

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, 24th February, 1970.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 10.10 a.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour Sir J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., F.Z.S., (Speaker); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Hon. R. 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. FERGUSSON, (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); Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; Mr. C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P.; and Mr. ELLIOTT D.MOTTLEY.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, 9th December, 1969, have been duly circulated, and if there is no objection, they will be confirmed.

Hearing no objection, I declare the Minutes of the meeting duly confirmed.

I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a Report of the Select Committee of both Houses of Parliament.

It reads as follows:-

"The Joint Select Committee appointed to consider the re-organization of the Offices of Parliament with the specific object of appointing a Clerk of Parliament and two Deputy Clerks of Parliament, to serve both Houses of Parliament, have the honour to submit the following Report:-

The Committee met on Friday, 20th February 1970 at 3.00 p.m. in the Senate Chamber, when the following persons were in attendance:

His Honour the President, Sir Stanley Robinson, C. B. E., Senator the Honourable F. G. Smith, Q.C. (Attorney General), Senator the Honourable P.M. Greaves (Minister of Home Affairs), Senator H. F. Alkins, C.B.E., Senator R. G. Mapp, His Honour Sir Theodore Brancker, Q. C., (Speaker), the Honourable J. C. Tudor, C.M.G., M.P., Mr. L. E. Smith, M.P., J.P.

The Committee are of the opinion that -

(a) the post of Clerk, House of Assembly should be abolished and that there should be established a Clerk of Parliament along with two (2) Deputy Clerks of Parliament;

(b) the Clerk of Parliament , 'should be a wholetime officer, while the two Deputy Clerks would be part-time officers;

(c) the salary attached to the Clerk of Parliament should be fixed at a point between the maximum of the Magistrates' scale \$10,800 and that of the Senior Crown Counsel, i.e. \$12,000;

(d) the salary scale attached to the post of Deputy Clerk of Parliament should equate with the Magistrates' scale Z9-1, commencing at the minimum of the said scale, i.e. \$7,500 and rising by annual increments to five points in the scale, i.e. \$9, 120;

(e) the Clerk of Parliament should be a barrister or Solicitor or a person with 10 years' experience in Parliament;

(f) the Deputy Clerk of Parliament should be a Barrister or a Solicitor or a person with five years' experience in Parliament;

(g) the Clerk of Parliament and two Deputy Clerks of Parliament should be appointed by a new and enlarged Debates Committee of which His

Honour the Speaker should be ex officio Chairman;

(h) the newly constituted Debates Committee should be comprised of five (5) members from the House of Assembly and four (4) members from the Senate;

(i) a quorum of the appointed Debates Committee should be made up of five (5) members, two of whom shall be members of the Senate;

(j) the Clerk of Parliament should be designated the Accounting Officer for Parliament;

(k) the Chaplains should be appointed by the respective Houses;

(l) the Clerk of Parliament and the two Deputy x Clerks of Parliament should not be entitled to leave passages, but would be granted leave at the discretion of the Debates Committee;

(m) the effective date for the coming into operation of the proposals should be 1st May, 1970;

(n) compensation to any officer whose post has been abolished should be resolved by the House of Assembly;

(o) the Librarian should be Librarian to Parliament; and,

(p) the Clerk of Parliament should be responsible for the efficient carrying out by the messengers of their duties;

The Committee are of the opinion that the Attorney General should as a matter of priority draft the necessary legislation to meet the 1st May, 1970.

THEODORE BRANCKER

Chairman. 20th February, 1970.

I have the Honour to inform the House that I have received a letter dated 19th February, 1970, from the Ministry of Home Affairs. It reads as follows:-

"Dear Mr. Speaker,

I acknowledge receipt of your letter of 9th instant in which you requested an investigation into alleged delays in printing the Minutes of Proceedings of the House of Assembly, In your letter you stated that the last set of Minutes circulated to Honourable Members was in respect of a meeting held on 18th November, 1969.

2. I have had the situation investigated and am advised that the priority customarily given to the Minutes of Proceedings of the House still obtains and that any delays that have occurred are due to the late receipt by the Government Printery of these Minutes.

3. I am further advised that the Minutes of the meeting of the House held on 25th November, 1969, were received by the Government Printer on 29th January, 1970, and circulated on 6th February, 1970. The Minutes of the meeting of 3rd December, 1969, were received on 2nd February, 1970, and circulated on 13th February, 1970. The Minutes of the meeting of 9th December, 1969, were received on 11th February, 1970, and will, I expect, be circulated with the House Papers for its next sitting.

4. No Minutes for subsequent meetings of the House have as yet been delivered to the Government Printer.

5. It would therefore appear that the concern expressed by Honourable Members is not attributable to

any fault of the staff of the Printery.

6. I shall be grateful if this information can be conveyed to Honourable Members.

I am,

Yours faithfully,

PHILIP M. GREAVES,

Minister of Home Affairs."

10.20 a.m.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Prime Minister I am commanded to lay the Pensions (Pensionable Offices) Order, 1970. Also, on behalf of the Minister of Finance, the Statement showing Net Customs and Excise receipts for ten months ended 31st January, 1970.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of a parcel of land situate at Ellerslie Gap, St. Stephen's Hill, St. Michael, for the purpose of improvement of the road leading to Ellerslie Comprehensive School.

On behalf of the Prime Minister, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the Pensions (Pensionable Offices) Order, 1970.

Also I beg to. give notice of the following Bills:-

A Bill to make provision for payment of allowances to members of the Senate and to amend and consolidate the law relating to the remuneration of members of the House of Assembly.

A Bill to provide for the control, maintenance and development of the public parks and beaches of Barbados.

Also, I am to say that the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 26 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, and the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 41 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph are ready.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Reply to Parliamentary Question NO . 55 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is ready.

QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. senior member for St. Joseph; his Question re School Meals Service.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker To enquire of the appropriate Minister

Will the Minister inform this House of the method by which workers with the School Meals service are employed?

Mr. SPEAKER:

The same hon. member his Question re remuneration paid to Bursary Assistants.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister

Is the Minister aware that the remuneration paid to those Bursary Assistants and the persons enjoying technical training through the good offices of Government, has proved inadequate due to the increase in the cost of living and bus fares?

2. Would the Minister consider increasing this remuneration?

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. junior member for St. George his Question re Gun Hill House.

Mr. HOPPIN:

To enquire of the appropriate Minister -

Will the Minister consider the possibility of converting Gun Hill House, St. George in a Youth Hostel for the use of young people of the Island?

Mr. SPEAKER:

The some hon. member his Question re fumes and soot.

Mr. HOPPIN:

To enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works -

1. Is the Minister aware of the great inconvenience caused to both pedestrian and vehicular traffic by the fumes and soot emanating from the exhaust of Diesel buses and trucks operated by both Government and private concessionaires?

2. Will the Minister take steps to alleviate this inconvenience by having the mechanical construction of these buses and trucks so changed that the exhaust fumes would be discharged from pipes jutting into the air above the said vehicles, thereby ceasing to pollute the atmosphere?

Mr. SPEAKER; The same hon. member:

his (Question re the Walkers-Jordan Highway.

Mr. HOPPIN:

To esquire of the Minister of Communications and Works

1. Is the Minister aware of the fact that more than one fatal ace ident has recently occurred at the junction of the Walkers-Jordans highway near Upright Street in the parish of Saint George?

2. Will the Minister take steps to have the highway so reconstructed at the point abovementioned as to lessen the bend in the road near the said junction and thereby render the corner less dangerous to both pedestrians and vehicular traffic using the said highway?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to make provision for payment of allowances to members of the Senate and to amend and consolidate the law relating to the remuneration of members of the House of Assembly be read a first time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to provide for the control, maintenance and development of the public parks and beaches of Barbados be read a first time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the suspension of Standing Orders 5, 14, 16, 18, 19, 40 and 45 for the remainder of the day's sitting. I need only add that, in consultation with the other side, we have decided to proceed this afternoon with the debate on the Resolution on the Development Plan 1969 - 72, and to continue it tomorrow afternoon. This debate will be started immediately after Question Time, and I am hoping, therefore, that such Government Business as we may conveniently do this morning will be dispatched before we rise for lunch.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1969-70 No. 65

A Resolution for the sum of \$400 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass, and if there are any questions arising out of it, I will answer them.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that. The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

10.30 a.m.

A Resolution for \$8, 100 was called.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass. I am perfectly willing to answer all necessary questions. All hon. members will know that this amount is for the purchase of a mechanical harvester to be used in experiments and on the A.D.C. plantations, particularly at Graeme Hall, to begin with. This machine will be put at the service of plantation and peasant owners. Following his visit to Australia, the Agricultural Engineer in the Ministry of Agriculture, Science and Technology made a Report about the mechanization of sugar cane. He travelled to Australia, made visits on sugar cane plantations, and the Report, I think, is already known to hon. members.

This \$8, 100 is the amount we are asking to be voted today. Already \$12,000 is included in the Estimates for the current year. This machinery is already in Barbados. The one we are going to buy has been used on trials for 40 hours. This is the type of machine recommended by the Agricultural Engineer.

Hon. members are only asked to give their assent, because we want to put this machine on trial as quickly as possible.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to second that.

Mr. ST. JOHN:

Mr. Chairman, I would have liked to have heard from the hon. member what is the cost of this machine, and what has happened so far as a result of the experimentations in Barbados generally with respect to mechanical harvesting, , mechanical loading, or any other aspect of mechanizing the cutting of cane and its loading. We hear now and again about these efforts; but we have not had the benefit of a comprehensive Statement in this House on the achievements to date, if any. This is a matter which, I think, would be conceded on all sides as being of great importance.

I feel that Parliament should be kept as up-to-date as any other body or institution with respect to any progress or problem that has arisen. After I have heard the hon. Minister in these two respects, I think we on this side would be able to have a clearer picture of what is taking place.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, there seems to be some reluctance, so to speak, on the part of the hon. Minister to reply to the points raised on this matter. There are certain negative factors, and I am now going to quote from the Development Plan

"There are certain factors tending to depress yields, and these factors are listed as including fires, mechanization of reaping, dirty canes, and Leaf Scald disease."

I see the point raised by the hon. senior member for Christ Church. Time and again we hear of experiments, and this Honourable House is often asked to bear the cost of these experiments that are carried out where Government is involved; but seldom do we see put before this Honourable House, or before the public in general, the results of these experiments. Our concern here this morning is that of knowing what the Island stands to gain from the mechanical reaping process. What has driven the Government to be a party to this exercise? What has led up to the situation complained of in the first paragraph of the Addendum? At line 3, it states:

"....also because of the increasing difficulty in obtaining hand labour for cultivation and reaping of sugar cane."

Mr. Chairman, let us not forget that Barbadians have acquired a desire for going overseas to Florida to reap canes. Now, what has forced these workers to go abroad, apart from the experience gained elsewhere, is something which Government must first investigate if it has not done so up to the present moment. Canes are being reaped by hand by Barbadian workers in Florida, and the workers come back and tell a story which does not show that they worked under conditions better than the conditions at home. On the contrary, the workers come home to tell us the inhuman treatment, or sub-human treatment, meted out to them and the volume of work they have to do in order to earn the United States dollar. 10.40 a.m.

You will find, Mr. Chairman, that what lures the Barbadian worker to Florida is that during the period of his contract, however difficult working conditions may be, there is a compulsory savings scheme so that when 'that worker completes his contract in Florida, when he returns home there comes with him - or as soon as possible after - an amount which he has not been able to discipline himself at home to save. That is the biggest catch in this exercise.

In Barbados we are experiencing some difficulty in labour to handle the canes. One reason for this, Mr. Chairman, is the present Government's attitude to the cultivating of sugar canes as expressed by none other than the Prime Minister at King George Fifth Memorial Park to thousands of sugar workers. We might tell ourselves that prior to that silly and wicked announcement by the Prime Minister there could have been tendencies leading to workers to desert agricultural pursuits - chiefly sugarcane cultivation and harvesting; but, Mr. Chairman, our people are a people who have come on to feel and believe that Government is right and perhaps that Government is not to be resisted. That is a feeling which has come along through the veins of our people over the years; so you will find that when the Head of the Government expresses a view that he longs for the day when he will never see another cane blade grow in Barbados, one must think of the damaging effect those words as expressed by the Head of the Government of this country must have on those who would be minded to turn to the cane fields or agriculture for a livelihood. We agree, Mr. Chairman, that the age to which we are moving has in itself a tendency to decrease the desire for persons to take to the cane fields as they did in the past; but, Sir, we claim to have a vigorous Trade Union in Barbados - and here it is that if the Trade Union Movement is honest to the agricultural worker, we are to say here and now that labour in itself would have all the dignity that could be attached to it for the simple reason that the worker of today is still primarily concerned with the purchasing power in his pay envelope at the end of the week. We cannot for a single moment suggest that the Barbados sugar industry can stand up to the rigours, financial or otherwise, of the industry in Florida; but, nevertheless, if we were to have an honest investigation into the sugar industry in this Island, and if we were prepared to accept and abide by the recommendations of honest

and impartial people who might investigate the economics of the industry, we might still find that the worker in the industry can get something more than he is getting at present. If there is a greater inducement, or if the worker has a greater incentive and urge to earn more money, apart from the fact that he is going to enjoy perhaps for the first time a trip by plane to Florida or elsewhere - and he has got to pay for it all around - apart from the fact that the worker can say he has seen somewhere besides Barbados where he was born - If we are offering wages which bear commensurate comparison with wages offered in the sugar industry elsewhere, are you going to tell me that our workers will turn from the cane fields and leave the canes unreaped? I do not believe anything of the kind. 10.50 a.m.

My own experience is that our people are agricultural workers, and are for the most part so wretchedly poor that in their desire to get all they possibly can out of it in its short period of harvesting, we have parents today who make all sacrifices, and they even keep their children from attending secondary schools In this Island for certain days during the harvesting period and put them into the cane fields - not because they love it so, but their own hard-pressed conditions, the conditions under which they live, make this necessary. If in our schools a broader approach and a greater appreciation for agriculture and for sugar cane harvesting is exhibited, we would see that in a short period we would find that people who now give the impression that they do not want to reap canes will gladly go there for what it has got to offer. We have seen, and I remember in years past, at our then elementary schools, our children were taught not to be agricultural labourers as such, but they were brought up in the soil and they were taught to appreciate its values, and I am to say that there is no prouder Barbadian than the Barbadian who owns a square foot of that land. You find now that what I am saying bears a considerable relation to what is before us here - the question of now proceeding to experiment with the harvesting of sugar cane mechanically.

We cannot set about it on any whole-scale approach and tell people to go back to the land; it is not done that way; but you have got to take our people there during their most tender years and teach them to appreciate the niceties that are to be found in agricultural pursuits, whatever they might be. You do not take a child and put a violin or a piano or any musical instrument before him and tell him to play; you do not do it that way; you try, as that child grows, to educate him in these pursuits by taking him to functions, concerts or whatever it might be where the benefit can be derived from seeing the artists at work. If we approach our cane harvesting, our main cultivation, in a manner to make people appreciate the art, they will have the pride and be able to behold the beauty of the greenery that is seen from the hill side. You do not do this; but you get a Prime Minister - we would hardly believe that at that hour of the day he would have been drunk with wine - but he told the workers that for his part he does not care if they never see a cane blade grown in Barbados again. What then are you asking the worker to think in terms of doing, whether reaping, planting or cleaning the canes? You are only asking the workers to burn them down. That is what the workers understand by that, but that is not we want. We have here before us a Resolution asking us for an additional \$8, 100 to purchase a harvester for experiments. But our system of cultivation does not allow for this; we have to consider the peasant farmers as well. If we are going to start planting canes to be harvested mechanically, it is going to bring about on entirely new system of farm preparation, and this in itself can create a considerable difficulty to the peasant farmer. He is the person in the industry whose interest, apart from the workers who cultivate, plant, care and

reap the canes, has got to be protected in this matter. It is alright for Government to experiment, for Government has made preparations for spending \$84,000 which is included in its Development Plan for finding ways and means of teaching our young men to appreciate the niceties of agriculture. Why spend this amount in experimenting in the harvesting of un-burnt canes?

11.00 a.m.

Mr. Chairman, the total cost of what is involved money-wise in the pursuit ought to be told us today. We have seen in the Addendum that an officer from the Ministry of Agriculture, Science and Technology visited Australia to see machinery in operation. What we are saying is that they could have sent six other officers to places other than Australia - to places with problems such as ours, and those officers could have been trained and sent back here to pass on their knowledge to our young boys and girls in order to make them appreciate what they have seen and what has made this Island what it is today, so far as our sugar industry is concerned. The young people should learn and understand that each and every one of us living today will die, and Barbados will still remain dependent on her sugar industry in a very great measure. We are asking the Minister to tell us something more than what he has said, particularly in regard to the points raised by the hon. senior member for Christ Church.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. senior member for Christ Church spoke of the report of former trials and experiments in relation to cost. There can be no cost, because the cost of the machine has already been told to the Committee. \$12,000 has already been voted, and an additional sum of \$8, 100 is required. You have already been told that and you do not want to hear it again. As far as I am aware, the experiments conducted by the Sugar Producers Association, I have no report on them. We are now going to conduct our experiments and our research. I want the hon. senior member for Christ Church to hear this. (Mr. St. JOHN I am hearing you.) We are at the beginning of conducting our research.

The hon. junior member for St. Peter has asked no question, but he has made a speech. There is nothing to reply to him about. He has asked for more information. I will still endeavour to give him that, but I will make one or two explanations vis-a-vis his remarks. He asked, "Why mechanize the industry?" He asked that in a long expatiation, but it boils down to: "Why have we got to mechanize?" We have to mechanize because sugar is a competitive product. In other words, the price of Commonwealth sugar depends on the agreement reached between the Commonwealth countries which grow sugar and the British Government. They meet once a year and arrive at the price. There is no other sugar besides Commonwealth sugar.

Now, in Barbados, where we have hand-harvested sugar, the price of producing sugar is far beyond that of sugar produced in other countries of the British Commonwealth. That is factual, and there is no

propaganda about that; there can be no electioneering about that. We in Barbados cannot hope to control that. We cannot hope to compete with certain countries with regard to the price of producing sugar. I am not dealing with European sugar and beet sugar; I am talking about cane sugar. It is true that we have to compete with beet sugar, and even if we did not have to compete with beet sugar, the problem is that sugar cane is competitive.

The hon. junior member for St. Peter asked why our sugar reapers migrated to Florida, and yet we are thinking about mechanization. The whole complement has not yet arrived, but already, I think, 1,000 workers from our sister Colonies in the Caribbean are here to assist with the harvesting of this year's crop. There, again, it is all right to blame a politician for making some remark and to suggest that as a result of that remark young Barbadian workers have ceased to enter the cane fields to reap sugar cane. If things used to happen like that I would be amazed; yet, the same hon. member says that if the Trade Union were honest, and if better wages could be had for cane reapers, then we would not have to import labour. That is an hon. member speaking in conflict' with himself.

Sir, if it were such an easy matter for any politician - it does not matter whom - to get on an election platform, or at King George V Park in St. Philip, and make reference to cane blades no longer standing and, as a result of that, the young people of Barbados stopped entering the sugar cone fields to harvest canes - I could not imagine that happening; a lot of things would have to happen before we could see that young men refused to go in the hot sun in our cane fields and harvest sugar. Let us face the fact that cane cutting is a hard job, done under gruelling conditions. Do not let us deceive ourselves, because Barbados is not the only country that has seen a fall-off from agricultural pursuits. In other places in the Caribbean area the same thing has happened, but I do not hear of any politician being blamed as being responsible for some people leaving agriculture.

As a matter of fact, it is universal and we are not unique. It is true that our young men do go to Florida and reap sugar cane, but the young man who will leave Barbados and go to Florida and reap cane is not necessarily a cane cutter at all. He may be a tailor, he may be a chauffeur, and so on, but that same young man will not cut cane in Barbados. If you were to expose him in that condition among fellow-Barbadians, he will be shy and he will not do it. However, if you put him in Canada or in Florida he will cut cane. 11.10 a.m.

That is a part of human behaviour with which we are very familiar, and it is far from being political; it is social. Now, sugar cane is a competitive business. In Barbados we complain of burning canes. In other countries burning canes is a practice, but we are so dependent upon sugar, that we have to see that we get every ripe joint taken to the factory and processed, because we depend on agriculture still more than anything else today. We therefore cannot compare what happens in one country and think it is very adaptable to Barbados. We must produce sugar as cheaply as we can in order to get as much money

from it to make it profitable to Barbados. In other words, sugar is competitive and we have to mechanise. The obvious shortage of labour makes us regard mechanism as a serious matter. We are now going to experiment and go into the matter. The hon. member made reference to the fact that we have \$84,000 provided in the Development Plan, but we are asking here and now to process this measure in order that we can begin our experiments.

Now a lot of what the hon. member said is not a matter for politicians. We know that the form of mechanism cannot continue on any wide scale; there may be some changes in the manner of cultivation, but the politicians cannot do that. The Technical Officers of the Ministry and the Extension Officers are those who will contact the peasants and educate them into the newly-proposed form of cultivation, if there is to be such. This is not political; it is educative; not by the politicians, but by those who see and know this business. I am unable to do that because I know my limitations. As I said, we handle sugar with other Commonwealth countries such as Australia, Mauritius, India and South Africa and other countries outside the Commonwealth, such as Cuba and Swaziland. I can tell the hon. member that there is a type of mechanical unit that is very expensive and that is made in America, but we have to see to it that in everything we do, we must profit out of sugar. We know that our sugar is sometimes sold on the world market, but we are permitted with a quota to sell at a price offered us by the Commonwealth Agreement.

I do not think there is any question except that posed by the hon. senior member for Christ Church. The hon. junior member for St. Peter seemed to want to generalise. I would like to be able to have questions put to me in a precise form, and I would do my best to answer them, because I am not making a second reading speech. I am presenting something in Committee of Supply. If I were making a second reading speech, I would be able to speak generally on mechanising as referred to, but here and now we are told point-blank that this is the beginning of our experiments in the Ministry of Agriculture. This machine will be put not only at the service of the Government's A.D.C.'s plantations, but other plantations and peasants as well. I was given that assurance and so I can tell the Committee. Again, Mr. Chairman, if at this stage there are any precise questions, I will endeavour to answer them.

Mr. HINDS; Mr. Chairman, the Minister who has just sat down said a few words which I noted. He said that the sun is hot in the cane fields, that cutting canes is a hard job done under gruelling conditions, that the shortage of agricultural workers is universal, that sugar is a competitive business and that cane burning is encouraged in other countries. One point he made was that you cannot take what happens in one country and adapt it to suit Barbados, and he went on to tell us of the work the Extension Officers of his Ministry would undertake in contacting peasants and educating them in the event of our planting canes to be reaped mechanically.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I said in the event of our having to introduce new methods of cultivation in relation to mechanisation of the harvesting. His hon. member must quote me exactly.

Mr. HINDS:

What is the difference between "if we are going to plant cones to be reaped mechanically" and "Extension Officers from the Ministry will contact the peasants and educate them in the new system of preparation"? Now, Sir, let us begin at the end. In the first place, there is hardly an Officer to be found to staff the Extension Department of the Ministry of Agriculture, Science and Technology, and there are many vacancies not filled for the longest time, and I am to say that little or no effort is being made to staff that Department. Now, the Ministry said that you cannot take what happens in one country and adapt it to suit Barbados. That is exactly what the Addendum to this Resolution tells us.

11.20 a.m.

I heard the Minister say that I would be talking in conflict with my own self, but the Minister is in conflict with what is stated here in the Addendum because all we have from the Minister up to the moment is that an officer from the Ministry of Agriculture went to Australia to see what is being done there and now they have come for money to do the same thing.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of explanation, the question of our knowing that we will have to mechanise arose long before this particular officer went to Australia. He went to see about the kind of machine which is adaptable to Barbados and it was discovered that the Australian machine, owing to similarity of land, will be more adaptable to Barbados.

Mr. HINDS:

The Minister told us that cane burning is encouraged in other countries. This is accepted in countries where you have snakes and other reptiles that are harmful to human beings and you have got to adopt these methods; but we do not have them in Barbados. The only thing you have in Barbados is a plant known as 'cow itch'. You are laying emphasis on that fact that sugar is a competitive commodity, but when was it not competitive? When will it not be competitive? I heard the Minister say that we have got to see that we get every profit out of sugar; but by "we" do you mean the workers? The workers do not share in these profits in relation to the same hot sun that the Minister told us is burning them in the cane fields. The Minister must understand that the sun is hot in Cuba, too. Where is he going to find sugar cane cultivation without hot sun at the harvesting period? Sugarcane needs rain and sunshine; the sun is to ripen the cane till the harvesting comes about; so wherever you are cultivating sugar cane, you must have hot sun. But we must see that the workers get a wage that bears some relation to the hot sun that shines on them because the Minister has told us that it is not merely the hot sun with which the workers

has got to contend; he says cane cutting is a hard job done under gruelling conditions. If that is the case.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Would hon. members on my left observe Rule 29(5)? Let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. HINDS:

If, therefore, that is the case involved, the Minister has not yet advanced a sufficient reason why we have got to spend money investigating or doing research into sugar cane harvesting mechanically; he has not made out any case for that - none whatsoever.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

Again, Mr. Chairman, I will just say something in relation to two matters mentioned by the hon. junior member for St. Peter. In the first place, this Resolution has absolutely nothing to do with the staffing problems of the Ministry of Agriculture; but since the hon. junior member for the parish of St. Peter cared to mention that there is a staffing problem in the Ministry of Agriculture, I will say this. The staffing problem of any Ministry is not the responsibility of the Minister; Ministers do not hire nor fire; the appointment is a matter...

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

No point of order may arise.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

At this point I take it that the Minister is now addressing the House on staff ing appointments and not on the sole purchase of a harvester, and I am not going to entertain this. Let the hon. junior member for St. Peter proceed to deal with the cane harvester.

Mr. HINDS:

When the hon. senior member was addressing the Chair I rose on a point of order, but since the hon.

senior member wanted to contend with the Chair that I had not risen on a point of order - he seems to think that he is still in the Chair - but nevertheless since the Minister has taken his seat, I will not proceed with the point of order.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1969-70 No. 63

A Resolution for the sum of \$375, 994 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, there are several items under Head 9, and I think perhaps the more important one is the first. Hon. members will remember that a certain number of persons are now being trained in the art of Cartography under a United Nations expert. This course was to have been finished by the end of December, and it was thought that it might be extended till not later than sometime at the end of this month. The course however is wider than was at first determined, and so it seems now that the additional subjects to be covered will necessitate the course lasting until perhaps the end of June.

11.30 a.m.

The provision asked for here is to carry this extension to the end of the financial year. I will answer any questions asked.

I beg to move that Head 9 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. St. JOHN; Mr. Chairman, I see here that due to the pressure, no doubt, of many members on this

side and other people, the Government has decided to recreate the office of Sub-Treasurer in various areas. I see here "Rent of Offices in St. Philip and St. Andrew." I would like to have a comprehensive Statement as to exactly where these sub-Offices are. I do not know where to find them. Are there any in St. George? This is important, because people still come to you and ask where to pay their taxes. This information should have been given to the people, and this is something that the Government Information Service should have recognised. If you make a major build-up for a change and, subsequently, you change things back to the original position, you must continue publicity in that respect for a certain period of time. Of course, the motivation in not doing it is that the Government does not want to admit that it had originally made a mistake to change it. It is very difficult to get through the central PBX to the relevant officer in the Division of the Financial Building. I know where the Sub-Offices are in Christ Church and St. Philip. Where is the one in St. John? (Asides.). I am now told that it is above the Almshouse.

With regard to the Valuation Division, I am not satisfied with the running of the Valuation Division, because of the fact that up to now there is still the age-old problem that changes of ownership should be recorded. In some areas, for years after properties are sold, they still appear on the rate books of this country in the names of the original owners. In addition to that the Government is losing revenue, because of the fact that they do not post up alterations and corrections to the various Sub-Treasurers in a sufficient period of time for them to take the necessary action. That has been going on for a long period of time. These officers have been undergoing training for a long period of time, and still there is no speed-up in the matter. I know this from personal experience. It is no use telling people, after they have sold land, that you will adjust things. The transaction is finished and closed, and you cannot go back and adjust it. The importance of this matter is that the tax bill goes out in the original owner's name, and he may throw away the bill because he no longer owns the property. It is then difficult for Government to trace the new owner, and when he is found he is called upon to pay the arrears of tax. It is very difficult to collect the current tax, never mind the arrears.

Sir, what about the new system of valuing land? Is there a new rateable sheet in Barbados? From what I can remember every five years there was published a new Valuation List, and a Bill was passed whereby the principles of the valuation were changed. I have never heard - and I have been trying to check on it - if the new Valuation List, assessing the land on the new principles, has come into force. What about the old list? This is very important not only for this, but for the Waterworks Department. We must know about these things. I must have an idea about these things, and this is the appropriate time for it to be done.

The last point I wish to make is that of the temporary Trade Tax Licences. I refer to the Interim Traders' Licence. That is not working satisfactorily now. You used to get that from the area in which you had your business. This is not sent out nowadays; it is supposed to be centralised. It is a very difficult operation now to get an Interim Traders' Licence, and the people are going ahead trading without a licence. In your transfer system you have not taken into account the facts that existed when we had three

separate Authorities. Although this matter has been centralised for some period of time it, obviously, is not working smoothly.

I notice that a new system of registration of motor vehicles is now being projected, and I would like to hear some details about it. Is it a mechanized system? I would hope that it is a mechanized system that you are going to introduce instead of the cumbersome book that you had before. Modern data processing is such that you could have a card index system for motor vehicles, but I see that there is a token of \$1.00 mentioned here. What is the new system? We should have been told all of these things. If you look at Item 17, Note4, you will see that there is a new system which is to be introduced. Are we going to have a system of registration by parishes still? Surely, we are entitled to this information.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Perhaps I should deal with the last question first. It appears that for the registration of motor vehicles they use at present 23 registers of which 11 are kept in the City, 3 in Christ Church, and 1 each in the other parishes. Each of these registers measures 16 1/2 inches by 13 inches, and they cost \$175.00. These are very large books indeed. They are time-consuming to manipulate, and very cumbersome to handle. The new system is a system of cards. They think that this is the most up-to-date system. It is already in use in the United Kingdom. The advantages to be gained are that it will be possible to see at a glance which vehicles are in arrears and those numbers for which no licences are yet issued. They also think that this advantage would bring about an immediate increase in revenue.

Secondly, they think that by the use of this system the public could be more quickly dispatched, especially in this part of the Island, because in the peak period of June and July there are, at least, 4 cashiers in attendance with no particular directions or restrictions as to which particular cashier the public should approach. 11.40 a.m.

It is felt that with the new card system a clerical officer would be available to furnish cards from the stacks of any teller so that the cashier would not need to leave his booth. Now the capital cost of this equipment is approximately \$16,000 with a renewal of cards in About 20 years' time. The present cost per card is eight cents, and there is provision to accommodate on increase in any foreseeable number of vehicles. Comparison can therefore be made with the number of 23 registers each at a cost of \$175 which amounts to more than \$4,000. Now since this is a triennial cost, assuming that the number of vehicles remain constant they feel that in 20 years the ultimate cost would be over \$26,000. I do not know if there is any information the hon.member wants on that Head, but briefly it is a new card system which they are using which will not only speedup the method of attending customers, but will record the information in a less bulky and cumbersome form.

With respect to the other matter which the hon. member inquired about-the location of Sub-Treasuries - I believe that steps are now being taken to collect this information and make it available. We have had some considerable difficulty in getting this out, but I believe that it will be available to the public shortly in a form in which it can easily be understood and quick to remember. I am afraid I cannot give any details at the moment of what is being done, but I know that this is so.

The question that Head 9 - Ministry of Finance -stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative with' out division.

Head 14 - Inland Revenue - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, this is a token provision to enable placement for purchase of two accounting machines so as to ensure delivery during this financial year. I will answer any questions which hon. members may wish to ask.

I beg to move that Head 14 - Inland Revenue -stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

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

Hon. J.C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, the background to this particular; request for provision is that sometime in 1968 - I believe it was in August -the subject of Broadcasting was transferred from the responsibility of the Minister of Education to that of the Prime Minister. In that financial year, 1968-69, under Head 38 -

Ministry of Education - provision was made to meet the payment of an amount to the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation equivalent to the duties collected by the Government on television sets and component parts to the end of that financial year. As I explained, provision of these funds is now the responsibility of the Prime Ministers Office, but owing to some oversight in this financial year no such provision was included in the Estimates, and it is therefore proposed to seek this sum to make good that provision.

Before I sit down, hon. members would like to have some idea of the statistics behind this policy. For instance, let us take the figures beginning from March, 1969, to December, 1969, both of the number of sets imported and the duty payable on them; March, 85, the duty being \$7, 143.53. April, 251, the duty being \$16, 689.07; May, 6, the duty being \$192.03; June, 182, the duty being \$12, 151.60; July, 82, the duty being \$5, 721.91; August, 223, the duty being \$15, 992.45; September, 131, the duty being \$8,005.86; October, 414, the duty being \$28,074.06; November, 414, the duty being \$29, 683.68; December, 319, the duty being \$23, 395.04. I think the total number of sets would be 2, 107 and the total duty \$147,049.23. I am afraid that the figures for January and February obviously are not yet available. I do not know if there are any questions any hon. member wishes to ask. If so, I will answer them. I beg to move that Head 16 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, what I would like to find out is something more in keeping with the operations of Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation itself. What I should like to find out is whether there is still an Agreement with Lord Thomson, and if so, when does that Agreement come to an end. I should like to find out whether the Agreement contained an agreement to pay Lord Thomson a service fee and how much money has been paid by C.B.C. in pursuance of this Agreement. The other point is this I should like to find out from the Minister as regards the training of personnel. I know you have sent your Manager, but to what extent are you training the people in television? I do not mean having somebody come here and lecture to them. To what extent are you giving your executive staff at C.B.C. training overseas? 11.50 a.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I will deal with the second question first. From time to time members of the staff of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation are sent out either on the initiative of the station itself or in accordance with the agreements with the British Broadcasting Corporation for training courses; I believe the last person was Mr. Hyndman of the Engineers' Department. Before that - and I am speaking now subject to correction - I think that both Mr. Gumming and Mr. Rudder and somebody else have had

training courses on the Programming side. This is four that I can think of. The Manager himself has been out, Mr. Phillips from the Engineering Department is on a course .at the moment, and I believe one or two others on the news side have had short courses; also, Mr. Best, when he was there, and someone else whose name I cannot recall, as well as Mr. Brewster on the Programme Production side. There must easily be seven or eight of them who, as far as I know, have had this opportunity, and this is something which will continue. I cannot at the moment tell the hon. member with what regularity or on what pattern, but I imagine that since the persons whose names I have mentioned held jobs or have held jobs in several departments, I would imagine that it is accepted policy to permit the training in all departments of the station - the Programming side, the News side and the Engineering side.

As to the hon. member's first question, I think that the hon. member was not a member of this Chamber when we last debated the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation, about two years ago, but it was explained that we were renegotiating our arrangement with Thomson - by the way, it is not with Lord Thomson as such, but with the Thomson Enterprises - and I am now in a position to tell the House what the position is because my latest information has been that the matter is still subject to negotiations between the Corporation and the Thomson Enterprises. My information also is that within another three months or so there will be a conclusion reached on the matter to the advantage of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation. This is all I can tell the House at the moment, but negotiations are still going on.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I wonder how long these negotiations have been going on. We learnt from the Minister that he has an assurance that they will be concluded to the benefit of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation, but he should tell us how long they have been going.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

For about two years as far as I know, but they have covered several aspects of the matter. They have covered aspects such as the commission on advertisement sales, management fees and one or two other matters. All are under negotiations, and I would not like to be pressed much further on this because I honestly would not wish to prejudice the negotiations that are going on. I give the House that assurance.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I do not think the Minister has answered one question, and that was whether under the old Agreement there was a 15% service agreement with Thomson. I would like to know how much money has been actually received by Thomson under that Agreement.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I am sure that that information would be covered in the 1967-68 or the 1968-69 Accounts. The hon. member has said that they have not been laid, but I am sure that we have laid 1967-68; it is terrible not to have laid any more recent than that, but the information to hon. members since would be included in that.

Mr. HINDS:

This Resolution, the Minister has given this Committee to understand, arose from Ministerial entanglement and Involvement and an oversight resulting there from.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Not really; I did say that there was a changeover of portfolios in August 1968, but the Resolution itself arises from the fact that it is Government policy to give the Corporation the Customs duties that we collect on television sets.

Mr. HINDS:

Was there really a changeover in Ministerial responsibility, or was there really a split? In other words, you divided Ministerial responsibility. Did the Prime Minister not accept responsibility for the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation and the Minister of Education retain other matters that were formerly within his own portfolio?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

The hon. member will probably wish to tell me what happened, but he must allow me to tell him the facts. The facts are quite simple. There had been a change and a reallocation of portfolios, and Broadcasting came under the control of the Prime Minister from August 1968; by one of these oversights which take place in Government from time to time, when they were making up the Estimates they took the vote out of Education and did not put it under the Prime Minister.

Mr. HINDS:

I wonder if the Minister would tell us when the present Manager of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation was appointed; was it August 1968?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I would think it would be before that date. This kind of detail would really not interest me; what

would interest me is to be able to answer questions arising out of a policy decision for the request of supplementary funds.

Mr. HINDS:

What we are learning here is that there is no policy whatsoever where the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation is concerned. 12.00 noon.

It was the case of more sex than politics. I am pretty fair to you when I tell you that. That is why we have no policy until today. I want to know who is responsible for the deploying of personnel and equipment at C. B. C.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, the answer to that is very simple. The senior staff of the Corporation, taking the directions from the Board, I would imagine.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, how many senior members of the staff are in direct communication with the Board?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I must tell the hon. member that, since I am not responsible, nor indeed is any Minister responsible, for the day-to-day operations of a Statutory Board, I could not undertake to tell him how many members of a particular staff of a public corporation are in contact with their Boards. I just would not know this.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I wish I could be tempted to believe what the Minister has just said. Are you going to tell me that you are running a Government, you have a Statutory Board, and you are going to have 10 or 12 senior officers running around to the various officers of the Board? You have a Manager, and, if the staff want to get in touch with the Chairman, they will have to do so through the Manager. The Minister knows all of that. Let us get to the point. Who should be held responsible for a photographer going to Roebuck Street - let me put it this way - filming something that never happened? What we do know is that C.B.C. has absolutely no policy; it is now corrupt, rotten, filthy and nasty. It is the type of thing that the hon. Leader of the House likes. It is a policy that now suits him, because you will find.....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I am taking objection to the remarks used by the hon. member that the policy of C.B.C. is rotten, corrupt, filthy, nasty, and it is the policy of the Leader of the House. I am asking that the hon. member be made to withdraw those remarks.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, ...

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I will first try to obtain the words objected to by the junior member for St. Thomas.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I will not hear any more debate until I get those words complained of. Mr. Deputy Clerk, would you get from the Reporter the words complained of for me?

The Official Reporter submitted a transcript of the relevant words.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

What has been given to me as said by the hon. member is "What we do know is that C.B.C. has absolutely no policy; it is corrupt, filthy, nasty; it is the type of thing that the Leader of the House likes." In my view Standing Order 26(7) has been contravened, and I am asking the hon. junior member for St. Peter to withdraw those words.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, if I have been asked to withdraw them, I withdraw them. All I have to say is that if the Leader of the House likes filthiness and nastiness, then the hon. junior member for St. Thomas should not quarrel with me; he must quarrel with the Leader of the House for liking that. The Leader of the

House never objected to my remarks.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Chairman, , on a point of order. I am now asking that those words be removed from the Hansard Report.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

In my opinion "if" prevents those words from now being withdrawn. Let the hon. junior member for St. Peter continue under Head 16. 12.10 p.m.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, was I not at all times speaking on Head 16?

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

That is what I want the hon. member to proceed with.

Mr. HINDS:

That is what I was debating all the time, Here we find that C.B.C. has shown itself as the type of operation where, as in some countries you can go and hire mercenaries or gang men, you can go and hire C.B.C. equipment and personnel. We appreciate the fact that television is show business, but you are taking a Government-owned Corporation and using it to mislead the nation in the most devilish fashion. We are concerned today with voting money for C.B.C. for them to take it and prostitute itself and to feed the nation with lies and make-belief. If the Manager of C.B.C. took part in it, he is dangerous and ought to be removed. The cameramen who are engaged in it are dangerous to society and ought to be removed. (Asides) '

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Members not addressing the Chair should observe the Standing Orders.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

You will always say that, but you never call the Minister's name. I have just come in to bow to you, and you are saying that members should observe the Standing Orders without calling the member's

name.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Whom is the hon. senior member for the City addressing?

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

You, Mr. Chairman. I gave you the sign to take my seat and that man over there was referring to my son-in-law.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

I object to the hon. member saying that man over there. Are you getting besides yourself?

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Yes, I am.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, we believe that C. B. C. came into existence behind some comparatively good motive. I do not want to say that it was nobly conceived, but nevertheless we have seen that it has so degenerated into allowing itself to be bought that the equipment and personnel employed by C.B.C. and paid for by the taxpayers of this country can be taken to any scene and used in such a manner. What I want to say is that all who took part in that exercise knowingly and actively ought to be removed. I refer to the exercise in which the headquarters of the Barbados Labour Party was flashed on the screen as if to show the hon. senior member for St. Joseph leaving the building in wrath and slamming his car door to give the nation the belief that such a row had broken down at the headquarters of the Barbados Labour Party between the hon. member and others, when in truth and in fact no such thing occurred.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

On a point of order, the camera does not lie. Is the hon. member trying to say that the camera is a liar?

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

No point of order.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, cameras do not lie, at least not the ones at C.B.C. The liars are the ones behind the camera. All those who decided to concoct this -the gangsters, the murderers - are murdering the nation as well. It is a dangerous den. You will find that a responsible member of this community can set out armed with C.B.C's cameras to put on that type of display. I will tell you, Mr. Chairman, that I am definitely a nervous man when I find people around me who would allow C.B.C's personnel and equipment to be used in an exercise such as this. It is not good for Barbados, and it is not good for C.B.C.

As I said, television is show business, but we have had occasions when some of the Ministers on that side ought to have been televised for a good cause and C.B.C's cameras were not available to them. The hon. Leader of the House knows to what I am referring specifically; but when you want to do the "DongerMan" stunts, the C.B.C. camera is there with you. 12.20 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, my own understanding of the situation is that the price for all of this is going to be an extremely heavy one, I am sorry to say; not my fault. However, let us get on with this Resolution. The Leader of the House has been at pains to give us the number of television sets imported and the duty on the various sets for the months of March down to December. That is all very good, but the information which the Minister ought to give this House he does not begin to set about to give; all he tells us is that it has all come about as a result of an oversight, and it is when dealing with these oversights that this side of the House ought to be ultra cautious. I am to wonder if the Minister is now telling us that the duty collected on the television sets also includes the duty on the component parts.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Yes.

Mr. HINDS:

The Minister did not say so in the first instance, and I have a very good reason for asking the Minister if the duty that he has given for this period month by month includes the duty on the component parts, because in truth and in fact we have had Statements of Accounts by this Corporation, and I am to tell you that it is the one Corporation that it has found itself keeping one set of books from which two different Balance Sheets have been able to be produced. The Chartered Accountants or whoever they might be - and I am not hiding behind the privilege of the House - can produce for the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation from one set of books two different Balance Sheets at one and the same time. I want the Leader of the House to get up and deny these things, but this goes to show the type of community in which we are living. You have too many professional crooks up there; from the opening

of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation, this island has been saddled with nothing but professional crooks associated with that organisation, and the Minister knows this. Bear this in mind; there was a time when the Minister paid more attention to the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation than I would say he paid to where he lives. Mr. Chairman, can the Minister tell us now what film companies have refused to do business with the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation, what organisations dealing with the sale or lease or rental of films have refused to do business with the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation? Is it not a fact that this same organisation takes its equipment and prostitutes itself and has not been able to pay its debts, and the suppliers of films withhold the supplies from time to time because they were unable to pay the debts? Can the Minister tell us now how many companies withheld their films from time to time? Instead of trying to put your house in order, you are prepared to take Christ from the altar and prostitute Him before the nation. That is what I am charging the Minister, the Leader of this House, of associating himself with. I saw him sit down there and shake his shoulders as if to make us believe that he did not know what went on at Roebuck Street; I wish I could believe the Minister, but nevertheless, whatever went on, whatever might go on, the fact remains that the type of films we now get from C.B.C. are the cheapest type, the knock-about type that nobody else wants - these lot of gangster films. There is hardly a film shown on C.B.C. without somebody drawing a gun, teaching people's children all kinds of nonsense. There is hardly an educational film on C.B.C., and all I am asking the Minister - he says he does not have the latest Statements of Accounts here, but yet you will find that the Minister who is responsible for C.B.C. cannot find it possible to be here - what we are asking the Minister to tell us now is if he can possibly find out how many companies have had to withdraw their supplies from C.B.C., and if that is not in a very great measure responsible for the very poor cultural quality of the films that we are now having shown to our children in Barbados.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I have one very serious complaint about the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation, and that is that for a number of years the members of the Opposition have been asking about time on the radio and on television for Party political broadcasts. This has been resisted strenuously by the Government, and at one stage they took the view that when the Barbados Labour Party was in power they would not allow it. As you will appreciate, there are a number of us now who at that time were not members of the Barbados Labour Party, and we feel that the policy which was advanced then by the Opposition, now the Government - you, Sir, place yourself in the position you find yourself in today. You requested over and over -unfortunately I will admit this, that my Party did not then see fit to institute a system of Party political broadcasts, but I do not believe that two wrongs make a right and that now after nine years the Democratic Labour Party should have done nothing to bring about a system of Party political broadcasts. I know that this was done for a limited time during the elections, and the way in which it was brought was done entirely to suit the Government. 12.30 p.m.

Now, here is where you find a failure of Party political broadcast. The Government has no need for a Party political broadcast on the Radio, because the Government Information Service projects, at the moment, the Party policy of the Government, and, in addition to that, wherever possible, the Government Information Service on the television is projecting Party policy. It is only right, if this happens, that the Opposition Party should be allowed time to project Party policy. What do you find?

You find that the Prime Minister is asked to come on television; he gives an interview; he attacks the economic system of the country and so on, but nobody from the Opposition is ever given an opportunity to oppose or answer that. Of course, that is done on a special programme.

We now have the Government Development Plan before us. After we have discussed the Development Plan today, I want to see whether the Government Information Service, or the Government, is going to see to it that somebody from the Opposition goes on television to face three panelists in the same way the Prime Minister had an opportunity of doing. That is what I mean by projecting Government policy, Sir. Is the Government prepared to allow somebody from the Opposition to go on the Government Television Programme and on the Radio, and project the policy of the Barbados Labour Party? In the Development Plan you are projecting Party and not Government Policy. Whatever criticisms are made in here on the Development Plan, is the Government prepared to allow somebody from the Opposition to go on television and make those criticisms? Do you think that the correct thing is for the Government to go and put its policy and nobody has any right to answer it? That is what it is boiling down to. The Government is entitled to go on television and put its policy, but yet it is afraid to allow members of the Opposition to have any say on television whatsoever.

This is significant, Sir. Watch television, or listen to the radio, and you will find that every conceivable organisation may be allowed an opportunity to go on television or the radio, but seldom do you hear of any person being asked to comment on anything who is a member of the Barbados Labour Party. They may ask the Church, but in those circumstances they would get somebody who is favourable to the Government policy. If they asked somebody from the Youth Organisation, that person would be expounding the principles of the Democratic Labour Party. Never once do you say to the Opposition Party: "Inasmuch as the Government has expressed its point of view, would you like time to go on the air, or on television, and express your point of view?"

The Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation is a Government institution. By Government, I do not mean the Democratic Labour Party. When a programme goes on and the Government Information Service looks after it, it is a question of the Government Programme and not a programme for the Democratic Labour Party; therefore, there are times when you should not project purely Democratic Labour policy. When the Prime Minister goes on television, it is only right that somebody from the Opposition should be asked to go, too.

Sir, look at the programme "Something To Talk About". That is a private programme, and the Prime Minister goes on it. Do you think the Prime Minister should allow himself to go on a programme like that, when he knows that the Opposition would be denied the opportunity to go on it? The Prime Minister should be big enough - he has nothing to hide. If his Government is such a wonderful Government, then why is he afraid of the Barbados Labour Party? Why is the Government afraid to give

the Barbados Labour Party time on the air? Is it because you realise that you will be put in the shade? Is it because you feel that the Barbados Labour Party will gain too great an image on television, because of the people they would put on television? I would seriously call upon the Government to let us have some sort of Statement with regard to Party political broadcasts not only on television, but on the radio and Rediffusion.

I believe that some time ago a Resolution was passed in this House about broadcasting of debates live. I wonder whether the Leader of the House will give us Information with regard to how far they have reached in this matter.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member who has just sat down is wondering why Government is afraid to allow the Opposition to go on the air. Now, the Government took me up to the United Nations, as a member of the Opposition of this House, and that is one of the reasons for my being here in this chair today. The criticism that is being thrown at the hon. Leader of the House can be traced back to that trip abroad. Was I a member of the Opposition at the time I made that trip? Now, wherever the members of the Barbados Labour Party go in the country, they are lashing right and left and everything is due to the Government giving me that trip to the U.N. I did not get up to speak so much on that, but it appears as though the Government does not know what to do. If the Government carries a member of the Opposition on a trip, a lot of things would be said about it. I do not know if the members of the Opposition are blue vexed because I was taken on a trip, and not one of them. They are either vexed because I had the opportunity to go up, or they do not want the Government to do anything at all, as far as the Opposition is concerned. The trip to the U.N. was paid from the taxpayers' money, although "something" that has no shame at all said that I went up there to eat food. That person, had no shame whatsoever. (Asides)

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I would like to ask the hon. member to confine himself to Head 16.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, I am going to confine myself, but I should be very glad if you would ask members to comply with the Standing Orders. If I am to confine myself to this Head, everytime you allow an hon. member to stray in here, I am going to get up and throw it at you. You allow hon. members to get up in here and confine themselves to everything except what is before the House, and from now on I will draw it to your attention. 12.40 p.m.

If you want me to confine myself, I will do so. I do not intend saying one word on the Resolution, but the hon. junior member for St. Peter referred to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph; so I believe he means me. He wants the House and the public to feel that a picture appeared on C. B.C. showing me coming from the Barbados Labour Party Headquarters in a rage. I do not know who told him so, but on the evening in question when I had to leave the Barbados Labour Party Headquarters, I did not see any cameraman or anybody at all, and I am happy to say that when I left the Barbados Labour Party Headquarters, I left in M-442, and the car that I got in as shown on the T.V. screen - because I was watching T.V. myself - was O-438. If the camera can change things like that, I would have to believe the hon. junior member for St. Peter. If the camera can change M-442 to O-438 and change the place where the picture was taken to the Barbados Labour Party Headquarters, then it is so; but I am sure that on the evening in question the hon. senior member for Christ Church followed me out of the building and we talked in the yard for a short while before I left, and the camera should therefore have taken him too. I am saying, Sir, that the members of the Barbados Labour Party are going to find themselves pregnant and they are going to carry the child for two years instead of nine months, and, whenever they deliver, it will be a 'Boy Child'. Why should the hon. member say that the picture was taken to make people believe that I left in disgust? I say here and now that it is false. If the picture had the Barbados Labour Party Headquarters in it, then the picture is lying, because how could it show the Barbados Labour Party Headquarters with me getting into the car when it was not so? I left the yard in M-442 and the hon. senior member for Christ Church was there. The picture I saw showed me getting into O-438. (Asides)

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Hon. members not addressing the Chair.

Mr. SMITH:

I noticed in the picture when I was getting into the car, but I did not see the Barbados Labour Party Headquarters. I would have to see it for myself, because where it was taken was nowhere there. If they wanted me to go back there, I would not go. I would prefer them to carry me back there in a coffin. From the treatment I have received there and they asked me to go back there for my fortune, I would say "no". The pet word of the hon. junior member for St. Peter is "murderer" and that kind of thing, but if that particular picture showed the Barbados Labour Party Headquarters, it would have to be taken without me, because it happened in the afternoon and not at the night. I cannot believe that the picture showed the Barbados Labour Party Headquarters. However, all I have done is to resign, and a man has to leave his wife and home for peace and allow another man to go in the same home and live, and he still has to maintain his wife and the man for peace! Do you mean you cannot resign from a Party? It was my intention to resign from the House also, but I changed my mind because they are not going to get away with murder. They are not going to get an easy seat if they want it; they have to fight for it and I will fight and hit hard. I will beat Blanche Smith if she wants to 'unfair' me. I am not a robber; I am not dishonest to my people. I love my people and they love me. Mr. Chairman, I will go no further at this moment.

Mr. St. JOHN:

Mr. Chairman, this gives me a good opportunity to deal with this matter. I did not intend to intervene in it at all because I did not like dealing with these issues in here. I like to deal with them outside because I can characterise the conduct of C.B.C. and all who are concerned in it as a typical example of journalistic dishonesty and moral degradation. It only illustrates once again the degeneracy into which this country has fallen, and as far as journals and the media of information are concerned, they have sunk as low as a gutter in which the sewer flows. That is what C.B.C. is operating at now, because here is the hon. senior member for Bridgetown saying on the floor of this House that he saw a picture in relation to the Barbados Labour Party headquarters. What the hon. senior member for St. Joseph said is perfectly correct because I was present on the afternoon. I can go further and say that Mr. Mapp came downstairs and we were downstairs for some considerable time and there were no cameras; but the skunks, those journalistic dogs at C.B.C. could use that with the feeling that in so doing they are promoting the interest of the Government, trying indirectly to promote disharmony. 12.50 p.m.

Those skunks, those dirty dogs at C.B.C., those journalistic dogs at C.B.C. could use that, aided and abetted no doubt by the feeling that in so doing they are promoting the interest of the Government and trying indirectly to promote disharmony. Defend that; I challenge the hon. Leader of the House to get up and defend that. Before we go any further in this debate we should have immediately a Statement from the Leader of the House that investigations will be 'immediately carried out, or we do not vote for this today because this is moral nastiness, moral corruption, intellectual fraud; and we cannot sit down here and debate intellectual fraud by a medium which costs the taxpayers of this country a large amount of money, a medium which people look up to as a purveyor of truth and honesty. In no part of the world would any person who participated in its production be able to continue to work and draw one cent of the taxpayers' money before an investigation was carried out. We are dealing with the fundamental things of human living - principles of truth and honesty; and the whole of Barbados is now saturated with the belief that truth and honesty are no longer important. We are not voting on this at all today. No vote can be taken on this debate today until the hon. Leader of the House assures this House that an investigation will be carried out into this false production that has been challenged here in this House. The hon. member involved said that he was not present at any time, and that nobody took his picture with the background of the Barbados Labour Party headquarters, and yet it is going to be represented like that. Are we going to have nothing from the other side? I will sit and listen to the Leader of the House; and if he does not undertake immediately in this House to cause an investigation to be carried out-I do not care that the Minister is in the Other Place; his place is in here and I will not be a party to a medium that draws the taxpayers' money being a participant of any fraud of any kind, whether it is done by representation or not. The truth must come out; so let us deal with that straight. Either we have that assurance now or this debate will go on.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member who has just sat down happened to have mentioned my name, but I said I did not see a picture with the Barbados Labour Party headquarters. It came showing the "O" car in front; it came showing the member in a very disgusted manner, and someone said to me that 'Smithie like he was catching a fit'. But I will tell you something that I happened to know. The people responsible

for the news at C.B.C. got on to Mr. Smith - and I will challenge him on the floor of this House to deny this. The very day that this happened they got in touch with him and he told them not to bring anything about it because he was giving the Party until the end of the month to make up and apologise, I saw that night and I heard my friend, the Minister of Communications, say that cameras cannot lie; but I suppose the Leader of the House will remind him of the picture taken of Princess Margaret in a bathing suit, and that it was discovered that she had never been there in any bathing suit and that they had a big thing in England about it.

I saw this picture. But the trouble about that is when a Government is in power it is there to govern, and I personally expect them to have more to say on the news media such as the television and radio than the Opposition. That is normal, and if the Opposition were in power I would expect them to have more say; but I do not expect them to be lying. I expect the Government of the Prime Minister to have more to say, not all the say, but more say, than the Leader of the Opposition; this happens all over the world; but you do not expect the staffs of these news media to disrespect or to care nothing about the members of the Opposition. If they are told some thing by the Opposition, they do not mention it during their news broadcasts, and C.B.C. cares so much about the reports of this House, or about what happens in this House, that they will get the news second hand outside and then bring it on the radio. If you would read today's report or listen to the report from Guyana on the Radio, you will find that that news media of Guyana reported Cheddi Jagan's criticism of Mr. Burnham, but nevertheless they brought it. All that he has said about the Republic they brought on the radio, but that does not make any difference, Mr. Burnham goes ahead with the Republic; but it is good for democracy in any case that all sides must be taken.

I want to say this. The bulk of corruption that goes on at C.B.C. is something that will stun you; it is not right; they just do not care. As far as they are concerned, there is no Opposition at all in the House of Assembly. Nobody is asking them to say anything that is libellous or that can bring a charge against C.B.C., because we say some things inhere that they could not possibly bring on C.B.C., on radio or on television; but there axe also genuine, normal criticisms that they could report even if you say Mr. St. John said so-and-so, Mr. Mottley said so-and-so, Mr. Hinds said so-and-so. But they just do not care; they think this belongs to the Government and they do nothing about it. As a matter of fact, I would say something here, and that is that I am afraid that there is a lot wrong. You will notice that here in Barbados when they are selecting people for "What's My Line" and other programmes, everybody in this country are aware of what they are doing; how could you expect. to be treated if the Opposition were the Government? I would say the same thing if the Opposition were the Government; there is a nasty crowd at C.B.C., a stinking crowd at C. B. C., a worthless crowd at C. B. C. and the trouble you have at C.B.C. is that they just feel that they must do nothing at all, or say nothing at all in the interest of the Opposition. I saw this picture, and I knew then that picture was a hoax, I knew then that this picture was not taken; I knew then that the car was the wrong car, because I had had information that the hon. member for St. Joseph politely got up, walked out, got in his car and went away, that there were no people there, and that he was not in this rage as people are saying he was.

1.00 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply and the postponement of one, and to 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.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until a quarter past two.

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.

On resumption.

QUESTION TIME

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Question Time be now taken.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am informed that the answers are ready to No. 26, which stands in the name of the hon. and learned member for St. Thomas, and this is on page 4, right hand column.

COURT STATIONERY OUTSTANDING AT GOVERNMENT PRINTERY

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister -

1. Is the Government aware that requisitions for Books of Record and other important Court Stationery have been outstanding for over a year at the Government Printery; and that as a result certain Clerks of Magistrates' Courts have been unable to enter Civil cases for summons or hearing?

2. Is the Government further aware that members of the public have suffered delay and inconvenience due to the conditions set out in paragraph 1?

3. Will the Government treat as a matter of urgency the printing of the outstanding work required for the efficient functioning of Magistrates' Courts?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, there plies are as follows

1. Yes, Sir. When the requisition was made, the coded numbers and specimens that accompany such orders were not submitted until several months later, and action at the Government Printery was held up until the required information was given. This situation has now been remedied.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

Can you tell us what were the accounts that were not submitted?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, not accounts, but the specimens and coded numbers that accompany such orders were not submitted until several months after.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

What steps were taken to discipline the members of the staff of the Magistrates' Court?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, this I cannot say, but I believe that if complaints had been made and drawn to the attention of the Chief Establishments Officer, or some such person, or the Public Service Commission, it would be dealt with. While I am on my feet, may I, for the information of the House, just amplify what I said. This is, apparently, the procedure which ought to be followed. When an order is placed, reference numbers and registers of books and records should be submitted, and the form should carry a coded number so that it can be identified. In this requisition of 10th February, 1969, several of the items ordered did not have the required information, and repeated requests of the Acting Clerk were not complied with until these Questions were filed in the House of Assembly. It would appear as if the Printery, on several occasions got on to the people responsible? but they did not reply to the Printery until the hon. member asked these Questions.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, is the Minister aware that the greatest lack was, in fact, in books of civil records in respect of which it is highly possible, to say the least, that the Government Printery had never printed them before since they had no coded number? These books run for many, many years at a time. I am sure, in respect of the district that covers the constituency which is represented by Your Honour and the hon. junior member...

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am afraid the Question is becoming somewhat vague and indistinct.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, is it possible that there could be no code number referring to the civil books of records, since in the constituency which Your Honour and the Leader of the House represent, where the principal lack was said to be, the old books of record pre-dated the Government Printery?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

That is possible.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, would the Minister say what sort of answer it is that says you could not print it because there was no coded number, if the item concerned could not have had a coded number since it was never printed before?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Perhaps they did not have that in mind when they submitted the answer. 2.25 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

If the hon. member wishes to tell me this, I am in no position to dispute it.

QUESTION re UNAVAILABILITY OF PRINTED SUMMONSES

Mr. SPEAKER:

Question No. 41 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if my Order Paper is wrong or something, but it does not appear as if this is my Question. It was tabled in " August, 1969, which is long enough that I could have forgotten, but I do not think this Question concerns me.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am having a check made.

Mr. SMITH:

This sounds more like a lawyer and I do not hang around the Courts to know what is happening. Anyhow, I will ask the Question. It reads as follows-

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Is the Minister aware that complaints which have been lodged in the Domestic and other Magistrates' Courts of this Island cannot be further proceeded with due to the unavailability of printed summonses to be served on Defendants in such cases?

2. Will the Minister see to it that such forms are made available from the Government Printing Office without delay?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, these two Questions were taken together and the Reply to No. 41 is the same as the Reply to No. 26. For the hon. member's benefit, I will Just repeat that Reply. It is as follows-

"1. Yes, Sir, when the requisition was made the code numbers and specimens that accompany such orders were not submitted until several months later and action at the Government Printery was held up until the required information was given. The situation has now been remedied."

QUESTION re OUTPATIENTS AT QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

Mr. SPEAKER:

Question No. 55 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, the Question re ads as follows-

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Is the Minister aware that Out-patients at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital have to wait long hours sometimes from ten or eleven o'clock in the morning until night before receiving attention; and in some cases have to go back without medical attention?

If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Minister state the reason for such neglect, and what he intends to do to alleviate this hardship?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, there ply is as follows-

"1. No, Sir. 2. Does not arise."

Mr. SMITH:

As a supplementary, does the Minister think this Question was asked in a manner to cause him to give such a reply?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I think one point has to be clarified at this stage. I want to bring to the attention of the House the great differential which exists between Outpatients and Casualty cases. The question is based on Outpatients and not Casualty patients. The term "Out-patients" is used in connection with persons attending a specialised clinic who are notified of the days and times on which they should attend for treatment or examination, and every effort is made to avoid requesting attendance of numbers in excess of those which can be handled at the time stipulated. They are told when to come and are treated within three hours on an average. Now this is what the Chairman of the Medical Staff Committee ' said "I feel sure that no Outpatient has to wait more than three hours to be seen, and, that all Outpatients are in general seen before the end of the session for which they have on appointment. Occasionally cases arise where old notes cannot be obtained and patients are then referred until another day."

.All I am trying to point out to the House is that there is a marked differential between Outpatients and Casualty patients. If they are Casualty, say, "Casualty"; if they are Outpatients, say "Outpatients". If it is a conglomeration of Outpatient sand Casualty, that is a different matter. The Question was put specifically and I have given a specific reply dealing with Outpatients, not with Casualty.

Mr. SMITH:

Is the Minister really serious? Can he tell me that Eileen Boyce of Hothersal Turning went to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital as an Outpatient at 10 o'clock in the morning and did not get back home until 9.30 at the night? Would the Minister state if that is true or not?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

The whole question is whether she is an Outpatient as such. Does she fall within that definition or was she a Casualty patient or a conglomeration of both? My advice is that the term "Outpatient" is used in connection with persons attending a specialised clinic who are advised what days and time on which they should attend for treatment or examination. Every effort is made to avoid requesting attendance of numbers in excess of those which can be handled at the time stipulated. Now the hon. member may probably want to get some more information. I will mention this, Mr. Speaker. During the months of May and June, 1969, the total number of Outpatients and general practitioners' referrals amounted in May to 9, 558 and in June, 12, 463. Of those the greater number represented Casualty cases as follows In May, 5, 167 and in June, 7, 896. 2.35 p.m.

Since the report of the Casualties, which include general practitioners' referrals, is obviously greater by day than it is by night, it must be assumed that the day rate is at least twice that of the night, and an equivalent of 16 hours' night is equal to 8 hours' day, roughly. All I am trying to say is: is it a fact that the case to which the hon. member referred is a genuine Out-patient's case, or is it a Casualty case? We here in the Assembly talk about cases going to the Casualty section as Casualties; but owing to the fact that there is free medicine at the Hospital, and owing to the fact that it has more modern equipment than the Out-patient clinics island-wide, the tendency has been that, the majority of people who are sick or who need some medical assistance go to the Hospital. But I am trying to point out for the third time that there is a differentiation between Outpatients as such, and Casualties as such. We have plans which will soon be implemented in order to take care of the same difficulty which many do experience; we have plans for erecting an Outpatients clinic outside the Queen Elizabeth Hospital in order to deal with Out-patient cases as such, so that there will be a marked differentiation, a physical line drawn between Out-patients and Casualties. This must be brought home clearly to the public and to the hon. members here.

We have money voted for this purpose, and the Out-patients clinic which operated in some way at the Town Hall, but not satisfactory to our standards - but a new Outpatients clinic and laboratory is going to be set up shortly in a separate and distinct building outside, , or in the curtilage of, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital to deal specifically with Out-patient cases. This matter is being looked into, and I think that in the foreseeable future we will have a better system and better attention for the Out-patients, and the Casualty cases will get more direct attention and treatment than they are getting at present. I want to bring this to the House for the fourth time that there Is a marked differentiation between Out-patients and Casualties,

Mr. HINDS:

Will the Minister tell us if there is only one Out-patients clinic at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

As far as I am aware, there is more than one clinic.

Mr. HINDS:

That being so, to which Outpatients clinic did his replies refer?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I have attempted to draw to the attention of the House the distinction between Outpatient cases and Casualty cases. I will read what the Chairman of the Medical Staff Committee said "I feel sure that no Outpatient has to wait more than three hours to be seen, and that all Outpatients are in general seen

before the end of the session for which they have an appointment. Occasional cases arise where old notes cannot be obtained, and patients are then deferred until another day." You will see that in the Development Plan which we will get shortly, arrangements are being made to have a better statistical service and a better Records Staff in order to trace these cases, and to be able to handle them more efficiently and have more staff to deal with them. There are several other trial procedures which are proposed in order to have a more efficient service throughout. The first proposal is the separation of patients from the family, etc. attending with them; the second is separation and identification of patients who have been seen by the doctor and who are required to wait for various medical reasons, and those not yet seen by the doctor; the third proposal is to strengthen the Records Office staff to provide more efficient handling of patients; the fourth, the introduction of a 24-hour records service for dealing with Casualty cases; the fifth, to strengthen the medical procedures and organisation in the Casualty; so these matters have all been gone into. But I can assure hon. members of the House that with the building and construction of this Out-patients clinic and new laboratory which will take over the work done at Enmore Health Centre, it will be possible to draw the line of demarcation, and Outpatients will be dealt with in that building, separate and distinct from the Hospital compound, and the Casualties will be dealt with as at present. There will be no inter-mixture, and there will be clear-cut cases; the free medicine which is provided at present at the Hospital will continue to be provided, because - again I repeat - the very fact we have that very big, expensive and well-equipped Hospital - one of the best in the British Caribbean, in spite of criticism cast here from time to time - the fact remains that it provides a very good service, and it sort of catches the imagination of all the people island-wide, and even those from overseas. They all go there and ignore the Outpatients clinic in the various parishes, and it is always bogged down with people every day in every year.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, all I ask the Hon. Minister is this. He says there is more than one Outpatients clinic; I have asked the Minister which clinic did he investigate in relation to the Questions asked.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the Question is a general question; it is not a specific question referring to any particular patient as was mentioned by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. The question reads

Is the Minister aware that out-patients at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital have to wait long hours sometimes from ten or eleven o'clock in the morning until at night before receiving attention; and in some cases have to go back without medical attention?

If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Minister state the reason for such neglect, and what he intends to do to alleviate this hardship?

So this is a general question, and for you to ask me which particular Out-patients clinic was investigated, I cannot tell you off this file because the whole question of the Out-patients clinic was investigated.

Mr. HINDS:

Will the Minister tell us if he investigated the Out-patients clinic in respect of diabetics?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, these Questions were asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, and they were investigated by all of the people who really run the Hospital and who are deeply involved; so that if the hon. member wants to ask something about a diabetic clinic - I suppose it is relevant to what we are discussing - but I will say this; he only wants to pull me out, but I have been here too long - 22 years; I will probably pacify him and give him something to hold on to.

2.45 p.m.

As far as diabetics are concerned, I had the opportunity, thanks to the hon. senior member for the City who made representations, and also I had the opportunity only recently to investigate diabetic patients in particular and the role of the Dietitian at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital mainly. I must say at the outset that although good points had been made by the hon. senior member for the City, he dealt with it not on a personal basis, but generally affecting the public at large. It is a good thing it did happen, because many thousands will stand to benefit as a result of his representations.

The position is simply this: to my mind, speaking as a layman, I would feel, at this stage, that although we have made a start in providing and securing the services of Dietitians as such, yet we have only started to scratch the mere surface. We need not only two Dietitians at a big hospital with 650 beds. We need about four Dietitians, about three or four highly trained men as Chefs, and a good Caterer.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, Sir. I wonder whether the Minister is thinking in terms of execution?

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am afraid there is no possible point of order, and likewise I would like to point out to hon. members that we are going somewhat far a field, and there may be other Questions, not supplementary, which would elicit the information sought. The Question which we have is merely whether the Minister is aware that Out-patients at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital have to wait long hours sometimes from ten o'clock in the morning before receiving attention, and in some cases until 9.30 p.m., or whatever the time is, before they receive attention. That is really the Question. I think we are going rather far a field but, perhaps, the Minister is allowing himself to be led away - I would not say 'astray'.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I cannot remember if the Minister gave me the answer to No. 2. "If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Minister state the reason for such neglect, and what he intends to do to alleviate this hardship?"

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, there has been so much discussion that probably the hon. member must have forgotten what the replies were. The reply to No. 1 was "No, Sir"; 2. It does not arise. There is no further explanation. If the answer were "Yes" in the first instance, the supplementary would be quite in order.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, in the light of the information the senior member for St. Joseph has offered, is the hon. Minister still saying that the reply to Question No.2 does not arise?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, again, for the third time I will have to read what the Chairman of the Medical Staff Committee said -

"I feel sure that no Outpatient has to wait more than three hours to be seen, and that all Outpatients are in general seen before the end of the session for which they have an appointment. Occasionally cases arise where old notes cannot be obtained, and patients are then deferred until another day."

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, since No. 2 does not arise, what steps would the Minister take if I can bring this lady to prove that it did arise?

Mr. SPEAKER:

Where would the hon. member propose to bring the lady?

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, at his office, or at the office at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member cares to ask a substantive Question and refer to the specific case, I would have the matter investigated, with the assistance of the hon. member, at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and at the Ministry in order to find out if the lady has been inconvenienced and has suffered from neglect, as has been suggested here. This Reply deals with a general case, and it does not deal with a specific case. The hon. member can ask a substantive Question; mention her name and the date, etc., and I will have it investigated and bring back the answer here.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what steps would he take against that officer, if I can prove my case. What steps would the Minister take against this particular officer, if it is proved that he misled him? I would like to know what would happen; otherwise I would not give myself all of that trouble. I would not give myself all of that trouble, unless he was going to sack, or penalise, the officer.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am afraid that what action would be taken against the officer if the case was proven does not arise, in my view, as a supplementary.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, has it occurred to the Minister that having to read a statement by an officer which states-

"I feel sure that no Outpatient....."

Is the Minister satisfied that that is a statement coming from an officer who has carried out an investigation and is in a position to advise him? I am certain that no such situation could arise.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I cannot do any more.

Mr. SPEAKER:

There are no more Questions to which, according to my information, answers have been laid.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, Question No. 28 which Your Honour directed should stay on the Order Paper from the 25th November, 1969. Since I have got the information as set out in the original answer and other information as well which I had questioned the Leader of the House about personally, I would not now seek to have the Question kept on the Order Paper for the purpose of supplementaries. I would respectfully suggest to Your Honour that the Clerk of the House may remove it therefrom, if the House agrees.

Mr. SPEAKER:

If the Questioner sees no reason for it to remain on the Order Paper and no member of the House indicates that he thinks differently, I hereby direct that this Question does not re-appear on the Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Private Members' Business be now taken.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Mr. St. JOHN:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item 11 be the first Order under Private Members' Business.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I beg to second that.

2.55 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Order No. 11 stands in the name of the hon. and learned Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. J . M. G. M. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I am asking for leave to take charge of this Resolution in the absence of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph who is prevented by illness from attending this debate.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am sure that all hon. members will share the regret of the Chair on learning that the hon. and learned Leader of the Opposition is at the moment indisposed, and we trust he will soon completely recover. Would the hon. and learned member for St. Thomas kindly convey that to the hon. and learned Leader of the Opposition?

The hon. and learned member for St. Thomas is asking leave to take charge of the Resolution which stands in the name of the hon. and learned Leader of the Opposition, and if there is no objection, leave is granted the hon. and learned member for St. Thomas to move a Resolution as follows:

"RESOLVED that this House note the Development Plan laid in the House on 13th January, 1970, and strongly condemn its failure to cope adequately with problems of inflation, banking and finance; the problem of the agricultural industry and fisheries; the problem of land utilisation; tourism; housing and social amenities; and education; and accordingly call upon the Government to review the Plan

immediately to make adequate provision for these problems."

The hon., and learned member for St. Thomas may now proceed.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, the honour of moving this Resolution falls upon me somewhat unexpectedly, but perhaps not so unexpectedly as the quality of the audience whom one may reasonably expect to be listening today. From time to time, Sir, we have Estimates presented in this House, and the Estimates are often distinguished by the absence of the Minister of Finance. Similarly upon this occasion the Development Plan is distinguished by the absence of the Minister for Development. In so far as it is distinguished by the presence of certain persons to whose actual presence I cannot draw attention, I would just remark that at some stage earlier when it was observed soon after the adjournment for luncheon, that it seemed that a certain quality of advice would be available to Ministers not normally available at such close hand, the remark was made "Here comes the real Government of the country" and it is a sad commentary on eight years of Democratic Labour Party rule that we should have degenerated to the same conditions that the hon. senior member for St. John, as he then was - or Junior perhaps - and the hon. junior member for St. Lucy should have castigated and attacked during earlier election campaigns when they characterised the Barbados Labour Party Government as being a Government by Civil Servants. But, Sir, anyone reading this Development Plan and observing the turgidity of the prose in the introductory remarks, the words which even Senator Frank Walcott would hesitate to use on a political platform such as "a disaggregated planning framework" - words which I am sure the hon. junior member for St. Thomas in his indefatigable search for four-letter animals to fit Cross Word puzzles would be unable to find.....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I do not look for four-letter words; I look for three-letter ones T-O-M.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

I am sorry the hon. junior member for St. Thomas has such an unfortunate position.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

In as much as there is no point of order, the hon. member should now continue to proceed with his address.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

There are many words here in this Development Plan which I do not believe the dictionary available to the hon. junior member for St. Thomas can assist us with. We are also told in the Plan that Barbados is one of the small Islands forming an archipelago in the Caribbean Sea. It is situated 59 37' west of Greenwich, most of the in-inhabitants are of African origin, and that the discovery of the New World set the stage for the settlement of Barbados.

If we are going to have a Development Plan, let us have a Development Plan that sets out the objectives of the Government over a particular development period sensibly and in a form in which we can appreciate them, and not buried in the midst of nearly 200 pages of prose which the persons to whom this Development Plan is addressed should all have seen before. I think that everybody who is interested in Barbados would know that it is in the Caribbean Sea and that it has a population most of whom are of African origin. Let us have a Development Plan which is not a travelogue or a tourist document; let us have a Development Plan that is better set out and does not refer you to Table II on page 31 that comes after Table Von page 12. These may seem only to be mechanistic criticisms, but, Sir, they are made on this side not for the sake of poking fun at any individual Civil Servant from the Ministry of Finance or the Planning Unit; they are made on this side because we want persons responsible for documents such as these to understand that they should be written in English that people can read and appreciate; they should be set out in a form that interested persons can understand and analyse; they should not be written by Civil Servants for Civil Servants in the Government Printery to have a great deal of work that gives rise to the sort of complaints you hear against it from time to time. It is no wonder that the last two Economic Surveys have come to this House too late to give any assistance in considering the Budget being presented by the Prime Minister if the approach to planning, the approach to statistics and the approach which producing this document requires for purposes such as this is the approach that we see in this document.

I have never found, and I say this quite deliberately, officials of the Ministry of Finance particularly helpful when it comes to the giving of information. Let me tell them right away that the Minister of Finance is not some ivory tower set above all of the Ministers and set above them, if possible. The Ministry of Finance is the central Ministry of a Government. Democracy means participation in Government, not only by members of the Government and members of the Opposition who are members of Parliament; it means participation by thinking persons in the democratic process. This is not a country, Sir, where the "ins" alone are in and the "outs" are out in utter darkness until they happen to be in. This is what the Democratic Labour Party has been trying to make of Barbados. One of the things the Civil Service should try to make of Government in Barbados is an understanding that there are persons of goodwill, interest and thought on both sides of the House, that the Opposition has a contribution to

make not only in opposition by way of criticism, but in the expectation that some day they will be the Government, and therefore they have to act responsibly at a certain stage when they are yet in Opposition. 3.05 p.m.

We cannot do this if we find ourselves obstructed, treated as pariahs with whom close association on the part of Civil Servants will result in some pressure of some sort of another on the Civil Servants themselves. I would like to exempt one or two Departments of Government from this general stricture; there are Departments of Government into which one can go, where one's motives are not questioned, where one can ask a question and get an answer, and where one gets an answer openly, not where one perhaps is told: "Well, let me tell you something. These are the facts; but if you use them in the House of Assembly, for God's sake, do not say you got them from me or say anything to indicate that they came from the Ministry." I will draw to the attention of every Head of Department of the Government of Barbados the statement made by the Leader of the House that every member of this House has a right to enter a Civil Service Department and engage persons responsible during normal working hours, I think he said, with questions which properly relate to their activities and to the member's position. I would draw this to the attention of Civil Servants; I hope that I will never again have the experience I once had before on a Budget debate of ringing the Financial Secretary and asking for information on a Local Loan and being rebuffed with what I considered the minimum of politeness.

Now, Sir, the Plan itself. I have heard the comment that all we really need to know about the Plan is contained in the last six pages - the Appendix, which is the summary of proposed Capital Expenditure - and I must say that I have found it easier to work with those six pages in examining the Plan than to work with the previous 170 which discuss it. I have already selected passages from the Plan

- I am not going to read out pages and pages at length

- but the substance of, for example, the agricultural section - to choose a page which I opened - half of it deals with current projected projects (which, perhaps, is proper), but half of it merely describes the work being done by the Ministry of Agriculture; this is material more suitable, perhaps, for a Department's Annual Report. What can you look at in this Plan and actually find out there from the Government intends to do on agriculture in this forthcoming period? We see that Soil Conservation is again the largest single item; I suppose that if you look at Appendix you will look at the Farming Incentive Scheme and try to analyse that. You will read in vain

- you will look in vain for any discussion on the Barbados Marketing Corporation, one of the projects of both Governments - not of the Democratic Labour Party regime alone - which has given the public

the greatest possible disquiet; all that we see here is that the main instrument of the Government's agricultural marketing policy is the Barbados Marketing Corporation. No suggestion is here that the Barbados Marketing Corporation is at the moment being shaken to its very roots by what we hear rumoured - I can go no further than that - is the prospective ending of the shrimp arrangements. Perhaps we will hear about this when a solution has been worked out and patched up, after the notice given to the shrimp fleet to vacate its premises at the Barbados Marketing Corporation at the end of this month has been withdrawn - or whatever, after this dispute has been patched up, we will hear about it; but all we are given in the Development Plan is a series of platitudes and descriptions of what the Barbados Marketing Corporation has done in the past and what it is intended to do - almost a paraphrase of the Barbados Marketing Corporation Act, 1961, with a few descriptions of some of the schemes which are being planned. "It is therefore intended that a new grading, packing and storage shed should be erected by the B.M.C. on a site yet to be determined". Is that planning, Sir, when in fact, for all I know, a great deal of storage space may soon become available at the Barbados Marketing Corporation, more storage space than it needs for any operation it is now embarking on at the present time? That is for all I know, but I may be ignorant; you never hear these things in the House of Assembly. Announcements are made, about major items of Government activity over television and radio; we never hear them in the House of Assembly unless we tried to raise them ourselves, having scratched and picked them up, at some previous stage.

I want to talk about the whole approach that this Government has been making to planning. One thing that this Plan does set out is the history of planning in Barbados; the first sketch Plan was published in 1946; it was the ten year sketch Plan. There was a Five Year Plan published by the first of the great Barbados Labour Party Governments in 1951-52; there was another Plan 1955-60, and there was a third of the great Democratic Labour Party Plans 1962-65 which included some of the earlier projects. It is put in a somewhat strange way in this Plan; then there was a 1965-68 Plan; then Barbados apparently got along without Plans for a year, and now there is this Plan in 1969-72 which appears in the year 1970, and which is being discussed in the year 1970. What is the great characteristic of all this Government's Plan, this Plan by an economist? His greatest characteristic is that he always talks about more than he can do. These Plans have been enormously, wickedly puffed up with the connivance of the responsible Departments. Far from any axe being applied to the Estimates as is applied to the Estimates of Current Expenditure, where it comes to the Estimates of Capital Expenditure we get such a situation as in 1965-66 where a total of \$18.9 million of projected expenditure was presented to this House, while actual expenditure was \$10 million - a little more than half. The following year, the Government came nearest to its projections - \$12 1/2 million projected \$11 1/2 million spent; but how was that achieved? That was achieved by mismanagement in the building of the Hilton Hotel; that was achieved by the corruption in the building of the Hilton Hotel; that was achieved by the shock the Barbados public had at hearing that its health needs were no more important in terms of money than the needs of the pocket of Mr. Conrad Hilton and those who operate the Hotel, because after all the Hilton Hotel and the Hospital cost roughly the same thing. 3.15 p.m.

Sir, my colleague, the hon. senior member for Christ Church, is correcting me; he is telling me that the Hilton Hotel cost more, despite the fact that the Hospital has to be equipped with surgical and other

equipment for the purpose of saving the lives of Barbadians. It deems that the recreation of those North Americans who can pay \$40.00 or \$50.00 (U.S.) a day or whatever the current rates are. Sir, is more important than the health needs of Barbadians, but that is how the money spent at that time was in fact spent.

Now, the following year \$12 1/2 million was projected, and \$8.5 million was spent. In 1967-68, \$9.7 million was projected and \$8.5 million was spent. Even although they had brought down projected Capital Expenditure of half of what it was in the Election year 1966 they were still unable to spend that. Is this not the negation of planning? Is this not making it obvious that the Government puts into its plans projects intended to impress those portions of an electorate gullible enough to be taken in by them, but that the Government has and had no real intention, or consideration, that it could have spend the volume of money voted for in the first place?

Sir, in the four years including the year for which there was no Plan, from 1965-69, \$39 million of Capital Expenditure was actually incurred in the development of this Island. The three years covered by the three-year Plan of 1965-68, were in fact, projected; so that the Government failed to spend in four years what it had hoped to spend in three, and the last of those years was the year in which the full Impact of devaluation was felt and, therefore, one might think that there was some inflation in cost over and above what had been expected at the time of estimates.

I am not one of those who believes that spending money is the only criterion of Government activity. I hear the Minister of Finance, from time to time, say that the Barbados Labour Party Government was spending, say, \$30 million, and his Government is spending, say, \$60 million. I do not believe that that is the only measure of progress in a country. It is our taxes that have to pay that \$60 million. I do not accept either, when you tell, at a public meeting, the Minister of Finance that the cost of living is rising that he is right in telling you: "All right, you have more money in your pockets, " because that is making inflation into an instrument of policy. That is exactly what inflation is all about. It means that when prices go up, you arrange for wages to rise to keep pace, or keep a little in front of them.

Sir, the entire world is on an upward incline, economically, at the present time. In Barbados the compounded rise in Gross Domestic Product over the particular period under review - seven or eight years - is 5 per cent, and this is not so bad. It is not as good as Trinidad's which is exactly twice, but it is not so bad. We might argue that in Barbados, at least until lopsided tourist development came along, we were distributing our money, perhaps, better than the Jamaicans and Trinidadians. It is not a bad rate of growth, and with a rate of growth like that, the goods that people can buy - people's real income is going to go up. There is no need to cut into it, Sir, by allowing a runaway inflation, and by adopting an attitude of Government that inflation is something you simply cannot stop in Barbados.

I have spoken in the House recently on this point, and I am not going to detain members with a long recapitulation of my arguments; but I do not think that we can too often refute the argument advanced by the Prime Minister that because we are an importing economy, therefore, we must expect inflation. Your Honour will certainly remember his strictures against the army of occupation, the Civil Servants, whom he likened to the troops that Napoleon occupied Europe with in the days of Ms sojourn in those northern parts, living off the local population selfishly, without regard for their real needs and aspirations. Your Honour will recall that he said that if the cost of living goes up, it is because he had to give a raise to the Civil Servants, and that this raise to the Civil Servants is responsible for things costing more because the money is chasing the goods.

Sir, my arguments on an earlier occasion were that no amount of money that you put in the pockets of Civil Servants in Barbados is going to more the motor car manufacturers in Coventry, or Birmingham, put one cent more on the price of their motor cars; but it may make the local agents in Bridgetown do it. It is not going to more the landed cost of certain goods in Barbados go up in price. To come from motor cars to the food of the people, it is not going to increase the price of rice, the price of imported meat or chicken, and so on. It should not increase those things, the very reason being that we import them. In the some way that we are totally unprotected against inflation in the Northern countries and against inflationary conditions in the countries that supply us with goods, similarly, we are protected against price inflation caused by wages inflation in Barbados. Sir, Barbados is too small for a wage inflation, which has undoubtedly incurred with Civil Service increases, to have the effect on the cost of living that this Government has allowed it to have.

I am not associating myself, Sir, with all of the strictures of the Prime Minister against these Civil Servants. I have no idea who the Civil Servant was who, the Prime Minister said, used to work next to him as a \$10.00-a-month clerk before the war, and ' now that man wants \$250 a month for the privilege of, living in his own house. I do not know which Permanent Secretary it was, and I hope that I would never associate myself with, or find my self having to make such remarks. But I will say that we on this side have to go a little of the way with him when he says that the cost of Government is going up more than Government is worth.

Sir, although this has been the Prime Minister's stand, this has been his record, this has been his attitude since I have been in the House, at any rate, yet, what has he done about it? Has there ever been any thought of having a smaller number of better-paid Civil Servants? Every few months we have Civil Establishment Orders. A workload comes into a Department; the present staff of the Department cannot cope with it; they get acting officers; they get pressure to make the acting officers permanent; those promoted like the taste of higher office, and those who come into the Service do not want ever to leave it again. A certain number of them are made permanent; the work goes out of the Civil Service Department, and the officers are still kept on the re.

I would suggest that, if the Civil Servants wish to cease to be regarded as an army of occupation, and the Prime Minister wishes to cease to have the headaches of an army of occupation, a serious look be taken at the reduction of Government costs wherever possible. Just let us try and see if we can reverse this trend. It is a trend that is universal, and there is no doubt about that. Its universality should not cause us in Barbados to say that if it is good enough for the people in England, it is good enough for us.

3.25 p.m.

I am told that the staff at the British Admiralty is something over 65,000 Civil Servants and there are no battleships to maintain, but in 1914 when there were 63 battleships, they managed to get on with 4,000 Civil Servants administering to these officers and men. In Barbados we are getting to be like this. Those experts from abroad who come down and take part in the process of the social corruption of the Prime Minister by flattery go away and tell him that he works harder than any comparable Minister in England or the United States. The Prime Minister works hard because he wishes to work hard. Barbados only has 250,000 people. I cannot believe that it takes ten Ministers to run our little country; I believe it takes ten Ministers to run the Democratic Labour Party because it has to keep everybody sweet, and the Permanent Secretaries. I want the Government to set an example at home in reducing the cost of Government. I would prefer not to see a Gross Domestic Product that goes up by its largest component being an increase of salary given to Civil Servants. I would prefer to see a smaller in number but better-paid Civil Service, and if there are Civil Servants who feel that nonsense is being talked, let them hear that wars had been won on nonsense, countries have been built on impossible dreams and Governments have succeeded on such imaginary schemes. Even right here in Barbados some of these Civil Servants must have been Civil Servants in the early days when the Barbados Labour Party was fighting to do something for the people of this Island, and they must have heard their seniors saying it was impossible ever to get adult suffrage, it was impossible to get a certain class of person in the House of Assembly and it was impossible to rule yourself. Now they are participating out of the process. The Prime Minister says that from \$10-a-month clerks to Permanent Secretary has been what they have seen in their short life-time. They have had this particular advancement; let them see if they can give the people of Barbados a little advancement in this respect.

Now, Sir, I want to say something about the specialised plans referred to in the document which we are discussing today - not the Resolution, the Development Plan. "Much of Government planning activity at present centres around the preparation of a long term Development Plan for the island. As a basis for meaningful projections in the development of integrated policies for the main sectors of the economy, studies have been prepared or are in the process of preparation in Master Plan for the Physical Development of Barbados. A comprehensive document has been prepared by the Town and Country Planning Office in conjunction with the United Nations experts and lays down guide-lines for future land-use policy in the Island. A twenty-year Plan for the development of water resources has likewise been already prepared with Pan American Health Organisation assistance, and a UNESCO Mission is

currently engaged in carrying out a comprehensive survey of the education needs of Barbados."

In other words. Sir, although this is the Development Plan 1969-72, we are told that there is a Master Plan for land use - something that has been knocking around for a long time. We are told that there is an education survey being prepared. We have seen, I think, the twenty-year Plan for the development of water resources, and we are told that the present three-year Plan therefore represents but one stage in a long term reconstruction of the economy, and then, immediately before and after that, the need to integrate social with economic planning and so on is discussed. But what real integration is there between this Plan and those Plans we have heard about? We have heard a piece of specious nonsense from the Prime Minister about not publishing the Master Plan for development because developers will see what the Government has in mind and will know where to go and buy land. I am going to say this, and again I say it quite deliberately; all the developers who want to know the axes of development contained in that Master Plan already know it. Mr. Pillersdorf and the other land racketeers form an association for the support of the Democratic Labour Party Government because it scratches their backs - and they want to scratch its back - are prepared to finance its publishing organisation and its electoral planning; they are fully aware of the provisions of the Master Plan for economic development. It is only we poor mortals in the House of Assembly who cannot see it. It is only we who cannot deal with that. That is one of the important things about planning in Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, let us take an example on roads. I am not going to deal with this in detail; other speakers on our side will discuss it. But, Sir, there is no doubt that any serious Plan for the Airport and for tourist development must indicate a road network which will allow traffic to move between the point of entry and the point of ultimate deposit. You cannot have Jumbo Jets, a doubling of tourism, a building of more hotels and apartments without overcrowding and overloading the road structure within St. Michael and Christ Church, The Master Plan may have valuable clues as to that, but we cannot see and get any idea of something like that. Even the Airport; again other speakers who speak on this side will deal with that. What does this document really tell us about the Airport? Figures are quoted; the same things are repeated that any thinking person knows about the need for expansion at the Airport. We see that there is to be a new terminal building. All these things are put there, but we cannot hear or get an idea of what the Government really intends and really wants to do about bringing Barbados into the Jumbo Jet age where the Airport is concerned.

They talk, Mr. Speaker, about education, Two thousand two hundred new places - I believe that is the figure - are to be provided in Secondary Schools; but Sir, what is there again in this document to indicate that the real problem in education today is that with the alleged free Secondary education introduced by the Government, there goes hand-in-hand the fact that a large number of school children of secondary age are not being educated free, that they have a demand for secondary education, that even if 2,200 school places kept pace with the increase in population it does not keep pace with the demand for what is a genuine free secondary education. There is no indication in this document that the Government has a serious recognition of that problem. There is a great deal of theorising which reflects no doubt the

thinking of a young theorist. "General education" and I quote "enlarges the individual's horizons and prepares him for life in society and for citizenship by providing at least elementary skills in communication and mathematics and some knowledge of the physical, biological and social world and human heritage". How does that help the poor family in Rock Hill, St. Thomas, with four or five children of secondary school age who have lacked the money to have them crammed at expensive schools, and through no fault of their own have lacked the cultural background which would allow them to answer the examination questions set at the 11- stage? How does this statement help that sort of family when they are scrambling to find \$45 or \$50 a term to send their children to the Federal High School or any of the other establishments maintained for the satisfaction of this need? 3.35 p.m.

What are they concerned about the distinction between education and training? "The distinction between education and training is essentially one of degree; education is concerned with knowledge, techniques and the development of personality factors broadly relevant for general purposes and life situations". Why do not they tell us something about education and tell us what the Government plans to do? Keep this for position papers when next the Minister, accompanied by a pack of Civil Servants, take a jaunt around the world; other people will be glad to know in other countries that Barbados has Civil Servants that can write a pretty speech, or a speech that will look pretty in print. Tell us what the Government really intends to do; where are these two Secondary Schools and the additional classrooms? Why does not the Government take hold of the problem of education and realise that it is not the vapourings of somebody who is against Sixth Forms that are important in Barbados today; the people want their children educated.

An Education Bill is soon coming down. I am neither going to attempt to steal the thunders of whoever on our side is speaking specifically on education, nor the thunders of those others who are going to be engaged on the Bill, but I will just say this. I very much hope that the Minister does not think that we will not observe that the making of the maximum age of any school child in a Government school to be 18 is not a hidden blow at Sixth Forms. I may put my sentence somewhat obliquely, but we can see that the Government is concerned at every level with promoting "cheap jack" educational theories and are not concerned with the need of the people out there in whose hands the future of Barbados lies.

Do you mean to tell me that the Minister thinks that the only problem of education in Barbados, that the only thing to which the expenditure of the people's taxes must be devoted is the Community College and its off-shoots? No, Sir; let us have something better than that from the Ministry of Education for the future.

Other members on our side will deal with tourism, but I am going to say something that I hope will not alarm hon. members on the other side of the House. I am impressed that for the first time it seems that we on this side have urged in the House about balancing tourist development and that it has at long last

begun to find the target. I daresay that some of the statements that find themselves in the Development Plan may have found themselves there over the body of Senator Peter Morgan, but leaving out Senator Morgan's plug which takes up the first two pages of the chapter, leaving out in fact nearly all of what is written in the chapter on tourism, we are happy that the Government appreciates that you can become just as much of a one-crop economy, whether the crop grows on the beach complete with bikini and rum punch, as you can where the crop grows in St. Philip and Christ Church with somebody labouring to cut it down. I am glad of that.

We urge on the Government that what may be suitable for the Bahamas, a fairly large land space with a very small number of people, a country where taxation alone is unlikely to provide the infrastructure required to give it the sort of self-respect that even small countries look for in this day and age - we are not those countries; we are just perhaps that little bit larger - I would have to ask the Economic Planning Unit to do a little survey to see which is the break-even point for size; where it comes to providing basic education roles and the like, we are just that little bit larger. I cannot remember which Development Plan it is which says that there are dangers when the number of visitors to the Island becomes as large as the number of residents, but there are obviously dangers that Senator Morgan has not recognised. Obviously. I am not going at length into that. The record of the Barbados Labour Party on tourism is quite clear; it was we who provided the first assistance for hotels and set up the Tourist Board. Our record is quite clear. We have never at any time thought of becoming a Party that is for tourism as against sugar, or against tourism and for sugar, or any other form of development; we hope we are the Party of plans, and in particular we want to relate tourism to inflation. This used to be the old excuse; I say 'excuse' because I think that in some places at any rate, tourism did go hand-in-hand with inflation. I am not saying that in Barbados it is only tourism that has caused inflation, but this is the stage at which we have to beware of it. The tourists are coming here; their effect on the economy is not only the employment that they give to the construction sector and to the service sector; their effect on inflation is not only their bidding for the local food delicacies - flying fish and fish generally and vegetables and so on - that is not the only effect. You have to remember that people come here to settle; the space in Barbados is limited; the credit of the foreigner is better than the credit of the natives; pressure is put on those resources that Barbados has least of by a population of tourists substantially rich than us. I hope the Government is seriously bearing this in mind when it speaks of its Plan for tourism. At some stage the tourist industry too is going to have to carry a bigger share of the burden of taxation in Barbados; at some stage it has to be done. They carry a burden on taxation now - mainly an indirect taxation - on the food eaten by the tourists, and some of the goods they purchase, deliberately restricting it, because the industry does not even have to carry the burden of indirect taxation on beds, air conditioners and refrigerators and the amenities of life which the tourists demand. 3.45 p.m.

They are carrying some of the direct taxation on food. The direct taxation on profits they do not have to pay during their holiday period, and they can get out of this by continual additions to their hotels. They build the additions whether they expect visitors or not.

Some Government in the future - and we expect it will be ours and we are prepared to face what is involved - will have to try to integrate the tourist industry not only into the economic development, but into the tax structure of Barbados. Let there be no mistake about it. The hotels are there, and the tourists are going to come. We are not proposing to tax the tourist, but we are proposing, and we are going to suggest, and we are sorry we do not see in the Plan, a more serious and determined approach to making tourism carry some of the burdens of the development of Barbados.

Sir, I really believe that a lot of the taxation that comes out of the tourist, perhaps most of it, comes from the pockets of ordinary, simple Barbadians. Nearly all of the income tax comes out of the pockets of waiters; it comes out of the pockets of a large number of construction workers that tourism has let loose on the landscape. They are the people paying income tax out of the tourist at the present time. Perhaps some of the taxi drivers are even paying income tax, but I do not know whether that is the position. I would not know about that. We have to make tourism contribute more than it does at present to the economy of this Island.

Sir, since I am talking about construction, there is another thread that runs through this Development Plan that entirely baffles me. It is obvious to anybody who knows the construction business that the stimulus of new hotel building is the reason for the construction boom in Barbados. There is new home building, but there is the stimulus of new hotel building. The Government ought to have an approach to the construction industry that would go like this: let us watch the new hotels that are being built; if there is a shrinkage in demand for new hotel space; in other words, not if tourists do not come, but if do not come in the increasing numbers that we have been expecting in the past, then there is likely to be a shrinkage in that selfsame year of new hotel construction. These things follow very closely on each other. Government should be saying "Let us balance our construction works, let us balance our programme so that we can absorb any productive capacity of the construction industry that falls off because tourism does not increase by 10 per cent in any one year" - or whatever the percentage is that the tourist operators would feel justified them in embarking on a new programme of construction.

I am sure that nobody in this House would like to see unemployment in the construction industry where such high hopes have been given to the skilled carpenters, masons and plumbers of Barbados of a high and steady level of employment over a period of years. It is something that can happen. All I can see in this Plan refers generally to construction. This construction, in our view, should be related to ameliorating some of the dreadful conditions into which housing policy in Barbados has got itself. I am not dealing with the conditions, Sir. There are other members on this side who have certainly brought a figurative tear to my eye when they tell me about how bad things are in Chapmans Lane.

Again, when we see the activities and the behaviour of the Minister of Housing in this House we cannot doubt - I am sorry he is not in his place - that his approach to the whole problem of housing is

not: "How many people can I put a roof over this year?" but it is "How many votes can I get from Orange Hill by a new housing programme, or alternatively by painting a few houses that have already been painted?" Sir, I think in saying that I put it charitably. I have never seen anything in the conduct of the Minister of Housing, since he has been the Minister, that suggests to me that he is interested in housing poor people, or rich ones, either, for that matter. It seems to me that his interest in housing is an interest in spending money, or in having money to spend - the Government's money, Sir. I think that when it was pointed out to him that he was spending some to help Mr. Peter Morgan in Christ Church North Central, that worried him. I am not so sure that he was entirely au fait with the full reason behind the development of the Silver Hill Housing Scheme. He understood that the wool was being pulled a little over his eyes, and it is noticeable that from the day he realised that, his true interest in spending money has been in spending a large quantity of money in attempting to paint Housing Authority houses in Barbados. What a racket it has been! When you tell him that he is not even painting with qualified contractors, he says "So what? Anybody can take up a brush!" Implied in that is that so long as they come from Orange Hill and St. Andrew'. Is that the way to conduct development in Barbados, Sir? Or is that an example of how to take the taxpayers' money and spend it in the worst possible conceivable way?

I am sorry about that, Sir, because there used to be a time when I saw in the Minister of Housing, before he was unceremoniously bundled out and shown the door and sent away like a puppy being whipped -before that stage when he was Minister of Agriculture, I used to think that he was seriously trying to do something within the limits of his advice and capabilities for the development of agriculture, the development of the Barbados Marketing Corporation, and so on. Since he has become Minister of Housing, I have never heard from the worst extremist of either side anything as bad as what I have seen' in the activities of the Housing Authority and the Minister of Housing. From the day when he took over when the Board was improperly constituted and he was seeking to fire people against the advice of the Attorney General; from- those days to these days when Mr. George Rogers has been getting a contract to paint houses that have already been painted, plus the other abuses connected with the Painting Programme, I have never seen a Ministry conducted with less regard for political decency and honesty than the Ministry of Housing.

I was not in the House, of course, in the days when the senior member for St. Philip conducted the Ministry of Development, when, upon his being relieved of that position, the present senior member for St. Joseph remarked that the berry tree will grow in another yard now.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, am I right in hearing the hon. member for St. Thomas? He said something about the senior member for St. Joseph saying that a berry tree was growing in another yard.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I really cannot say. I regard it as a point of order for the hon. member to enquire whether he is right in hearing.

Mr. SMITH:

Did you hear him, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER:

I was listening attentively. He made certain reference to a berry tree growing in another yard, but I did not take it to mean the yard of the hon. member.

Mr. SMITH:

I do not know anything about it, Sir. I never told the hon. senior member for St. Thomas anything like that.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, the senior member for St. Joseph can tell me that he has the Official Gazette in which the Prime Minister, or the hon. junior member for St. John as he then was, said that he only went into his house once, and on that occasion he had a pig tied to the dining room table. He has the Official Gazette with that, but he does not have the Gazette in which he said after Mr. Crawford's dismissal, that the berry tree will grow in another yard, Sir! I heard him say it. 3.55 p.m.

I am sorry if his memory seems to have been shaken by the events of the past two weeks.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am afraid we are tending to stray from the Development Plan of the three years.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

But, Sir, anyway I was not making any attack on the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. (Hon. N. W. BOXILL Are you frightened?) It is well known that I am frightened for Mm.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Hon. members not addressing the Chair, please be inaudible if they are thinking aloud.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

I walk in fear and I never call his name on a political platform. (Hon. N. W. BOXILL That is a deliberate lie.)

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let the hon. member continue. If I may say so, he was doing well whilst on the subject.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

Thank you, Sir. We hear a lot and we see a lot and are forced to say a lot about corruption, but corruption is not only corruption of actually putting the money in your pocket or your father's pocket or your friends' pocket. There is a corruption of spirit that overcomes Governments. A Government that has to buy a Minister may very well be a Government that has an attitude towards political decency. That is not the attitude which it may have had when it came into office; it is not the attitude of what is still a good old description of right thinking men and women, and more and more we are coming to believe that this Government is losing itself in the bogs of every sort of moral and political corruption. There is not any aspect of Government where members of the public do not assume automatically that political favour or financial favour or social favour are among the factors that have been taken into consideration when dealing with activity. I wonder how the Government likes that. I wonder what a Government feels like when it knows that the public assumes that, in matters of Town Planning and Development, considerations other than the economic good of Barbados or the desirability of a project may need to be employed before Town Planning permission is granted! How can the Government feel, knowing that the public regard that a programme for the rehabilitation of houses in the housing areas with some justification is maintained just for the purpose of employment of political touts and putting money in the pockets of relatives? How can a Government feel to know that? That is the thing that baffles me. How can people feel when they see that the public think that they are a Government whose natural instinct is to be unfair to their opponents and unreasonably generous to their supporters?

On our side, as members of the Government would know, we are replete - as Secretary of a political Party I hear it every day - with reports from our friends: "Well, look, my job is such; I have to get a passport, but you can take it from me that the D.L.P. will never get my vote." We hear that one way or another from persons whom I am sure it would surprise members of the Government to have described to them. We do not believe all. We are aware of the necessity for that thing known as 'keeping in with both sides'. We have persons who at election time contribute to our funds. They give us \$500 and give the Government \$1,000. (Hon. N. W. BOXILL How much do you put in your pocket?) The hon. junior

member for St. Thomas wants to know how much I put into my pocket. I put all in my pocket and carry it to the Bank and bank it in the name of the Barbados Labour Party, and if I bank it for myself or if I bank it in my name, it is just a guard against people like the hon. junior member for St. Thomas ever joining the Party and managing to reach a position like Treasurer and drawing it out and carrying it away. The hon. junior member for St. Thomas had better be careful. It is not so long ago when he was told by one of his constituents that he is going to lose. He said "So what! Ten years ago I did not have a house and I have a house now." I will give him chapter and verse.

Mr. SPEAKER:

We are not concerned with the development of any of the hon. members for St. Thomas.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

On a point of order; as far as I know, I was born in a house, unlike other hon. members in this Chamber, and, as far as I know I have been owning my own house from almost the time I started to work, which was in the 1940s; so that could not be true.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order. Let the hon. member continue with the subject matter of the debate.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

Why can't we have Standing Order No. 29(6) applied? Doesn't the hon. junior member for St. Thomas want a cup of tea? If his interventions were amusing or even sensible, we could stand them; but he does not have to impress his Civil Servants that he fights against me.

Hon. N.W. BOXILL:

On a point of order, the hon. member asks me if I want a cup of tea. He should know that he has never seen me in there eating. He comes here specifically, everyday that the House meets, to eat.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is no point of order.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

At least I have never been in that dining-room and shouldered aside other members of Parliament and run out with two plates of food in my hands.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let us keep this debate at the level it deserves to be kept at. Hon. members not addressing the Chair will please observe Standing Order No. 29. Let the hon. senior member for St. Thomas continue with that which is important.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

I could not agree with Your Honour more than that the activities of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas are deeply and profoundly unimportant.

Mr. SPEAKER:

This House is not the least bit concerned with any civil war which seems to take place in St. Thomas.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

The Prime Minister could not get our heads knocked together; I hope Your Honour is not going to attempt it. Well, Sir, the Plan has a statement which it says deals with policy objectives. This is where the dangers of tourism are set out, and where there is some retreat from the assault upon the sugar industry exemplified in the Prime Minister's 'cone-blade speech'. There is no retreat, however, from the Prime Minister's statement on fisheries, that Barbados consists of two sorts of people, human-beings and fishermen; that will, no doubt, be dealt with by other members.

Sir, when we look at the objectives, what does it mean to say? These are the major economic and social objectives. "To expand employment opportunities in the economy with a view to reducing and progressively eliminating wastage of human labour." That is a Civil Servant's way of obscuring the fact that the Government wishes to decrease unemployment. 4.05 p.m.

"To increase the rate of growth of per capita real income within the limits set by the prior need to expand the stock of capital in order to expand employment opportunities." Sir, I could not tell what concept is being obscured by that particular piece of 'Civil-Service-ese', but in so far as it sets the goal of increasing the rate of growth of per capita real income, I want to say some thing on that. Economists are allowing themselves to be bewildered by the magic of per capita real income. Despite what the figures show, Kuwait is not the richest country in the world; it may have one of the highest per capita real

income figures, but it is not the richest country in the world; the United States is. Russia may appear to have a high per capita income - I could not even tell you what it is - but there would be a money inflation on it because of the artificial exchange rate on the Ruble; my own experience is that the average Russian is no better dressed or fed than the average Barbadian, and he is much less likely to own a motor car or a refrigerator or many small consumer goods which we take for granted. He is better educated and has infinitely better social security and much better taxation, but he is less likely to have consumer goods that we have; none the less by any standards Russia is a rich major country and we are a poor one.

You can get caught up in this business of per capita real income. The per capita income of Jamaica appears large because it has large extractive industries whose gross earnings are divided through by the Jamaican population, and inflate the apparent income of Jamaicans. To me it is quite meaningless to say that because Reynolds Bauxite sends out a large volume of aluminum to North America every year, the Jamaicans as such are richer people than the Trinidadians or Barbadians, since they on paper share in the income of the Reynolds Aluminum Company. Similarly Trinidad; of what use is it to the slum dwellers in Laventille and John-John to be told that the oil companies earn so many million dollars a year and therefore Trinidad has a high per capita income? Do not let Barbados be bewildered by this. At the moment we are not going to suffer the dangers of this sort of extractive industry inflation; we are not going to suffer that because we have no extractive industries; but I would like all the planners to get right away from the concept of believing that you just divide through the income of every person or organisation in Barbados and that you will therefore immediately arrive at a necessary index of wealth.

Sir, Jamaica, again, is the example we look at in which the Jamaican middle class is affluent, the Jamaica artisan is well paid, but the Jamaica peasant lives in misery and the slum dweller lives in much worse than misery, further down the scale than misery. In Barbados little enough is known of the multiplier effect and the incomes of ordinary people. Again taking the unfortunate army of occupation as an example, little can be really deduced from a Civil Service increase as to how much real increase there has been in the wealth of Barbados. Little can really be said because I do not think that the statistics are sufficiently analysed in depth; there are not the resources in the Statistical and Planning Departments, and the financial departments in Barbados to make surveys in depth of the multiplier effect of tourism or the multiplier effect of an expansion of the order of a Civil Service increase. Little enough is known on that for us to know what effect on overall income these effects on particular income may have. I very much hope that the Government will not be accepting that per capital income is the be - all and end-all, and that you only look at that to see an index of the prosperity of a country.

Education is always left out of any analysis of any sort - the index of the very prosperity of Barbados. It is not only a matter of putting something into people's heads; that is not the only matter; the very prosperity of Barbados can be connected up with the education of its people, and you will look at figures of per capita income not even for any indication of how well educated a people is, how healthy a people is, what is the level of social services in a particular economy; none of that will be shown by figures

such as these. I am afraid I cannot quite gather the proviso or qualification for Objective 2 "within the limit set by the prior need to expand stock of capital" , and we will have to get our little collection of experts here to explain what that means. I could not address the House on that.

Objective 3, "to reduce the growing deficit on the current account in the balance of payments." I could not agree more with this. When I heard the figures in the last Budget speech, lacking at that time an Economic Survey, produced by the Prime Minister as to imports into Barbados, I could not believe my ears; I trembled over here to hear it; I am not even sure if the Economic Survey which was the last that was laid before us gives overall figures. A deficit at Current Account of \$48 million for a quarter of a million people, 10 million for a quarter of a million people, 40 per person. Think of what they would mean; the pound would be down to a dollar if the United Kingdom had the balance of payments deficit comparable to that, and the Prime Minister just comes into the House and tells us it exists and we must reduce it! He made no suggestion as to how it is going to be reduced. What is import substitution going to do for it in the agricultural sector? If I remember the Tripartite survey correctly it said that 500 acres would grow all the vegetables which are at present imported into Barbados. That is scratching at a serious drastic problem, because no country, no matter whether its currency is linked to sterling and therefore there is an automaticity about the correction - no matter whether or not that is so, no country can exist where there is a deficit on balance of payments equivalent to something like 15% of the per capita income. I hope I have got my figures right; no country can exist under those conditions.

I repeat; think again of what it means. It means that every Barbadian - the little children, the newborn babies - when you divide it right through, is importing the equivalent into this island of \$192 in goods every year. How can any Government face that and put it as Objective 3 without any accurate, without any serious plan to attempt to reduce it? What does it mean? I do not understand a figure like that; in economic terms I could not conceive a figure like that. What could have happened to Barbados to allow a country like Barbados to allow a deficit of that sort to grow to that level?

Objective 4. Sir, "to diversify the economic structure so as to increase the viability of the national economy." 4.15 p.m.

"The economic structure is being diversified with sugar as well as tourism so as to increase the viability of the national economy."

That is one of those pious platitudes, I suppose. I hear the Prime Minister with them, and I do not know if I have to blame a Civil Servant. When the Leader of the House, the Deputy Prime Minister, speaks on economic affairs, which is, mercifully, seldom, he also produces phrases such as those. You

cannot say that they mean nothing, Sir, because they meant something the first time they were used. The last time I heard anything about viability of the national economy, we were then being told that it was sufficiently viable to support Independence, but it has been rehashed again.

Sir, the fifth objective:

"To increase, through the mobilisation and more effective use of domestic resources, the participation of nationals in the key sectors of the economy."

Well, Sir, this is the sort of thing that a Civil Servant puts, if he is told to prepare a plan to nationalise all of the hotels. I must say that I do not think any such intention lies behind these words. I suppose it means that the Minister of Home Affairs is going to get tougher with the 100 or 200 English and American girls who work as receptionists or other jobs knocking about now in Barbados one way or the other. What is the point in this, Sir:

"To increase, through the mobilisation and more effective use of domestic resources, the participation of nationals in the key sectors of the economy."

You think of something revolutionary when you read that. Sir. You look for something massive; you look for a policy. You look for a policy where the bankers are not going to be allowed to continue to accept deposits from the public of Barbados on a much larger scale than the loans and advances which they are prepared to make to Barbadian citizens; you look for an attack on private marketing of sugar, Barbados' main export crop. You would expect, when you see something like that, that there is going to be some suggestion of a restriction of absentee ownership and that sort of thing; you would expect that in hotels the Government is going to deplore the massive domination of the big hotel industry in Barbados by foreign nationals. There is none of that, Sir. A mere objective has been put in here not even to pay lip-service to a revolutionary ideal. It is nothing, unsupported by imagination and thought and initiative in the earlier passages of the Development Plan, but merely to give the idealistic supporters of the Democratic Labour Party, if there are any left, some thought that this Government is really trying to do some thing for Barbados and not merely scratch its own back and the back of its friends.

Objective 6, Sir.

"To increase the degree of occupational mobility in the society so as to ensure that jobs are open to all on the basis of merit, and that the best talents are available to the community in all fields."

Sir, imagine the Democratic Labour Party making that an objective in a Development Plan! The Democratic Labour Party has set the pace in the restriction of jobs to those who are prepared to toe the political line. The Democratic Labour Party has set itself a target of rooting out all sympathisers of the Barbados Labour Party irrespective of merit, and irrespective of the contribution they could make, irrespective of the quality of their talent in the Boards and other public activities not immediately coming under Civil Services auspices - the Democratic Labour Party whose Minister can get into the House - not only the hon. senior member for St. Andrew, the Minister of Housing, but the Leader of the House himself can come in here and talk about jobs being available primarily to members of the Democratic Labour Party, because you have to give jobs to your friends! The Leader of the House did not say that; the Leader of the House said that it was the prerogative of the Minister of Education to give out the jobs on the School Meals Service on his personal recommendation, and when specifically questioned as to whether he thought it desirable that the members of the Democratic Labour Party should be given preference in jobs paid for by the taxpayers, he said: "Yes, because it was the Democratic Labour Party who had initiated the School Meals Service." I challenge the Leader of the House to deny that exchange in a Parliamentary Question.

The Minister of Housing, with the lack of understanding of political morals that he has increasingly demonstrated - a lack of understanding of political morals that may go hand-and-hand with a certain personal charm and, as far as one can judge, decency in relationships; but yet there is the disfigurement of political life in this country, the debasement of the currency of politics - and yet in an exercise in hypocrisy we read here as an objective of the Government:

"To increase the degree of occupational mobility in the society so as to ensure that jobs are open to all on the basis of merit....."

Sir, only take the example of that poor, little, political racketeer, H. G. Nestfield of Orange Hill, St. James, a faithful servant of the Barbados Labour Party while we were in power, fired from the Housing Authority because he worked as a chauffeur for the Leader of the Opposition, in the wilderness for 7 years - 7 long years - when I did not even have the heart, as Secretary of the Barbados Labour Party, to call on him to bring in his receipt book for the subscriptions that he used to collect in Orange Hill from Party members. I felt that his need was greater than ours; so I did not worry with him.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker what part of the Development Plan is he dealing with?

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am afraid that those details do not form a proper part of the Development Plan.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

Sir, it is the part of the detail of political immorality in the Democratic Labour Party. Nestfield is now cock-of-the-walk in the Housing Authority again. The same officials, who said they would never work there if Nestfield was employed, are having to swallow it, whether they like it or not, and Nestfield, his head full of Democratic rum and his pocket full of Democratic money, is walking about busily engaged in abusing his betters - his betters whom he was not ashamed of when he was nearly dying to go to get loans guaranteed at the bank.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

The point about Mr. Nestfield, however irrelevant, has been made. Let us return to the main issue.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

Perhaps we are directing a microscope on a political life when we deal with Nestfield, Sir. It takes a microscope to see an ant, but this one really sticks in my throat

"The best talents being open to the community in all fields."

Are the best talents open to the community at C.B.C.? When have you ever seen a member of the Barbados Labour Party on C.B.C.? The last time we had one..

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member is not correct, because he himself told us on the floor of this House that they had more than half of the workers at C.B.C. as members of their Party.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No desirable point of order. (Asides.) At this stage hon. members should recall Standing Order No. 29.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

I am not worrying with him this time, Sir. 4.25 p.m.

I am not worrying with the Minister this time. Some of ours have been fired. They have gone down to less than half. I am not talking about employment at C.B.C. I am talking about whether it is desirable that the national broadcasting and television medium should operate an obvious and deliberate policy of a selection of performers, selection of subject, selection of theme, operation of programme based upon political discrimination. If an objective of the Government is that the best talents are to be available to the community in all fields, why doesn't it open the screens of C.B.C. to political discussion? We are not begging for any favours; we are begging to give the people of Barbados a little political education. Let the people of Barbados hear over the radio and see over television a little honest political discussion for a change. If the members of the Government are afraid of having members of the Opposition across a debating table on a television screen, they have no right to be members of the Government, If the Manager - I am not referring to the General Manager in particular because I have the greatest respect for him - but if the management of C.B.C. is afraid of exposing its political friends in meeting with members of the Opposition on the television screen, then they had better analyse their position and ask themselves why they are supporting a particular political Party. If they think that the members of the Government cannot make as good Party political broadcasts - it may or may not be true, I do not know - as the members of the Opposition, why don't they reconsider their political affiliations instead of cutting off all Party political broadcasts altogether? Was there ever a country in which one of the mass media entirely ignored the whole concept of political discussion besides Barbados? And look at the example it sets in the .Advocate-News newspaper. I prefer the Advocate in the days of the 1951 election when it could call for the return of the Electors Association to power because the Bushe Experiment had been a failure. That will be found in an editorial of the week-end before the 1951 election. I prefer the Advocate that could say that to the Advocate that could refuse to publish a Press Release of the fact that certain things that appeared in C.B.C. were not all they appeared to be. I would not pursue that. I was not in the House at that stage, and when we return to that I will have a statement to make. But without the example of the Government station, how can you expect a newspaper to behave any differently?

Mr. Speaker, this document here, all 176 pages of it, is of value chiefly for the last few pages that set out the actual proposed Capital Expenditure over a period. We, Sir, are going to look with interest to see if this Capital Expenditure can actually be achieved. Despite devaluation, despite inflation, the Government is still planning for the next three years only a few more dollars than it planned for 1965-68. This may in part be due to criticism we have levelled year by year at the dishonest method of capital estimation, this puffedup document here telling us in painful length much of what we know already. If that is the Democratic Labour Party's answer to our criticism, that there has been no Development Plan

for a whole year, that we do not know what lines the development is intended to proceed along - if that is the answer, it is the worst and most disgraceful answer that I think has ever been laid in this House.

When we read one of the cleverer journalists, remarking on the penultimate Ministerial appointment that Caligula's stable is well stocked even in Barbados, we should realise that with Ministers such as those we have, we cannot really expect a Development Plan much better than this.

Sir, I am aware that it is the wish of Your Honour and the Leader of the House that we should go and have tea. The hon. junior member for St. Thomas may go out for whatever private purpose he indulges in during the break, but I am not moving the suspension of the sitting for fifteen minutes; I am moving that this Resolution do now pass.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to second this Resolution, but before doing so, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for twenty minutes.

Mr. HOPPIN:

I beg to second that.

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

4.35 p.m.

On Resumption:-

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe that one of the objectives of any Socialist Party would be to encourage persons living in any society to own their own homes, to be able to buy their own houses, and for those who cannot afford to buy houses, then to ensure that there is an adequate supply of houses for that category of persons to rent. That must be one of the prime objectives of any Socialist Party. Let me begin by saying I do not know who is responsible for the writing of that part of the Development Plan that deals with Housing - I do not care, either. I have but one observation to more on it, and that is that it is quite clear that the person who has written that portion of the document is simply out of touch with the needs of the working class people of this community. As the senior member for St. Thomas said, the document contains a lot of bluff. All that this document attempts to do is put forward ideas. When from the record of the Government over the past nine years, the Government has failed to achieve in any one year what they hope to do in this portion of the Development Plan.

If I may begin by just adverting to certain relevant portions of the Development Plan, where it says under Housing:- "Economic factors are also of great importance in considering housing policy. Costs of construction for a large percentage of the population are prohibitive and the capital available to the country is scarce". Another portion of the same document reads "The housing problem then resolves itself into the scarcity of land and of capital". It goes on to say "The scarcity of land in the urban area for housing development and the high price demanded by owners have in the past exerted a serious brake on the Housing Authority's building programme and Government has been forced to divert Government - owned lands into housing". This excuse - and I can call it nothing more than an excuse - is contained here in this Development Plan where it talks about the scarcity of available land and the scarcity of capital. One has only to look at the Manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party in 1966, and under the heading "Housing" the Government said then "In 1961 the Democratic Labour Party expressed its philosophy that as many citizens as possible should be encouraged to own their own homes". That is basic for any Socialist Party, even for a Party like the Democratic Labour Party, professing to be Socialists. "The only limitations for implementing this programme have been the competing demands for equally important services, for finance and the growing scarcity of available land". What has happened here is that this Development Plan which is published three years - in actual fact, published almost four years after this Manifesto, can do no more than to repeat what the Manifesto has said, "that the only limitations on implementing this programme have been the competing demands for equally important services, for finance and the growing scarcity of available land."

I believe it is our function not merely to accept this for what it stands; we must do more. We cannot continue to accept these statements from the Government that you have no other reasons other than the scarcity of capital and of available land. Let us really look for a minute and analyse to see if this excuse is really a genuine one. It is a very simple thing for any Government to get up and say "we cannot get

available land and we have other services for capital". It is not a case where they say they do not have any money; it is not a case where they say they do not have any land at all, but they qualify it by saying 'available land', 'suitable land'; that is the qualification the Government has put on the housing needs of this country, talking about suitable land and the scarcity of capital. The truth is that the Government has been spending on other projects and we on this side say that it is more important to have spent this money to provide houses for the working class people than to have spent it on the particular projects, or to have spent the amount of money that they spent on the particular projects.

First of all, let me look at the amount of money the Government has spent since 1966 on providing houses overseas. They say capital is scarce; they have not got any money; there are other equally important services than to build houses for the working class people of this country. I believe I am right in saying that the average price of building a home for a working class person in this country comes out to just under \$7,000 per house. This Government, this so-called Socialist Government, in all its might and wisdom saw fit to spend \$1 million overseas on buying houses for Ambassadors, buying Embassies, and the last thing they did late last year was to spend \$195,000 to buy a house which as far as I know, they obviously cannot find a tenant for, and it is supposed to house the High Commissioner for Barbados in London. 5.05 p.m.

While I am on this matter, I do not know if the people in this country are aware of this fact, Sir. The Barbados Government is keeping Sir Lionel Luckhoo in London at the present moment as High Commissioner for Barbados at a time when he is no longer High Commissioner for Guyana. The present High Commissioner in London for Guyana is Sir John Carter, but the present High Commissioner in London for Barbados is Sir Lionel Luckhoo. Guyana has got rid of him, but Barbados is going to keep him there. Sir, you know well the Government we have to deal with. If my statement were false, one of the Ministers would have been on his feet already denying it. This is not a case where silence is being golden; it is a case of silence meaning the affirmative and signifying that my statement is correct. The Leader of the House is the Minister of External Affairs, but he does not seek to deny it. How can this country maintain or justify its present position by keeping Sir Lionel Luckhoo in London at a time when he is no longer High Commissioner for Guyana? The purpose of appointing Sir Lionel Luckhoo as High Commissioner was that he was jointly representing Guyana and Barbados, but today Sir Lionel Luckhoo no longer represents Guyana and is merely representing Barbados.

Let me go back to the question of spending money on overseas housing. This Government has decided to spend \$1 million overseas. This has nothing to do with the recurrent expenditure in the Ministry of External Affairs. This is what it decided to spend within the last two years. Any division of the \$1 million by \$7,000, which is the cost of one house in Barbados, will show that if that \$1 million were spent in Barbados it would provide 140 houses, but not for 140 people. When we take into consideration that in a house there will be a man, his girl friend or wife, and at least 2 children, and when you multiply 140 by

4 it shows the number of people that houses could be provided for if we spent \$1 million in Barbados on housing. We would provide houses for at least 560 people. Of course, some families would be bigger, but this Government feels that it is more important to spend \$1 million to provide housing and offices for 5 people than to provide housing accommodation for 560 people. That is the so-called Socialist Government that we have to deal with in this country.

Sir, sometimes certain things hurt my heart. I do not mind the Ministers, because the Permanent Secretaries can push everything over them. I represent a very poor constituency, but I do not believe half of the Permanent Secretaries who wrote this Report ever went into Chapman Lane or Green Park Lane. They are out of touch with the needs and aspirations of the people in this country. I want to deal with the backbenchers such as the junior member for St. Andrew and the junior member for St. Philip. How can they justify going to the people in St. Andrew or in St. Philip and say: "Yes, I agree with the Government to spend \$1 million overseas and not to provide housing, roads, or social amenities here. It is more important for the Government to spend the money on housing overseas". I wonder how some members of the Government feel when they go into the districts. I wonder how they can face the people. They are riding on the bandwagon, and whatever the Kiaki King says they will accept.

The Prime Minister has always said in this House: "The people giveth and the people taketh away". That is what I have to say to the backbenchers. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR "The Lord.") He said "the people." He knows what he is talking about I know the correct quotation. The Prime Minister says that the people giveth. Let us go on. While dealing on this question of housing, it is beyond my comprehension - I did not support it, and I would never support it even if my father gets into power - how Government could give Permanent Secretaries a housing allowance. I am totally against it; I think it is grossly unfair to the poor taxpayers of this country to have to subsidise the housing of a few Permanent Secretaries. The Government cannot spend money on building houses, but it can spend \$50,000 to give Permanent Secretaries housing allowances. Nothing could be more disgraceful than to have to pay a Permanent Secretary \$1300 a month, about \$90 for travelling, \$60 a month entertainment allowance, and then turn around and give him a housing allowance to live in his own house. Some of them are living in their own houses, and they have other houses rented out. That is the sort of criminal situation that we have in Barbados today. The Prime Minister said in this House that he was blackmailed by the Civil Servants into agreeing to that. Everybody knows that the blackmail is filthiness, and that is what the Permanent Secretaries used on him. If you give the Permanent Secretaries a housing allowance, then you will have a good case for Ministers to get a housing allowance. That is the crux of the matter. That is how we are spending the taxpayers' money in this country. The Government is saying that it is more important to give a few Permanent Secretaries a housing allowance than to build houses for the people in Chapman Lane.

Sir, the Minister of Housing said in this House that some people live in houses with hole sin the roofs

so big that they do not have to turn on a light when the moon is shining. The same Minister can sit in the Cabinet and agree to give Permanent Secretaries a housing allowance. I have no brief for Permanent Secretaries, and I do not care if they vote for me. When I see something is wrong and criminal, I will say that it is wrong and criminal. It is a disgraceful waste of the taxpayers' money for a Government to bring a Development Plan here and say that you cannot spend money and that the housing problem resolves itself into scarcity of land and capital. How can you say that capital is scarce and at the time give Permanent Secretaries \$50,000 a year? You can work it out; it may not sound like much money now, but over a period of 10 years, when it reaches \$500,000 you will see how many poor people have been robbed out of houses. You will then know which is important.

The Prime Minister came into this House and said that he was blackmailed by the Civil Servants. He has not got the guts and courage, when this House is debating the Development Plan, to come here and take part in the debate. On the otherhand, he will go on a political platform and curse somebody's mother, father and so on. What sort of man is he?

Another example of the wastage of this Government is the money that has been spent on the Hilton Hotel. Corruption existed in the building of the Helton Hotel, because nobody can tell me that the fire, which burnt all the papers and documents relating to the Hilton Hotel, is an accident. 5.15 p.m.

It is strange that the original contract of the Hilton Hotel was never laid in this House. It is strange that to this day this House has not been given a proper figure of the cost of the Hilton Hotel, but all the books have been burnt. Could that fire have been said to be an accident? That was obviously a fire designed by a corrupt mind to hide all the evidence of corruption.

Now, Sir, on the second prong, the second excuse that they use is the scarcity of available land. Do you know, in other words, what the Government is saying here? It is saying that they have certain land in their possession, but it is too good to put working class people on, because I have listened to the Leader of the House, the Prime Minister and the hon. junior member for Christ Church talking about the 700 or 800 acres of land they have at Wildey. They talked about building a new Parliament up there, but you have never heard anyone talk about building a housing scheme at Wildey. Wildey is part of Christ Church and the sort of standards we have in this country would forbid the Government from building working class houses in that area.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, the hon. member's memory seems to be failing him, because if he would recall, I happened to have handled that Resolution for the acquisition of 600 or 700 acres of land at Wildey and it

was on the basis of a portion of land being allocated for housing that I presented the Resolution.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

That is no point of order.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

It is a point of order now, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I ask the hon. junior member for Christ Church to withdraw that remark , made to the Chair and to do so immediately.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to withdraw that remark.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I accept the withdrawal. I am hearing the hon. junior member for Bridgetown.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

It was the hon. junior member for Christ Church who said it would be good to build a Parliament on some of the land at Wildey. You did not hear them talking about building working class homes at Wildey. The Government owns Graeme Hall Estate, but Graeme Hall Estate was bought by the Government for \$450,000 to build houses for Civil Servants. Nobody looks after the working class people of this country. Graeme Hall is in Christ Church, and that is too good, according to the standards of Government, for working class people. You must forget Socialism when you are dealing with them. You look for some back land, plantation land as in Bagatelle or between cane fields to put people. That is the sort of Socialist you have over there. That is the sort of hypocrisy and double standards you have in this country, and yet, Sir, they have the gall to talk about scarcity of available land. What they mean is that they have land, but they are not putting working class people on it. How can a Government have 800 acres of land and write in a Development Plan that there is a scarcity of land.

They build an average of 100 houses a year. Do you know how long it would take to use 100 acres of

land? I bet you that if somebody decided in St. Thomas or St. Andrew that he has three or four acres between the cane fields that the Government would run and buy it quickly to put houses on. If you want to move the people in Chapman Lane, why don't you offer to send them to Wildey? Why offer to send them to Bagatelle or to Country Road?

Now, Sir, I want to go on to deal with the Housing Authority, because if there is one institution along with the Government that is responsible for the poor state of housing in this country, it is the Barbados Housing Authority. Do you know why that is? It is the attitudes of the Government and Statutory Boards of this country. The attitude of the Government is that unless you are a member of the Democratic Labour Party you cannot make any contribution at all to this country, and instead of putting people on Boards who can make a contribution they pick up every yard-fowl because he is the holder of a D.L.P. passport and put him on the Boards. You only have to look at the Boards and see. The sole criterion as far as Government is concerned is whether you are the holder of a D.L.P. passport. For what other reason would you find a man like Howard Roberts getting a job at the Housing Authority? He got fired when he disagreed with the Party. Sir, there is as much corruption at the Housing Authority today as exists in any other part of Government, and that is saying a lot because there is a lot of corruption existing in the Government. I am sorry the Minister of Labour is not here because I would like him to tell the House when the Housing Authority has ever published an advertisement in the newspaper for tenders for any work at the Housing Authority. I would like to find out from the Minister when Rayside got the contract at Silver Hill whether the contract came as a result of tenders. Everybody in this country knows Rayside's position. I went through a bye-election and I had to suffer to see Rayside's trucks driving through my meetings every night trying to break them up. Rayside's position in the D.L.P. is so well known that something is bound to be corrupt. Whenever you can find that a known member of a political Party is being given contracts without the Housing Authority going to tender, there is bound to be corruption. Everybody knows that Rayside was a road builder. How is it that he gets a contract to build houses? How much money is Ray side to build these houses for? You do not pick up taxpayers' money and spend it like this.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, every body knows Ray side's position at Cave Hill with the U.D.C. That is another corrupt place too. For the number of years you had U.D.C., you built only eight houses, and Rayside now has the contract up there and he is having trouble in finishing the houses.

Let us go on to painting. I would like to know who had the contract for painting the houses at the Pine and if it ever went to tender. I would like to know why it is that a man who works with the Waterworks Department in St. Andrew had the contract for painting the houses at the Pine. He never once went to the scene. He was the front man for somebody else. That is the sort of corruption you have in this country. 5.25 p.m.

I am sorry the Minister is not here. I would like to ask him where the paint was being kept during the time this job was done; everybody knows the paint was kept at "Melbourne". This is the sort of corruption we have in this country. I am not saying that because "Melbourne" was painted up it was with that paint; all I assaying is that the paint was kept there.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

May I draw to the attention of all hon. members Standing Order 29 (6) which deals with the behaviour of all hon. members when an hon. member is addressing the Chair.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Do you think, with all due respect, that if you had an impartial Board at the Housing Authority, with people on it who could tell the Minister that this was wrong, the Minister would ever attempt to do these sort of things? But it is because he has a Board of lackeys, a Board of Democratic Labour Party yard fowls that this sort of corruption can be practised.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

May I draw to the attention of the hon. junior member for the City Standing Order 26 (9) "The conduct of HerMajesty, 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 substantive motion."

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I am fully aware of the Rule, with all due respect, Sir, but if you would tell me where I went wrong, I would be much obliged. As I was saying, if you had a competent Board of individuals who were there not because they belong to any one political Party but because they were there with one idea in mind, to provide proper housing to suit the working class people of this country, this sort of corruption could not be practised; and I do not blame the people who work at the Housing Authority, the officers of the Housing Authority, because if they dare open their mouths to say anything about what is going on up there, out through the door they go. That is the sort of Government we have to deal with, but this corruption cannot go on for ever and ever. You cannot have corruption at the Hilton; you cannot have corruption at the Housing Authority; for me to talk about corruption I would spend the whole day talking about it.

In this Development Plan, as I said, I think the person who prepared this is either stupid or basically

ignorant; how can a Government after nine years in office publish something like this as a Development Plan? There are two portions I will read, the first being: "Any proper assessment of present and future housing needs must await a comprehensive survey which would also establish precise criteria for standard housing requirements". Only an idiot could write this for a Government in power for nine years. Again it says, "the need for a comprehensive survey of housing needs has been demonstrated, and efforts will be made to obtain technical assistance to carry out the survey and train local personnel in this field." Let us analyse those two statements. "Any proper assessment of the housing needs must await a comprehensive survey" .In other words, after nine years in office the Government does not know what are the needs of the working class people of this country; they must now do a comprehensive survey under this Development Plan. They have been in power from 1961; and in a Development Plan of 1969 they say they must await a comprehensive survey to see what are the housing needs of this country! What has been happening for the last nine years? The same Minister who is now Minister of Housing was Minister of Housing before; what was he doing then? What has been the Government doing for the last three years? In 1963-64 the Government built 81 houses; in 1964-65 they built 135 houses; in 1966-67 they built 128 houses; in 1967-68 they built 217, and 63 of those were completed from the year before. That is what the Government is doing. Under the Barbados Labour Party, during the five years after the Housing Authority was set up, the record of the Barbados Labour Party in the field of housing was 1,300 houses built at 13 housing estates between 1956 and 1961; that has been the record of the Barbados Labour Party. It was the Barbados Labour Party who back in 1955 saw the need for establishing some Authority in this country to have responsibility for low income housing, or housing for working class people; it was the Barbados Labour Party in their wisdom that appointed the Housing Authority but little did we know when we established the Housing Authority that the Government would use it for corrupt practices.

I am dealing with statistics, Sir, to show the ineffectiveness of the Democratic Labour Party. I am reading from the Twelfth Annual Report of the Housing Authority, and I am dealing with loans advanced. I am not even going back to 1953, 1954 and 1955 when the Barbados Labour Party was in power. The Barbados Labour Party, through the Housing Authority, advanced \$709,010 on loan per year; in the 1955-56 period they advanced \$700,064; in 1960-61 they advanced \$236, 891.42 in loans; in 1961-62, the last year the Party was in power they advanced \$208, 870.36 in loans. The first year of the Democratic Labour Party, 1962-63, \$97, 652.56 as compared with over \$208,000. Let us go to 1963-64 \$50, 339. 5.35 p.m.

\$

In 1964 - 65 they advanced - 21, 851

" 1965 - 66 " " - 62, 840

, , 1966 - 67 , , , - 70, 885

" 1967 - 68 " " - 47, 560

The lowest the Labour Party ever went to was in 1961 - 62 when the amount was \$208,000 as compared with the highest of the Democratic Labour Party which is \$97,000 in the first year. We spent that \$208,000 at a time when you could buy more with the money you received. When the money, is worth less this Government is spending \$21,000, \$62,000 and \$70,000. It is obvious that the Democratic Labour Party is not aware of the housing needs of this country. I am not surprised to hear the Government talking of a comprehensive survey after 9 years. With a housing policy such as this you must need a comprehensive survey, because you are completely out of touch with the need for housing in this country.

For the sake of comparison, let me read these two things, Sir. In the Ninth Annual Report for the year 1st April, 1964, to 31st March, 1965 - the number of applications received for housing from the inception of the Housing Authority in 1956 - 1965 - only 9, 898 applications were sent in. Up to that period of time in 1965, 2, 962 families were accommodated. Despite the dishonest statement in the Development Plan, which I will deal with later, Sir, in the Twelfth Annual Report it says that the total number of applications received for the period 1st April, 1956, to the 31st March, 1968, was 13, 658. The number of houses built during that period was 3, 742. In other words, during the interval of time between 1965- 68 you had an increase of applications of 3, 760, and out of that 780 people received houses. In a period of four years 3, 760 people applied for houses. I am taking the dead centre of this Government's tenure of office. Sir, 3, 742 people applied for houses during that period of time and only 780 got houses.

In other words, since the inception of the Authority over 10,000 people have applied for houses and have not yet received houses. What survey do you want? Is the Minister not aware of what appears in this Annual Statement? The dishonesty referred to in the Development Plan States:

"This is exclusive of the present unsatisfied demand indicated by a backlog of 7,000 applications to the Authority."

That is dishonest, Sir. The backlog is over 10,000, but in order not to make the Government look too bad, the Civil Servants start juggling the figures and put 7,000 instead of 10,000. That is the sort of dishonesty that the Government can tolerate, but it is the sort of dishonesty that the Opposition will not tolerate. Politics has gone to a very low level in this country, because of the Democratic Labour Party. This is due to the inability of the Democratic Labour Party to deal with the problems confronting this country.

Sir, the Civil Servants are aware that the Government is an ineffective Government and, in actual fact, they are ruling the country. They can dictate to the Government, and that is why you hear about Civil Servants blackmailing the Government. I am sorry the Prime Minister is not here, because some Civil Servants may feel that I am attacking them. It was the Prime Minister who said in this House that the Civil Servants were descending on the Treasury like an army of occupation. They were taking everything out of the country and putting in nothing. Those were the Prime Minister's words. He calls them an army of occupation, but I would not like to say what he is to them.

What can we see from the figures? The loans have never once got above \$50,000 in the first year the Government was in office, and they fell as low as \$21,000. That clearly indicates that the Government is not aware of the housing needs of this country. You have had the other figure si have re ad where I pointed out that in 1963-64 the Government built 81 houses; in 1964-65 it built 135 houses; in!966-67it built 128 houses; in 1967-68 it built 217 houses. With that in mind let us look at the way in which the Government tries to fool people. I must re ad the paragraph which deals with needs. It states:

"Any proper assessment of the present and future housing needs must await a comprehensive housing survey which would also establish precise criteria for standard housing requirement. However, a recent survey indicates that given an estimated present population in Greater Bridgetown of 108,200 people and an estimated 20 per cent or 21, 640 persons in the same period, the additional demand for low-cost housing for the next 10 years for a natural population increase only is 5, 140 persons or some 1, 350 accommodation units.

When account is taken of the demands which would arise from displacement should substandard housing areas be developed, and from the expected expansion of commerce and industry in the City, the total demand for low-income housing in the metropolitan area would seem to involve 11, 762 persons establishing a need for approximately 2, 940 dwellings in the next 10 years."

5.45 p.m.

Dealing with the larger Bridgetown alone, this, I believe, is referred to as the 34 acre Plan. I am not dealing with the 91/4 acres in Emmerton; I will come to that later. This 39 3/4 acres which is Greater Bridgetown would require, according to this Plan, at least 2940 houses for the next ten years. When you go on to read a little further, you will see under low cost Housing" that "the Government will continue to provide housing for low income groups. It is proposed to build 300 houses per year for this group". One part states that they intend to build 300 houses per year, but you go back and find that for the Bridgetown part alone you require 294, and this is not a recent survey. If I may refer you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the Tripartite Survey carried out by the British, Canadian United Kingdom and American Governments in 1966, you will see what was said dealing with Barbados on the question of housing. This would come under the Development Plan for 1965-68. "There appears to be a considerable requirement for finance for housing development i.e. slum clearance for low cost housing, for medium cost housing scheme. The Government places a high priority on housing development. The slum clearance and low cost housing programme is executed by the Housing Authority which at present builds 150 houses, i.e. \$5,500 to \$6,000 a year". It goes on to say: "The Draft Master Plan indentified 91/2 acres in Bridgetown as first priority for slum clearance due to inadequate means of sanitation and overcrowding, and 39 3/4 acres of second priority for slum clearance due to high population density ranging from 85 to 145 persons per acre and a high degree of dereliction. These areas appear to be priority in the next five years for slum clearance."

This Plan was published and the Housing Authority never said that the contents were not true. "The Housing Authority estimates that there is a requirement for 3,000 low cost housing units in the Bridgetown area over the next ten years requiring an expenditure of \$18 million - or \$1.8 million a year." This means that as far back as 1966 the Housing Authority and the Government were aware that in order to meet the housing needs in the Bridgetown area alone you needed to build 300 houses a year and 3,000 houses over a space of ten years. If you look at the figures of the Government from 1966 you will see what the figure for the entire Island is. The 300 houses are for Bridgetown alone, setting aside outside parishes, but the Government in 1966 built 128 houses for the entire Island.

In this Plan the Government plans to spend \$2, 253,000 in 1969-70. \$1 million in 1970-71 and \$1 million in 1971-72. That is the planning and thinking of a Government that has become tired; it is a tired, sick and worn-out Administration headed by a tired and sick man. As somebody has stated of the Prime Minister, if he is like this now that he is 50, you can imagine what he is going to be like when he is 51.

Now, Sir, on the question of slum clearance, just to show you that people just sit down and write a lot of nonsense and bring in here, let me, first of all, read the Development Plan of 1965-68. At page 85 under the heading of Slum Clearance it says: "Slum clearance and re-development is an important aspect of the Government's social policy, but it cannot be divorced from the housing situation, and the Government has been forced to hold slum clearance to a minimum under the present situation of housing

shortage. However, some slum clearance operations are essential and this is especially true at Emmerton area where the lack of waterborne disposal of waste poses a health hazard. It is therefore proposed to clear this area, and a Committee has been appointed by the Housing Authority to report and make recommendations on slum clearance with respect to other areas. An amount of \$500,000 is allocated for slum clearance". Despite the fact that it would take \$1.8 million a year, they allocate \$500,000 a year.

In the 1966 Manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party they say: "Immediate attention will be given to the clearance of Emmerton area of Bridgetown where water disposal presents a health hazard."

There you have the 1965 Plan and the 1966 Manifesto. This is 1970. Listen to the Development Plan again. "A number of settlements in the metropolitan area are unsatisfactory in the above context and a gradual process of rehabilitation will be started in this Plan beginning with Emmerton Lane, a district comprising 9 1/2 acres and approximately 280 chattel houses. The method will be to clear lands and properties, and if improvements are not made by owners, temporarily housing displaced persons elsewhere while adequate accommodation is being constructed."

Sir, an analysis of the 1965-68 Development Plan would show that Emmerton Lane was supposed to receive the benefit of a slum clearance. It is the only portion of Barbados that the Government could refer to in a Development Plan of 1965-68 as a slum area. Chapman Lane is the only portion of Barbados that the D.L.P. could refer to as a slum area in the 1965-68 Development Plan and come back again in the 1968-72 Plan and call a slum area. Is that a Government that really has the interest of the people at heart? Do you mean that purely because the people in Chapman Lane will not support the people from the Government Party they are not to live like human beings? Sir, I know it is a well-known fact that the Prime Minister recently said on television that there are two types of persons - human beings and fishermen. 5.55 p.m.

I wonder in which class would the Prime Minister like to put the people of Chapman Lane; purely because Government cannot get votes down there, do you mean the people must suffer? Let the Government go on with the development of the tourist trade; let them go on to build up Christ Church and St. James. You are allowing a sore to fester in this country; you are allowing areas in Bridgetown purely because they do not support you, to run down; you refuse to give them proper amenities; you refuse to give them even something like a light purely because they do not support you. I issue a warning to the Government; you will have a lot of trouble in this country if you continue to develop metropolitan areas and have no regard whatsoever for the working class people in this country; people are no longer content to hear that we are getting \$54 million from tourism, etc. The man in Chapman Lane, Greenfield, Green Park Lane - all these areas - does not feel any benefit from the \$54 million coming into this country, because the Government through spite and vindictiveness refuses to spend any money on the City of Bridgetown.

There is a well-known statement of the Prime Minister after he won the elections in 1966 when he said: "If I cannot take Mottley from the City I will take the City from Mottley". Well, there are two in the City now; let him continue to starve the people of development and he will see what will happen in this country. That is a warning I issue to the Prime Minister.

I turn now to the question of middle income housing, and I think the least said about that the better, because if there is one Statutory Board that is sinking money, it is the Urban Development Corporation. It is losing money like water, and nothing is being done. For all the years it has been in existence, for all the years the Government has had the land at Cave Hill, you have got eight or ten houses built on it. This cannot be right; you cannot spend taxpayers' money like this. If people cannot do a job properly, let them resign and let somebody else come in and do it; but do not hold the country to ransom because somebody is somebody's friend, because the Manager may be the Prime Minister's good friend. If he cannot do the job properly, let him resign; there are a lot of people in this country who can do a job properly in the interest of this country.

Sir, I began by saying that the housing programme of any country, the policy of any Socialist Government should be one to encourage people to own their own homes, and secondly for those who cannot own their own homes, to make sure that there is available housing space for them to rent. One thing that is quite clear from the past policy of the Government, from the present policy of the Government, is that the Government is not carrying out these aims. Before I finish, let me say that there is talk about multi-storey flats in this country; but listen to the Manifesto of the Government: "Additional housing at Cave Hill will be provided through the Urban Development Corporation." I do not know if eight houses can be termed additional housing - not even one per year.

"Additional housing at Cave Hill under the Mortgage Insurance Scheme. The new site will be provided with, parks, playing field and all facilities required for a thriving progressive population". Let us be realistic; they are talking there about housing for Civil Servants and middle class people. We do not hear that sort of housing when you hear them talk about multi-storey flats; is it that this Government feels that the middle class people of this country are thriving and progressive, but they do not feel that the working class people are thriving and progressive. Do you not feel that the working class people are entitled to these same amenities that certain people can afford? I beg to second the motion.

Mr. HOPPIN:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move the following amendment to the Resolution, and the amendment should read as this

"BE IT RESOVED that this House noting the Development Plan laid in the House on the 13th January, 1970, approve the several proposals contained therein and accordingly undertake to expedite their implementation by speedy legislative action."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, ...

Mr. ST. JOHN:

On a point of order, Sir, having a look at this amendment I ask Your Honour to rule whether it is in order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

This procedure is quite in order; there is a Resolution here standing in the name of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, and the hon. junior member for St. George has moved an amendment which is quite in order.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

On a point of order, what amendment has the hon. junior member for St. George moved? With great respect, I will not challenge the right of the hon. junior member for St. George to move an amendment, but what amendment has he moved? A document has been given to us saying "Be it resolved....." and I have heard the hon. junior member for St. George say these words. He has moved a separate motion altogether; there is no amendment in what he has moved.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

My recollection is that the hon. junior member for St. George said he would like to move the amendment to the Resolution; therefore I think it is quite in order.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

On a point of order, perhaps Your Honour does not take the point I am making. An amendment says "I beg to move that the Resolution be amended as follows". He never said that; he said "I beg to move an amendment to the Resolution" and then he went on to say "Be it resolved that this House.....", no question of an amendment in the form in which he has drawn. What is he leaving out and what is he

putting in?

6.05 p.m.

As far as I know, Standing Order 23 has not yet been suspended. How is Your Honour going to obey Standing Order 23 based on what the hon. junior member for St. George has said? How is Your Honour going to put any question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part"? How can you put that question, if that is all the material on which Your Honour has to go on? One would understand that the hon. junior member for St. Thomas would make noise, but then he does not pretend to have a knowledge of parliamentary procedure.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, maybe I do not understand parliamentary procedure because I did not get my education at....

An. HON MEMBER:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what is he speaking on?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Do you not have any manners? Your father before you did not have any manners - you little pig.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The hon. senior member for St. Thomas has asked me to rule, and I am about to rule. The hon. senior member for St. Thomas has raised a technical point. I do not think it is a very serious point, because there is only one Resolution before the House, and I rule that it is in order, and the hon. junior member for St. George is now about to make his amendment.

Mr. HOPPIN:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Amendment is this "Delete all words coming after 'January 1970' in there solution moved by the junior member for St. Joseph". The Resolution should then read

"RESOLVED that this House, noting the Development Plan laid in the House on 13th January, 1970

approve the several proposals contained therein and accordingly undertake to expedite their implementation by speedy legislative action/

Before I take my seat, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should like to say that I was a bit disappointed at the speech made by the senior member for St. Thomas. I thought that the senior member for St. Thomas, who has been in such fine form lately, would have put this Resolution in its right perspective, but I have heard from the senior member for St. Thomas some ramblings here and there on the Development Plan. I have heard the last speaker accuse the Government so much of dishonesty and corruption, and so many things have been said of Civil Servants that I was wondering what is going to happen. I do not know whether this attack on Civil Servants was due to the fact that the hon. member might have noticed certain persons sitting in the Gallery today.

Anyway, the Resolution that was moved by the junior member for St. Joseph.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. HOPPIN:

I thank you, Sir. The Resolution that was moved by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was an outright and complete condemnation of the efforts of this Government which has since 1961 shown an originality of thought and ideas needed to cope with the problems of 1970. Surely, no Government could be so unaware of its responsibilities and duties to the people, after being called to office, as to neglect them in the manner described in the Resolution. (An Hon. Member Read it to them!) These are my notes; nobody gave me anything to read.

Sir, the 1969-72 Development Plan has shown the record of the Government since its inception, and we intend to carry it through. I leave this Resolution to the mercy of hon. members to support it when the time comes, because they can see the merits of this Plan. It is an ambitious Plan, and the Government intends to carry it through, regardless of what the members who have spoken already have said about it.

I have already moved an Amendment to this Resolution which I hope will be seconded and passed.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to second the amendment. As we are about to suspend the sitting now, I am not going to give up my right to speak tomorrow evening when we come back here. I reserve my right to speak now, and I hope to speak tomorrow and do Justice to this Resolution.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think this concludes today's business, but, before I move the suspension, I am asking leave for the Minister of Labour, National Insurance and Housing to give notice of two Resolutions.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to give notice of two Resolutions. If there are no objections, leave will be granted. There being no objections, leave is granted.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$70,004 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of Government to supplement the Estimates 1969-70, Part II - Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1969-70, No. 67, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Also a Resolution to grant the sum of \$200,000 and to place it at the disposal of Government to supplement the Estimates 1969-70, Part II - Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1969-70, No.68, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at next week's sitting to deal with these Money Resolutions of which notice has just been given.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUPOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 4 p.m. tomorrow when we will resume debate, under Private Members' Business, on the motion we have been discussing since half past two re the Development Plan.

I warn all hon. members that I think we ought to try and finish this debate tomorrow night and, if it requires sitting until midnight, we will be willing to do so. 6.15 p.m.

I would like to have the undertaking that it will be finished tomorrow night.

Mr. ST. JOHN:

I can give the undertaking subject to the behaviour of the other side. I notice that the Prime Minister is not here today; we hope he will be here tomorrow.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

We will accept that provided that you speak to the members on your side.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I had only given way temporarily for the hon. member to make his intervention. I willingly give him that assurance about the behaviour of members on this side. I am hoping that the hon. senior member for Christ Church now that he has the opportunity to wield the Parliamentary whip in control of his Party - or soon will - will give us the equal assurance that behaviour on his side will be equally under control. I just wanted to say one more thing. Mr. Deputy Speaker. This debate is taking place, it is true, in Private Members' Time which is in excess of the time normally devoted to Private Members' Business at any sitting. I am making no apology for it. I think it is an important enough debate to take up the attention of the House for several hours, but there is still a certain amount of Government Business to be done on the Order Paper. If hon. members are required to come out on another day, I hope it is clearly understood that they will be so summoned to come out on another day this week to let us continue Government Business. I said last week that hon. members could not expect to have it both in the jug and in the bottle at the same time. If our time is used quite importantly, I think, and quite sensibly on a debate of this nature, I think some other time during the week we must come out and do Government Business. As long as this is understood, we can play the parliamentary game as it

should be played.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was not present when the House was in Committee of Supply, but there was, I understand, a Resolution on C.B.C. in which reference was made to a certain matter that appeared on television. I will not be present at the next meeting of the House next week if things go as expected, because I will be on a Parliamentary visit. I wonder if the Leader of the House would care to tell me if this debate is going to be continued, because there is something I would like to say about the conduct of C.B.C in connection with the showing of a photograph of the headquarters of the Barbados Labour Party of which I am Secretary and concerning which I contacted C.B.C. and was quite roughly handled over the telephone upon the occasion. I wonder if the Leader of the House could tell me whether I would get an opportunity to speak on this Resolution in Committee of Supply later in the week. But to this debate; not one of us got up to object to anything that was said about us, whether it was true or untrue, and they had a field day. Now that it is our turn to reply, they are jumping up all the time. Anything I am saying in here is parliamentary and factual, and I will not have to withdraw it. What could be more irrelevant than the so-called statements made by the senior member for St. Thomas? Nothing he said contributed to this debate.

Mr. SPEAKER:

May I suggest that the hon. member endeavour to contribute to the debate.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

You may suggest what you like, Mr. Speaker, because you are in the Chair. When you were not in the Chair yesterday, the other side said all sorts of things. I am a Minister of the Government, and I am going to reply to them. I am not replying on behalf of the Government; I am replying on behalf of my Ministry. I do not mind how irrelevant they may say I am. They fought Tyrone Evelyn for writing an article in the newspaper and referring to a 'split down the middle'. It is not only a split down the middle, but at both sides, too. They do not like to hear these things. Do not quarrel with me; let them quarrel with themselves.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I do not quarrel with anyone.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, about 2,000 years ago a woman had a child. This child was called Jesus. According to the records, we have it that when this child reached the age of 12 his history was lost until he was about

30 years of age. This may sound irrelevant to them, but I am building up my point and they would not understand it. Nobody knows whether the child went to school, or what the child did for 18 years, because there is no record of this. We were also told that this child was the greatest person who ever came on earth. This child has done something for all of us to try to emulate. This child has given us something called Christianity. There are also such people as Plato, Aristotle, Buddha and a few others who have contributed something to this society and we do not think they ever saw a school door. However, these people had something to offer.

Mr. Speaker, the reason why I mentioned that is that there is a misguided idea in this community of ours that as soon as somebody goes to a University he knows everything, and nine out of ten times he cannot make a bake or sew a button on his shirt. Nine out of ten times he is not the most intelligent person in the community; but because he goes out, fools around for the better part of his life, comes back here with a white thing on his head looking hideous, and ends up before a Judge with a black gown, he feels that he is a lawyer. (Asides.) The lawyers feel that only lawyers have any sense. I am yet to find three lawyers with any real sense. There is nothing original in law. Any idiot can be a lawyer, with all due respect to the lawyers in here. A lawyer goes into a Court with a case, and he starts to tell the Judge about something that took place in 1412. The Judge looks up the case, and gives his decision on that. (Asides.) Yes, all of this is in the Development Plan.

I am merely pointing out to the lawyers that they must not fool themselves that they have more sense than anybody else. If all the people in the world were lawyers, I do not know how all of you would have been able to bribe the jury. I did not worry to listen to them yesterday, because there was nothing particular that was said by the other side. We heard a lot of vituperations and abuse. Not one of them said that on page so-and-so the Government failed to do this or that. 4.10 p.m.

The Plan is so foolproof that all they could have done in wasting people's time was to generalise, and all the generalising was abuse. I found it rather strange that they got up and started to abuse me, but as I have always said, Mr. Speaker, I am a pachyderm; my skin is thick. There is absolutely nothing that can be said on the floor of this Chamber, whether true or untrue, that could ruffle me or to make me become angry, not even if they mentioned that I received stolen bananas, because that is not true, and I can always tell them that my name was never changed to a number.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, is the Minister saying that it is not true that he received stolen bananas?

Mr. SPEAKER:

That could not possibly be a point of order. Let the hon. member preceed with his address.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

They contributed absolutely nothing to the debate on the Development Plan. Now I will not waste time with anything the hon. senior member for St. Thomas said, because he did not say anything worthwhile, but in passing he did mention something about the Government's housing policy, and how they started the housing policy. Anybody going to the Pine in the direction of my office can look on the right and see a bunch of cow pens that they built for human beings to live in. They did not even put in proper roads for the people to get in and out of the houses. There were no partitions or doors in these houses, and - do not talk about wash basins and toilet facilities! They went into Bay Land and built upstairs houses in this modern day without any toilet facilities; so imagine on a Sunday you are going to look for a sick friend, and while you are going upstairs somebody is meeting you on the waydown with a mug in her hands. They say that we do not have any policy, and the hon. junior member for Bridge town is joining in this stupidity. (Asides) I would not even call him a political urchin. He does not understand what is going on at all. Junior seems to think that to harangue and talk loud is going to get him somewhere, but he will find out that when 1971 comes. The main point is that Junior mentioned....

Mr. SPEAKER:

I do not understand who mentioned.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Junior.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member, I take it, is not referring to an hon. member of this Chamber.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Everything that is mentioned does not have to be mentioned in here, Mr. Speaker. I am talking about something I heard from Junior. Junior mentioned that we did not want to move the people from Chapman Lane to Wildey, and that this is our policy. I am going to put something to him now. Since he knows that we are so vicious and do not want to move these people, his father is one of the big land-owners in this country; he owns a big mansion. Why doesn't he encourage his father, since he is his father's pet, to forsake his house and turn it into somewhere for these poor people, and divide the land and let them live up there to prove how much Socialist he is? (Abides.) I have no skeleton in my closet.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Behaviour of members not addressing the Chair evenly applies to members on both sides. I will urge the hon. Minister again to proceed with his contribution.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

I am proceeding with my contribution, but I am making points to contradict the points that the opposite side made.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is entitled to do so.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Thank you. If the hon. member so much likes these people in Chapman Lane as he is saying, his father is a land-owner; and I am asking him to persuade him to divide up the land and let these people live on it; but do not come in here and try to make people believe that he is this big Socialist. What I have found out about Socialists in Barbados is that they are willing to share half of what you have, but they are never willing to share half of what they have. This is the problem. (Asides.)

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let the hon. member continue on the debate and let hon. members listen in silence.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

I did not interrupt the hon. member; I allowed him to speak freely; but, as I said, they had absolutely nothing to contribute, and before finding points to talk about, or to show Government that they had omitted this or they should put in that, there was a complete harangue. (Asides.)

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am afraid I cannot hear the hon. member who is addressing the Chair.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, you are not supposed to hear me all the time. The hon. junior member for St. Peter

yesterday when we were having the suspension of the sitting, got up and was trying to show to the gallery that the members on this side have to allow Civil Servants to do their work and what not, that they never do their homework, and a lot more things that are not worth mentioning, and I am going to read from the Laws of Barbados to show this Chamber who were doing their homework. These are the Laws of Barbados for 1956 with Index of Acts 1956-Ito 1956-66 in alphabetical sequence. On page 900, 1956-44 it says "Waterworks (Amendment) Act, 1956." I am bringing this to show to the House and those who listen that we on this side do our homework, despite the harangue and vituperation you may hear from the other side. It says

"4. The sections of the principal Act specified in the First Schedule to this Act are hereby repealed.

5. Section nine of the principal Act is hereby amended -

(a) by deleting the words and figures "Compulsory Powers (Land) Act, 1888" and substituting therefor the following -

"Land Acquisition Act, 1949";

Now in the First Schedule to the Act Sections 4, 5(3), 6, 7, 12, 13, 14, 15, 26 and 38(2) are repealed. In the Laws of Barbados Vol.11, 1894 -6 to 1906 - 5, here is what Section 12 of the Act says on page 10:

"It shall not be lawful for the Department to proceed in the extension or establishment of any waterwork hereby authorised unless they shall, previous to the commencement thereof, lay before the Legislature for approval a plan showing the limits of the part of the proposed waterworks, prepared on a scale of not less than three inches to the mile..."

Now, Mr. Speaker, those who have been following will see who have been doing their homework, because you will lie member that a few weeks ago - this month, if I am not mistaken - I came here with a Resolution to extend pipes in Drax Hall, and there was a big harangue about not bringing in a plan. When I pointed out to them that I had never seen plans... (Asides.)

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is not elegant, but it is not unparliamentary. 'That there was just a big harangue' is just a phrase.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

If he does not know, Mr. Speaker, this is not a school, and if it were a night school, it would not have started already. Let him go and join a night school. I am not here to teach anybody. He had a better opportunity than I, but the problem with some of them is that they went and stole other boys' lunch at school and had to be put out early. I did not get any lunch to steal; so do not blame me.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let the hon. member continue his constructive contribution to the Development Plan.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Now, all you can hear from the other side is who is ignorant and who has sense, but up to now they have not contributed anything to this debate. Everybody on this side is supposed to be ignorant including myself, but I am making a living, and making it better than most of those non-ignorant people; so something is wrong. They had better try and get ignorant, then.

4.20 p.m.

They are not making a good living; they are not contributing anything to this society; all they are doing is trying to harangue the people who are trying to do something. The policy of the people on the other side, as I have been noticing, is to.... (Asides)

Mr. SPEAKER:

Hon. members

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, I was afraid to use the word "honourable" when addressing the members over there, because it tends to dislocate my jaw, but if you want me to call them hon. members, I do not want to have any tiff with the Chair and I will abide by the wishes of the Chair. I will say "honourable", but it

hurts my mouth whenever I say that. (Asides)

Mr. SPEAKER:

Hon. members not addressing the Chair!

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, do you see why I cannot get on now? They have no manners and they will never get any; they came along and saw a few cents, but they had no training. That is what is wrong with them. The Development Plan speaks for itself, and I do not have anything to say on the Plan. It is for the other side to find fault with the Plan, but they cannot do so. Yesterday the junior member for the City spoke mostly about Chapman Lane. He is like the senior member for St. Thomas. Is Chapman Lane the only part of Barbados, and Porey Spring the only part of St. Thomas? These are the pet subjects of the two hon. members. (Asides) You idiot, do you want to teach me how to pronounce words?

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is purporting to address the Chair. The hon. member said "You idiot".

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, you know as well as I do that that was an aside. You know that I would not call you an idiot in the Chair. Your Honour knows that I would not do that.

Mr. SPEAKER:

If only the hon. member would ignore the loud asides.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

I cannot ignore them, and I do not intend to ignore them. They are like hecklers at a political meeting. I do not ignore hecklers; I will deal with them. There is nothing in the Plan that I have to defend. I am contradicting irrelevant statements that were made by members on the opposite side. The junior member for the City did not say much yesterday. As a matter of fact, I did not listen to what he was saying. (Asides)

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let the hon. member proceed, and let the junior member for the City restrain himself.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, I intend to proceed as long as you can keep the mouths of members on the opposite side shut.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am afraid that I can only try to do that, just as I can only try to keep the hon. member on the Development Plan.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

I am on the Development Plan, Sir. The hon. junior member for the City spoke about the Government's policy towards poor people, and said that the policy .was to keep people in the back. Nothing could be further from the truth, and I will prove that to you on the floor of this House. This Government came into power in 1961, and it introduced on the floor of this House free secondary education. When this Government was campaigning on this matter, the members of the Opposition said that it could not be done, because it would mean that we would have to tax the people more and so on.

Sir, we proved to them that it could be done. They said that we would have to find oil and so on. We did not find any oil, but we did what we said we were going to do. Since we started to allow poor people's children to go into High School, the Opposition turned around and said that we were allowing the children of rich people, who could afford to pay, to get free education. (Asides.) Statistics will prove.... (Asides.) This is a question of pronunciation; this is English; you did not learn this; you went to learn a little bit of law and you did not get through too good with it, either.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Again, the hon. member is presumed to be addressing the Chair.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

If you will only assume that presumption, Mr. Speaker, we will get on with the debate. When we started to allow poor, black people's children to get into High Schools, the members on the other side started a new gimmick. They said that we were allowing the rich people's children, who should be able to pay, to get free education. I remember either in the late '40s or early '50s the parent of a child had to deposit 5 in order to get that child into a Secondary School. The slogan was that we were allowing

barefoot agricultural people to send their children to Secondary Schools.

Mr. Speaker, the same member who stood on the floor of this House and said that this Government has no policy, and that the only policy it has is to keep poor, black people in Chapman Lane, must have forgotten a lot of things. I have appealed to both the junior member for the City and the senior member for the City to ask the people in Chapman Lane to agree to be removed from Chapman Lane in order that we might be able to raise the roads and make Chapman Lane a more habitable place. However, because of political expediency, they are behaving like Communists. They keep people in intolerable ignorance and starvation, and they always have to look for a hand-out. That is their motto. (Asides) I am nothing to do with what they write; I am something to do with the way they act.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I can hardly hear the hon. member.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

I am not talking to you, Mr. Speaker. This is their policy, and he has the temerity, the gall, more brass than the statue of Nelson, to come on the floor of this House and accuse this Government of having a policy not dedicated to helping the poor, unfortunate masses of the community. Nothing could be more untrue and unfair than for any member, who knows the facts, to try to fool the people that this is the Government's policy. He bluntly refused to do anything to help the people in Chapman Lane that he is always talking about. He did absolutely nothing to help them in their plight in Chapman Lane, but this is the way they operate. 4.30 p.m.

I remember, Mr. Speaker, when some people left this country and were going to join the British Forces during the War. They were torpedoed just off Bermuda and some of them went to Bermuda. The Government of this country under the leadership of the Leader of the Opposition had decided to give these people \$96 for their losses, but somewhere in the early 1950s or late 1940s when this Resolution came to the floor of the House to be debated, you yourself, Mr. Speaker, argued that \$96 was not an equivalent amount to pay these people who had suffered losses, and the Leader of the Opposition in reply to you said that a lot of the people did not have \$96 when the ship went down. Junior was only about eighteen years, if so old. If he is now 28 years old, he acts as though he had 28 years' experience one time, and not as if he knows what has been going on in this community. I know he would not know because he was in his mansion and did not know what it was to be poor and suffering. I can afford to talk because I am from among the masses. He has been able to look down on them. I have never been able to look down on them; I have always had to look up with them; so I am bound to know better than he does.

As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in this Plan that we on this side have to defend, but members on the other side like the hon. junior member for Bridgetown and the hon. senior member for St. Thomas made no point whatsoever, but just barely generalised. They did not say they thought the Government would have done so-and-so, or that the Plan could have been better. All they did was to abuse people and accuse somebody of stealing money. Everybody who associates himself with this Government is a thief, but there is no person who could truthfully say that any person in this Government has ever lost a house belonging either to the Government or himself. I challenge anybody to get up and say this did not happen with their Government. A whole house got lost; imagine a house dropping off a lorry. I will show you the viciousness of some people in this community. When you get this viciousness we on this side do not suffer; it is the general community that does, because the community always seems to be gullible to some of the things that are said. From the time the Barbados Labour Party brought certain member son the floor of this House in 1966, the trend is to abuse as many decent people in public or private life as possible in order to scare decent people from making any contribution to the society. The moment a person comes to contribute something to this society, he is vilified and victimised, and if the person makes the mistake of aligning himself with the Democratic Labour Party, God help him; there is no rest for Mm.

Mr. Speaker, since this Party came into power, I will show you what we have done and what we intend to continue to do. In 1965 we built 1.7 miles of road; in 1966 we built three miles; 3.8 miles in 1967; 1.3 miles in 1968; 1.2 miles in 1969 making a total of eleven miles. These are new roads; but we have asphalted a total of 191 miles of road. (Asides.) You see what I told you, Mr. Speaker? The hon. junior member for St. Peter asked me if they were macadamised roads, but the hon. senior member for Christ Church is saying I do not know what is meant by macadamised roads. He has all the dictionaries in the world. He alone went to school; so the world started off with a University. Let me tell him this: there is no country in the world, no matter how big or small, that ever started with a University first. They have to start with an elementary school like the one I went to where you get your basic training.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, Mr. Idiot, with all due respect to you, Sir. I heard the hon. member refer to me as an idiot.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member started...

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mine was an aside, Sir. I am sorry.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member should let his asides be in conformity with the Standing Orders -inaudible. But did the hon. member seek to make a point of order?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw that.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I believe it was not a point of order.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

No, Sir. It was only a loud aside.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

That goes to show the amount of respect lawyers have. You would never hear a non-lawyer addressing the Chair and say "on a point of order, Mr. Idiot." This is the kind of respect a lawyer would have for another lawyer. I would not look at my poorest friend and call him an idiot unless we were in an argument. (Asides.) If I called you so and you decided to address the Chair like that, it means you are a bigger idiot than I thought. If I am wrong, does it mean you have to be wrong too?

Mr. SPEAKER:

I really would ask the hon. member to proceed with this very important elebate.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, we asphalted 191 miles of roads. (Asides.)

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am afraid I am not hearing the hon. member for St. Thomas who is on his feet.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

The hon. member knows I always more a good speech, especially when I am pounding him. At Seawell Airport we used 164 tons of asphalt in 1964, 982 tons in 1965, 475 tons in 1966 and 30 tons in 1967.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I thought the hon. member was dealing with roads. Now he has gone on to asphalt.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Is that a point of order?

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, I have been making some notes from what the Minister was saying. He gave us from 1965 to 1969 the miles of roads done, and then he gave us another 191 miles of road. Then he goes to tons of asphalt. I just do not understand what he is doing.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Point made. A doubtful point of order, but it is a point. 4.40 p.m.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

In 1964, 16, 625 tons of asphalt and 25 miles of road.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I should be glad if the hon. member would speak into the microphone. I am sure all hon. members are listening and would like to hear what he is saying.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

In 1965, 30, 991 tons of asphalt and 40 miles of road. In 1966, 18, 548 tons of asphalt and 28 miles of road; in 1967, 23, 747 tons of asphalt and 33 miles of road; in 1968, 25, 925 tons of asphalt and 35 miles of road; in 1969, 19, 584 tons of asphalt and 30 miles of road, making a total of 191 miles of road that we have asphalted since we have started, and we have used 135, 421 tons of asphalt.

Now, I heard members on the opposite side talking about the Government policy towards housing and so on. Sir, Barbados is a small community without much waste land, if any. I have also heard hon. members opposite talking about Social Centres and so on. A Social Centre is not a shirt you can make every day. You do not build Social Centre in the same way as you would build roads, or in the same manner as you would install water in houses. If we came into power and found that they had built Social Centres, should we continue to build Social Centres? They built Social Centres, gave them to the people, and never went back to have the people's minds socially cultivated. Those Social Centres were turned into glorified dance halls.

Mr. Speaker, since we came into power we have provided a Mobile Library travelling through the country; people can now go to the Library and get a book even if they do not know what is in it, because it is fashionable. (Asides) If you do not want to listen, you can get up and go out.

Mr. SPEAKER:

But I have to sit down and listen.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

That is your fault; you wanted to be in the Chair, but I did not want to be there. That is an occupational hazard. You do not want to hear, but you have to listen. You are just like a Magistrate sitting and listening to somebody talking. You do not want to hear, -but you have to listen.

Mr. Speaker, in order to get water... (Asides.) You can shoot me; I am not afraid. I am afraid of three things; poverty, old age, and retribution. When the senior member for Christ Church's father-in-law was in the office in charge of the Waterworks Department, you would pay money at the Waterworks to have water installed at your home, and a year would go by without your getting the water; you had to go back to the Waterworks Department everyday, and a week would go by without your seeing him. He was the first man that I knew who started to orbit and live in space. He could not be found.

Mr. Speaker, in 1961 the Barbados Labour Party went out. In came the Democratic Labour Party, and we installed water at a rate of 220-odd connections per month. There is nobody in this community who could truthfully say that they paid for water and had to wait a month to get it.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Has the hon. Minister ever heard of Arthur Eversley of Welchman Hall, St. Thomas? Will he deny that his henchman, George Medford, at the Waterworks Department, told Arthur Eversley that he could not get any water since he was telling lies against him?

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Minister has said that nobody can say that he paid his money and had to wait more than a month to get his water supply. I have named the President of the Democratic Labour Party Constituency Branch in St. Thomas, Mr. Arthur Eversley, who, because his attitude annoys the Minister, had to wait until I, eventually, had to go and beg for him - he was my opponent, and I had to go and beg for him to get a water supply in St. Thomas.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is making a second speech.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, that is what I would call a deliberate lie. I beg to withdraw that remark, because it is unparliamentary. He is a stranger to the truth. As I have said on the floor of this House, there is such a thing as congenital meaning from birth. There is also such a thing as embryonic. Some people are embryonic liars - liars from the day conception took place. (Asides.) Are you not getting up? I am making a statement categorically on the floor of this House that there is no person who can truthfully say that he paid for water, and had to wait over a month to get it. (Asides.)

Mr. SPEAKER:

Is the hon. senior member for St. Thomas attempting to draw my attention to the presence of strangerst

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Apparently he is, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

It was just an aside, Sir. (Asides)

Mr. SPEAKER:

Has the hon. member concluded his speech?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

No, Mr. Speaker, I have a list of water connections.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

On a point of order. Perhaps I had better ask, since Your Honour has already ruled that these are not points of order, if the Minister will give way to allow me to mention another name. Winston Straker of St. Thomas paid for his water three years ago, and he has not got his water supply. 4.50 p.m.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member got up and read out a fictitious name to you. (Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS rose.) Sit down! I am addressing the Chamber. Don't you have any manners? That is the trouble with you big-house children; you never have any training.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I think this very important matter of St. Thomas and water could be better discussed on a more appropriate occasion.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

He knows he can come to me outside. Because 'Slims' beat him, that does not mean I will beat him too. I will only beat him if he gets fresh.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let the hon. member proceed developing the Plan.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, in 1962 the water output was 11.2 million gallons per day; in 1963 it was 12.8 gallons; in 1964 it was 12.3 gallons; in 1965 it jumped to 15 million gallons; in 1966 it dropped back to 14.2 million gallons; in 1967 it was 15.7 million gallons; but in 1969 it jumped to 18.63 million gallons. Now hon. member swill note that in the years 1964 and 1966 the consumption fell back somewhat. This was not because we were not putting in services, but because there was a high rainfall and a lot of gardens were not watered because there was no need then. When we came into power there were about five reservoirs - one at Castle Grant, one at St. George, Bowmanston in St. John and so on. In my time we have constructed two and are now building a third. The hon. senior member for Christ Church ought to be the last person to criticise this Development Plan, because his parish never had it so good. They are getting two reservoirs. We are now putting in twelve-inch mains, and if you pass Maxwell Road you will see that. (Mr. ST. JOHN That is because of the hit we put on you.) Hit you put on whom? Mr. Speaker, I apologise to the Chair. This was because we saw the need and because we feel that standpipes should go out of vogue. We know we cannot eliminate standpipes completely, but it is the policy of this Government to put water in almost every home that can avail itself of the service. All we ask people to do is not to waste it because it is to precious (Asides). I heard an aside, Mr. Speaker, about Benn Hill. The Benn Hill problem is one that we need to rectify, but the hon. member cannot say that this was done because of him. Nobody can accuse this Government of being one-sided and that we do things for parishes where the people gave us seats, because we did not have a seat in St. Peter, St. Joseph or St. James. Look at St. James today. You can go and fish in the Salt Pond; you do not have to go out to sea. Some people are never thankful. (Asides) The hon. member says we know how to make love, but if he would behave himself, he could come too. He is glad to come because he made an application already, but it has not been accepted.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, I have never made application to the Democratic Labour Party for membership. I have supported them with my money and helped to build the Party, much more than the hon. member has ever done for it.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has made his . point, but it was not a point of order.

Mr. HINDS:

I helped them to open their first bank account and pay their rents. When they received your cheque for \$28 a month and it was crossed and they could not cash it, they had to bring it to me, and I banked it and gave them my own cheque.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I hope the hon. member is not suggesting that my cheque has ever bounced.

Mr. HINDS:

Oh, no. You crossed it to embarrass the Secretary of the Democratic Labour Party because he had no bank account.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

I am glad to hear this, Mr. Speaker. They are approbating and reprobating at the same time. We had no money; we could not even cash a \$28 cheque; but they were still on the platform saying how much money we had from the merchants. Something is wrong somewhere.

Mr. St. JOHN:

On a point of order, the hon. member was talking about ten years ago. Today they can cash \$1 million.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

I never said the hon. member was a member; I said he applied and was rejected.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I repeat that I have never applied to the Democratic Labour Party for membership.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has made his point, and I would ask the hon. junior member for St. Thomas not to deal with applications for membership of Parties. It is entirely outside the scope of the debate. That can come in at another time and in another place.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, I agree with you that it is outside the scope of the debate, but it is as much outside the scope as Nestfield who was mentioned yesterday, and I had to remind the hon. senior member for St. Thomas that Nestfield is in St. Lucy. I have a photographic memory.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Of course, two wrongs do not make a right.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, Sir, the hon. junior member for St. Thomas has just said that he has a photographic memory, but he did not tell us whether or not the pictures come out blurred.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of anything at all.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

It is no point of anything, but I can answer that.

Mr. SPEAKER:

If the Chair says it is no point of order, the speaker must continue with the subject matter.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

They come out very clearly because there is no pornography on them. You would only get this on minds of pornography.

We built a reservoir in Lodge Hill to hold 5 million gallons in 1967, and one at Rising Sun to hold one million gallons in 1969. We are now building another reservoir between Callenders and Providence that will hold two million gallons of water; so the hon. senior member for Christ Church should be quite happy as far as water is concerned.

With regard to pumping stations, we have Hampton where the production was raised from 1.2 million gallons per day to 4 million gallons per day during this period. At the Newmarket Pumping Station, the capacity is 2.5 million gallons. I am giving these facts to the House because there will be no need for hon. members to ask for them. These are points which we thought the two former speakers would have mentioned and I would have given the facts. The policy of the Barbados Labour Party - not the policy, because they have no policy - but the theme of the Opposition is to abuse, vilify and try to victimise. After the hon. junior member for Bridgetown finished his harangue yesterday, some nincompoop outside told him that he made the finest speech he has ever heard. 5.00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, it may be the finest speech that that nincompoop has ever heard. (Asides) With regard to pumping stations, there was the construction of a Booster Station at Hanson with a capacity of 400 gallons per minute. Ashton Hall Pumping Station has a capacity of one million gallons per day. Molyneux has a capacity of one million gallons per day. Alleynedale Pumping Station has a capacity of 1.25 million gallons per day. An existing well was put into operation at Colleton, and its capacity is 5 million gallons per day. I do not want to bore the House with all of these facts, but when the hon. member got up yesterday and spoke without making any real contribution to the debate, I decided to have this put in the Hansard for the sake of posterity so that people could see that, despite the nonsense spoken on the other side, members on this side could get up and not only contradict, but bring evidence to prove that what we are saying is true. The only thing they have said that is true is that we are the Government.

Mr. Speaker, the following connections were made:

In 1962 - 1, 340

In 1963 - 2, 827

In 1964 - 2, 302

In 1965 - 2, 293

In 1966 - 2,800

In 1969 - 2, 452.

Anybody can divide this number by 12 and see what he gets. This would give an average of over 220 connections per month. This is fantastic. Nobody in the history of Barbados for the 330 years that we have had parliamentary democracy can say that they had a better achievement than this. The total number of services added during this period 1961 - 69 was 19, 794. I have just been told that when the Democratic Labour Party came into power in 1961 there were something like 2,900 service connections outstanding in a small community like this; yet, the junior member for the City and the senior member for St. Thomas have the gall, they have more brass than Nebuchadnezzar or the statue in Japan of Buddha, which is the biggest statue in the world, to come here and try to make out a case that this Government is a Government of the rich.

Mr. Speaker, this is what we have done for the rich. We have passed the Tenantry Bill to prevent them from throwing people off the estate land, if they do not go and cut canes. That is why you have seen so many lawyers, solicitors and doctors from poor homes nowadays. They have had an opportunity to go abroad and study instead of cutting canes or heading trash. We have seen to it that poor children were sent to school in order to get a good education. The hungry children who used to go to school are now getting meals. It will be remembered that the Leader of the Opposition said that school meals were for children in cold countries. I have never heard anything so stupid. I must not eat food because this is a warm country

Mr. Speaker, every five minutes you can hear members on the other side talking about the educational system and the screening test. They say that this child or that child was unfaired, but they cannot bring any evidence to prove it.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I took charge of the debate on the screening test, and I gave to the Leader of the House the names of the children who had been unfaired. I challenged him by giving him the names, and he took no proper steps to prove whether I was right or wrong.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Point made.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, he said that he gives names to the Leader of the House. I can give the Leader of the House names, too, but that is not evidence. What I am saying is that when they were in power the children never knew when an examination took place. They had to look at the home the child came from; who were its parents; what kind of tea the child used to drink; how it ate its food and so on; but we got rid of all of that. That was their policy, but we came along and said that there should be free education for the masses. You have heard a lot of criticism about that, but today they have the temerity to come to this Chamber and criticise the Government on these points.

Mr. Speaker, they want to criticise the Government regarding school meals, but we all know what happened to the school children in a particular parish, which was something that needed a thorough investigation, in my opinion, by the Police. I say no more.

Mr. SPEAKER:

It would be irrelevant to attempt to say any more.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, I refer to the miles of main laid during the period January, 1962 to December, 1969

In 1962 we laid 17 miles of main.

, , 1963 " " 17 " " " (Aside.)

Mr. SPEAKER:

Need I remind hon. members of the Standing Orders!

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

He is asking for information, information, Mr. Speaker, and I will give it to him. As I was saying.....

In 1956 they laid 18.57 miles of main.

In 1957. " " 8.21 " " "

In 1958 " " 8.15 " " "

In 1959 " " 15.41 " " "

In 1960, , " 6.8 " " "

In 1961 " " 20.0 " " "

Of course, that was Election year. If you were not having elections, the people would never have got so much water. It was a good thing the Democratic Labour Party came on the scene; otherwise up to this moment I would still have been carrying water in a bucket. I was one of the unfortunates; I did not live in a big house like some of those on the opposite side. I did not have a father in a position to get a big job for me like some other people; so I had to work for my living. Today I am extremely proud that I worked for my living.

Mr. Speaker, one day a Barbados Labour Party pimp told me: "You know you are doing a good job; it is a pity you were a seaman". I am proud that I was a seaman, because the Queen's husband was a seaman, Lord Nelson was a seaman.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

In referring to the Queen, the hon. member must be wary.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

I am wary both ways, Sir. Imagine a pimp for that Party could tell me that] I have to thank God that I was a seaman, and I am going to show you how vicious this society is. I built a house on land that I paid for in 1947 as a result of being a seaman. If I had remained in Barbados I would not have been able to buy anything. Members on the opposite side went into the Registry to find out how long I owned that land. When they found out that I had bought it in 1947 they almost dropped dead.

Mr. St. JOHN:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. That is a grave reflection on hon. members. Let him name the member who did it; otherwise we will know that it is a nasty, manufactured statement.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let the hon. member proceed with the Development Plan, and not personality.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, only yesterday I had to speak to the senior member for Christ Church and warn him that the House of Assembly is not a Law Court. 5.10 p.m.

Mr. St. JOHN:

On a point of order, not being able to name them, one only sees what a vicious character he is.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has to withdraw that.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is not a point of order, but the hon. member must deal with the Development Plan.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, I am asking that he withdraw that remark. He cannot call me vicious. I have never been a thief or killed anybody.

Mr. St. JOHN:

I withdraw that. All I ask is that you ask him to withdraw the remark that members on the other side went to search up to show how vicious people in this country are. He used the word "vicious". He then followed it by dealing with members from the other side. He must withdraw his too.

Mr. SPEAKER:

In view of the robust exchange I do not ask either hon. member to withdraw, but I ask all hon. members to discontinue with this and let us get on with the debate.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

We are on to the debate, but with all due respect to you, for some reason or another you have a tendency to allow lawyers on the floor of the House to deviate from the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Now the hon. member is not entitled to suggest that the Chair tends to favour any section, any group or profession. I will forgive him this once for saying it, but let him not say it again.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, in 1961 they put in 20 miles of road because it was election year, but out they went. We started in 1962 from 17 miles to 29 miles in 1969; we put in a total of 152.14 miles of pipe as against 77.14 miles by the Barbados Labour Party; so this will show conclusively.. (Asides.)

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let the hon. member continue.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Of course I am not supposed to hear what he has said, because I can deal with him. Now the amount of mains we have laid...

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would give way, could he tell us the size of these mains that were

put in from 1956 to 1969? Were they large mains that made it possible to put in small ones? If the Minister does not wish to give me on his feet, perhaps it would be possible to supply me with them before the end of the debate.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

I have some here, but I will give the hon. member later. I can give him mine.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

I would be glad to know both.

Mr. SPEAKER; I must say, however fascinating this may be to the hon. members for St. Thomas for both to be standing and having a conversation with each other, they must remember that the Public Buildings in Bridgetown is not Porey Spring, St. Thomas.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. He never meets me there. He makes sure that when I am in Porey Spring, he is out. The mains laid are as follows three-inch mains, 23.2 miles; four-inch mains, 80.5 miles; six-inch mains, 21.1 miles; seven-inch mains, 21.1 miles; eight-inch mains, 7.8 miles; nine-inch mains 1.26 miles; ten-inch mains, 6.6 miles; 12-inch mains, 14.8 miles; 15-inch mains, 5.65 miles, making a total of 191.91 miles of mains.

Mr. Speaker, you heard all sorts of things levelled against this Government yesterday, but now you get the facts as they are and not as somebody would like them to be; a blind man on a trotting horse can see the amount of work that this Government has done in this short space of time.

Now, since this Government came into power, we thought that street lighting was not as good as it should be; but one must not forget that the Government has records to its credit—that is, it is the only Government that I know of that was elected democratically that had to pay two wage increases in its five year period and one in this period, making three since it was in office. (Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Army of occupation?) I have heard more vicious statements made about Civil Servants on the floor of this House by members on the other side. Only yesterday members on that side told me about some members of my Department writing the Prime Minister saying that they could not work with me. My reply is that if somebody cannot work with me it is not because my mouth is stink or because I am an idiot; it might be because they feel they should have things as they want them, and I say I am the

Minister and therefore they will run things as I want them. I am not saying this is what happens, but if this is what somebody feels, I have already said on the floor of this House that I am a Barbadian and have nowhere to go. (Asides)

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am sure that hon. members want to continue to hear the Minister.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

I have heard the father of the hon. junior member for Bridgetown tell me that he had to represent me on more than one occasion. I do not want anybody to represent me. I am a Barbadian; I have never been a thief or a vagabond, and I have never been locked up for arson, rape, carnal knowledge, procuring or any of these things. I am making a point, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER:

If only I could see the point; it is so subtle.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

It is very subtle. I do not want anybody to say that he had to represent me against anybody. I am old enough to take care of myself. I have been all over this world, and I have always been able to take care of myself, in and out of this country. 5.20 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, this shows the mentality of these people. I heard an aside about some Norfolk Kid knocking me out, but nothing could be further from the truth.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, if the hon. member would give way.....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

I am not giving way; I have not said anything for him to get up on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let the senior member for St. James make his point.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member said that he can take care of himself in and out of the country; he further said that Norfolk Kid did not 'knock him out. I am saying that Norfolk Kid, the Bouncing Scavenger, knocked him out.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order; a point of considerable irrelevance.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, this shows the mentality of these people. Here it is he is mentioning a scavenger, so he is not a human being; these are the people who are representing the poor people. Not long ago I mentioned, when the junior member started to get hot under his collar talking about my attacking his father, that they are supposed to be representing poor people; but now he is talking about a Norfolk Kid, a scavenger; so he is not a human being.

Mr. CRAIG:

I never said Norfolk Kid was a scavenger; I said Norfolk Kid the Bouncing Scavenger. That was like Joe Louis, the Brown Bomber.

Mr. SPEAKER:

It is time that we proceed with this debate.

. Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, getting back to the serious side of this debate, when we came into power we discovered that they had a few Mercury Vapour lamps and only in certain areas. All the other lamps were incandescent; so we have decided to relight the town, as well as the suburbs and outskirts. As soon as we started to import a particular lamp the pound was devalued; so we had to think differently. There is a firm here that began to make lamps which we are now using, but which I have just been told we seem to be running into trouble with getting, and this is one of the reasons why the area from Highway 1 down to Speightstown has not yet been properly lighted. We were awaiting a shipment of lamps; so when the hon. senior member for St. James get up to talk, I am giving him the facts. He ought to be the last to talk

anyhow, because he got lights in Holder's Hill that he knows nothing about; but we are doing the highway, and especially along there by Sandy Lane, we intend to light the whole area. I heard the hon. member on the floor of this House say that he counted the lamps and that from Black Rock to St. James he only counted 13 lamps. Maybe he can only count to 13; that is not my fault. I went recently and I am sure that from Black Rock to Swiss Chalet has about 21 lamps. I am not trying to say that this is adequate, but I will go on. In Ellerton there are 24 100-watt incandescent lamps and these have been changed and we have put in 71; in Holder's Hill there were 44 incandescent lamps and we put in 75 - an increase of 31; at Regency Park there were none and we put 59 lamps up there; Free Hill, Black Rock, had 4, and we put in 15 - an increase of 11; Carrington Village had 29; there are now 55. (Asides) The Labour Party was in power for 17 years and they did not put any.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this will go to show that although I have touched on almost every field - those that concern me and those that do not - I do not mean to steal any thunder from the members on my side - but this will go to show that this Party in the short term that it was in power, has done more in this short time than the Barbados Labour Party did in all of its time. Furthermore, when the Democratic Labour Party came into power there was no such thing as doing a tenantry road; they never did any tenantry roads unless they were for their friends.

Mr. St. JOHN:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member is giving the House inaccurate information. There was a procedure for that, both with the Vestries and with the Local Government, whereby any road in any private tenantry by way of petition could be handed over. Do not talk foolishness.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is no point of order. May I remind the Hon. Deputy Leader of the Opposition that he has not yet spoken - at least, standing up?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, nobody is trying to deny that this was on the Statute Book of Barbados, but has it ever been invoked?

Mr. St. JOHN:

Many tenancies were done under it; he does not even know; even Westbury Tenantry was done under it; go and check it and see.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Westbury Tenantry was done under it, and the roads in Parris Gap... (Asides)

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition should refrain from giving free legal advice; it is not fair to the members of his profession.

Mr. St. JOHN:

I was trying to stop the public from being misled.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, he cannot give me any legal advice; he cannot give me any advice at all, unless it is wrong advice, because he is misleading the House. 5.30 p.m.

This law was on the Statute Book. The argument they always used was that if they invoked this law... (Asides) Look at Delamere Land, Carrington Village, Waterhall Land, and so on. Did all of these places come into existence after the Democratic Labour Party came into power? You....

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is, presumably, seeking to address the Chair.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

I was not addressing the Chair then.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Please take your seat.

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

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Behave yourself.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

What do you mean by 'behave myself?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Is the hon. member addressing the Chair? If so, please continue to address the Chair.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, will you wait and let me address the Chair?

Mr.. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The hon. member is on his feet.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

If you will give me a chance, I will do so. I cannot address the Chair while you are speaking. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was saying that the law referred to by the senior member for Christ Church was on the Statute Book, but one does not have to travel far to see that what I am saying is the truth. You have Delamere Land, Bannister Land, Carrington Village, Westbury Road, Deane's Village, Sealy's Land, Holder's Land. Go to any part of the country on these tenancies and you will hear the argument the Barbados Labour Party used. They said that they could not repair the tenancies because they were private tenancies.

Sir, the Democratic Labour Party agreed that the tenancies are private tenancies, but we know that the people who live there are Barbadians and they have to pay taxes. We will repair the roads and protect the people. It will be noted that there is a Clause in the law to the effect that, if the landlord decides to sell the tenancies, or to get the people off the land, he will have to pay Government 50 percent of the Development Charges. This is done in order to safeguard the people who live on the private tenancies. The people on the other side would have been satisfied at election time to go around and abuse people, to try to victimise people, and so on, but they would never try to get the people out on the 'Church and Market' roads.

Now, two members on the other side came here yesterday and spoke for the benefit of a number of people who came here to hear the debate. I am glad that they came, because they went away completely disillusioned. Do you know what they said? They said: "Look how people could be misguided! We almost went and voted for a strong Opposition and nearly succeeded in voting for a weak Government." That is the sort of thing you will get. We do not have anything to be worried about. I have given our record on the floor of this House as something for posterity. Long after many members of this Chamber have departed this world, and I am in the Place above, where I should be, it will be said.... (Asides.)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I should like to draw to the attention of all hon. members Standing Order 37(6) which deals with the conduct of all hon. members while an hon. member is addressing the Chair.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

When history is being read out, by that time I am sure that the children of the West Indies will be studying West Indian History and not about the battle of Waterloo, what Cromwell did, the battle of Hastings, and so on. They will be thinking of West Indians and what West Indians contributed to the West Indian life. The period from 1961 onwards will be a renaissance, because a metamorphosis has taken place between the years 1961 until when the people of the country, say, 50 or 60 years hence - (Asides.) Most of us will not be here, but the name of the Democratic Labour Party will live on. The youngsters will then say "What a pity that we do not have anybody today who could lead this country as the Hon. Prime Minister has led it from 1961".

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I take this Development Plan not as a White Lie, not as a document that any Barbadian, or West Indian, would be justly proud of, but I take it as a document handed down to the Civil Servants of this country, compiled, produced and brought here before this Hon. House. To my mind, I see it as a Government Manifesto. I see it as a D.L.P. Manifesto given to the Civil Servants, and brought here by hon. members on the other side. 5.40 p.m.

I have not made a study of the entire document, because I am here to direct all my observations to the Ministry of Labour. It is regrettable that nothing has been said about the labour force in this country by way of offering some kind of hope for the people on whose shoulders the brunt of the economy is borne. I am satisfied in my mind that the Government of today is a Government (a) representing the foreign classes, (b) the local classes and (c) death for the masses. In 1966 we were told that we now have a country, but the taxi driver we have as a Prime Minister in 1970 tells this country and its citizens that we

soon will not have a country. All this in three years and about two months. This half-baked economist is mortgaging this country to foreign sharks, and I am convinced that members on the other side are coupled with this foreign corruption which we see day after day, and the man in the street remains the sufferer of all time. I am going to give some figures here this evening that are going to shock many members on the Government side. Some of them are shameless, and therefore you cannot shock all of them.

I am going to direct my attention first to International Scientific Limited because the Government boasts of 500 people being employed in that one industry. I am going to cite the Barbados Industrial Development Corporation's "Operation Beehive", and I am going to quote from some Evening Post magazine of November 1969, soon after the Prime Minister realised that we did not have a country. He wants to jump out of the driver's seat, but he has to come out in political blood. Let us look at the whole set-up at ISL. This is a Socialist Government. We were told that we were Conservatives and that we ran with hares and hunted with the hounds. They were hunting with the financial sharks. I have here a photostat copy of a case concerning a Policeman who was just arrested and jailed in Canada for \$533,000 Canadian out of which he is said to have bought Pickering's in Barbados and has shares in one or two hotels here. The Government is not screening these people well enough because they are in it. You had Calvin Sides; these villains who can come and throw themselves on the backs of people of this country. You are saying that you soon will not have a country, but you will soon not have a Government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Government said they are attracting youth; but the only person they could attract was the Minister of Agriculture who is smiling and happy, a man about 65 years of age, and they are trying to attract a political culprit. They have succeeded, so far, up to a point.

Let us, Mr. Deputy Speaker, take a look at this ISL set-up. You have a man called Kovar who is General Manager or President whose income is \$3,200 a month; he has a house in Society to live in, a car, free telephone and free electricity; he has to pay for gas. On the other side you have a man called Norland who has been working for two months without a work permit and doing the same job as John King, a national, at a salary of \$2,200 a month and has the services of a motor car from the Belmont Taxi Company. John King, a national, gets \$190 per month. They are people working at ISL known as stringers whose maximum wage is \$27 a week. They have to produce memory planes, ten of which make a stock. ISL is selling one stock for \$1,800 U.S. One stock produced by one girl working for \$27 a week is sold for that amount; and the girls cannot join the Trade Union. I hope the Minister in his reply would not get up and say that it is the Union's fault; it is the Government's fault because the Government is well aware through Carlton Brathwaite, their Liaison Officer, that when many of the members of ISL went to join the Union, they called in Senator Frank Walcott of the Barbados Workers Union, Mr. Darnley Lewis of the Employers Confederation, who with Mr. Kovar sat down and discussed the problems of the workers at ISL. The girl who was pushing this, Yvonne Grazeette of Free Hill, Black Rock, was given promotion to \$160 a month and told that they had trained her and the only place she

could go to work from there was at Du Pont; and they telephoned and told Nelson not to employ any of their staff that came down there. 5.50 p.m.

Now I am saying this to let the Government see that there are members on the other side - I see the Minister of Tourism shaking his head; he is not in it; he is not in the Pirate Morgan setup. Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a man by the name of Chatterton, a University graduate - his salary is \$550 W.I. per month; but , the man that Chatterton succeeded was getting \$2,800 per month plus a free house and a free motor car. This must happen because in 'Operation Beehive' this is what they say: "Unfortunately we cannot decide for you, but here is some information to help you make your decision. The highest literacy rate in the world, 98.7%" - this is an advertismment for the Canadians and for the Americans and for the other rogues - "You can take advantage", do you hear what they can do? "You can take advantage of an easy-to-train labour force, surprisingly high productivity..."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

May I draw to the attention of the hon. senior member for St. James Order 29 Rule 5, "Members shall not read newspapers, books, letters or other documents except such matter therein as may be directly connected with the business under debate." I am not saying that the hon. member has contravened this Rule, but I am drawing it to his attention at an early stage.

Mr. CRAIG:

You are refreshing my memory, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

No provision is made for refreshing memory.

Mr. CRAIG:

I am going to refresh yours; I am not challenging Your Honour's Ruling. What I am saying is this. I am reading from a magazine and you can ask me....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I am not here to be taught the Rules of this House by any hon. member; if I rule, I rule, and my Ruling must stand.

Mr. CRAIG:

Let us look at the employment figures. You have here that there is an average of 200 persons in Barbados who earn between \$80 and \$100 a week. That is the top bracket; this was up to 1966. You have 2,700 persons who earn between \$40 and \$60 a week; you have 6, 134 persons who earn between \$30 and \$40 a week; you have 21,000 persons who earn between \$10 and \$20 a week, and you have 29,000 persons who go to bed every night in this country earning under \$10 per week, and your cost of living between 1966 and 1969 jumped up by 29%. The Socialist Popes who sit on the other side are now shouting and brawling, but they should hang their heads in shame; it took the people eight years to realise that they now have not got a country.

When you look around and look at the hotel workers and the agricultural workers, they are the people who provide the greater part of the economy of the country, and this is what you see. The artisan working for a place like International Constructions, Senator Frank Walcott said they should be paid \$1.25 per hour and when challenged on it, his reply was that they could hardly get much more at Public Works; then you come in here and crucify the boys at Public Works for not working as efficiently as they should. But how can they? How can they, when you find \$8 million for Civil Servants to give some of them a housing allowance? I speak with conviction on this. I do not agree with giving Civil Servants a housing allowance; you are giving a Civil Servant one-fifth of what the agricultural worker is earning in one year for one month, and then you say that you are Socialists!

There is nothing at all in the Development Plan to show that you are prepared to raise the standards of the workers of this country; all you have done is to hang them with poverty. You can see it in their eyes. You are shouting about free secondary education; you produce a meal a day; but what about the family with six and seven other children that cannot produce a meal for themselves as well as for the other child? When Government says in the Development plan that they had 93,000 persons as the labour force in 1966, 89,000 in 1965, and that one fairly obvious change in the structure of the labour force has been the decrease of the number of workers engaged in the agricultural sector and says nothing else about the workers, what do they mean? All they said is what they have done, not what they are going to do. In their own Manifesto in 1966 they shouted: "we are the champions of the masses"; tonight I can say they are the masters of the foreign sharks. Anyone can look at this and see all the Ministers on the other side, the Sam Ashbys....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

May I draw to the attention of the hon. member that every one here knows he is making reference to Senator Sam Ashby?

Mr. CRAIG:

Sir, it is true that I can safely be considered....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I simply said Senator Sam Ashby.

Mr. CRAIG:

I would say Senator Sam anybody, but to my mind Sam Ashby is a vagabond, a crook, a villain. I would not say Senator Sam Ashby is.

6.00 p.m.

These are the people, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Government has done something for during its nine years in power: the Ashbys, the Morgans, the Procopes, the Charles', the Jews, and so on, and all along the members on that side were shouting that we were running with the hares and hunting with the hounds. If we did that, we were doing it with our own nationals. This same kind of thing brought blood in Cuba, Sir. Do not be surprised if one morning we got up and found blood on your steps. I am not afraid to give my blood for the people who gave me the opportunity to come here. They gave me a message to come to Parliament with. If I have to give my blood for the viciousness of the Democratic Labour Party, I am prepared to do so. When you have economic power, when you have foreigners infiltrating and your economic power is threatened, then overnight they will get political power. The writing is on the wall, and yet the people of this country refuse to open their eyes. (Asides))

Sir, I have a juke-box, but the Government of this country has not given me anything yet. In 10 years Senator Morgan has been given the C.B.E. For doing what? For finding people for the Prime Minister to mortgage this country to. I warn hon. members on the other side to take stock of their business. They are travelling on a dangerous path. The road is not that smooth; they cannot, night after night, drive around keeping a lot of public meetings, and buying rum and corned beef for people.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I take it that the hon. senior member for St. James is still speaking on the Development Plan.

Mr. CRAIG:

Surely, Sir. I am dealing with labour. I am saying that the members of the Government cannot run around buying corned beef and rum to give the labouring class of this country. They cannot do it to the

Morgans and the Ashbys. I am not saying that the Minister of Labour will go to Orange Hill and bring down a whole truck load of people, kill a cow and two pigs, with the hope of getting votes in Orange Hill. I would not say that at all.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

All of that is irrelevant to the Development Plan.

Mr. CRAIG:

It is not really, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I say that all of that is irrelevant to the Development Plan

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am dealing with the labour force of this country. I thought that what Government would have done was to give a true picture of the labour force of this country, rather than having the Labour Department at Fontabelle in one central place. They should have, at least, a place where the unemployed could register at Post Offices, because nobody at St. Andrew, St. Lucy or St. Philip, will go all the way to Fontabelle to put down his name when he is not working. I will throw this out as a hint to Government that it is something which I thought they would have projected in the Development Plan, because you cannot have a true picture of things at the moment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, to strengthen my argument on how Government have set about to exploit the working-class people of this country, the labour force in particular, one only has to look at the high cost of living. I have drawn to Government's attention the thousands of people who go to bed each night and are earning under \$10.00 per week. I heard the Minister of Labour say only a few days ago that we have a better standard of living in Barbados. His argument on that was that the cost of living was high, and we had a better standard of living. In all parts of the world you will find economists employed to help reduce the cost of living, but nothing is done here. The Minister himself said that he is satisfied that you can only have a better standard of living if you have a higher cost of living.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you have people who go abroad for three or four years, they come back, take a drive through Bridgetown, look around, and then say that the country is progressing; it has good roads; it has modern buildings here and there; the shops have good clothes; the boutiques have American clothes.

Do you know who owns the boutiques? People like Juman. They charge between \$1800 and \$2000 a month, so that the same people you are training - the hair dressers, the dressmakers, etc. are unable to get one of these boutique to rent. The boutiques are taken up by the Hotel Managers. Look at McGregor Street and you will see ThaniBros., Paul, Wall, and so on, and when you look around you can see the wives and the sisters of the majority of the Hotel Managers working there. All of the secretaries and receptionists they have came into Barbados on six months' vacation, and they find themselves into these posts, getting good salaries, free food, free housing, and so on. However, during the summer they would take girls from the Training School, pay them \$12, \$14 or \$18 a week and say that they are training them. During a certain season the sisters, the cousins and the uncles and so on operate just like the Indians are operating in Barbados. The Indians say that they cannot employ anybody, but you will see them bringing down their relatives to work all the time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is where we find that the labour force of this country has been exploited, murdered. The people at the bottom remain infinitely poor; foreigners come here and trade; they make a lot of money and go back out - like the ISL which is going to be bought now by a firm called Plexi. They have not paid the Development Board one penny since 1966, but they have figures projected to make \$682,000 (U.S.) in the first six months of this year out of the sweat and blood of your children and my children. Ten foreigners are working at I.S.L. at the moment with a minimum salary of \$2,200 a month. Not one of the workers at I.S.L. can go and join a trade union, and this is known by the Government. If they join a trade union, they have no job.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, are the members of the Government going to sit here and allow these things to happen all the time, because they find themselves sitting on the Ministerial bench and having political power? They have power and Government reigns supreme; you can make and break. I am, therefore, asking the Government to break this strangle-hold around the neck of the masses, because you are hanging them. 6.10 p.m.

Sir, I am going to leave Government with these few words. I sincerely hope that this country is going to be free at last of the sledge which Government is throwing into the stomachs of the masses day after day. Just as we have been relieved within our own ranks of a political nuisance, so am I sure that this country is going to be free of the strangle-hold which the Ministers and other members on the other side have held them in for so long from 1961 until they call the final halt.

Mr. CORBIN:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, after sitting and listening to the various speakers on this Development Plan which we have before us, I am sorry to think that members could at this stage get up and criticise Government in such a way. Now this Government has done everything that lies within its power for the people of Barbados, Let me first deal with the water supply. With respect to tenancies, the Act was and

still is that everyone who is going to sub-divide land would have to run water and make roads for the people. Some of the people who are in this House were agents for selling land, and they sold the land to the poor people without running water or making roads which would relieve the pressure off the Government, and today it remains the same. They failed to do it in their time, but all you can hear now is about the corruption and nastiness of this Government. Before corruption can come you must search for the source and see where it started, because it did not start with this Government. It started long ago when people failed to do those things which they should have done. The Conservative Government and the last Government failed to do these things, and what they failed to do for 300 years, this Government must do within eight years.

Sir, when I was in the Vestry of St. Andrew, Mr. Josh Haynes who has now died, was selling out Baxters land at \$1,400 per acre, and because he was Chairman of the Sanitary Board he wanted to run pipes on his land at the expense of Government. I was on the Board at that time and I told him that he was getting \$1,400 an acre for the land and I would not sit here and allow him to call on Government to run those pipes because it was in his power to ask to have the pipes run where he wanted. One of the members of the Vestry told me that I was barking, but I did not know what I was barking at; but I told him he was like a dog-in-the-manger: he could not eat the hay, nor he would not let the horse eat it. Today about a quarter of a mile along one of the cart roads at Baxters you will see that Mr. Haynes built a stand himself, but the pipes have not reached there yet. As long as I was there he could not get one length of pipe. That is what members should fight to do when they see evil. That was a bit of corruption.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, people all over the Island are using the water pumped from the reservoirs to water their-gardens. Members in this House see and know that this is taking advantage of Government, but they fail to tell the people that they are wrong. Yet they would come in here and say that the water which people should be drinking is being used to water the land. That is where the corruption is springing from.

With regard to roads, you hear members talking about Chapman Lane and these other tenantries. Surely the tenantries need development; but let me say that the tenantries belonged to the Capitalists. They rented the land to the people, but the Local Government had power to run water and make roads in these tenantries and tender the bills to the owners. Why didn't the Local Government do this? Why didn't the Vestries do it? In eight years this Government must make a new world. You could not want this Government to do more work for eight years than it has done. Any man who says that this Government has not done good, has no truth in him. We now have the East Coast Road which we thought would never come into existence. Is that a seed of corruption? You have the School Meals programme; is that corruption? The houses which we are building now excel any that the last Government built. Is that a seed of corruption? You have free Secondary Education. Is that a seed of corruption? Free Secondary Education has relieved many a father and a mother, because formerly when the school term came around, you would see the mothers turning to their husbands and they would sell every fowl at the door to see if they could get the fee to pay for their children; but this Government has relieved them. The God

of Heaven will bless this Government for this deed and no man on earth can criticise it. I say it is an everlasting seed and a seed of light, and no man can stop it from growing. .

Let me come now to housing. When this Government came into power, they found houses that the last Government had built. There were some in St. Andrew and when I went to examine them, I found that they had no doors to the bedrooms. This Government brought a Resolution for money to rectify and make additions to these houses so as to separate the mothers from the children. 6.20 p.m.

Look at the condition of the new houses that we are building, and anyone would know that it will take more time to build a modern house of this nature and kind than the ones before; so therefore we could not build as many houses as those that were built before. This Government is doing its best and is hoping to do more. I heard the hon. member talk about \$8 and \$10 being wages paid to people in this country, but look through the whole of Barbados in every department and see if there is any man or woman working for less than \$10 a week. I remember in 1959 we were asking for \$3 a day for cantoniers and the last Government said they could not get as much as that, but today they are working for \$35.75 per week. We have done everything that lies in our power to do. Look at the roads; look at the Barber Green roads. Every member knows the difference when he is driving on Barber Green roads and when he is driving on the other rough road; what kind of consciences the members have who speak against the Government? They have dead consciences. Lift up your eyes again on the fields, and look at the water supply; come down to St. Andrew and see the pipes we have down there - nine toilets and baths for the convenience of the public; look at the East Coast Road. Tell me, what more can Jesus do? Look at the foundation we are building; what more can we do? The only thing Government has not done yet is to give life to a dead man, and I hope one of these days we can do it.

We intend, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to help every living human being in this island, and we have drafted our plans, and our plans will show results. I have served a useful purpose to my people of St. Andrew, when my time has expired I will say this to my people, "Thanks to God for the privilege and to you for putting me where I can help you. I remember in 1960 I predicted that the God of heaven would shake the Labour Party, and, I am going to tell you - the time of history will come; and if you go on with this kind of corruption, this nastiness and speaking against this present Government - what about yourselves? You will take over? If so, make good foundation for yourselves. I heard the senior member for St. James talk against Senator Sam Ashby saying he is nasty, he is this and.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

That was not said.

Mr. CORBIN:

I will never do that in here nor outside. Hon. members come in this House to shield themselves behind privilege, but why do they not go outside and say these things? They will not have enough money to pay for damages. Why will we not behave like human beings? You would not allow anybody to squeeze you; why will you squeeze someone? You will not be able to kill and take possession as Ahab did to Naboth; are you going to take possession that way?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have all good wishes and all goodness for this Government; it is doing a good work and I hope it will continue until the end. I thank you, Sir.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, perhaps it is about time that we look at the health of the nation and see what the projection in our development....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

If the hon. member would just give way for a moment.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I believe it has been indicated to the hon. member that if at seven he is still speaking he may move the suspension for an hour and a quarter.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think it is about time that we look at the health of the nation and see...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I apologise to the hon. junior member for St. Peter, I thought the Leader of the House has said he had risen on a point of order.

Mr. HINDS:

Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we must look at the health of the nation and see what relation the projections in this Development Plan bear towards same. There is one thing that this Development Plan sadly lacks. Perhaps it is an aspect of life to which too little attention has been paid in the past, and as a consequence this nation finds itself tonight sadly with a Prime Minister who, as demonstrated throughout the Development Plan, has not set about in any measure whatsoever to provide the cure therefor. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have too many lunatics in this island today.

What have we got before us here in this Development Plan? If we were to look at the Report on Health Services in Barbados published by the Ministry of Health, this in itself gives us a lot to talk about; but when in a Development Plan for the years 1969-72 you are going to find that all of the projections, or what we are asked to accept as projections have their basis on individual opinions. 6.30 p.m.

This is the string and the health cord of the nation for the period 1969 to 1972, as projected in our Development Plan. All of the projections are based on opinion only, and what weight can be placed on this opinion is left to be seen.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I like to render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's. When we come to our Health Services, the Government certainly has something to its credit. What it has done is to abolish the term "almshouse" and to set about to dispense the same services, and in some cases services worse than the worst almshouse in this Island has ever offered to the poor people of this country. It has set about to dispense those services in institutions that are now called District Hospitals and so on. Why do I say so, Mr. Deputy Speaker? I do not say so for fun. I say so because the cries of the poor people housed in these District Hospitals are reaching out to the nation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not want, for a single moment, to appear to be travelling too fast in this matter. You have it here for yourself, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that our Central Institution for providing for the sick and the needy is the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, but we have it on record now that the people in the Pay Wards at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital are crying out for hunger. If that is the condition obtaining at the Pay Wards at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital in Barbados, then you can think for yourself, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what will happen to the poor, old people who are beggars at the gate, so to speak. They are the beggars at the rich man's gate, so to speak. Where will they get the food from, Mr. Deputy Speaker?

We have seen the Government toying with the administration of our Health Services during the latter part of last year, and this is what we have to say on the matter. The Government has succeeded in disintegrating those services which has been functioning, though not under a central body, in a comparatively orderly manner and to the extent that, at least, hunger was not amongst the complaints of those people to whom the Health Services of this country are supposed to reach down at the bottom, so far as the people at these District Hospitals are concerned.

Now, this Development Plan sets out at pages 135, 136 and 137, and a few other pages, to give us what Government would like the nation to believe are things that can be done and will be done; but, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they are based on opinion only. You will see that even where we have an estimated expenditure for the periods 1969-70; 1970-71; 1971-72, amounting to something like \$2, 653,043 based on opinion only, only lunatics would be expected to accept it in any final sense, or in any sense at all capable of being associated with something called planning.

Now, the Development Plan tells us that proper health planning depends on the availability of adequate and accurate statistical data. Here you have a Plan that contradicts itself, because when we read that to plan health properly it depends on the availability of adequate statistical data, and then you say to plan for the health of the nation for the period 1969-70; 1970-71; 1971-72, you have nothing but opinion on which to go, then we must come to the conclusion that, where health is concerned, this Development Plan was provided by lunatics for lunatics.

We want to go further, Sir. You might have all the statistical data, all the relevant information and whatever is necessary for the production of a worthwhile Plan, but do you know what else you need? You need people who are not in themselves on the lunatic fringe to sit down and make use of the statistical data. But what have we seen, Mr. Deputy Speaker, where figures are concerned? We have seen that figures can be made to represent one thing today, and the same set of figures can be made to represent something else tomorrow. You, Mr. Deputy Speaker, will bear me out that even when the statistical data is available, and these borderline cases of madness have to deal with the figures, then you must come to the conclusion that there is little or no hope left for the nation, according to this Development Plan, in matters of health for the period 1969-72. 6.40 p.m.

It is a good thing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we on this side of the House have been able to take what figures are available, and see how they relate to the Health Services, because whenever we speak of health, we think of human beings. Here you have a population which in 1966 was projected to be 252, 931, and you can look through this Development Plan to see what projections Government has for increasing the number of dentists in relation to the population. According to this Report, you have only fifteen registered dentists to cater to a population of 252, 931; but what is more, if the Minister of Health would have his Ministry do some research, he may discover that of the fifteen registered, two are not

practising at all. So you will find that your dental services, according to this Report, shows that the Government plans to cater to the dental services of the people are sadly lacking. Let us look a little further and tell ourselves that during the past two or three years you may have had an addition. While there is nothing in the Report to show that the death rate has been rapidly increasing, and while our birth rate is giving us no cause for concern in its truest sense, you will still find that in truth and in fact during the past two or three years the addition to the strength would amount to an additional one or possibly two dentists to cater to the needs of all these people.

Now there is the case of the Midwives. We are having no end of trouble in this community, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We are still having unregistered and untrained Midwives practising and running the risk of endangering the lives of the community. We have got to express our happiness to see that they have come through, for the most part, without running into graver danger, so to speak, and that in their own untrained and unskilled manner they have effected the delivery of children; but nevertheless in any attempt to upgrade our Health Services, one has got to take utmost care and give utmost consideration to the services rendered to any community by your Midwives. We have today a Gynaecologist whose services are available, so that even if the untrained Midwife or even the trained Midwife should find herself running into any difficulty, we still have a hope. But how limited are the services of the Gynaecologist? What is the Government doing? What does the Development Plan show us? What is their projection for 1969-72 to increase the strength of that department of our Health Services? Even in the case where you have 337 Nurses Midwives registered, applications had been received at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital from Midwives who had received training in England, had been posted to do work in Africa, were recommended to go from Africa to work in New York State, and on returning to Barbados were promptly told that there was no room in the inn.

Our contention, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that if the Government had any intention of upgrading the services of these Midwives, here they would have a nucleus of people who had not only been trained, but had served in primitive Africa. In other words, they went to these places where they could have gained an experience that they could never have gained if they had returned immediately to Barbados upon graduation in the United Kingdom and 6.50 p.m.

...in New York City, and you will know that you have got to meet the requirements of the New York State Board before you can practise there. Are you going to tell me then that after Barbadians have gone all through this and returned home to make their services available for the benefit of their community you are going to be told there is no room in the inn at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital? That is not the worst. This "Come back home" call was sounded, and I remember the case of Dr. Walrond, to state only one - eminently qualified people came down here, glad to be home to serve their home, and what do you find? You still find the Government has got to recruit the halt, the lame, the maimed, the blind to patch up its Hospital Medical Services. That is what they have been recruiting here; the Minister would not rise to deny it. We have had some doctors practising at this Hospital who accepted themselves as being best fit for employment in the Cheapside Market slaughterhouse; that is the type of thing that our

community has been passing through during the past eight years under Democratic Labour Party rule. It went the rounds about here that the doctor was '007'; evidently the Democratic Labour Party subjected the community to all of this.

We have had at our Health Centres, at the St. Philip Health Centre - and I do not want to enumerate all of these cases, because I do not want to bring tears to the eyes of the Minister whose very life is bound up in our Health Services. I feel he tries to put his all into it. He would like to see it a better service, but his likes and dislikes might end there. I want to tell the Minister of Health that he has a Permanent Secretary who is his biggest obstructionist in the Ministry of Health; that Permanent Secretary is in the person of Mr. Carlisle Burton.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, I think that it is my duty to ask the member to withdraw this, because unless he has concrete evidence to back up any statement of that sort, it should not be allowed to go down on the record because that Permanent Secretary happens to be one of the best Permanent Secretaries in the entire Service, and he is very knowledgeable and has done a great deal for Health Services in the entire Caribbean.

Mr. HINDS:

Is that a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker? The Minister has risen talking about withdrawing, but that is a joke. Mr. Deputy Speaker, that does not come under any Rule. I have offended against no rule; I can tell Carlisle Burton or any Permanent Secretary what I know about him. He tells you that it is on a point of duty; he does not rise on a point of whether what I say is right or wrong.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Health has asked me to ask the hon. junior member for St. Peter to withdraw the remark made about a senior Civil Servant. Unfortunately, there is no provision in the Rules; there is Rule 9 of Order 26 which covers members of the Government and other persons, but in the absence of an Order in the Rules I cannot ask the hon. member to withdraw the remark.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the Minister knew his duty and wanted to do his duty on this occasion, he could have politely asked for whatever information is at my disposal to be placed at his, and then he would have judged the case; but ask me to withdraw what? I really do not want to bring tears to the eyes of the Minister, and I am asking the Minister not to provoke me. I do not want to hurt him; because somebody is a Permanent Secretary means absolutely nothing to me. What we are concerned with is that

if you find a Permanent Secretary who can protect a criminal employed in the Public Service of this country - I am now referring to the Dietitian of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital - if you can find a Permanent Secretary protecting, covering up, for that type of individual - and understand this, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am charging the Dietitian Hetty Deane, at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, now as being guilty of the death of a former junior member in this House who died last year. That is not all. I want to say here and now; the nation owes a lot to the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown; the action he took, just a week or so ago, to save the life....

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be suspended until 8.15 p.m.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I beg to second that.

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

7.00 p.m.

On Resumption:-

Mr. SPEAKER:

It is my understanding that when the sitting was suspended the hon. junior member for St. Peter was addressing the Chair. That hon. member may, of course, now continue.

RESOLUTION re THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I was saying that the nation owes a debt to the hon. senior member for Bridgetown for the part he played not many days ago in bringing to the attention of the hon. Minister of Health the fact that a patient at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, a diabetic, was being given the wrong type of diet. That is about the best way I should put it. The Minister acted quite promptly to try to avert, as much as he could, any further incidents, but even since then we have the case of another diabetic also being given the

wrong diet - a diet consisting of more starches than anything else. The old gentleman, although being told by someone who had his interest at heart, that this food would not do him any good, had to admit that he was hungry and he ate it. That happened at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital in a Pay Ward.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I see two hon. members on their feet.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I was just pointing out to the hon. member a political rat in the House.

Mr. SPEAKER:

On which side of the House?

-Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

In the centre, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I think I can say that the Minister is in possession of such evidence; but what is being said when the Minister tries to deal with matters of this sort is that Miss Deane is qualified. We find that, whenever the Minister attempts to have these wrongs corrected, he is told that the Dietitian is qualified. Qualified to do what? Qualified to cause the death of people by giving them the wrong diet? That is a qualification, too. What we are saying is that any Civil Servant who protects a Dietitian, however eminently qualified she may be on paper, in such circumstances - I am saying here and now that any Civil Servant protecting that type of person is guilty by association of the death of the persons. It is not good enough for this sort of thing to be going on, and then somebody says that she is qualified. The competence of these qualified people must be investigated at all cost. An enquiry must be held to examine the competence of these people. We cannot allow things to go on like this.

Mr. Speaker, you will find that the obituary of some member of the community will be announced tomorrow, or the day after. We have had an experience of this already. People have died at the hands of Dietitians eminently qualified. Fortunately, for this country, in the days when we did not have people qualified, or not trying to be qualified, nothing like this was happening.

Further, you will find that these eminently qualified people have not been qualified in how to get on with other people, and that is one of their shortcomings. I am saying that the administration of the Kitchen Department, amongst other things, at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital has broken completely down. You will find that stealing is contributing to diabetics being given the wrong diet. I have said repeatedly in this House that if you find a cook - I want to call the name of Olga Du Bois. If Olga Du Bois goes to the Director of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and says: "I do not want to steal in here any more; I have finished stealing, and I feel that nobody else has any right stealing; I want to see the stealing stopped;"; then she is punished for that; she is transferred; she is accused of creating disunity, and so on. All sorts of accusations have been laid against her, merely because she says that she does not want to steal any more. This stealing is still going on.

Mr. Speaker, what do you find? When diets are prepared for the diabetics, you will find that some person, who has a few men about the Institution to feed in the yard, has to steal from here and there; so that when the time comes to serve proper diets to the diabetics, the Supervisor and others have to take up whatever is left to make up a meal to serve the diabetics. There is no proper administration of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and I would advise the Government to close the kitchen and let somebody cater to the Hospital from outside.

Mr. Speaker, a doctor, who was attached to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, was ill and he could not eat the food served there. He would have been glad, because of his complaint, to remain there and rest for a few days, but he had to leave there in order to get something good to eat. He was not a casual doctor; he was a Specialist attached to the Hospital, but he could not remain and eat the meals at an Institution at which he was practising as a Specialist! 8.25 p.m.

Remember, Sir, this is not a casual doctor; this is a Specialist attached to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. He could not himself remain in the Institution at which he practises as a Specialist. He had to get out because of the dietary problems, and you are going to tell me on the face of it that the doctor cannot stand it. People who have no cause whatsoever to cry in their lives go into this Institution, and when complaints are brought before the Minister and he tried to do something to let the public feel that he is not satisfied with what is going on, a Civil Servant lets you know that this Dietitian is qualified. What is she qualified to do? To commit murder? Is that what Civil Servants are protecting? They are guilty by association, and I can have no respect for any such Civil Servants.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that I will return to the case of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital before I sit down, but there comes to mind one other case, and I have got to ask the Hon. Minister if Government really and truly means to do something about the situation there with respect to dieting. There is a lady, a Miss Barbara Clarke, a qualified Dietitian. She has had as many four year courses of training as the

Government could have wanted; she was attached to the Montreal General Hospital, and she came to Barbados on more than one occasion and made application time and again at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital to be appointed as Dietitian, and they would not even reply. Ask the Civil Servants who keep these peoples' applications. They only want the type of Dietitian whom they can twist and turn about - and I do not want to say 'will kill people' - and whose incompetence as a Dietitian is responsible for the death of a member of this community. I am not concerned with whether a member of the community is a member of this House or otherwise; he is a human being, and if you do it unto one, you will do it unto me, if the occasion presents itself. Miss Barbara Clarke is eminently qualified; they could find nothing against her; but if she had been appointed to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, you would not have a Chef who can now stand up in the centre of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and lower his trousers in the presence of the maids and then take his ten fingers and rip open his rectum! That is what is going on at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Administration has broken down. There is so much strife and confusion in the Kitchen Department where these meals have got to be prepared. Nobody wants to eat food prepared by a Chef who blows his nose in his apron and then goes to attend to the food. He does not have time to prepare proper meals. The same Chef goes about the kitchen with a junk of meat for the oven, and it is labelled "Pay Ward". He is being paid for it by the people to whom he serves it, but the sign is only to make people believe that it is Pay Ward meat and not to touch it; but by the time it is finished, no Pay Ward patient has seen it at all.

I am mentioning these things to let the Minister understand that he is going to have a strike with which he will have to battle for days, and I am saying it now to avert the strike. I want the Minister to take action because I do not want the sick and suffering people in the Institution to suffer worse than they are suffering now. In other words, I am giving the Minister the low-down so that he can act. He cannot say he did not know or did not hear about it. I am telling him exactly as it happens. They do not want any decent Dietitian at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

You have another Dietitian now, a Mrs. Kim. I am really waiting to see where they get the money from to pay her; but Mrs. Kim claims she is qualified. She came down here with no intention apparently of working as a Dietitian, but her husband is attached to the Hospital staff, so they are accommodating her because her husband is working down here. Miss Barbara Clarke went abroad and studied and would be glad to come back and serve her own, but perhaps she has no husband to be attached to the Hospital; so there is no room in the inn for her. These things are not fair. They do not want a Hospital Kitchen properly administered; they do not want honest and upright Dietitians who really know what they are doing, and the trouble with Miss Deane is that she does not know anything about therapeutic diet, and the relationship between herself and Mrs. Kim is that when she suggests one thing to Mrs. Kim, Mrs. Kim does exactly the opposite because she is not taking orders from Miss Deane. Mrs. Kim realises that Miss Deane does not know as much as she does and is not prepared to take orders from her.

Now, Sir, how would the Minister of Health feel if anybody even remotely related to him became ill tomorrow and had to be hospitalised there and be left at the mercies of a situation such as I have related

to this House? It is about time that something be done in the Hospital Kitchen, and I am warning the Minister because I would not like to see the strike that is now being organised come off, and I would like the Minister to be in full knowledge and take appropriate action now. 8.35 p.m.

If it is a personnel matter, Miss Deane has a record of not being able to get on with staff in the Guyana Hospital where she was attached; she has a record there of not being able to get on with other people. It is known to the Minister, it is known to the Acting Director of the Hospital that from the first day she went into that Institution she was proving to be a liar, and a liar beyond a liar, and she has not stopped lying and telling lies on people until today. How in the face of these things does she remain qualified? The situation has got to be looked into. I heard the Minister say just a few days ago that what is needed is more Dietitians; more Dietitians of the Hetty Deane and Mrs. Kim class to do what? Cause confusion? We do not want that at all.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, I just would like to assist the hon. member. I suppose, being an expert on matters pertaining to Dietitians, etc. the hon. member should know that in any up-to-date recognised Hospital you find one Dietitian for 30 or 40 patients; at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital we have two Dietitians for 650 people with the result that it is for that reason I made the suggestion which I intend to work on, that unless we have at least four Dietitians with two Chefs and a Caterer, we are not really in a position to grapple the problem.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am afraid that is no point of order, but I would remind the Hon. Minister of Health that according to my records he has not yet spoken, and if he wishes he can make a full reply; but that cannot be done on a point of order.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I would bow to your Ruling, Sir, but I would ask the hon. member if he is aware that in all recognised Hospitals a Dietitian is attached to 40 patients and no more.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That can be explained to this House when the hon. member speaks as he is entitled to do.

Mr. HINDS:

I am grateful to the Hon. Minister, but the dice is loaded against him. I heard him make mention of special diets. I am not an expert on dietary matters, but I am no fool. What I want to tell the Minister is that at present in the kitchen at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital there is no such thing as a special diet and a regular diet as such, and that is one of the most dangerous situations at the Queen Elizabeth that is now in practice. In other words, as the Bajans would say, they cook one pot for everybody; that is what is wrong at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. The Minister has put his hands on it. They prepare one meal for everybody; that is what is wrong.

From the time - some time in December or some time last year - I do not very well remember the month that it stopped - when they used to have special diets prepared for the diabetics and then regular diets for the regular patients, it is not now.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Again, Sir, on a point of order, I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member. It is not correct to say that there are not separate diet sheets. I have copies of.....

Mr. HINDS:

I am not discussing diet sheets; we are talking now about food, not paper. Miss Deane has produced some diet sheets that she herself does not understand, and that is what is causing a lot of confusion between herself and Mrs. Kirn. They have got some of the same diet sheets from Mr. Leacock, and even there adjustments had to be made, and the doctor is grateful to a Dietitian for referring matters that were seen. I do not want to say what was wrong, but the doctor was grateful, so to speak, for having certain diets listed drawn to his attention, and a Dietitian was given the green light "If you know that so-and-so should be so-and-so, by all means go ahead and do this."

Mr. SPEAKER:

May I just suggest to the hon. member for St. Peter that he is going into some very great detail in this matter which is a public matter, but which does not come in such detail very properly under this head of the Development Plan. May I suggest to him that he deal with the Development Plan, on the aspect of Health, and I suspect that the hon. member is the shadow Minister of Health.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you will agree with me that there are two extremes which come together at some stage or other - life and death. That is what we are discussing; we are discussing the death of those who have gone on and the prevention of the others, and also to save the lives of people who might go to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I appreciate the fact that I have gone into considerable detail, and

perhaps Your Honour was particularly touched when I had to make mention of Mr. Leacock; but these are things that can be substantiated, and we are willing to have them threshed out. In case somebody does not like this person or that, I am not interested in that; I want to see and know that the day somebody belonging to me or to you or to anybody takes-ill, they can go to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and receive attention in their dietary matters by experts - people who are not merely concerned that Barbados is paying a bigger salary than Guyana, and "I come here for the money". We do not want that kind of people; we want people who are concerned with contributing something to the country for the dollars they are receiving.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have here in this Development Plan a matter which should be cause for concern in itself. This Development Plan, as it is called, is suggesting that the Ambulance Service should be attached to the Fire Service. I said earlier that this Development Plan was written by a lunatic, and when the suggestion is made that the Ambulance Service operated by the Queen Elizabeth Hospital -we do not have any Interim Commissioner, Local Government Districts and so on, and this Development Plan is still talking about these things, I do not know what that really means, and could mean at this stage, 1970; considering that the Plan in it self was published late, all of these things should be put right. 8.45 p.m.

These are Districts that were formerly administered by the Local Government Commissioner, but they are now saying that the Ambulance Service should be operated and administered as a branch of the Fire Service. As a result of that, a sum of \$28,000 has been allocated for the purchase of four additional units for this Service.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister himself knows that an additional four units is only touching the hem of the garment. It cannot assist regardless of who is going to administer the Service, because the additional units cannot meet the demand that is now being placed upon the Ambulance Service. I should like to bring to the Minister's attention the fact that there are many Outpatients who travel long distances. Some of them have to wake up before six o'clock on mornings to catch the most convenient bus that is leaving their district for Bridgetown, and then they have to remain at the Out-Patients Department for long hours before returning to their homes. The Minister knows that the Ambulance Service ought to be equipped and brought up to full strength, and not only by four units at a cost of \$28,000. One must bear in mind that this is for the period 1969-72, and they are going to buy four units to improve the Service.

Mr. Speaker, we have too many of these people who are suffering, and especially with the increase in bus fares, these poor people cannot return to the Hospital to benefit from the Out-Patient treatment that the Minister tells us is available and so valuable to them. It is our duty to urge the Government to reconsider this matter. It shows a complete lack of ability in planning the Ambulance Services in this Island, and to suggest that it be operated as a branch of the Fire Service is, to my mind, throwing an undue strain and an unnecessary burden upon a Service that is already overburdened with its own

problems with which it can hardly cope.

Regardless of what staffing you are going to give to the Ambulance Service, we are still suggesting that to attach it to the Fire Service can do the Fire Service no good, and it cannot improve the efficiency of the Ambulance Service in this Island. The sooner the Minister decides to desist from that course of action, then, I think, the community will be better served.

With regard to Hospital facilities, I do not think that any useful purpose will be served by going into it in detail. However, you will find that when Government harnesses the private sector to supplement Government's contribution - the St. Joseph Hospital, 3 Private Hospitals, and 4 Government Hospitals - all they can provide is a complement of 2, 625 beds. We have to relate this figure to the size of our population, Mr. Speaker. We have to bear in mind the high rate of accidents, the heavy demands made on our Medical Service, and so on. What we find is that people who ought to be hospitalised for treatment to their eyes - I am sure the Minister will not deny that the waiting list is long. People have been waiting for beds for periods of between 6 to 9 months. These are things that the Development Plan does not take into account. It falls down on these things, and it makes no provision to remedy the situation to which I seek to draw to the attention of hon. members.

Mr. Speaker, we are quite prepared to examine the Plan to see where money can best be spent to improve our Health Service, but Health Service, like any other service, must have a basis on which to build. This Plan admits a complete falling down in this respect. It is not our fault, and it is not our Plan. What has given considerable grist to our mill is that this Government, which has been in power since 1961, can come here today and tell us that it does not have statistics upon which it can make a Plan for Health Service in this country. What a mockery!

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to relieve the hon. Minister in order to ease him a bit, and I will turn to the question of Community Service. 8.55 p.m.

Now the hon. junior member for St. Thomas made mention of the Community Centres that were in existence in 1961, and I think he even went through the gamut of things that have brought the situation to what it is today. It is patently strange that ever since 1945 or thereabouts there was there for the Barbados Labour Party Government or any succeeding Government to have seen that when the recommendations for the establishment of Community Centres in this Island were really to bear fruit, the suggestion was that those Centres ought to be staffed by a Warden of the Elementary Schoolteacher class. In other words, if that had been done by the Democratic Labour Party, the Barbados Labour Party or any other Government, the situation that the hon. junior member for St. Thomas was able to complain

about and which Government has put up with from 1961 until today, without taking steps to remedy it, would not have come about. His Government lived with and revelled in it. If they had appointed Wardens of the Schoolmaster class, those people would have been able to organise Committees and bring them to work. They would have been able to institute cultural activities and lend an entirely different tone to the life of the people who live in these Housing Scheme areas. The Government was content to live with the situation from 1961 until today, and then you are going to hear a Minister telling you about what they found.

We have had no attempt by hon. members on that side to give us any light, because the Development Plan as such does not provide guidance for anybody in Government, and certainly not for anybody in the Opposition. All the Minister who is responsible for our roads and communication system can do is to get up and trot out figures about how many lengths of pipe they laid and where he told you he laid them. I even heard the hon. junior member for St. Andrew tell us about the wonderful things that his Government has done, but the hon. junior member for St. Andrew is still so blind that his colleague who is Minister of Communications and Works has not seen fit to remedy the situation in his own constituency at the Mount in St. Andrew which borders on St. Peter where you have two standpipes producing nothing but hot air, and this situation has been going on for years. (Mr. CORBIN: They are above the level.) That is true. Everything is above the level, even the level of the understanding of the hon. member. You will understand that the people from the Mount at St. Andrew have to leave living on the hill and go down in the bottom according to the hon. member, but I am to tell the hon. member that the people who live at the Mount in St. Peter will get water. Let him understand here and now that the people at the Mount in St. Peter and St. Andrew are ready for this Government whenever they come. (Mr. CORBIN It was so in the last Government too.) Even the hon. senior member for St. Peter has gone about the Castle not so long ago with some of his henchmen, and when he was rebuked and rebuffed, all he could do was to turn to his henchmen and tell them that these people must have come from St. Lucy.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

On a point of order, I deny that. Of course I expect to hear that because I expect to hear no thing very favourable regarding myself from the hon. member who is on his feet. I categorically deny that.

Mr. HINDS:

Is that a point of order?

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

As far as the Mount is concerned, I categorically deny that.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The denial has been made. Further than that the hon. member would be making a speech. (Asides)

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

I did not catch what the hon. member just said, but nothing but venom, spleen and spite can ever be expected from such a character.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, what is going on? Has he made his point of order? Let him take his seat.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The point of order was made in the first sentence.

Mr. HINDS:

Let him tell me those things in St. Peter; that is the place for it.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Exactly, St. Peter. Now let us deal with the Development Plan here.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

On a point of order, has the hon. member just told me what he said in St. Peter or here?

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is not a point of order. Let us continue with the high level of debate, bearing in mind that there are a lot of hon. members who have not spoken and are entitled to speak.

Mr. HINDS:

One of the major problems facing this country on the question of roads arises from people alighting at Seawell Airport, and we have got to bear in mind that preparation has got to be made roadwise to cater to those people who have got to leave Seawell Airport and drive to the northern part of the Island and to

the West coast. We have got to face the situation that leaving Seawell Airport you have got to cross at the Bridge road junction or the Chamberlain Bridge junction.

9.05 p.m.

In other words, you must cross St. Michael and come along the outskirts, along Eagle Hall and Highway 1, or turn at the Bridge Road Junction, up Station Hill and the Bow Road to guide the tourists. We are not thinking in terms merely of the tourists, but this Island is blessed with what we call a natural dry river - I am referring to the Welchman Hall Gully and the vast area along which it stretches right into Bridgetown - and this Development Plan does not show us in any respect that Government is capable or able to grapple with the problem of providing the type of road that is necessary to put people from Seawell Airport to the West Coast without butting into Bank Hall, Eagle Hall and Highway 1 and throwing them on the already deeply and over-congested City of Bridgetown.

This brings me to the point on the question, whilst in Bridgetown, of parking lots. That ought not to be Government's concern to the extent that this Development Plan and Government would have you believe this; the Government has an answer in its hand right now, and it is to insist on it with the rebuilding of the city - the burnt out areas - to make each firm responsible for the provision of its own parking on the roofs of the new buildings. Make this a Town Planning provision; if not, they will not be able to build; this will enable them to accommodate their own customers and their own staff and relieve the Government of having to buy these expensive lots in the City of Bridgetown to provide parking for people. It would relieve the situation to a very considerable extent. We also have to come here at Hincks Street and begin from there to provide ourselves with a road that can put us along the West coast, right into Speightstown and beyond.

Mr. Speaker, I know that making mention of that type of road will cause considerable headaches and heartaches to many people, but it has got to be faced. We cannot get away from it; we cannot shelve the question too long; it has got to be done. The Minister for Communications is not particularly concerned, but we want to admit that these things cost money; they must cost money. But let us also ask ourselves what on earth today is not costing money and will not be costing money. We need, and we must have, a Transport Authority; we certainly do favour the setting-up of a Transport Authority. It has got to be brought about so that we can put the country in good hands; you cannot continue to have matters of roads, our communications system as far as roads are concerned, being treated in the haphazard manner which we have at present.

You will find that there are some operations being carried out on our roads in this Island and one must ask one's self what type of planning takes place, because we find that the very road that has been asphalted in one week is dug up the week after, and the travelling public is very much inconvenienced.

And not only that; these operations that are being carried on at the moment by the Mitchell Construction Co. or whoever they are - they are allowed to dig up too much road, too much excavation at one time for too long a distance, and it remains uncovered for a period far too long for any civilised country. These are things that have got to be dealt with now, because despite the fact that we are having an increasing volume of traffic on the roads, one of the things that we have got to address our minds to is the question of doing something about our speed limits. This is a very touchy subject, but we have got to find ways and means of relieving the congestion on our streets. We need, if we are to retain our present system, that when you arrive at Eagle Hall Corner, something has got to be done there to the traffic, vehicular or pedestrian, that is going right into Bridgetown, and the question of fly-over bridge will have to be considered sooner or later. These things cannot be shelved much longer, Mr. Speaker. 9.15 p.m.

Now, I am very sorry the Minister of Communications and Works is not in his place. There has been a wanton waste of the taxpayers' money at the Harmony Hall roundabout. We are not saying that it might not have been necessary to carry out some sort of development there, but, evidently, it has been tackled by people who are insincere - I do not want to say dishonest. Sir, you will find that these are things which are not merely improving sidewalks. You have to tackle things more boldly than this. We find that there is in this Development Plan a sum of \$510, 782.

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

Mr. HINDS; Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will find that even the Government, in putting up this Development Plan for 1969-72, is in itself uncertain about what it intends doing in respect of road construction and road improvement, because it tells us at page 109:

"The general alignment of the Spine Road has been determined by the availability of relatively unused land, taking into account traffic density that will accrue along the proposed routes....."

It goes on to say:

"..... with a proposal of this nature involving expenditure of such large sums (current estimates are in the vicinity of \$20 million) it is necessary to weigh the alternatives carefully and for this reason it is proposed to seek external technical assistance to carry out an in-depth study of the project during the Plan period. No financial allocation has been made for the project....."

In other words, the Government is telling us that all it intends to do during the period is to get technical assistance. It intends to get people to come here from overseas, study the position, and by the time the members of this Government are out of office, then the next Government will have to deal with the findings of these people. In the meantime, between 1969-72 nothing will be done. We do not even see from what is projected in the Plan that they can make use of the \$510, 782.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I realise that this debate is now about to begin, so to speak. There are certain other hon. members, I believe, on that side as well as on this side, who would want to make their contributions. This is what I must say; the Plan stands condemned in respect to its Health Services projections, in view of the fact that everything is based on opinion only. It does not have a prop on which to stand with respect to roads and public transport proper, in view of the fact that the Government in its own Development Plan tells us that its three-year period will be spent in trying to get technical assistance to carry out what it calls an "In-depth Study" of the project.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I feel that the nation has had enough of this approach to insanity. We have seen in every way that this Government is a tired and worn-out Government. It has happened that it was a Government of young hot-heads who thought they had a lot of speed, and they found that they had more speed than sense. They have now come to the end of their tether, and no better evidence will be needed to satisfy that statement than for anyone to attempt to read what is called the Barbados Development Plan, 1969-72.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Plan carries a foreword by the Prime Minister, and it tells us at paragraph 1 that the projects and policies outlined in this document are designed to reinforce these trends and to increase the rate of growth of income and employment in the ensuing years. Mr. Deputy Speaker, to attempt to relate these things to human beings and human activities, what we find sadly lacking is a comprehensive plan by a Government that has been in office since 1961 and, above all, it falls completely down since its management policies are completely absent from a document such as this.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, yesterday afternoon..... (Asides)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I see the hon. Minister standing; is he addressing the Chair? 9.25 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. senior member for St. Thomas and the hon. junior member for Bridgetown spoke yesterday and levelled certain criticism at the Housing Authority, and they also mentioned acts of corruption or general corruption in housing. I am not going to condescend to the gutter to deal with any form of corruption; I shall let that go and treat it with the contempt it deserves.

I wish just to reply to certain points raised by hon. members. I think the hon. senior member for St. Thomas did say, however, that I was morally corrupt. My only reply to this is that if doing the will of the people who have chosen my Party to run this Government, if leaning to the side of the people who have supported me in gaining my seat, if showing preference to people who are Party supporters of mine or who are supporters of my Party is an indictment on me - if this makes one morally corrupt, then I am guilty, and I am proud to be guilty, and as long as I remain in politics I shall always be guilty of this sort of offence. He can preach until the cows come home; that type of preaching will not stop me from retaining my seat and will not get the Democratic Labour Party out of power, because all he is doing is advertising me and what I stand for. That is the sort of politician I am. If I have to go to the people and ask for votes, I have to do the will of the people. If we are spending the taxpayers' money on them, any sensible Government spends the taxpayers' money on people to remain in power. They spent the taxpayers' money badly during the course of 1956 to 1961 and they went out of power, and to get back in power they have hell. They cannot get back there easily, and if they think so, they have another thought coming. The hon. senior member for St. Thomas tells me that for me to get back a seat after all I have done for the people, the D.L.P. must get 22 seats. He is a big joke. I am going to give them so many lashes in St. Andrew, and the people they run down there will lose their deposits. If, as the hon. member said, I gave contracts at the Housing Authority to Party supporters, I shall do it every time. What does he want me to do? Give the contracts to his supporters? Over my dead body. Any time I have a hand in a contract, it is going to a D.L. P. member or supporter, and they can talk from Jack Boot to slipper - I shall be doing it.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, will the Minister then undertake to raise at Cabinet the abolition of.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Has the hon. senior member for St. Thomas risen on a point of order?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

I asked the hon. member to give way.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I am not giving way. The hon. member spoke already. I said that if I had any hand in any contract and I know that people have sympathy towards my Party, I am going to give it to those people. I have absolutely no apology to make to the hon. member or anybody else.

Mr. CRAIG:

On a point of order, ...

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Did I offend you?

Mr. CRAIG:

Am I to understand from the Minister that if a man.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

That is not a point of order.

Mr. CRAIG:

You can only tell when I am finished.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

You cannot rise on a point of order and ask a question. Why don't you learn politics?

Mr. CRAIG:

I am on a point of order, and when I am finished, you can tell me that. You cannot anticipate me.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

You cannot ask a question on a point of order.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, three hon. members are on their feet.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I wonder if the hon. senior member for St. Andrew would give way to the hon. senior member for St. James.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

If he wants me to give way and asks me to do so, I will be decent enough to do this.

Mr. CRAIG:

On a point of order, do you think this is the Federal High School? Am I to understand from the hon. Minister that if a citizen of this country can do a job better than another person from the D.L.P. or the B.L.P., he is prepared to waste the taxpayers' money by giving it to the D. L. P. supporter rather than to a person who is capable of doing that job properly?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Point made.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

The answer to that is "No"; but as long as the men are competent to do the job, my sympathy goes towards a supporter of the Democratic Labour Party. Every time they get on their feet in here, they criticise me for this. I have only this to say when you are in power you do what you like; when I am in power I do what I like. If giving assistance to my Party supporters can keep me in power, I am going to do it. Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the hon. member says that, were his Party in power, he would not show any sort of sympathy towards people who have placed them there, this is telling the people of this country not to support the Barbados Labour Party because they are ungrateful. Of course, people know they are ungrateful. I want to make this quite clear.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the Minister suggesting that the entire system of tenders

worked out so painfully in so many countries and in Barbados and exemplified here by a Tenders Committee which deals with the handling of Government contracts is a wrong system?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I am not saying it is a wrong system. I am saying that if an award for a tender comes to me for my approval, and I see that supporters of the Barbados Labour Party and supporters of the Democratic Labour Party have put in tenders, I will give it to a supporter of the D.L.P. Do you want me to be dishonest? I am telling you the type of politician I am. 9.35 p.m.

Mr. HINDS:

Just on a point of order, sit down and save yourself. Mr. Deputy Speaker, does the possession of a Party card mean that you are a Party supporter?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

That is not a point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

At least they make some kind of contribution to the Party; what I am saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, ...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I am reading from 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."

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, they will jump up because they do not like my type of politics.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Is the Hon. Minister addressing the Chair?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. members on that side were allowed yesterday to attack my kind of politics on the Development Plan. Nobody stopped them, and I am replying now and nobody is going to stop me. During the time that the hon. members were discussing the Development Plan, they said it was dishonest of me to give any sort of sympathy or give preference to supporters of my Party.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, I dealt with housing and at no time.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

That is not a point of order, that is a point of elucidation.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

A point of elucidation then.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

A point of elucidation cannot be made by any hon. member unless the hon. member addressing the Chair gives way.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

The point is, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. members accused me of moral dishonesty in dealing with contracts, and I am explaining my position. This is hurting them; do you know why?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I expect all hon. members of the House to comply with the Standing Orders.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

This is hurting the hon. members on the other side because their supporters have been attacking them, telling them that they heard them say on the floor of the House of Assembly that if they were in power they would not give any sympathy to their supporters. Some of their supporters told me so, and some of their supporters have left the Party because of what they said in here. (Asides)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

This is not a political meeting for heckling; I will not stand for this.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

On the question of contracts they want to know about Rayside's contract. A contract was awarded to Rayside and Company to build 100 houses at Silver Hill. The Housing Authority's Estimates came to this House some time late in July or early August to be approved by this House - a year's programme; no fault of mine - but the point is that you had just a few months to complete the programme. The Estimates from the Housing Authority were at the rate of \$6,700 per house. The Housing Authority has never yet completed a job within the estimate. Mr. Rayside offered to do the houses at \$6,500 each and the taxpayers of this country saved \$20,000 from the 100 houses; what is wrong with giving him the contract? I see nothing wrong with it. The Housing Authority built 50 houses and cannot get a house under an estimate nor near the estimate for the 50; what is wrong in giving someone a contract to do a job satisfactorily?

The other side, when they were in power, gave out contracts to the same Rayside without advertising and they have come in here asking about advertising. There is a letter on the files of the Housing Authority. When Costain closed down, they wrote to the Bank advising the Bank that they could lend Rayside money to buy equipment from Costain and that the Housing Authority was guaranteeing Rayside regular contracts. This was in their time - not in our time. Everybody knows when Costain sold out, and they guaranteed Rayside employment and, more or less, endorsed the loan for him at the Bank. What is wrong with giving him the contract? I have only done what they have done, and I would do it tomorrow again.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

May I draw to the attention of all hon. members Order 29, Rule 6 "While a member is speaking, all other members shall be silent or shall confer only in undertone and shall not make unseemly interruptions." I am going to see that this Rule is observed.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am accustomed to heckling. When they do not like what is being said, they must heckle; when what is being said hurts them, they must heckle; that is their type of politics. They go around this country talking about their record; the hon. member was talking yesterday about the number of houses the Labour Party built, by the same Housing Authority; they are now asking me who they are. The Housing Board that wrote the Bank guaranteeing Rayside work so that he could get money to buy Costain's equipment; it was the same Housing Authority that they got in here and jumped up saying how many houses they built. But they did not think of corruption then; they

think of corruption now.

9.45 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, they think of corruption because Rayside is on our side now. Why did not they criticise him when he was on their side? They can praise the Housing Authority under them for the work which it has done. They said that they built so many houses under the Barbados Labour Party, but they are being attacked now for committing the same offences that they are criticising us for committing, and they want to know who were the members of the Board and who were the members of the Labour Party then. They are saying that they were not in the House at the time; yet they talk of the history of the Barbados Labour Party, but they look down on the former members and supporters of the Barbados Labour Party. That is what I call ingratitude; they look on them with contempt; now that they are being criticised, they look at them with contempt and ask, who were they? I give a note of warning; two or three years from now they will be asking, who are they and where did they come from. This is the kind of character you will get on the other side. (Asides)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, they praised the hon. senior member for St. Joseph at Eagle Hall, but today he is the worst thing you can think of, so far as they are concerned. This is the type of character you will get on the other side. (Asides)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I have already drawn the Order and Rule dealing with the behaviour of members not addressing the Chair to hon. members. Again, I am asking the hon. senior member for St. James to bear the Standing Order in mind.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I heard voices on this side. Am I to understand from you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that you heard my voice alone?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I heard the voice of the hon. senior member for St. James.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, whenever you come here and criticise them for having built houses like

cowsheds in which to put human beings, they say that this group is not responsible for that; yet this group wants to get the kudos for the houses built by the Housing Authority during the regime of the Barbados Labour Party! I understand that the hon. junior member for the City said that the Housing Authority built a certain number of houses under the regime of the Barbados Labour Party. Now, when we took over the Housing Authority there were about 2877 houses. They now claim that they built them. Okay. If they built them, then they built them from the time of the old Housing Board. Those were Conservative days. They are now taking credit for not only what was done after 1944, but what was done before that period as well.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to show you the sort of classic dishonesty that people indulge in. If they want to hear of dishonesty, then I will mention the type of dishonesty which I know. The type of dishonesty which I know of is giving people the wrong information. They were not honest enough to tell the people of this country that they did not build the quality houses which we built; they were not honest enough to tell the people that every time they omitted to put doors to the bedrooms of the houses they saved \$100; they did not tell the people that everytime they refused to plaster the houses they saved money and the water would go on the people. When it rained the people in the houses got wet. They did not tell the people that, because of the fact that we had to repair all of the houses that they had built, we could not build as many new houses as we have done before. That is what you call moral dishonesty - dishonesty in the propaganda which they have been sending out; dishonesty in the things which they talk. How could we build as many houses as they have built, when we had to go and repair all of the houses that they have built? We had to go and put wash-basins in all of them.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, they talked of our refusing to carry people to Wildey where white people live. Yesterday they talked about putting houses behind cane fields for people, and said that they have carried people where white people live. They have built houses where the white people live; but, whenever you go to the estates that they have established, you can see a great difference between the type of cowshed that they have built and the proper houses which private people have built in this country. Go to the Pine now and you will see a big difference in the houses we built and the houses they built. Go to Parkinson's Field and you will see proper houses built. In order to build a proper house, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will have to spend money on it. With regard to the number of houses built, let me ask them about the money. I can tell them how much money it was.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have the facts here. During the regime of the Barbados Labour Party, from 1950 - 62, the money spent on housing amounted to \$7.6 million. That is the grant that the then Government gave to the Housing Authority in that period. I say 1962, because I give them credit for the pro-gramme which had started before we took over. I like to give Jack his jacket. I even give them the houses that we have finished for them. I repeat that the amount of money that they gave the Housing Authority by way of Labour Welfare Grants, of Capital Grants, amounted to \$7.6 million. That is an average of \$584,000 per annum. That is for a period of 12 years.

Now, from 1962-70 the amount of money the Democratic Labour Party granted by way of Labour Welfare Grants, or Capital Grants, to the Housing Authority, to house people and to repair the cowsheds that the Barbados Labour Party Government built, to put washbasins in the houses that they built, to put in proper toilets, partitions and doors in order to give the people who live in those houses some sort of privacy, was \$10.3 million. I have a bombshell for them now, because the people of this country will get \$6 million this year for housing. When we come here next week with our Estimates we are bringing down a \$6 million programme for housing this year. You have never spent anything like that amount on housing. Far from spending so much on housing, you lost a house - one dropped off a lorry. 9.55 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, between 1962 and 1970 we spent \$10.3 million. They spent \$7.6 million in twelve years; yet we are criticised for not spending money on housing because we do not believe in the low standards in which they indulged. We believe in giving people proper houses. Anybody, whether he be a lawyer, real estate agent or printer, would be satisfied to live at either one of the houses at the Farm or at Pleasant Hall. The houses we are building at Silver Hill are proper houses for people to live in. When people come to the Housing Authority asking for houses and you tell them that the only place you can find a house for them is at the Pine, they say they don't want to go up there; they cannot live in those houses. There has not been one person to whom you offered a house built by the Democratic Labour Party who would hesitate to accept, because we built houses; we did not build cow sheds. We feel we should give the people of this country something proper. We feel we are giving them a good education. We feel we are looking after the health of the country in a manner that the Barbados Labour Party has never dreamed of, and we are giving them the best type of house that we can produce for low income people. They cost money and the people are happy in them. When it rains and the bed is close to the wall, they do not have to push around the bed any longer, as was done with the cow sheds the last Government built. We had to spend some of the money we voted for houses on making right their mistakes. They say that we only built 1, 100 houses in our time. This perhaps is true; but we built houses of quality, and you cannot get quality and quantity at the same time. We go for quality; they go for quantity. They go for housing people in conditions that are worse in some cases than the conditions in the slums in this country. They built houses for people, and if they had a call of nature at night and it was raining, they had to go through the rain to get to the toilet. That is the type of mentality they have, and the type of treatment they have to offer the people of this country. Not one of them would build a house and put the toilet outside for their servant, far less for themselves, but they built houses and put the pits outside. There was no water-borne system. We have given them proper homes and we shall continue to do so. We might not be able to build 500 in a year because we build proper houses, but we are going to give them proper homes. We are not even giving them toilet chains any longer; we are giving them the low sweep, because if the rich man can have it, they can have it too. It costs more, but the people have more pride. (Asides) I have never told anybody not to pay the rents. I told people that they have to pay the rents, and if they don't I will get them out. I like to be brutally frank. I will get them out even when the hon. junior member for Bridge town goes and defends them and put them in his garage to sleep. (Asides) I am not talking about 'Slims'. When they owe \$1,000 in arrears of rent, I will put them out even if all the lawyers on the other side go and defend them for not paying the Housing Authority's money.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I fail to see how hon. members can come in here and criticise us for not building houses, and they could go in the Law Courts to defend people who owe \$1,000 in rent arrears at \$2.09 a week. I understand, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that a certain lawyer refused to go and defend 'Slims' and 'Slims' beat him.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

That is not in the Resolution which deals with the Development Plan.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am dealing with housing and I am dealing with a man who was a tenant. I heard the hon. junior member for St. Peter come in here and lambast Civil Servants and call them by name. He took honest Civil Servants for a ride. I am dealing with dishonesty; they started the dishonest talk and I am telling them where the dishonesty is. I am telling them that their own Party supporters refused to pay the Housing Authority their rents which amounted to over \$1,000 at \$2.09 a week, and some of them went into the Courts to try to defend them. It is true that one who was afraid of 'Slims' went along to the Court. He did not get through, though; but the other fellow who pretended not to be afraid of 'Slims' decided he was not going to the Court and 'Slims' beat him. He came in here with his hand in a sling. After he did not get through, he put 'Slims' in a garage to sleep, and 'Slims' decided that since he could turn him into a motor car, he was going to carry away X-554, and this resulted in fighting.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

On a point of order, I am the licensed owner of X-554. If the hon. senior member for St. Andrew has information with which he can assist the Police to the effect that one 'Slims' carried away a motor car from me, I would be glad if he would assist the Police. But he made certain allegations about lawyers representing one 'Slims'. I represented one James A. Haynes, known as 'Slims' but this is an attack on two lawyers. I know that the hon. junior member for Bridgetown also did it. I represented him on one occasion when the Housing Authority sought to evict him, and contrary to what the Minister has said, that particular case slipped me.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

That is not a point of order. It is a point of explanation.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

Subsequent to that, I refused to represent him and he went to the hon. junior member for Bridgetown.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Point made.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you see I have my facts. I said that the hon. member who refused to represent 'Slims' got a beating for it, and the other one who was afraid of 'Slims' had to go to the Law Courts. 10.05 p.m.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

No Minister can get in the House and say that any hon. member got a beating for refusing to represent anybody; apart from his knowing it to be untrue. I am informed in fact that two members of the House did represent him, and this is something that happened four years ago.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

No point of order.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

No, but the Minister must not do it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

That is not a point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I forgot that the hon. member told me that he beat 'Slims' that 'Slims' did not beat him. I challenge him now to get up and say this is not true.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

On a point of order, he has challenged me; so let me say that this person called 'Slims' and I have

never had a fight.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, back to a more serious matter. I was saying they do not really have any case when they attack the Gov-eminent on its housing policy. The junior member for the City can justifiably query what is being done about slum clearance in the City. A survey is currently being carried out in the City, and I think I told the hon. member this, not on the floor of the House. I mentioned it to the hon. member and pointed out that a survey is being carried out in the City to assess the needs of the City area in respect of housing to see where assistance in some form can be offered to the people who live in what is termed as the slum areas in this island in meeting their housing conditions. I expect to have a report on this survey on the conditions in the City area or in all the slum areas in this island, not necessarily in the City of Bridgetown as such, but there are certain areas of Brittons Hill where people are living in sub-standard housing, and a Report of this survey will be submitted to me some time during the year. I have not waited until this Report is submitted, but I have included in the Estimates for this year a certain sum for slum clearance, and this will be spent on slum clearance.

I am not satisfied with the housing conditions in especially certain areas in the City; I feel that the people in the City - I could not care what their political complexion is - but they must live in proper houses. This is not a case where I am doing a favour for anybody; this is a case where we are looking after the needs of the people of this country, and it is my intention to do something to improve the housing conditions of the people who live in these areas. The hon. member for the City is a bit worried over the fact that the loans to sugar workers and general workers made over the past - not this current year, but over the past two years - amounted to a little less than in some cases what was received. This has happened because a lot of money going to sugar workers must come from the Labour Welfare Fund, and the hon. member is aware that since 1963, we have not been having the best of crops because of the cane fires; because of the cane fires we have lost a lot of money in the sugar industry. A lot of money which we would normally expect to get from the Labour Welfare Fund we did not get; however, we were able to increase last year the amount of money loaned to sugar and general workers, and this year I promise hon. members to come to this House and ask for a million dollars to lend sugar workers and general workers. You cannot service more than that in one year; even to service loans to sugar workers and general workers you have got to increase the staff of a section of the Department, but the service has got to be carried out.

I found that the applications were only processed when money was made available. The Housing Authority has had instructions to have the applications processed whether there is money to meet these applications or not; so there will be a back log of applications processed and approved by the Authority by the time that this money is released to them, and I think the people will be happier. We also increased earlier this year the amount of loans available; there was no plan on housing; nobody in his right senses could expect to spend a million dollars a year on housing, last year.....

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, did I understand the Minister correctly when he said that nobody in his right senses could spend a million dollars for housing for one year?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I do not think the hon. member understands what I am saying, which is that when you look at the housing needs of this country and the plight of the people in this country, obviously you can only conclude that when they put a million dollars in the Development Plan to spend on housing in one year, it is a big mistake. 10.15 p.m.

Anyhow, I want to assure hon. members that they will not be getting only \$1 million a year on housing; they are going to get a big sum of money to spend on housing. This year I am going to build more houses than the Barbados Labour Party have built in any one year. (Asides) You built 300 houses a year, and I am going to build 350 houses a year. (Asides)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I told the hon. member that a survey has been carried out. He is criticising our policy in housing, and I have told him that we are increasing the number of houses to be built this year. I have replied to the point made when he compared the money spent on housing by the Barbados Labour Party during the time they were in the Government with the money spent by the Democratic Labour Party. I do not think he has any point there, because we spent more on housing than they have spent. We spent more money on housing in 8 years than they have spent in 12 years.

The hon. member spoke about lack of parks and so on. It is only since the Democratic Labour Party held the reins of Government in this country that anybody came to the conclusion that, in establishing a Housing Estate, you were establishing a community. It was only under the Democratic Labour Party that Community Centres, Day Nurseries and Playing Fields were provided in the Housing Estates. When the Pine was laid out they left a piece of open pasture in front of the Pine's workshop; they left a piece of open pasture at Golden Rock, and so on. The Democratic Labour Party had to go at the Pine in an area which they had laid out for additional houses and build a Community Centre and a Playing Field. (Asides) We built it behind Parkinson School. (Asides) Was the Barbados Labour Party in power in 1964?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, do you know what is wrong -with hon. members on the other side? They do not understand that they are not in power today. The Pavilion and Playing Field at Parkinson Field were

built in 1964, They left a piece of land there which looked like a gully with a lot of swamp where water settled down at Grazettes and expected the people at Grazettes to use that as a Playing Field. We have established a proper Playing Field there with a Community Centre which cost over \$60,000; yet they talk about the lack of provision of Playing Fields on the Housing Estates. We are the only people who looked after housing in this country and provided this sort of amenities for the people in the Housing Estates.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, they do not like to hear me talk about Orange Hill. They criticise me in Orange Hill. Anyway, in Orange Hill this year we are establishing two new Housing areas and they will have all of these facilities. At Pleasant Hall we did not establish cowsheds up there; we built proper houses; the area did not have enough room for a playing field, but the people can use the Garrison. We have given the people a very modern Day Nursey, which every resident in the area is proud of. Where there was no room to build a modern Day Nursery in all of the Estates, we have converted houses into Day Nurseries. We have done that at Colleton, Sayes Court, Ellerton, and we are building one now at the Farm, 10.25 p.m.

A Nursery is now being built at The Farm, and hon. members had the estimates for the money for that Day Nursery. Bagatelle has a Day Nursery; Six Cross Roads has a Day Nursery. All these were built by the Democratic Labour Party who saw that in establishing a Housing Estate, there were certain amenities that must go with it for people in the area; so for the first time a policy on housing emanated from the regime of the D.L.P. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not think there was anything else that was said that is worth my replying to. I have replied to the salient points, and I will complete my address by saying that I shall continue to do what I can to improve the plight of the lower income people of this country as far as housing is concerned.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think my first task here tonight is to deplore the allegations - I would not say the conduct be cause that is the regular pattern of behaviour which is experienced in here nowadays - and unwarranted attacks which were levelled at my Permanent Secretary, Mr. Carlisle Burton, who as a Civil Servant is not in a position to defend himself.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, how does the Minister know whether or not the remarks were unwarranted? Does he know what information is in my possession?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I hope the hon. member knows that is not a point of order.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I am saying that my first duty and task here is to defend in no uncertain manner the unwarranted attack launched on my Permanent Secretary, Mr. Carlisle Burton who is a highly qualified man, who has been honoured by Her Majesty the Queen, who has been a senior official in the Civil Service for many long years and was the Permanent Secretary to Dr. Cummins when he was Premier - and 'if Dr. Cummins in his wisdom and experience thought it fit under the Barbados Labour Party Government to have Mr. Burton as his Permanent Secretary, that is clear and ample proof that he is a very competent man and above reproach. But not only was this unwarranted attack launched on him. A Civil Servant is not in a position to defend himself, and I think it is wrong, unfair and inequitable to try to embarrass a man who is doing a good job and who is regarded as one of the best Civil Servants in the entire Service.

Mr. HINDS:

Can you embarrass a Civil Servant if he condones murder?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

That is not a point of order.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

That would not throw me off. That is only a bait, and baits like that I do not fall for. I would like to draw to the attention of Your Honour that not only has Mr. Burton been recognised in the local Civil Service, but also far afield at Pan American Health Organisation Conferences, at World Health Organisation Assemblies, at Caribbean Health Ministers' Conferences and many other meetings we have held in certain parts of South America where Mr. Burton's work has been exemplary and of a very high order; and to sit here and see a man of his calibre being attacked by people who are not really knowledgeable in these matters is wrong, unfair and unkind. We are having a Caribbean Health Ministers' Conference in April, and Mr. Burton has been selected on the Standing Committee which really guides this Conference and lays out the agenda and does the groundwork etc. Mr. Burton has been selected as the representative for Barbados on this Standing Committee, and he has been appointed Co-ordinator Convenor and Organiser of this Conference. I do not know how the hon. member managed to make that accusation, because Mr. Burton does not work with the Hospital and neither do I.

However I will deal with the main thing that the hon. member wants to hear about. These are unwarranted attacks not only on Mr. Burton, but I am accustomed to hearing these attacks on the Dietitian and it seems as if Mrs. Kim is being roped in too, poor soul. I do not know how she happens to

get roped into this, but the fact remains that Dietitians are being attacked. Now the hon. member made a point about the qualifications of Miss Deane and those of Mrs. Kim. Both are highly qualified Dietitians and have conformed with all the requirements of the medical profession as far as the practice of dietetics is concerned. There is no differentiation as such between the Dietitians; either can be a therapeutic or either one can be administrative. That is the advice I have got.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, it is silly for the Minister to get here misleading this House. It is not every Dietitian who is a therapeutic Dietitian, regardless of what advice the Minister got.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

My advice, Sir, is that they are both trained according to the regular course, and on the question of who is therapeutic and who is administrative, they can interchange. 10.35 p.m.

Miss Deane is responsible for general administration and for the management of the kitchen. Reports by Nutritionists and Dietitians of the Department show that great improvements have taken place over the past year.

Mr. HINDS:

The Minister knows that is a lie.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Is the hon. member addressing the Chair?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

We have had visits from experts, and we have had visits from someone who is well-known - I do not want to call names but since the hon. member has called names I will have to -Miss Zephirin, and she has recently made a tour and inspected the place and is very satisfied with the work which Miss Deane is doing; she says that an excellent job is being done by her.

Mr. HINDS rose.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Has the hon. junior member risen on a point of order?

Mr. HINDS:

The Minister has given way.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

But the Chair must be informed on what he has risen.

Mr. HINDS:

If you ask if I have risen on a point of elucidation, I can say so; but the point is this, I wonder if the Minister can tell us if Miss Zephirin interviewed those patients about whom he received complaints very recently.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I am stating, Sir, that Miss Deane is responsible for the general management of the Kitchen, and the other Dietitian, Mrs. Kim, sees after the therapeutic side of the work and the special needs for diabetic patients. There are separate and distinct diet sheets for diabetics; I have specimen copies here; and there are other sheets for the general wards. So to suggest that only one set of food is cooked.....

Mr. HINDS:

It is so.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Is the hon. junior member for St. Peter addressing the Chair?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

The Diabetic Clinic in use at the Hospital has been approved by the Medical Staff Committee, and the Specialists at the Hospital produce diet sheets. In the case of which the hon. member has made specific mention, the Chairman of the Medical Staff Committee prepared a diet sheet after he discovered that for

a day or two the diet which was being given to the particular patient was in conformity with diets for diabetics right enough, because the particular doctor, the Chairman of the Medical Staff Committee, his diet sheet is more stringent and more exacting and not as liberal as in the case of other doctors who diagnose for diabetics; but this particular doctor - I am referring to the Chairman of the Medical Staff Committee - after a day or two had expired... All I am trying to point out is this. Whereas the Dietitians gave the regular diet for diabetics which is used generally by a lot of Specialists, but which did not conform with the particular doctor's diet sheet, it is only then that she conformed with the diet sheet as prescribed by the Chairman of the Medical Staff Committee. It was not that she was providing the wrong diet at any time, but she was providing the diet regularly used by many of the Specialists who do not feel that any harm, was done; but this particular doctor, the Chairman of the Medical Staff Committee, he goes to the letter of the law and saw that no carbohydrates at all were given. It is for that reason that some of them complained of being hungry. If you are accustomed to eating a big bowl of rice and a piece of plantain, then you will always complain about being hungry if you do not get all this food to eat.

The Chairman of the Medical Staff Committee gave a special diet sheet, a copy of which I will pass to the hon. member for his consumption - it is not for publication - and that is being complied with rigidly to such extent that diabetic patients naturally feel that they are not getting enough to eat. That is the position, and these are the diet sheets; there are other diet sheets which are the regular diet sheets for diabetics, and that is what I want to draw to the hon. member's attention. These are diet sheets for other diabetics, and then there are regular diet sheets for the general wards - people who are not suffering from any diabetic ailment; so you have a special diet sheet prescribed by a special doctor for special patients under his care, which other Specialists use - I have copies here - and then there are regular diet sheets for the regular people at the Hospital who are suffering from sugar.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, would the Minister admit that a patient, a diabetic, was fed dry peas and rice and fried pork on Sunday for dinner at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I have already drawn to the attention of all hon. members the relevant Standing Order dealing with the behaviour of members; I am not here to be told by anybody at all what to do.

10.45 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have not concluded my speech; I gave way. Now comes the question of Miss Barbara Clarke. The hon. junior member for St. Peter called names, and I am afraid I will have to call

names, too, if I am to reply efficiently and adequately. There is an allegation that Miss Barbara Clarke applied for a job and never received a reply. Miss Barbara Clarke was offered a job by the Ministry of Health, and she accepted a post in the Ministry of Education. (Asides.) I am giving you the facts. The hon. member made this point in dealing with Hospital Services. He criticised the Hospital generally, but I want to let him know that the Barbados Hospital is not under-supplied with hospital beds. What is really needed, Sir, is better utilisation of existing facilities, and this is shown by a Committee which dealt with bed allocation in Barbados quite recently. Therefore, it would be spending taxpayers' money badly to think of purchasing new beds when we have unused beds at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

With regard to the Ambulance Service, he said that only four Ambulances will be bought over the planned period. Now, the Ambulance will be used for ambulance purposes only. They will work round the clock with 34 posts in all. The staff will be increased and the Ambulances will be on the job 24 hours a day. The Ambulances will be controlled through the Fire Service Wireless, but would be stationed at the Hospital and in various places where Ambulances are placed-at the District Health Centres, etc.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Out-patient Clinics are being built up to take care of patients referred to the Hospital. The point I am trying to make is that, with the setting up of the Out-patients Department in the curtilage of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital in this planned period this year, we will be providing adequate accommodation for Out-patient cases as such, and there will not be any conglomeration and admixture at the Out-patient Clinic, Casualty, and so on, cluttering up the work. The Out-patients will go to a specified house or building and be dealt with as Outpatients expeditiously, and they will understand then for the first time that they are Out-patients, Casualty cases will continue to go to the Casualty, and they will be dealt with as expeditiously as possible, because we intend to employ more doctors on a sessional basis in order to see that quicker attention may be given and the service is improved.

The hon. member decried informed opinion. If we do not go by informed opinion, what are we to go by? Must we go by uninformed opinion? Informed opinion means the best possible advice you can have at your disposal. In my Ministry I try to use people who are knowledgeable. I see to it that the Permanent Secretary, the Senior Assistant Secretary and the Assistant Secretaries at the Ministry do their work. I do not do all of the work; I delegate the work and have it done. The hon. member will be surprised to know that I have here a Progress Report on the work done on the Development Plan up to now. It is all here but I would not worry to tire hon. members with this. I did not hear any questions asked about how far we got with it and so on.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will mention in passing that one of the main points in our Plan is to increase the supply and improve the quality of professional, technical and administrative personnel. I should like to mention to you, Sir, that the Caribbean Health Manpower Project has been established on a regional basis with a Director, who is Doctor Alexander Robinson, being based in Barbados. Discussions are

being held regarding the development of para-medical training on a regional basis, and a local training programme for Health and Welfare Personnel has been in progress right now at the Extramural Department. Advantage has been taken of the Pan American Health Organisation Personnel who are stationed here, and we have experts examining various departments of the Hospital from time to time and rendering very useful service. They grant Fellowships and Scholarships to many of our personnel, and the standard generally has improved. It is all right for hon. members to get in here and criticise the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I am glad the Prime Minister is here now, because he will hear me talking straight.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what we need at the Hospital are more Dietitians. Two Dietitians cannot fill the role at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. That is only touching the surface. What they need - (Asides) You all talked a lot of tripe, and most of what I am saying is not tripe. I am not talking through my hat. I am speaking as a responsible person, and I have been to the trouble of having things prepared. I am giving you chapter and verse. I can talk as long and as loud as any of you and longer. I am saying that we need, at least, four Dietitians, two properly trained Chefs, and a Caterer. We have about four hundred special cases to deal with in that Hospital, and it is difficult for two Dietitians to deal with them, whether it is Miss Barbara Clarke - who has been recommended by the hon. member, and there is still room for her - or whether it is Mrs. Kim, or Miss Deane who has done a lot of yeoman work in trying to organise the Department and the Kitchen. The fact remains that we want two more Dietitians, 2 proper Chefs and a Caterer, and then we will be moving on a right footing.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the points made by the hon. member have been noted. I have about six pages of his notes relative to pulling down pants, etc., in the kitchen, and the blowing of noses in aprons, etc. I like to investigate these things personally. When I go to the Kitchen to investigate these matters, do not write in the Truth that the Minister has no right going into the Kitchen to investigate matters. On the last occasion when I went to investigate a matter, I was criticised for trying to execute my duties to the best of my ability and in a manner in which I felt I was satisfied in doing.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order. I will promise not to criticise the Minister if he goes to do his duty but not if he goes to get people to sign a petition against other people.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

That is not a point of order. 10.55 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I was saying, Sir, that the hon. member talked about informed opinion. There is no need for statistics to decide where to place Out-patients Clinics; these can be determined according to the centres of population. We have recently had an officer trained in health statistics who will now assist in the computation and compilation of morbidity and other health statistics, and this will enable us to evaluate existing programmes such as the T.B. control programme. I have to go by informed opinion. I am not a doctor, and I have to go by the best advice I can get. It is all right to get here and shout about the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, but the fact remains, irrespective of what is said inhere and irrespective of the criticisms levelled at me or the staff of the Ministry, the Dietitians or the Government generally, that the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is a training hospital for doctors - there are about 28 of them doing their final year - technical staff, and soon will be training druggists and other technicians for the highly skilled and technical work at the Hospital. The Hospital has turned out hundred of Nurses and Ward Assistants with the assistance of Pan American Health Organisation, the United Nations and the British and Canadian Governments. What is more, our Hospital has been granted full recognition by the British Medical Association in England and our course of training has been reduced from a four-year to a three-year course, and our standard of Nurses is equivalent to theirs.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is all right to get up in here and shout and talk, but the fact remains that our Queen Elizabeth Hospital is as good as any in the Caribbean and is probably the best in the British Caribbean, and we have every reason to be proud of it because it is rendering yeoman service and is providing free medicine, drugs and treatment for our people, irrespective of which parish they come from. The people of St. Peter are well received and attended to, just as the people from Christ Church.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think we can stop at this point. Now I am suggesting that we meet on Friday afternoon at 3 o'clock. I want hon. members to understand me quite carefully. This debate is a very important debate on the Development Plan. To accommodate it we have surrendered a little of Government time. I am suggesting, therefore, that when we come on Friday, from 3 o'clock until we break for dinner, that that time must be used to conclude this debate so that after the dinner break we can go on to Government Business. We must get Government Business finished, because we are approaching the time when the Appropriation Bill has to be done, and that will take two or three days and perhaps a fourth day; so I want all the decks cleared in Government Business by next Tuesday so that in the week after we shall know what we are doing.

I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until Friday, 27th February, at 3 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

11.00 p.m.

On Resumption:

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I observe that there is no quorum and ask that the Bell be rung.

The Bell was rung and no quorum was obtained.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

It now being four minutes after 3 p.m., and there being no quorum, this House now stands adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday, 3rd March, 1970.

3.05 p.m.