitled to make a speech? The hon. and learned junior member for the City has had leave of the House to speak, and after the Minister had replied, any person rising now must rise on a point of order - not to make a speech.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

I am asking leave of the House to speak; there is no rule which says you cannot speak after a Minister has replied.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

You can, if you ask for leave; but there is no ad infinitum.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

But I am appealing to the Chair because if the Leader has replied -the Leader has the right to speak first.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

That is the point I am making.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

I did not know that the Leader of the House had replied; so I am asking Your

Honour to permit me to speak.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

It is a matter for the House to decide whether leave will be granted for any member to speak.

SIR GRANTLEY ADAMS:

All I am suggesting, Sir, is that the Leader of the House ask the House permission to speak again....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, the Resolution has been introduced by my colleague, the Minister of Communications and Works; I am not in charge of it. The hon. member probably has not grasped what is going on.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to find out from the Minister...

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I apologise for my interruption just now.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to find out from the Minister whether he has a plan relating to this. I cannot sit here and be asked to vote for the approval of the purchase of this land when I do not know the land. Let us suppose for a moment - I am not saying that the Minister is dishonest - but let us suppose the Minister was dishonest or let us suppose the Government was dishonest; let us suppose the land does not even exist; do you mean that we must sit here and vote money to buy land that does not exist? 2.50 p.m.

The mere statement by the Minister, or in the Addendum, that the land is situated at Halls Road does not make it so. I do not know Simon Jordan; I know Tweedside Road, but I do not know Halls Road. The mere statement by the Minister repeating what is set out in the Addendum cannot satisfy me that the Government is purchasing any land at all. I would like to be satisfied in my mind, before I vote for this Resolution, what land the Government is purchasing, I would like to see a plan, and I would like to know exactly what parcel of land the Government is purchasing. This is no secret. The Government seems to believe that it must govern by secrecy. If a plan is in existence it is not a confidential plan; it is not the Ministers personal plan; it is not the Permanent Secretary's plan.

Sir, when the Leader of the House wanted to buy land at Lammings, he had the decency to bring the plan. Must the Minister of Communications and Works depart from this procedure? If the Minister wants to be stubborn and he does not want to produce the plan, then we will have some trouble. I had no intention of making a speech on this Resolution, but I will now make a speech. The motion before the House is:

"RESOLVED that the House of Assembly approve of the compulsory acquisition by the Crown of the parcel of land described in the Schedule hereto for the following purpose, namely:- For the purpose of Highway Improvement, and that the Senate be invited to concur herein, and if concurred in,

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

Sir, the Schedule to the Resolution states:

"All that certain piece or parcel of land situate in the parish of Saint Michael containing by admeasurement 3, 100 square feet or thereabouts Abutting and Bounding on lands of one Simon Jordan, on a public road known as Halls Road and on a public road known as Tweedside Road or however else the same may abut and bound."

The Addendum to this Resolution states:

"In accordance with the provisions of Section 5 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1949...."

I do not know who drafted this Addendum. I would hate to think that we are paying a Civil Servant to draft this Addendum. He has drafted it in such a manner that he misleads his own Minister. The Minister got up here and spoke of the 1949 Act. The 1949 Act had been substantially amended. The person who drafted this Addendum obviously has misled the Minister. I do not mean 'consequential', but 'substantial' amendments, Sir. The person who drafted this Resolution sees fit to talk about Section 5 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1949, when he should have been talking of Section 5 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1949, as amended. Any person who looks at this Resolution would believe that the Land Acquisition Act is still in force as originally drafted. This shows that the Minister can be treated by the Permanent Secretary 'as he likes. Even if the Permanent Secretary does not have as much sense as the Minister, he can still treat him as he likes.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

On a point of order. The hon. member talks about a Permanent Secretary treating a Minister as he likes. That might be true, but...

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I object to that. That is not a point of order, Sir. I want you to rule. The way he prefaced his sentence - it could never be a point of order, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY .SPEAKER:

That is not a point of order; that is a point of elucidation.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

On a point of elucidation.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I am not giving way on a point of elucidation.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

You are not supposed to give way.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Then you must take your seat. You cannot speak unless the hon. and learned member for the City gives way.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

He cannot get up and give an answer, but he gets up to curse somebody. That shows the mentality of the Minister.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I will not have such remarks.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I take offence to the statement that I got up to curse somebody. I did not get up to curse anybody.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I withdraw the words, Sir. He does not have enough intelligence to curse anybody; so I was wrong. As I was saying, when you read this Addendum together with the Schedule it shows the sort of respect

that the Civil Servants have for the Minister. Nobody could put a Resolution drafted like this containing absolutely no relevant information in the hands of a Minister and tell him to come to Parliament with that sort of thing. You could only do that to a person you have no respect for, and you wanted to see him attacked in the House of Assembly. I am surprised to find that they have no respect for Mm. (ASIDES.) Will you call on the junior member for St. Thomas to stop interrupting me, Sir?

Now, the Addendum states:

"In accordance with the provisions of Section 5 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1949, the approval of Parliament is sought for the compulsory acquisition of the parcel of land described above in the Schedule....

How is it described in the Schedule? It says:

"All that certain piece or parcel of land situate in the parish of Saint Michael..."

As the junior member for St. Peter has said, technically it is wrong, because it does not state that the land to be bought is in the Island of Barbados. The Schedule goes on to say:

"containing by admeasurements 3, 100 square feet or thereabouts Abutting and Bounding on lands of one Simon Jordan, on a public road known as Halls Road and on a public road known as Tweedside Road or however else the same may abut and bound/"

That is the way the land is described in the Schedule, but that description is in itself a defective description, because it does not give sufficient information to this House for us to say that we can sufficiently identify the land in question. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have no doubt that you can envisage, even with the description in the Schedule - land abutting Simon Jordan; land abutting Tweedside Road; land abutting Halls Road, and it could not be the portion of land described in this Schedule. 3.00 p.m.

What happens if there is land on both sides of Simon Jordan's land? How are we to know which

portion of land we are buying? Let us assume for a moment that there is land to the left and right of Simon Jordan's land. How do we know which portion the Minister is asking this House to approve? The only way we can honestly know is if the Minister would produce the plan, but that would be giving too much information to the Opposition, and as far as the Minister is concerned we are not entitled to that information - only the Cabinet,

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have never heard anything more strange from the truth.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I am objecting to those words. The Minister said he has never heard anything more strange from the truth. In other words he is calling me a liar in an indirect way.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

I was making my point of order . . .

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Just now I said of the Minister that he was stupid and you called on me to withdraw the remarks.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

That is the type of situation I was trying to avoid when I said to the hon. junior member for Bridgetown some minutes ago that although his language was not unparliamentary, it was inviting similar language. The words complained of by you do not deliberately refer to you as a liar, and therefore I do not regard them as unparliamentary.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I bow to your Ruling. You can appeal to me for reason and I would accept your Ruling; but you cannot appeal to the Hon. Minister to withdraw the words because he cannot reason with you. I accept that.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

The point of order I got up to more is that the hon. member is really fulminating and is contributing

nothing to the debate.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Sir, that is not a point of order. Whether or not I am contributing to the debate is a question of opinion. I want Your Honour to rule.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The hon. junior member for St. Thomas has risen on a point of order.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

To say I am contributing nothing to the debate is a question of opinion.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

I am saying that in my opinion the hon. member is contributing nothing more to the debate, and I ask that the question be put.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Sir....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

On a point of order....

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I would like to know what is the point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Two hon. members are on their feet.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the question be now put since the hon. member is contributing nothing to the debate.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I would like to see if anyone of the Government Ministers has the courage to second that. I would like to see whether they are prepared to come into this House of assembly and stifle debate when the Government refused to give the Opposition proper information. Let me see if anyone of them has the courage to do it.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to second the motion.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I am not surprised that the hon. member seconded it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The contribution by the hon. and learned member over the last ten minutes has been nothing but a repetition of what he said before. A motion has been made and therefore I will put the question.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 9 be the next Order of the Day.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT NEW CASTLE, ST. JOHN

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Order No. 9 is the instant Order of the Day, and it stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House, to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of parcels of land at Newcastle, St. John for the extension of St. Margaret's Mixed School.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is an acquisition of two parcels of land, a small piece and a large one; one 4, 380 square feet and the other 49, 195 square feet for the purpose of extensions to St. Margaret's School. I do not know if there are any questions hon. members would like to ask. I have passed the plan around. I cannot anticipate their questions; so hon. members will have to ask the questions for me to answer them.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass. Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the mere fact that a plan has been produced here shows one single thing, and it is that the Civil Servants have more respect for the Leader of the House than they do for the Minister of Communications and Works. I believe the reason he did not produce the plan is because he never had it.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

On a point of order, what is before the House?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

A Resolution.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Is it a Resolution dealing with the Minister of Communications and Works?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

There is a Resolution on which the hon. junior member for Bridgetown is speaking.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

As I said, the hon. member gets peeved because nobody calls him learned, but we are prepared to pass a Resolution calling him "learned", and if that will make him learned, we will call him "learned". (Asides) Going to study law is one thing; but getting through the examination is a different matter.

As I was saying, Sir, the fact that a plan has been produced here shows a difference in respect that the Civil Servants have for the Leader of the House as compared with the Hon. Minister of Communications. 3.10 p.m.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. My point of order is to bring the law of Barbados to the attention of the House.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, will you rule if that is a point of order?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Yes, it is the law. There is nowhere in the law where it is said that the Minister has to or shall show it.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Is there anything in the law that says you should bathe or have common sense?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

I read part of the Land Acquisition Act already for your benefit, but I will read it again. "A notification published in the Official Gazette. under the preceding sub-section shall describe....."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

That is a point of explanation, not a point of order.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

He does not understand the difference, Sir.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Perhaps I am like the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Is he the only person you can try to curse?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I have already told the junior member for St. Thomas that that is a point of explanation and can only be made if the hon. junior member for the City gives way.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Yes, I made the idiot get up.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

The only member who was on his feet at the time was myself Sir, and I object to those words.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

That reference to "idiot get up" was clearly directed to the hon. junior member for the City and I would respectfully ask the Hon. Minister to withdraw the remark.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Well, I beg to withdraw it; he is not an idiot then.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I am objecting to the remark.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER Would the Minister please withdraw the remark?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

I said he is not an idiot any more.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

He must withdraw the remarks; I am no idiot. When you called upon me to withdraw my remarks I withdrew; so he must withdraw that properly.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

He said he had withdrawn....

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

He must withdraw his remarks properly.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The words I heard used by the Hon. Minister were; "I withdraw; he is not an idiot". Those were the words I heard used.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

All right, Sir, he withdrew them.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL rose.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I am on my feet.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Would both hon. members please sit? This thing has been going too far. The latest edition of May's page 467, dealing with points of order "When a Member speaks to order he must simply direct attention to the point complained of and submit it to the decision of the Speaker." I am not hearing anymore speeches whether they are real, legitimate or fraudulent speeches this afternoon on points of order.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was saying when I was so rudely interrupted - and the point I was trying to make was that when the Government is coming here to buy land, we have been called upon to agree to this, and we can only do so if we know exactly what the land involved is. The production of this plan shows that the Permanent Secretary has more respect for the Leader of the House than he has for the Minister of Communications and Works. It is no wonder that the Civil Servants signed a petition and asked the Prime Minister to move the Minister from that Ministry. What I would like to find out from the Leader of the House is whether the reason for the compulsory acquisition was that a price has not been agreed to by the owners of this land, or, if a price has been agreed to, what price the Government is paying for these two portions of land.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, anyone looking at these two Schedules must have a guilty conscience when it must be seen that the persons who drew these Schedules attempted in every respect to comply with the law. You will see that these two Schedules give what one must call a measure of precision in their description; but we find the Government resorting to buying or to using the Land Acquisition Act for the purchasing of these plots of land. We have here a plan showing the area of land which Government intends to buy from Cecil Mayers in one respect, and from Colin and Trevor Mayers in the other. I want to ask this; how does Government know that this land in the First Schedule really and truly belongs to Colin Mayers? I want the Leader of the House to pay attention to what I am saying; how does Government know, apart from having the land, that this land belongs to Colin Mayers? As we understand it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is a case where the people who claim ownership are not in a position to give a marketable title; but you will find that if these Schedules, or if Government's intention to purchase these plots is advertised where people can see, people who have an interest in these plots

would have an opportunity to state their claims.

3.20 p.m.

It is advertised, but where? His Minister says that it is advertised in the Press and in the Official Gazette. What I have been trying to find out time and time again is the circulation of the Official Gazette. How many people read the Official Gazette?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am grateful to the hon. member for giving way. I should like to let him know that the advertisements came out in the Advocate-News on Thursday 27, Friday 28 and Saturday 29, November, 1960, and in the Official Gazette on Thursday 27, November, Monday 1, and Thursday, 4 December, 1969. It was advertised both in the Advocate-News and in the Official Gazette.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, happily for me I am in the newspaper business myself. I am very serious on this. Can the Leader of the House tell me what is the circulation of the Advocate newspaper on Thursday, Friday and Saturday? Now, we are advertising land where one man pays "This is mine." In this case one man is saying this portion is his, and two others, apparently brothers, are claiming the other portion. If the Minister had told me that it had been advertised in the Sunday Advocate -the Sunday Advocate is a newspaper that everybody who can afford it, will try to get a copy. They have been clever enough to advertise it on Thursday, Friday and Saturday, when the very people interested in these plots would not have seen a newspaper.

Sir, he goes on to tell us of the Official Gazette. The Official Gazette has little or no circulation. These lands are in St. John, and I doubt whether 200 copies of the Official Gazette are circulated in the parish of St. John where these lands are. I should like the Minister to tell me whether as much as 200 copies of the Official Gazette are circulated in St. John. You will understand that there are people in the U.S.A. - and this might be a case where one brother is here occupying land that can very well belong to two or three sisters who are abroad, or in some other part of the Island. He agrees to sell the land to the Government. They put it in the Advocate on Thursday, Friday and Saturday, and in the Official Gazette, but the people who are entitled to a part of the land can do nothing about the matter when it is too late.

Sir, we are asking the Government, in view of what we know is happening in this Island by people passing land through the Court in order to get a title, to see to it that these plots are advertised not only in a daily newspaper, but in a newspaper which the people read. I am not laying claim for the newspaper

in which I might have an interest, although the paper in which I have an interest is the one the people read. That would not be fair. You need not put it in a newspaper in which I have an interest. You can put it in the form of a hand bill, and stock it up in shop doors shop windows and so on in the district where the land is. You can stick it up in St. John on school buildings and so on, so that everybody in the parish will know what is going on concerning the land.

Sir, it is not safe for Government to continue buying these plots in this manner without giving sufficient publicity of the intended purchase by Government. I would not like to know that I am a party, as a member of this House, to passing any Resolution to compulsory acquire any person's land, and weeks after I might then learn that brothers, sisters or cousins, who axe entitled to a portion of the money, were denied their portion, mainly because sufficient publicity was not given of Government's intention to purchase the land. I am asking the Minister to consider these things. These things axe worth being considered for the safety of the people and the safety of the Government. I feel that no hon. member would like to know that he is a party to acquire land compulsorily which does not belong outright to the person with whom the Government negotiated.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should just like to make a few comments. First of all, in answer to the question raised by the hon. junior member for the City, which also arose out of remarks made by the hon. member who has just sat down, the Land Acquisition Act is being invoked here so that the Government may have a good indefeasible title. Secondly, while I appreciate the remarks and the points made by the hon. junior member for St. Peter, I have to insist that we are not breaking the law here. The law says that you advertise in a daily newspaper and in the Official Gazette. I do not think myself that the people responsible for this deliberately choose any three days as distinct from any other three or four. It may be in this case that there was no particular reason why the days Thursday, Friday and Saturday were used. I have seen Land Acquisition Notices appearing on Sunday. I am certain that hon. members around this Table has seen that, too; therefore, I do not think that there is any discrimination in this particular aspect.

It is a good point, I think, that certainly in obscure pieces of land acquisition, the hand-bill method or a wider distribution of notices may be used, because there is the odd case, perhaps occurring a bit more frequently, of landowners out of the Island or in the Island and not knowing when transactions are being undertaken. Only with the proviso that the hon. member must understand that we are not doing anything illegal here and the law has been complied with, as he himself has admitted, in the particular form of this notice, I can take the point that we ought to investigate and set on foot a wider distribution of notice to cover precisely those cases where there may be doubt as to what someone is doing, whether acting on behalf of, or acting without the knowledge of, other owners or co-owners of the land. 3.30 p.m.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

The hon. member did not state the price.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

The price is in the Addendum.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 5 be the next Order of the Day.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

I beg to second that.

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

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT LAMMINGS, ST. JOSEPH

Mr. SPEAKER:

Order No. 5 stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Lammings, St. Joseph, for the construction of a school.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, this acquisition is one - and hon. members will see the plan that has been passed around

- of an extra two acres or thereabouts on the Lammings Plantation for the purpose of erecting a school. There is a little history to this, and I am, sorry the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is not in his place, because I think he and other members would be interested. We have to go back a bit. The original plan for the purchase of land at Lammings was for the purpose of resiting the St. Bernards School and certain other houses in the parish of St. Joseph threatened by soil erosion. This original purchase involved an area of 10 acres, 3 roods, 10 perches of which 2 1/2 acres were purchased for \$5,400 with funds allocated to the Ministry of Education for the purpose of land acquisition. In the second land acquisition Resolution, we purchased the remainder of the land and completed that transaction.

In the meantime, the Ministry of Health was interested in an area for the playing field in the same district, and during discussions between the Ministries we acquired another plot of approximately 6 1/2 acres which was then considered more suitable for housing and a playing field, and of course much more suitable as a school site. The Ministry of Communications and Works, as well as the persons in the Ministry of Education involved in the consideration of a school site have now decided that the plot now marked in pink on the plan is the best possible site for the school because of its flatness and because of course they will have less trouble in foundation excavation than they would on the spot already bought, and they have decided to recommend the purchasing of this extra bit. I do not know if there is anything else hon. members would wish to know. Anyhow, I will answer whatever questions they ask. This of course has been advertised in the Official Gazette of various dates: 11th December, 1969 and two successive days both in the Gazette and in the daily newspaper.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass. Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the Hon. Leader of the House to the Schedule describing this plot of land and ask him to compare it with the description given in the Resolution just passed by the House.

Now, Sir, the solicitor for Cecil Mayers, Trevor Mayers and Colin Mayers evidently knew how necessary it was to describe where this land is, and you will find that you can look at each of these Resolutions that come before us to see whether the Civil Servants have copied them from qualified solicitors or otherwise. You will see in the resolution before us now that it says: "All that certain piece or parcel of land situate at Lammings in the parish of Saint Joseph containing by estimation 2 Acres or thereabouts." It does not state that either Lammings or the land we are talking about is in this Island. In other words, if the one we have just passed is right, we have got to accept that the drafting of this one is wrong.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

If the hon. member would give way, I would be quite willing to insert those words for greater clarity and precision.

Mr. SPEAKER:

It may be thought that the situation of Lammings is fairly well known to this House.

Mr. HINDS:

But it goes much further than in side this House'. It is the taxpayers' money. Now, the Minister tried to unravel for us some of the problems with which the Ministry of Health at one time and the Ministry of Education on several other occasions happen to be confronted with this siting of the school at Lammings. The Ministry of Housing also became involved at one point.

I would like the Minister to tell us exactly how many acres Government is purchasing at Lammings; how many for the Ministry of Health's purposes, how many for the Ministry of Education's purposes, and how many acres for the purposes of the Housing Authority. Tell us at the same time how much money is involved.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

The total acreage would be 10 plus 6 1/2 plus 2 or 2 1/2 or whatever this is, or thereabouts.

Mr. HINDS:

Just one point. When you were introducing the Resolution, you made mention of 8 acres; where does that come in?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

No, it was 10 acres 3 roods 10 perches. I am sorry; hon. members will remember when I introduced it I said the original plan of the purchase involved an area of 10 acres 3 roods 10 perches and that of this lot 2 1/2 acres were purchased early and were paid for first.

Mr. HINDS:

What is your point about foundation excavation?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I think the hon. member would recall that some months ago we acquainted Parliament with the fact that of the three Maple Leaf pre-fabricated schools which the Canadian Government gave to the people of Barbados it was decided to place one in this area as a replacement for the St. Bernard's School, and I think some hon. members also visited the proposed sites. It has now been discovered in connection with the original plan that foundation problems have arisen, that the foundation is not the best kind for the school to be built where the site was originally designed; so the proposal now is to abandon that and site the school where we are now acquiring this extra bit of land.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item 13 be the next Order.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No. 13 is the next Order of the Day and it stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade and Tourism to move the second reading of a Bill to repeal the Exports and Imports (Restriction) Act, 1939, and the Miscellaneous Controls Act, 1958, ' and to make new provision for the prohibition or restriction of the exportation and importation of goods, and for the control and regulation of the production of vegetables and the keeping of livestock, and of the prices of goods generally.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

Mr. Speaker, for some time this Government has been very concerned about the steady rise in the prices of goods and, in particular, the increased cost of several items of foodstuffs.

Although the cost of several of these items has been due to the source of supply, it is apparent that in many cases the burden of the high costs has been passed on to the consumer in the fixing of retail prices. In order that the Government should have greater control in looking after the prices and keeping a fair margin of the percentage and otherwise all profits made by importers, it is decided to introduce this Bill. In this Bill the Government feels that in order that a good cross-section of the community should be represented, we feel that representation should be made by organisations like the Chamber of

Commerce, the Manufacturers' Association, the Consumers Association and the Trade Union, so that we could have a good cross-section of every segment of the community as well as the people involved in this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the Bill is clearly set out in the Objects and Reasons of this Bill, and I now beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a Bill of this nature is always welcome because the object of this Bill is designed to protect the consumer; any legislation that is brought before this House should not only be with the intention of protecting the consumer, but must in fact protect the consumer. 3.50 p.m.

Sir, I do not want to repeat much of what I have said recently, but I think that the increase in the soft drink industry shows the necessity for having a Price Commission. You had an example of three of the Island's leading soft drink manufacturers coming together and deciding they were going to raise the price of their soft drinks, and then telling the retailer the price at which the soft drinks should be sold. This as I believe the senior member for Christ Church said, was a conspiracy on the part of the manufacturers of soft drinks in this country; it was a conspiracy which the Government did not object to and so far has done nothing about it. I hope that during the course of this debate the Minister of Trade would be good enough to tell the House what was the outcome of his meeting with the soft drink manufacturers on Tuesday morning.

You will remember, Sir, that, on Tuesday afternoon when we were discussing the Resolution during Private Members' Time, the Minister of Trade was not present. We on this side of the House would certainly like to know, seeing that no public statement has been issued by the Ministry, what the Minister has to say with regard to the outcome of those talks, and what the Government intends to do about the matter.

I do not believe that the Government has given the question of prices in this country much serious attention, because the whole system that is operating in this country needs changing. The system that is operating at the moment is that the agents, Mussons & DaCosta, or any other agent would import-I am

dealing now entirely with foodstuffs - from overseas whatever item it is. They in turn would sell it, having placed upon it their mark-up, to the Roebuck Street merchant; he in turn, when he places his mark-up upon it, would then sell it to the retail shopkeeper, and then the retail shopkeeper, when he places his mark-up on it, would then sell it to the consumer. That 3-tier system of mark-up which is prevalent in this country has to be wiped out once and for all. That system whereby the consumer must pay markups to three sets of merchants must be wiped out. Unless that is done, then Government cannot hope to control the cost of living in this country.

Sir, this Bill does not attempt to remedy that situation. In fact, I do not believe the Government has a policy by which it hopes to remove this present inequitable and unjust 3-tier system of mark-ups; so it places a tremendous load not on the manufacturers' representatives, not on the wholesale merchants in Roebuck Street, but the squeeze is felt first of all by the retail shopkeeper, and then the entire burden or the entire system of the mark-up is placed upon the shoulders of the consumer. It is off the shoulders of the consumer that I believe the Government should remove this system, because it is the consumer in this country who can ill afford to pay the prices he is called upon to pay.

Sir, let us assume that an article cost \$1.00. If the merchant is the General Agent for the Overseas Company, and an article comes to him costing \$1.00, invariably because he is the General Agent, he will probably get a discount on that \$1.00. The Minister may not know this, but I know it is a fact, Sir. A merchant, who is a General Agent particularly in the West Indies, will get a discount on that \$1.00. It may be that the merchant will only pay 95¢ for the article, but that discount as a rule, does not come into Barbados, because if it came here the merchant would have to pay income tax on it. I know for a fact that what the merchants would do in these circumstances is to keep an account overseas, and that discount is credited to their bank account overseas and they do not have to pay any income tax on it.

Now, Sir, you have an article costing \$1.00, but in actual fact it will only cost the merchant 95¢. Let us assume that the merchant puts on 5% or 10% before he sells the article. He puts on his 10% and sells the article to the Roebuck Street merchant at \$1.10; the Roebuck Street merchant puts on his 10% and sells it to the shopkeeper for \$1.21; the shopkeeper then puts on his 5% and sells the article at \$1.28. 4.00 p.m.

Now, Sir, here is an article which comes into the country, on the face of it, costing \$1.00 and by the time it reaches the consumer it costs \$1.27. In actual fact, it cost the merchant only 95¢. It is this unjust and inequitable system that the Government must tackle, and purely to have price controls cannot tackle the system. It is a decision of fundamental importance to the development of this country. If it is to continue this way, there is absolutely no hope for the consumer when he buys.

Now, Sir, I am not putting forward a Party statement or policy as such. I am not the Shadow Minister for Trade; but the sort of thing I would like to see is the establishment of a Government agency which would become the sole importer of foodstuff in this country. Mr. Speaker, I see you turn your head quickly. I think that if you had a statutory agency of Government being the sole importer of foodstuff in this country, immediately you would be cutting out two tiers of mark-ups, and it would mean that from this Government agency you could sell directly to your retail shops and the retail shops could sell to the consumer, and you could then effectively control what mark-up is being placed on the goods. In the same example I gave just now, if you have a Government agency importing this article for \$1.00, then the Government would put on the mark-up of 10 percent and then it is passed on to the consumer, and there and then the Government agency through legislation such as this can control the price at which these goods must be retailed. This may sound a bit radical, but I think it is only the method by which the Government can really tackle this question of the cost of living in Barbados. I would not advocate this on behalf of my Party; it is a method that I personally would advocate and I would like the Government to study this method, because I think in the long run it would benefit the country as a whole. I advocate this method only as regards foodstuffs. I do not advocate an agency for cloth or any luxury items.

Now, Sir, you may be wondering how an agency such as this would work, and I know there are a number of people who have their qualms about Government agencies and statutory corporations; but I think the time is coming in Barbados when the Government, whether it is the present Government or the Barbados Labour Party Government when it comes to power in 1971, has got to decide to make the offence of stealing any property or money belonging to the State more punishable and with a more severe sentence than that punishable for any ordinary individual. You can only stop people from stealing money at the Marketing Corporation if they are going to be prosecuted and not allowed to pay back the money. You can only get people to stop stealing from the statutory bodies in this country if they are going to be prosecuted when they steal money and have a sentence as a deterrent. There is no use pussy-footing or beating about the bush with this, because people in this country have the idea that once something is nationalised it belongs to them and they can do as they like. This comes about from a lack of political education in this country, and we must make people realise that if they are going to steal from the State, they run the risk of a very severe punishment.

In advocating an agency such as this, I am not advocating an agency to be the arm of any political Party. It is an agency that I would like to see working in the interest of the people, and the people who are appointed to it should be appointed on the basis of their ability to serve and their knowledge of economics, finance, banking or law. It should be an agency where people with sufficient technical skill and know-how should be appointed. I do not believe any Government should adopt the idea of saying that because a man belongs to Muss on and DaCosta or because he is white he should not be appointed. Let us realise there is a problem before us. Let us use people who have the ability and technical know-how to run an agency such as this, people who for years have been importing foodstuff into this country. Let us use their ability and give them the first opportunity to serve their country, and if the commercial or mercantile interests of this country decide they do not want to serve on it, that is entirely a different matter; but I have no doubt that the commercial sector of this country, if they are offered, would take an

active part in an agency such as this. They may not at first like the idea of the Government taking away a lucrative business from them, but it is in the interest of the country as a whole that I would advocate such a scheme.

I believe, Sir, that the purpose of the Marketing Corporation when it was instituted was to ensure that the cost of living did not rise too quickly; but if it is one Government agency presently constituted that is failing in its duty, it is the Marketing Corporation, because it has failed to keep down the prices of food-stuff in this country, and it has a very bad reputation in this country. I am not dealing with the actual stealing of money. I have heard it asked on many occasions by people who grow vegetables why they should take them to the Marketing Corporation, because if the article is going to be sold for 400 at a supermarket, the Marketing Corporation perhaps is going to sell it for 38 cents, but the difference is that the Marketing Corporation is going to give the producer of that article less for it and is going to put a bigger mark-up on it. In actual fact, the Marketing Corporation may offer the man 20 cents for it and sell it for 38 cents. Producers are not prepared to deal with the Marketing Corporation in these circumstances. They will tell you it is far better for them to go to a supermarket where it will sell perhaps for a penny or so more than the Marketing Corporation, but the supermarket is going to give the producer a much better price than the Marketing Corporation is giving them. 4.10 p.m.

I think the Marketing Corporation should change its policy towards the producer. It is not the function of the Marketing Corporation to have any big mark-up on any article; we can only encourage people to diversify the economy if we are going to give them a proper price for their produce, and therefore the Marketing Corporation should cease the practice of cutting down the prices to pay the producers and put on a big mark-up. This way your Marketing Corporation can never function properly because you will always have a shortage, and the shortage is going to come about because the producer is going to prefer to go to the supermarket with their produce. One of the sectors in which the Government spends a lot of money is the importation of foodstuffs into the country; I believe at one stage that almost a third of the revenue of this country was being spent on food stuffs, and I think that the Government has got to encourage people, first of all, to produce more and to guarantee proper prices for local produce. You have got to guarantee proper prices even if it means that the Marketing Corporation has to subsidise in one way or another the produce of the country, and to ensure, if you want to diversify the economy, that the people who produce vegetables are getting a fair price.

Another function is this. I grant that at the moment you cannot supply your entire domestic demand, and therefore there is need to go overseas; but it has always been a problem to me why it is that the Government allows the Marketing Corporation and the big importers of foodstuffs in this country to import vegetables from the United States of America, a hard currency area where the balance of payments is being affected, rather than to encourage trade with the Windward and Leeward Islands. I am talking about things like cabbages, carrots, lettuce and tomatoes; even oranges and limes. I would like to ask the Minister one direct question; I notice that limes are being sold between 8 cents and 10 cents, and I would like the Minister to tell this House if the Marketing Corporation has any sort of agreement with

the Marketing Corporation of Dominica to supply limes to this country especially at this time of year. I will give way to the Minister.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to give the hon. member answers to anything he asks me, but later, Sir.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I would like to know how much money the Government intends to continue to spend on the importation of foodstuffs; I think they are taking this a bit too lightly. I stopped yesterday to buy some limes and the lady said that, as it was I she would sell me for 8 cents but the usual price is 10 cents. I know that up to about a year ago the Government had no sort of agreement with the Marketing Corporation of Dominica for the supply of limes because at that time a client of mine was trying to negotiate the idea of bringing fruit into this country from the Islands and I had discussions with the Chairman of the Marketing Corporation in Dominica and there was no such agreement at the time. Anybody who visited Dominica would know that Dominica has a wonderful supply of limes, oranges and grapefruit among other things, but I was told by the same gentleman from Dominica that Dominica exports more limes to the two French Islands, Martinique and Guadeloupe, than they do to Barbados, and yet limes can be sold in Barbados at 10 cents.

I do not understand the economics of the Government because if you go into Carifta - and the Minister of Trade will probably know this - people like DaCosta and Mussons who are bringing oranges to this country and to the Marketing Corporation, where are these oranges coming from? How on earth can the Government justify bringing oranges from Florida? If the Marketing Corporation is bringing in oranges from Florida to supply the Mental Hospital or to supply any of the Government institutions, how can you justify this at a time when you can get oranges from Dominica and from Trinidad at a much cheaper price? Will you allow people in this country to import vegetable from hard currency areas and never to look to your own West Indian Islands to develop their trade? It is simply if you are developing light industries in Barbados to satisfy the domestic market - I am not dealing with industries which come under the Industrial Incentives Act where the industries are here making things to be exported; I am dealing with your local industries, your clothing industry, your aluminum industry etc. If you want to increase, if in addition to your domestic market you want to export this stuff, the answer is going to be to export under Carifta to the Islands. How can you expect to have any sort of trade with the Windward and Leeward Islands when you refuse to buy their prime products? It is an unfair situation. 4.20 p.m.

In addition, how can you expect to do a proper trade with the Windward and Leeward Islands if you do not trade with them in an effort to increase the purchasing power of the Islands? You can only trade adequately with the Islands if you increase their purchasing power. Let us, therefore, stop looking at Florida and the U.S.A. as the first market for our foodstuffs. Stop this stupid idea of believing that things

coming from Florida are better than things coming from the West Indies. Let us help to develop the agricultural Industries in the Islands; let us develop our trade with these people, because it has two effects. One is because of the rate exchange, the balance of payments, etc. If you trade with the Islands, anybody can see that it is going to be cheaper - the freight, the cost of the article and everything will be cheaper. Secondly, if you want people to trade with you and buy the things you are making, then you have to develop their purchasing power by trading with them.

As an example of what I mean, Sir, I remember in 1968 at a time when tomatoes were selling in this country at between \$1.80 and \$2.20 a pound, I was in St. Vincent and tomatoes were selling at 20 a pound there. What attempt has been made by the Government to handle these problems? The Price Control Commission is only to control the price that you have at the moment, but it is not the answer to the unjust economic system that we have in this country. There is need for a radical re-thinking on your approach to these methods; there is need for radical re-thinking of your approach to the 3-tier system of mark-ups that you have in this country. For far too long political Parties have been getting on the platform licking at the Big Six; it is a political gimmick; but, after almost 10 years in power, what has the Democratic Labour Party done to break the stronghold of the economy of the Big Six in this country? Absolutely nothing. Ask the man in the street what he thinks of the Big Six in this country, and he will tell you that they are doing better under the Democratic Labour Party than they ever did under the Barbados Labour Party. (ASIDES.) I admit for a fact that when this Government was in power in the 1950s, it did not deal effectively with them.

Sir, as you will appreciate, other than for two members now in this House of Assembly, that this Party is differently constituted. Your Party, Sir, as presently constituted, has been in power for virtually 10 years, and you have done absolutely nothing to break the stranglehold of the Big Six on the economy of this country. What is more, Sir, a survey or a look at the operations of the Big Six under the government of the Democratic Labour Party will show that the Big Six have done everything in this country to consolidate their position under the Democratic Labour Party.

Now, Sir, you started first with Wilkinson & Haynes and R. & G. Chollenor. It was under the regime of the Democratic Labour Party that R. & G. Challenor and Wilkinson and Haynes joined and became Wilkinson & Challenor. That was the first part of the consolidation of the economic power in this country. Nothing was done by the Democratic Labour Party to prevent that consolidation.

Again in 1965 two of the giants, if I may adopt the language of the learned senior member for St. James - (Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Who is he?) Two of the real big mercantile giants joined together in 1965, and what did the Government do? Not one single thing about it. I am talking about Musson & DaCosta. It was either in 1964 or 1965 that Musson & DaCosta joined. Sir, anybody with any knowledge of monopolies, etc., would have objected to this, but the Government did nothing about it.

Rather than that, you have the Prime Minister making glowing speeches always refers to these little quips "What sweetens goat mouth burns his tail." Tourism is sweetening our mouths, but it is also burning in other places. It is the tourist that is responsible for the high cost of living in this country. There is not one single person I have met as a guest within the past four months - and I have met quite a few of them - who did not complain of the high prices charged by the hotels. The whole problem to my mind is that they push the prices up to get the tourist dollars. The man in the street has not got a particular supermarket to go to buy his things; he has to go to the same supermarket that the hotels are buying from, and they are going to buy in bulk and at fantastic prices for the purpose of satisfying the tourists; but the masses are the people who are suffering because of these prices.

I came in here some time ago with a question asking Government to increase the Price Control Officers. If I am not mistaken, the Government increased them by about half a dozen, and sometimes, you look in the papers you can see that a supermarket has been fined \$500 or \$240 for selling something a penny more than the scheduled price. But how often does it happen? I believe that a regular check should be made at least once a week on many of these business houses in Bridgetown, especially the supermarkets like Super Centre in St. James where they have some fantastic prices. Just recently I saw in the newspapers that Simpson's Supermarket was charged and fined for selling something one penny over the scheduled price. Obly God in Heaven and the supermarkets know how long they have been charging a penny over the scheduled price; but it is not the scheduled price that needs attacking; it is the import agents like the Brydens who need attacking. Find out what they are bringing in and at what price, the charges at the Port, and make sure they have a reasonable margin, because whenever you have a high mark-up by the import agents, they pass it on to the retail agents, and the retail agents pass it on to the shop-keeper, and then it is the consumer who is getting \$13.44 a week that has to carry the punishment. I know of very few things on which you have a price control - sardines, corned beef and milk. These are what I can immediately call to mind. There is also fish, but the Minister knows that people take advantage of selling fish at higher prices in the market. They do not need defending. I have seen the Prime Minister's Personal Aide walk into the market, and as soon as he gets in you can hear: "Skipper, which of these do you want?" He probably is getting his for nothing, but you can find a poor person standing there and paying fabulous prices for the fish.

I am told - and I believe the Minister would be able to clear this up when he gets up to make his reply - that when big catches of flying fish are brought in, they are taken to the Marketing Corporation where they are kept and sold to the hotels at high prices. Here again the man in the street is the person who is getting the punishment. The Minister said just now that people are educated and they are not thinking like yesterday.

5.25 p.m.

I know they are educated, and I will agree with you, but you cannot fool them again; I am convinced of this. I beg your pardon, Sir, I do not believe that Government can fool them again.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Actually the word "you" would refer to the Chair.

Mr. CRAIG:

I am satisfied that unless Government can carry out a survey and make a determined effort to control the prices in this country, they are heading for trouble, and I am a bit concerned because we are praising ourselves that we have a big tourist industry, yet the people who are experts in this field are criticising the fact that we are putting down more and more hotels and cannot get enough guests to occupy them. A man like Mr. Earl Smith who is knowledgeable in matters pretraining to the Hotel Industry is telling you that you are heading for a crisis in this industry. I am sandwiched. I have to accept the knowledge of Mr. Smith on one hand, and I am wondering why people are still investing in this unless they were sure they are going to get back their money. The prices at these hotels are very exorbitant; a scotch and soda costs \$1.90, a Banks Beer 90 cents, and at the end of the season you will find each hotel adding two more cottages or two wings, and the manager is on vacation in Europe, but the hotel workers who are responsible for all this at the end of the season are left with hardly anything. There is a classic example which I would like to draw to the Minister's attention, and it is that there are training girls at the Hotel School here; yet during the season you will find little white girls doing the big jobs for the big money, while the locals are left till the summer when there are only three or four guests in each hotel and they are paid at \$12 a week. These girls have to buy the same lipstick and they have to go to, their hairdressers and have to buy their clothes to make themselves look presentable in Bridgetown the same way that the white ones have to do it. The people who manage these shops like Paul's go to London and the United States and buy ties and shirts in bulk and "seconds" from down in the basements of all of these stores, and when it comes to the end of the summer season they come back here and sell them at very high prices - \$14 for a tie and \$22 for a shirt. It is in these places that the prices of goods should be controlled, and it takes a Bill like this to do it; for this reason I would support it. I know my colleague is rather anxious to say a word or two on it, and I sincerely hope that the Minister who is in charge would let me know how many Inspectors they are going to have to do this work who will be more vigilant where these supermarkets and many of these stores, especially the Jews and the Indians, are concerned.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that further consideration of this Bill be postponed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I beg to second that.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J.C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next at noon.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

5.35 p.m.