

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, 21st July, 1970.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12. 15 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour Q. E. SARGEANT, (Deputy Speaker); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J. P.; Horn K. N. R. HUSBANDS, J. P., (Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology); Mr. E. St. A. HOLDER, J, P; Hon. C. E. E. TALMA, (Minister of Health and Socil Welfare); Horn J, C. TUDOR C, M. G", M. A., (Leader of the House); Mr. J. W. CORBIN, J. P.; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES, J. P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J. P.; Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD, J. P.; (Chairman of Committees); Mr. C. A. E. HOPPIN, J. P.; Mr. L. S. CRAIG; Prayers were read,

Mr. HINDS entered the Chamber and took his seat.,

MINUTES

-Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, 19th May, 1970, have been , printed and circulated, and unless there is any objection, they will be confirmed.

There being no objection, I declare those Minutes confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Finance, I am commanded to lay the following -

An Account of the transactions In Rum in the Island, for the quarter ended 30th June, 1970.

On behalf of the Prime Minister, I am commanded to lay the following: -

The Civil Establishment (Part-time Officers) (Amendment) Order, 1970.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 5) Order, 1970.

On behalf of the Minister of Trade, I am commanded to lay the following: -

Report of The Public Utilities Board for the year 1969.

On my own behalf, I am commanded to lay the following: -

The Physical Development Plan for Barbados.

Report of the Commission of Enquiry appointed to enquire into the outbreak of certain recent fires in the City of Bridgetown.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

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

Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Part-time Officers) (Amendment) Order, 1970.

Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 5) Order, 1970.

On behalf of the Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of the following: -

Notice of amendments to be "moved-in" the Supplementary Estimates, 1970-71, No. 3.

On behalf of the Prim(c) Minister, I beg to give notice of the following: -

A Bill to repeal the Chaplains and Printing Committee Act 1891 (1891-24), The Legislative Debates Act, 1894 (1894-7) and the Officers of The Assembly (Salaries) Act, 1912 (1912-2),

On behalf of the Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of the following: -

A Bill to provide for the implementation of certain of the provisions of the Agreement between the Caribbean Development Bank and the Government of Barbados relating to the Headquarters of the Bank.

On my own behalf, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 112, asked by the hon. junior member for St. John, is ready.

Hon. G. O. FERGUSSON:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 66, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, is ready.

Also Oral Replies to Parliamentary Question Nos. 100 and 103, asked by the hon. senior member for St. James, are ready.

Also, Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 106, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, is ready.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW entered the Chamber and took his seat.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. CRAIG:

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

To enquire of the Minister of Housing:

(1) Is the Minister aware that it is the intention of the Barbados Housing Authority to convert the playing field at Thorpe's Housing Area, St. James into a residential area?

(2) Is the Minister aware that such a step would deprive the residents of the said Thorpe's Housing Area and of the surrounding districts of a much needed recreational and/or games centre?

(3) If the answer to (1) is in the affirmative, will the Minister use his good offices to prevent the execution of the project mentioned above?

Mr. SMITH:

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

To enquire of the Minister responsible for Housing: -

Will the Minister state for the information of this House the names and addresses of those persons

in receipt of Public Assistance but unable to qualify for loans on their own whose houses are being repaired by the Housing Authority from the Fund provided by Government for this purpose?

SELECT COMMITTEE REPORT

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Report of the Committee which was appointed last Tuesday on the Bill to make provision for regulating the carrying on of Insurance business in Barbados is now ready.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was under the impression that I was a member of this Committee, and I have never been summoned to a meeting. As a matter of fact, I would not say I was not summoned, but I have never received such a summons, and it is most amazing that I am now hearing that the Committee met and the Report is now ready.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not Chairman of the Committee. As a matter of fact, the hon. junior member for Bridgetown is the person who is presenting the Report to the House in the absence of His Honour the Speaker, who is normally ex officio Chairman of all Committee. My information is that the hon. member who has just sat down was summoned by the usual means of communication, that is, through the post by a printed notice - I certainly received one - and I understand that the hon. member was not in attendance at his usual place of business when efforts were made to reach him by telephone to remind him of the meeting. We had a quorum and the majority of the members were members of the Government side, and the Chairman was a member from the opposite side.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not prolonging this or trying to make an issue of it. I am not saying that a summons was not sent. What I am saying is that I have never received a summons, and it is rather strange to hear that someone tried to reach me at my place of business and I never heard anything about this. I am not saying anything against the persons who are responsible for summoning members. However, be

that as it may, we must accept this.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA a Bill to repeal the Chaplains and Printing Committee Act 1891 (1891-24) the Legislative Debates Act, 1894 (1894-7) and the Officers of the Assembly (Salaries) Act, 1912 (1912-2) was read a first time.

12. 25 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to provide for the implementation of certain of the provisions of the Agreement between the Caribbean Development Bank and the Government of Barbados relating to the Headquarters of the Bank be now read a first time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 9 be taken as the first Order of the Day under Government Business.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in 1967 in my budgetary proposals I introduced in this House an Act to impose a charge of \$2. 00 on all outgoing passengers using Seawell International Airport, and that was described as the Airport Service Charge Act, 1967. On 12th May this year I proposed that the charge be increased to \$3. 00 in the case of persons travelling within the Caribbean - which area, of course, will include the Guianas and the Bahamas - the Guianas advisedly in that French and Dutch Guiana will be included in the area - and for persons travelling outside the Caribbean the Charge will be \$5. 00. We have legislation dealing with the provisional collection of duties, and it is necessary for us within the statute time to pass enabling legislation to give effect to the proposals which were made in the Budget Speech. I should mention that the charge has already been collected as from the 1st July, and the purpose of this very short amendment to the 1967 Bill, therefore, is to merely change the figures to \$3. 00 and \$5. 00 with the attendant anticipated increase in revenue. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and the House went into Committee Mr. YEARWOOD on the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed. Clause 2 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS; Mr. Chairman, under Clause 2 it is stated that each traveller on each occasion is expected to pay either \$3. 00, in the case of persons travelling within the Commonwealth Caribbean, or \$5. 00, in the case of persons travelling elsewhere; I wonder if each traveller is also to be taken to mean and include children of tender ages.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

The hon. member was in the House, I believe, when the main Bill WAS passed, and there is provision in the main Bill for exempting children under certain ages. I can check it, but my recollection is that children under 12 years are exempted.

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

Clause 3 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Chairman, I omitted to correct the hon. Junior member for St. Peter when he said that the Bill related to persons travelling within the Commonwealth Caribbean. In my introduction Your Honour will remember that I said 'the Caribbean, including the Bahamas and the Guianas, including French and Dutch Guyana'; it could not be the Commonwealth Caribbean if it includes those territories.

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

Clause 4 was called and passed.

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

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Order No. 11 is the next Order of the Day.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as the Objects and Reasons set out, this Bill would amend the Interpretation Act, 1966-10 in the respects which are set out already in the Bill In addition to what is given there, it may be as well that I amplify the various points raised. 12. 35 p.m.

The objects of these amendments are as follows: -

Section 6 of the principal Act should be amended to shorten the form of the "words of enactment" in Acts of Parliament.

Section 10 of the principal Act relating to references to the Crown should be amended to reintroduce the provision that the Crown is not bound by statute unless it is expressly stated therein that the Crown is bound thereby. This provision of the principal Act has been inadvertently deleted by the Existing Laws Amendment, No. 2 Order, 1967.

Sections 15 and 17 of the principal Act should be amended by substituting the words "Governor-General's assent" for the words "Royal assent. "

Section 9 of the principal Act should be amended so as to increase from \$120 to \$500 the maximum fine which may be imposed as a penalty for the contravention of a statutory instrument.

Section 32 of the principal Act should be amended to ensure that the expression "the Act" if used in statutory instruments or documents shall be construed as referring to the ; Acts in which the instruments or documents are made.

Section 43 of the principal Act should be amended to provide a definition for the expression "prescribed by Parliament".

Section 51 (3) should be amended to expand and clarify the provisions of section 51 (3) dealing with the proof of statutory instruments.

The object of this amending Bill is merely to bring it into line with present-day arrangements since we have received Independence, and to make certain essential amendments, some of which were inadvertently omitted.

I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Clauses 1 to 9 inclusive were called and passed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

On separate motions of lion, C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon.,. G. G. FERGUSON, the Kill was read the' third time and passed.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Order No. 10 is the next Order of the Day, and it stands in the name of the hon. and learned senior member for St. John, and it is to move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Public Officers Loan and Travelling Allowances Act, 1948.

PUBLIC OFFICERS LOAN AND TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES ACT 1948

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Public Officers Loan And Travelling Allowances Act, 1948, is the Bill which we are seeking to amend here. The provisions are very simple to authorise the Government to advance loans to certain classes of public officers who are required to travel for the performance of their duties for the purpose of enabling them to maintain full comprehensive insurance coverage of the vehicles purchased by them under the Act to the extent of the full amount of their liability in respect of the last mentioned loans.

The last time we dealt with a matter like this, as far as I can remember, was in 1969 when we made an amendment to the Public Officers Loan And Travelling Allowances Act, 1948, whereby the Ministry responsible for Finance could take out a policy in respect of the class of public officers. This arose out of the failure of many postmen who had purchased auto-cycles and scooters to obtain from the Insurance Companies comprehensive policies. The Insurance Companies agree that, if all of the postmen were insured in a sort of bloc insurance, they could get coverage in this way.

In 1969, we amended the Act to make it possible for this to be done. Now, we are up against a situation in which many public officers who are required to travel - not people who merely want to purchase motor cars - we do not lend money to public officers to purchase motor cars unless the requirements of the posts are that the officers should travel in the course of their duties. 12. 45 p.m.

We have come across cases in which officers have not been in a position to afford to take out at one time in a lump sum the full insurance coverage which is required by law as long as they continue to owe money to the Government; so the purpose of this Bill really is to insure us against this kind of eventuality where loans have been granted and the Government would not be able to recover this money. What we are doing is protecting ourselves by making it possible to advance insurance money in respect of vehicles on which loans have been acquired by the individual public officer. The amending Act of 1969 does not fully cover a situation such as the one with which we find ourselves confronted today.

I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it has been represented to me that officers who have served under the Local Government system for as many as twenty years have been refused loans and have been told, on making application now that the Central Government has taken over, that they would have to serve two years under the Central Government system before they can ask for loans. I would like to hear from the Minister of Finance if this is Government's policy and what could be the cause for it in view of that fact that Government would have to accept all the liabilities and assets of the Local Government system. After an officer has served much more than his apprenticeship, - twenty years is above any apprenticeship in any institution in any part of the world - we would certainly like to hear what could have brought about such a restriction or any condition which tends to make it difficult for those officers who had served in the Local Government system to obtain loans without having to serve two years in the service of the Central Government, when we must bear in mind that all the service now must be considered as Central Government service.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is extremely difficult, if not virtually impossible, for me to answer a question like that. I do not run the Government by conspiracy. All the legislation relating to public officers' travelling is legislation which has been passed" by this Parliament or some previous Parliament. There is no Civil Servant, Head of Department or anybody who can improvise rules, as he or she goes along, to discriminate against a particular class of public employees. I cannot answer questions by rumour; I cannot run the Government business by rumour. Any time that the hon. member wishes to come up to the Establishments Office to lay a grievance on behalf of one of his constituents or any other member of the public who has something more than a rumour, he is entitled to do so.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, the proper place for any hon. member to lay his complaint is on the floor at this House.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I do not agree that that is a point of order or that he is correct because too much of the time of the Legislature is wasted with people coming in and saying they heard that so-and-so only had half a pint of peas to eat with his food at Glendairy Prison last night. The Legislature is here to legislate and this is what we are doing by the passage of this Bill. Hon. members are entitled to ask questions about the administration of a Government Department or any other matter for which the Government is

responsible; but if we have legislation which ordains that so-and-so should be done, it is not really becoming of a member to come in here and say, in the middle of this serious debate that a man spent twenty years in Local Government and somebody tells him that he has to serve another two years. The hon. member like myself and any other hon. member in the Legislature has to check back on the legislation and say he does not see anything there relating to that, or giving anybody any such authority, and ask who is the Government official who told him this. Then the hon. member need not come to the House to get publicity for it, because if he is genuinely trying to assist a case of deprivation or discrimination, he gets in touch with the Establishments section and says this is the position in relation to so-and-so. But to turn every single rumour and complaint into an indictment against the whole country and against the Government is not becoming, as I said before, because I could not stop an hon. member from doing it; but all I am saying is that if he really wants to assist a particular case, he should read up the law and not ask me questions in the middle of a debate like this, because I am not answering the questions. I do not know the answers.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would be glad to read the law. When I first came to this House I was told that I would be given copies of the laws of Barbados, and until today I have not been supplied with those laws. I would be glad to read them.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

The answer is that I cannot help the hon. member. I neither know, neither can I help him. If I knew, I would try to assist him. Do you mean that because somebody came and told you so, it is a statement of fact? Come up to my office and bring the name of the officer who told the man so.

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

On the notion of Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

Clause 1 and 2 were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Mr. CHAIRMAN

reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

. 12. 55 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER; Order No. 13 is the next Order of the Day, and it stands in the name of the hon, and learned senior member for St John.

Rt, Hon. E. W, BARROW; Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Resolution which we have before us is to authorise the storage of petroleum in a building known as the Powder Magazine situated at Powder Road In the parish of St, Michael Your Honour will remember that three or four years ago we had a lot of dampness in the Powder Magazine and we had to construct a new Powder Magazine at Gun Hill in St. George. Since that time the Powder Magazine has been empty, and the present building in which petroleum products are stored, next to the Queen's Warehouse, is unsuitable. This is purely as a temporary measure because I am investigating now why Government should store petroleum and explosives for merchants. I think that this is something which the Government should be relieved of, and it is a purely temporary measure, while we have a Committee comprising of the Commissioner of Police and the Comptroller of Customs examining it. I should like to add personally that I do not think we should have gun powder or petroleum stored in the middle of the Bank Hall or the Bush Hall area because from the point of view of hazard in case of any accident a lot of destruction could be caused. I would be very. glad to see the Powder Magazine moved from up I there, and what is even more dangerous is the fact that fuses and high explosives were stored in the same building and this of course is entirely wrong; the fuses ought to be stored away from the high explosives, and we have a Committee examining the possibility of electrical detonation of high explosives.

In other territories of the Caribbean all explosive work is done under the supervision of the Police. If you want to blast a well or anything else where explosives are involved the Police have to come with the electrical detonator after the charges are laid and people are within a safe distance, and then the charges are set off electrically. This would make it impossible for fishermen to dynamite fish. I only mention that en passant because it is not strictly germane; but I know that other hon. members of the House would be concerned about the storage of explosives and petroleum in this area. I am pleased to say that the Committee which recently investigated the causes of the fires in the City of Bridgetown, and which was invited as part of its terms of revise and make certain recommendations about what activities should be carried on within the metropolitan area of Bridgetown - and that Report was laid today on the Table of the House - and I think one of the recommendations is very strong on the question of storage of petroleum and matters of that kind. I would like to assure members of the House that, as far as we are concerned, the use of Powder Road is purely a temporary measure, and we will make proposals for the storage by the importers of petroleum and explosives, or alternative arrangements for Government

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Mr. Deputy Spatter, I think we are jumping from the frying pan into the kettle, but what the Prime Minister said is true. I do not know what kind of petroleum will be stored there; he said this is only a temporary measure; but why have you got to go there? This is a very dangerous thing. He mentioned the fact that the Commissioner of Police and the Comptroller of Customs are investigating the matter, but what about the Fire Department? This is a densely populated area, and I consider that this is more dangerous than the Powder Magazine because something will have to happen to the powder for it to go off. I would suggest to the Hon. Prime Minister that this be postponed and ask him in the interest of the people in this area to have this postponed; what is the hurry for it? Are you bound to have some place to store gasoline? This is a thickly populated area, I move that it be postponed; these temporary measures last 15 and 20 years.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I could just answer the question, the hon. member wanted to know what the hurry was. There is a lot of congestion at the Port; the building next to the Marketing Corporation is the one which is used as the petroleum warehouse. By law we have to have places designated as petroleum warehouses; that legislation needs looking up, but that is the law at the moment, and we can only store petroleum products in petroleum warehouses. 1.05 p.m.

I have suggested to the Committee that the proper place to store petroleum products is in the yard of the refinery, or the Esso installations, or at Holborn or Spring Garden, or up at Black Rock - anywhere where petroleum is already stored - and have it in bonds where the Comptroller of Customs can have the key and have it properly fenced in. The immediate problem is the over-congestion at the Port. They need additional space. But I should like to assure the hon. member that the amount of petroleum which is involved is very negligible. There are merely a few drums, and this is just a stopgap measure. That is how I, personally, feel, but we have to get the Fire Officer and everybody to look into this matter. Right now, there is still the congestion at the Port which has subsisted ever since before Christmas last year, and we need additional space for the Queen's Warehouse. We already have approved plans and voted money in the Estimates for the building of a new Queen's Warehouse inside the Harbour itself. That is why I say it is a stop-gap measure.

From the pyrotechnic point of view, a few drums of methylated spirit, stored in a cellar with walls about six or eight feet thick, would not explode like a bomb; there is no danger of that; but the danger is fire. I am satisfied that the fire could be contained within the confines of the Powder Magazine itself. The high explosive is more dangerous in that area. I, honestly, do not understand why it is necessary to have this nowadays, but this is what the law requires.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, ' Sir I think that you could find some place in Black Rock, or where the gasoline is now stored, and the Comptroller of Customs could be given the key to the padlock. I believe the Minister means well, and I move that the matter be postponed, I feel that the people responsible for the petroleum should be responsible for finding a place to store it.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not know the area at the old Powder House, but I would be in favour of storing gasoline underground up there. It would be dangerous to store it in drums when you have so many houses in that area. I am sure there are other places where gasoline can be stored. There is a site in C oily mo re Rock where Weatherhead's buses used to be kept, and gasoline could be stored there. I feel that too many house8 are in Powder Road for anybody to store petrol in that area.

Sir, I know what can happen with gasoline. You will be surprised to know that if too much heat goes to those drums of gasoline, anything can happen. I do not know why they want to go to Powder Road; I think they may as well go to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and store it up there. Sir, if you are going to store the gasoline underground you will be putting it in a safe place, but if you store it on the surface with all of this heat in a thickly populated area you will be asking for trouble. We should not do anything to put the people in fear. When the people go to sleep at night they cannot tell what will happen. I think we should do anything to save people's lives, but we should not do anything to take lives.

Sir, I should be very glad if the Government would take second thoughts and ask the people concerned to look for another site. I know that they can get sites. I have just mentioned a site that would be suitable. I agree with the Hon. Prime Minister that it could be stored where they are already storing petrol. You can get space at Esso in Black Rock. Wherever these people have gasoline stored, you can find a big area. I believe that they have some reason for going to Powder Road. It is very near to the Police Station, and I do not know whether they want to put the Police or the prisoners in fear. I am not in favour of storing gasoline in that small, thickly populated area. I will second the motion for postponement so as to give the Government a chance to ask the people to look for another site.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think all that has been said on both sides of the House is enough to satisfy the mover of this Motion that we should not allow any storage of this petroleum in such an area. The Prime Minister, in moving the Resolution, did mention that he was concerned with the people who were responsible for the petroleum and they were asking the Government to find somewhere to put it. Many of these people who own refineries own three or four acres of land; so why cannot they store the petroleum there? Why cannot they do that, instead of storing it at Powder Road, Bank Hall, where you have all chattel houses and hardly any insurance on them?

Sir, I would suggest to this House that we should not think only of postponing the matter, but we should first consider the legislation whereby the people responsible for petroleum should look after it themselves, rather than asking the Government to look after their own affairs. Let them put it in their own back yard. Why put it near a number of black people? Why not put it at Sunset Crest? Why not put it at Sheraton Park? Why not put it at the back of Culloden Farm where there is a lot of land? Why carry it in Bank Hall which is Just like Orange Hill? I beg to support the hon. member's motion for the postponement of this matter, and I beleive that the remarks made will not fall on deaf ears.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Sir, there is nothing for the hon. member to get hot over, be cause I do not feel very strongly about this. As a matter of fact, there is a minute here written by me way back in March when the Comptroller of Customs first recommended this in which I asked whether we really needed a petroleum warehouse. We then had a meeting, and we were assured by the Fire Department that there would be no danger. However, under the Act of 1882 you must have a Keeper of the petroleum warehouse. Now, there was a Keeper of the Powder Magazine who had a little house on top of the rock. If it were all that dangerous, then I am sure they would not have perched this kitchen on top of the Powder Magazine.

Sir, things like petroleum and so on are only dangerous when they are ignited. You are more likely to get spontaneous combustion of bagasse than you are likely to get spontaneous combustion of petroleum. I think another reason why the Powder Magazine was located there is that it was then under the surveillance of the Police at District "AM, and there was no developed community living at Bank Hall.
1.15 p.m.

As I said, psychologically I do not think it is a good thing, but from the point of view of actual danger, I would willingly have them store it in some of the stables at Culloden Farm because I would not ask the people in Bank Hall to put up with something that I would not put up with; so if they can make proper provisions to put it in the stables the re, I would have to find alternative quarters for the horse of the hon. senior member for St. Michael and my own, and I have been reminded that the two cows of the hon

junior member for St. Thomas would have to look for holes too.

I would like to assure the hon. senior member for St. James that I have no objection, and I am not putting something that would be dangerous. This is a recommendation made by a Committee. There is congestion at the Port, and I do not particularly like petroleum anywhere in Bridgetown at all; but we were assured that there is no danger of any fire or anything like that unless some arsonist actually went and punctured the drums. I asked why they could not store it in the open, but apparently all the fuel for cigarette lighters - butane and so on - come under the Act of 1882, and they are in little cardboard containers and metal tins, All these things have to be stored In the petroleum warehouse, and also the white gas that is used for gas irons. You, therefore, have to have something indoors; it cannot be stored in the open.

Again I want to emphasise that pschologically I do not think it is a good thing. You move out the gun powder and you move in the gasolene; but as far as from the point of view of danger to the population, I have been assured that there is no danger, and I do not feel very strongly about it, neither does any member on this side of the House. There will be a little more inconvenience at the Port if we do not move out the.....

Mr. CRAIG; On a point of order, if the Hon. Prime Minister would give way, I do not think it is necessary for him to continue. If he has no objection for storing it at Culloden Farm, he can stop and let us get on with the people's business.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

But we will have to bring in an amending Bill to store it there.

Mr. CRAIG:

We can do that, Sir.

Rt. Hon. E. W, BARROW:

In order for us to do that, I am willing to move that further consideration be postponed.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

I beg to second that.

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

THE LEPERS (REPEAL) ACT, 1970

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Order No. 12 is the next Order of the Day, and it stands in the name of the hon. junior member for Christ Church.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Objects and Reasons set out that this Bill would repeal the Lepers Act, 1904, which is now really obsolete in the light of Section 10 of the Health Service Act, 1969 and the Health Services (Communicable and Notifiable Diseases) Regulations 1969.

Hon. members will remember that the above Health Services Regulations came into operation on 1st December, 1969, and it is felt that adequate provision is included in these Regulations for the control of infectious diseases including leprosy, and the Lepers Act of 1904 is now rendered obsolete. I have some information here if necessary, but I mention in passing that the present population at the Leper Hosptial is seven. There have been no new admissions and there are roughly thirty-eight discharged patients who present themselves at regular intervals for medical examination. The majority of these remain in good physical condition. It is felt that the Lepers Act could be repealed in light of the passing of these Regulations under the Health Services Act.

I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that,

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

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

Clause 1 was called and passed, Clause 2 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. SPRINGER:

Mr. Chairman, before Clause 2 is passed, there has been some concern by some tenants at Danesbury who have been made to move by the Court through the manoeuvre of the land owners, and it appears that some of these people who were made to move were lepers. I would like to know if the Government is aware of it and what action is planned in this matter.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Chairman, it is interesting that the hon. member should ask a question at a time like this and that in the introduction of the Bill which we are now discussing mention should have been made of the persons who suffer from Hansen's disease. I am very happy to say that the last time I visited the institution - I think we have got the number of people residing there down to seven altogether, and some are people from outside Barbados and not native Barbadians. This is a very interesting thing that has arisen, and I am authorised to say that the Government is very concerned because way back in 1965 this House passed the Tenancies Control and Development Act, and the main provision of this Act was to prevent the eviction of persons who live in tenancies - a tenancy being described in the Interpretation Clause as an area of land which is now or shall be hereafter subdivided into lots for the purpose of being let to tenants for housing purpose and which contains more than five lots; so that wherever you had five or more houses on contiguous parcels of land, the effect of what I considered to be this really revolutionary bit of social legislation was to prevent landlords from evicting people because of the high increase in the values of land in Barbados during the past ten years or so, since people have now found this to be a very attractive island to live and invest in and land prices have been going up, not from yesterday or the day before, but from as far back as 1964 or 1965. 1.25 p.m.

I could disclose now that the occasion on which this legislation was introduced was an occasion on which several tenants were up before the Supreme Court because there had been a contract for the sale of land adjoining President Kennedy Drive - and land in which a prominent member of the Party of which I am Chairman had contracted to sell somebody else and I had to say that I was very sorry but we were not going to allow him to put these people off, and he assisted us in drafting the legislation. Up to today, as far as I know, those 180 people have not been evicted although there was a matter before Sir Kenneth Stoby at the time to evict them because Mr. Peterkin had a contract to purchase the land. There has been a great deal of social legislation in this country, because I remember when I first started to practise in the Law Courts of this Island we used to have people thrown off land regularly; they used to serve the notice on them on Friday night and they had to take up their houses as if they were suitcases and move them somewhere else. The hon. junior member for St. Thomas said that some of the houses had to be taken away in a paper bag because the termites had them like saw dust. We passed the Tenancies (Control and Development) Act in which it was stated that no owner or lessee of a tenancy or part thereof which is now or shall hereafter be subdivided into lots for the purpose of being let to tenants for housing, shall without the prior permission of the Town and Country Planning Officer signified in writing divide or sell in lots any part of such tenancy. This legislation immediately had the effect which we desired, because a lot of people who were given notice were protected. We also included provision in this Bill that the rents could not be increased unless certain things were done whereby the landlord felt that he could apply to the Magistrate for an increase in rent; some people have tried to increase rents illegally and we have stopped them.

You will be surprised how many people in Barbados are not aware of the provisions of this law; some landlords pretend that they do not know about the law, and a lot of tenants are genuinely ignorant about the provisions of the Act, so that we still have people - not only us on this side, but I suppose that members on the other side would have constituents coming to them telling them that they were given notice, and we have to send them back to the owners and tell them to look at the 1965 legislation and to leave them in peace.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I wonder if the Prime Minister is really dealing with Clause 2.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I am dealing with Clause 2 because this is Committee and a very important question has been asked. I am in Committee and I think that I am entitled because it deals with lepers, and what I am talking about is lepers being evicted from Danesbury in Black Rock. If Your Honour wants to rule me out of order on a very important matter like this which everybody in the House wants to hear I will have to sit down; I feel I am within the limits of my jurisdiction and authority to speak on this, but I may be wrong. I am giving the background to the question which was asked by the hon. senior member for St. Michael. The

land that I am drawing to the attention of the House is land on which traditionally people who have been discharged from the Hospital for Hanson's disease were living. What I am trying to point out is that we passed this legislation here in this House but I do not think that even the real estate agents on the other side disagree, whether for political reasons or otherwise with this legislation.

A development which I do not like in this country whether you are within the law or not, is that people will deliberately seek ways and means to frustrate the Intention of the legislation; to subvert and to circumvent the intention of the legislation I will explain what I mean as briefly as I can. The law clearly says that if you have more than five Houses on an area of land, the people must be secure in their holdings. The previous legislation which we had on the security of holdings, of course, related to agricultural tenancies which we passed some time in the fifties, but this is related specifically to people who were renting out lots of land which in those days were uneconomical; probably the roads were bad, they never put in any services and they.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I think at this time the hon. senior member is irrelevant to Clause 2 of this Bill. This is a Bill to repeal the Lepers Act and I certainly like the hon. senior member to confine himself to the Lepers Act.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

What I am dealing with now is the background to all this. This is a Committee and a question was asked in Committee of the Government, and it would not be only churlish but unmannerly of the Government not to give the House the explanation to which the House feels itself entitled. I do not think that apart from you there is any other hon. member here who does not want an explanation; if I was out of order; I would have to be out of order at the beginning; I cannot be out of order because I have spoken too long. But I am saying that the hon. member has asked about lepers who have been discharged, who were evicted off land, and I am giving the reply specifically because this Bill is dealing with discharged lepers. I was saying that from time immemorial the people have tended to gravitate together in an area in Black Rock, and this is one of the areas known as Danesbury. This is no leper colony or anything like that; it is just that these people knew one another, it was convenient and within walking distance of the Hospital.

Danesbury is a piece of land about seven acres in extent that belongs to somebody whom I regard as a personal friend of mine; we were at school together, and he is probably known to members of both sides. I am dealing with a principle, and I do not care whom I offend; but I think that members of the legal profession who sit down and deliberately try to contrive ways and means of subverting and circumventing the written statutory intention of the legislature, are not doing a good service to this country, to themselves or to their profession, because this is what has happened. What they have done now is to say that they want this land for development; I hear they want a gasoline station, they want a

hotel, the Light and Power Company wants a piece of land. Five lepers were living on the land; they did not serve them with any notice to quit. I am telling you something which is very serious, and I am telling you what measure I intend to take to counteract it. 1.35 p. m,

Sir, I am not intending to upset any decision in any Law Court; the Court is over there and we are over here so when I come with my proposals in the House they will have nothing to do with any decision made over there, They can stay over there, and we can do our business inside here. I want to get the position clear, and I am referring now to what has happened, Hon, members are familiar with a device called a 'foreclosure action'. You have people living on a tenantry; you want to get them off; you cannot serve them notice, because the 1965 Act prevent you from doing that unless the people are three months¹ in arrear, and then you have to serve notice on each Individual one. What you do is to mortgage your property - whether it is a fictitious mortgage or not, I am not sure. (Asides.) A fictitious mortgage is a legal device or legal fiction. Our foreclosure action is usually based on the doctrine of a fictitious mortgage in which I say that I lend you the money this morning and you have to pay it back by twelve o'clock. At twelve o'clock I can go to the Registry and say that you owe me this money; you have to pay it back by twelve o'clock and I cannot see you, and I am levying on your property. You can take foreclosure action, and the Court then publishes a notice saying that the property is going to be foreclosed on for payment of this mortgage and they advertise for liens and encumbrances. (Asides.) That is the law; I am not saying that everybody acted outside of the law, but the law is defective.

Sir, what has happened in this particular case is that there is a mortgage for \$5,000 for an acre of land on which tenants were; the tenants were not served with any notice that the land had been sold; there is nothing to prevent a landlord from selling to another landlord; you do not have to tell the tenants anything at all; but he pays subject to the tenantry. In a forclosure action you do not have to tell the tenants anything either. The problem is that the Court then makes an order that the property is to be sold; a tenancy is not considered to be an encumbrance. I, personally, feel that a Court ought to take statutory notice, once it is drawn to the Court's attention that there are tenants on the land. The Courts ought to take statutory notice and declare that this should be an encumbrance.

Sir, I have a social conscience, and I am not only a lawyer; we even have our own societies of Socialist lawyers; there are lawyers and lawyers. One good thing I can say about Barbados, if I may just dilate on that point, Sir. You can always get justice in Barbados, because half of the lawyers do not speak to the other half; so they can never get together....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I do not think this is relevant to Clause 2, and I am going to ask the Hon. Prime Minister to stick to Clause 2. (Asides.)

I will not have this type of behaviour from the hon. senior member for the City.

Rt. Hon. B. W. BARROW; I do not see any misbehaviour; that is good behaviour for him.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Good behaviour in the hon. senior member for St. John's opinion, but not in the junior member for St. John's opinion and I am in the Chair.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

This is one occasion in which the senior member for St. John has to defer to the junior member for St. John. We have to finish at two o'clock; so I will go through very quickly to the point of the five lepers. I could almost describe this as the case of the five lepers. It is a pity they were not six, but they were more than five tenants. What happened in this particular use of the five lepers, or ex-lepers, or people who had been discharged from the Hospital, is that a foreclosure action was brought in the Supreme Court, and the Court ordered the land to be sold, as the Court is entitled to do in any foreclosure action. The next step after the Court has made such an order is that if the person who has bought the land through the Registration Office cannot get vacant possession, he has the right to apply to the Court for a Writ of Possession to throw anybody and everybody off the land. It is only at that stage that the poor tenants then realise that there has been some Court action about the land which they are occupying. (Asides.) There is no law that can take care of every eventuality, or any dishonest machination that may be improvised. I merely say that in passing.

Sir, the point I am making at this juncture is that any tenant who is faced with a similar situation only knows about it officially when he gets the notice with the Writ of Possession served on him, and there is really no defence to a Writ of Possession. A Writ of Possession is only a step further on a judgment of the Supreme Court which has already been made and sealed out of the principal Registry of this Island. The position is that these tenants are in a position where they have to leave, and some of them were even inveigled, or persuaded, that they should consent to the judgment, giving possession in this case to the Barbados Light & Power Company,

I am very straightforward, and there is no complication as far as I am concerned. The Law Courts have issued Writs of Possession against these people; I understand that the Housing Authority has made alternative accommodation for them because of the Court order, but there is nothing to prevent this House from compulsorily acquiring all of the land in that area. The position right now is that I was able

to get the Cabinet to agree this week to compulsorily acquire all of the land in Black Rock. We are leaving out the Rum Refinery, because there are too many buildings on it. We are starting with all the Oil Companies and their installations; the playing fields, the storage tanks and everything. About fifteen or seventeen acres of land which I wrote to Trinidad two years ago and told them that I wanted for I. D. C. - 1 told them that they could re-locate the Gas Company. If they want to play ball I will acquire the whole of Spring Garden; the whole of Danesbury,... (Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: The whole of Paradise Beach.) That costs too much -\$6 million. (Asides.) We can sell back some of the land to them.

Sir, instructions have been issued to the Crown Solicitor to acquire the land compulsorily, and we will be coming here with the notices next week. Do you think I am making fun? If I may address the Chair, Sir, all the land in Spring Garden belongs to Texaco Antilles and Shell Antilles; all the land on which the Barbados Light & Power Company have their generators, and all the land that they have agreed to buy and the whole of Danesbury will be acquired. If people are going to subvert social legislation in this country by using devices to get around it, and they have no conscience about throwing human beings off the land, then we have to take very strong measures in this matter.

Sir, we do not have to come to the House in the first Instance. We come to the House when we publish the first notice, according to the Land Acquisition Act, and ask the permission of the House to acquire these lands. Now, I have made my intention very clear. We are going to replan the whole area: part for housing; part for industrial development; we will probably sell back, or give back, if no money is passed by that time, to the Light & Power Company the land on which their generators are standing. We are not going to allow foreign companies to come into this Island, throw tenants off the land, and get around legislation that has been passed to protect people who, traditionally from the discovery of this Island, have lived in conditions which are almost subhuman without roads, water and so on, and then to be unceremoniously thrown off through a legal device.

Sir, I have been negotiating for over two years with Texaco Antilles about the land which we want - down there for industrial development, but every two months I can hear that Mr. K. R. Hunte, or the Light & Power Company, has bought a piece of the land, 1.45 p.m.

They cannot come and sit down around the table and discuss the re-planning of the whole area for the benefit of the inhabitants of Black Rock. We need a proper road going down there; we need land for industrial development; we are going to put in the installation for the conversion of liquid petroleum gas because our supplies are running out. All that, we have already decided on, but we cannot get people around the table, and if they are going to throw people off by Court order, the Court order is effective, but the Court cannot tell the Government what to do with its own land when the Government acquires the land Compulsorily; so everybody's plans will be frustrated until they decide to be reasonable and to act like human beings in the interest of the inhabitants and the poor people of this Island. I am very

grateful to the hon. member for asking the question. I make no apologies. I am not stating what we intend to do; I am stating what we have already decided and committed ourselves to do.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY; Mr. Chairman, it is not often I find myself in agreement with speeches made by the Prime Minister, but this is one of those few occasions. I do agree that no Government at this stage of our development can allow foreign land owners to come in here and evict tenants. In saying this I want specifically to refer to Bannister's Land just off Belleville. Bannister's Land is now owned by the Royal Bank Trust Company. What has happened recently is that in contravention of the same Tenancies Development Act to which the Prime Minister earlier referred, the Royal Bank Trust Company through their agents purported to increase the rents of the tenants in that area, without having made the necessary application to the Magistrate for permission to increase the rents. This was brought to the attention of the Government and the reply given by the Minister was that investigations reveal that there had been an unauthorised increase in the rents at Bannister's Land, but the infringement has not been reminded to conform with the provisions of the Tenancies Control and Development Act.

One would have expected in the circumstances where the Royal Bank Trust Company was clearly in breach of the law as set out under this Bill, that this would have been an example to prevent foreigners coming into this country and doing this sort of thing, and under the Act it is provided that a person who increases rents or evicts tenants in contravention of the Act can be prosecuted, and, I believe, can be fined up to \$1,000. It is unfortunate that the Director of Public Prosecutions, even after this has been brought to his attention, has not seen fit to prosecute the Royal Bank Trust Company for raising the rents in breach of this Bill. However I have lodged a case for one lady living in the area and that case has come up, and is coming up again this week on the 24th, before the Magistrate.

The other point is that I agree with the Prime Minister when he speaks about lawyers using their ingenuity to get around this Bill, because what has happened now is that since the Royal Bank Trust Company has increased the rents illegally, and since the Government, I believe, has carried out some sort of investigation, what the Royal Bank Trust Company has decided to do is to limit the size of the spots that a person was renting. They are now redefining the boundary so that if originally one person has a spot on which he had a house belonging to his brother or sister or some family, the Royal Bank Trust Company has now decided that you have got to pay two sets of rent. They cannot increase the rents, but they will make you pay two sets of rents instead of increasing the rents.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I think I was right when I told the hon. senior member for St. John that in my opinion he was irrelevant; and I am now going to tell the hon. junior member for Bridgetown that in my opinion he is irrelevant.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I can do no better than to follow the very learned words of the Prime Minister when he said that he could not be irrelevant for talking long; he must be irrelevant at the beginning and not at this stage. Nevertheless I can do no more than to repeat those words. Nonetheless I think I have made the point that I do agree with the Prime Minister when he said that action has got to be taken against foreign companies coming in and trying to evict the local tenants. But what I would like to see is a greater effort made in Bannister's Land to ensure that the Royal Bank Trust Company does not use any legal ingenuity to get around the Bill, and, where they cannot increase the rents directly, to use some legal ingenuity to increase them. As I said, they are redefining the boundaries in an effort to increase the rents, and I hope the Government will investigate this matter.

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

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

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INSURANCE ACT, 1970.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the next item is the consideration of the Select Committee Report on the Insurance Bill.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the Report of the Select Committee which was presented earlier today be adopted.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I beg to second that.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I Mr. Deputy Speaker I beg to move that the Bill as amended be read a third time.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I beg to second that.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill as amended do now pass.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I beg to second that.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

It now being 2.00 o'clock p.m., this sitting now stands suspended until 2.30 p.m. 2.00 p.m. On resumption.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I observe that there is no quorum and I ask that the bell be rung.

The bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

It is now question time, and Question No. 112 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. John.

Mr. YEARWOOD:

To enquire of the appropriate Minister -

Is the Minister aware that the present law governing the inheritance to the real property of a person dying intestate and leaving such real property in this Island, in most cases causes great distress and hardship to the children of such deceased person in that the eldest son of the deceased person is entitled to all such real property (subject to the widow's right of dower), to the exclusion of his other brothers and sisters?

2. Will the Minister have the said law amended and revised so that (a) all the children of the deceased person should share and share alike in the disposition of his real property; and (b) provision be made for children of the half-blood of such deceased persons in such law?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Dr. Deputy Speaker, the reply is as follows "A Draft Bill has been prepared revising the entire law relating to the administration of estates. This will include provision for the abolition of primogeniture and will shortly be placed before Parliament".

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

Will the Minister invite those responsible for preparing the Bill to ensure that the Administration of Estates Act, 1910 which provides for a special widow's charge on the property of her husband if there are no children be brought up-to-date, if possible, within the provision of the Bill?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Yes, I will draw that to their attention.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Question No. 106 standing in the name of the hon. and learned senior member for St. Thomas.

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

To enquire of the Minister of Communications & Works -

1. Will the Minister make a statement as to communications he received from the Inter-Governmental Philatelic Corporation based in New York, soliciting a contract for the marketing of postage stamps for Barbados?

2. Will the Minister state what decision has been reached?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Reply is as follows

"Between November, 1966 and December 1967 a number of communications were received from the Inter-Governmental Philatelic Corporation in connection with the offer, of their services as Barbados' Philatelic Agents for the purpose of handling the publicity and sale of stamps overseas.

The offer was carefully examined by Government and it was decided to retain the services of the Crown Agents as sole agents for the publicity and sale of stamps overseas."

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker, was any offer received during 1969?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is nothing here on the file showing any information for 1969.

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

Can the Minister say whether a petition from the Barbados Philatelic Society has been received, and whether it appears in that file, relevant to an offer which according to my information the Society made either during 1969 or the very early part of this year? Is there a petition from the Barbados Philatelic Society addressed to the Prime Minister on that file?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is nothing on this file dealing with any information for 1969 or 1970.

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

Will the Minister undertake to ask his officials whether such an offer is not currently under consideration, but has not been included in the answer to this Question, and will he accept my assurance that I know a communication from the Barbados Philatelic Society has been addressed to the Government?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can assure the hon. senior member that I will make a note of it and investigate if for him.

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker, can the Question be left on the Order Paper until the Minister has made his investigations?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the only reference made here on the file subsequent to the Cabinet decision of 5th December, 1966 is that the Inter-Governmental Philatelic Corporation made representations to the Hon. Prime Minister on the matter, and in a Minute dated 10th June, 1969 the Hon. Prime Minister

directed that the decision to retain the services of the Crown Agents should be re-examined in the light of further representations made by the Inter-Governmental Philatelic Corporation; so apparently they did in 1969 make representations to the Prime Minister himself, and he referred it back to the Committee for Investigation.

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that now creates an entirely different situation, because it seems to me that notwithstanding the answer new representations were made, and I would particularly ask in those circumstances that the Question now stand on the Order Paper for a proper answer to be prepared. This is something I am asking about concerning last year; I am sure the new Minister will wish an opportunity to go into this further and see what has happened. Can I take it then that the House will let it be left on the Order Paper? 2.40 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I think you are bound by the assurance given by the Hon. Minister.

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

Sir, I believe that one of the original decisions taken to give the Crown Agents the work was that the Crown Agents would set up a Philatelic Office here in Barbados and employ people. They are not going to keep an office in Barbados if you take away the contract from them.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The Question has already been answered, and the Minister has given the assurance that he will make a statement on this matter.

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

Sir, I cannot ask any more supplementaries on that Question until the Minister has made a further statement; it will have to remain half-answered.

DISCRIMINATION BY INSURANCE COMPANIES AGAINST BARBADIANS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

No. 66 standing in the name of the hon, senior member for St. Thomas.

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker. To enquire of the appropriate Minister -

1. Is the Government aware that certain companies licensed to carry on Motor Insurance business in Barbados pursuant to the Motor Vehicles Insurance (Third Party Liability) Act 1952 impose conditions on persons who insure vehicles for self-drive hire that discriminate against Barbadians and seek to restrict the use by Barbadians of self-drive cars?

2. Will the Government investigate this situation and review the operating licenses granted to any Insurance companies who can be shown to have pursued a policy of discrimination against Barbadians?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, -the Reply is as follows

"1. Yes, Sir,

2. The matter has been investigated and the Insurance Companies involved have now removed those conditions which discriminated against Barbadians."

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

Sir, does the Minister think it appropriate that, instead of giving an answer in this Honourable House to an hon. member on this Question, a Press Release should have been first made to the Press that the licences of certain Companies should have been revoked?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think I have seen Statements in the newspaper on two occasions - when the licences would have been cancelled preventing them from carrying on insurance altogether, and when

they agreed to remove these conditions. We investigated the matter and the same reply was given. A Statement was made in the newspaper by all concerned in the investigation.

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. The point I am making is this I asked this Question in December, but the Press was given the answer to this Question in June. Why was not the House given the answer before? It was as a result of this Question that investigations were undertaken and the licences taken away. Why was not the House given the answer to the Question before the news papers?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

No. 100 standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. James.

INADEQUACY OF HYDRANTS IN ORANGE HILL

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, No. 100. To enquire of the appropriate Minister -

1. Is the Minister aware that the number of hydrants in the district of Orange Hill, St. James is inadequate?

2. Will the Minister take steps to increase the number of hydrants in the said district without delay?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the reply to No. 100 is as follows

"There are three fire hydrants located at Orange Hill, St. James due to the expansion in the number of dwellinghouses and the new developments taking place, plans have been finalised for increasing the number of hydrants and generally improving the supply and pressure of water in that area. '

Mr. CRAIG:

Sir, there is only one supplementary I would like to ask to that. How soon? (Asides.) Mr.

Deputy Speaker, an Idiot over there says 'as soon as possible'. Will the Minister say how soon he hopes to carry out this work? The stupid boy Edwards over there is saying 'as soon as possible'. He is only a nuisance.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Deputy Speaker,...

Mr. CRAIG:

Sir, I apologise to the Chair and to this Assembly for the manner in which I conducted myself just now. Whatever remarks I might have made, were not made to the Chair.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to assure the hon. member that it will be as soon as I can possibly have it done. There are a lot of implications in this matter including hydrant pumps, water pressure, possibly larger mains and so on, and I cannot give the hon. member a definite reply on this. There is a lot of technical work involved in this matter, and I will have it done as soon as possible.

Mr. CRAIG:

I wish to thank the hon. Minister, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Question No. 103 standing in the name of the said hon. member.

SPRINGHEAD TENANTRY ROAD Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, 103. To enquire of the appropriate Minister

1. Will the Minister in accordance with Government's, declared policy as to tenantry roads, give urgent

priority to the repairs to Springhead Tenantry Road, St. James?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the reply to Question 103 is as follows

"The current year's provision for the reconstruction of private tenantry roads is already fully committed. Accordingly, consideration will be given to the repairs to this road when next year's Private Tenantry Roads Programme is being prepared."

Mr. CRAIG:

Sir, I know that Springhead is a very sensitive area, and I thought it would have been fixed this year. It is a part of Orange Hill that goes on to St. Andrew, and I thought the work would have been done. (Asides.) When you spoke on a point of order for an hour and a half, I did not hear noises. Are you nervous? I hope that the Minister will give this matter priority in his Programme for next year, due to the fact that, even when my Government was in power, the people in this area have suffered quite a bit. If the Minister pays a visit to the area, he will see for himself what is the position. I thank the Minister, and I hope that the matter will be dealt with as soon as possible.

**PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS RESOLUTION REQUESTING GOVERNMENT TO SET
UP JUDICIAL COMMISSION OF ENQUIRY INTO ADMINISTRATION OF THE
BARBADOS HOUSING AUTHORITY**

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

It is now time for Private Members' Business. On the last occasion when Private Members' Business came to a conclusion, the Hon. Leader of the House was speaking on Order No. 1.

2.50 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, one of the Roman historians it may have been Julius Caesar, I am not quite sure now in describing a military campaign remarks apropos of his enemies "This is the kind of war in which the Germans - I think he said - 'exulted' or in which they made their best attacks". I think that this motion before the House is just one such kind of war or one such kind of battle, I would not, Mr.

Deputy Speaker, demean myself or my Party by defending Government or the Minister in any other way than the way in which I am doing, because I do not think that It is a proper thing if someone accuses you of cutting off somebody's finger for you to say that you are no better than me. I think the best form of defence would be to point out that in addition to accusing us they have also accused people who are now closely associated with them, and therefore shows that the kind of tactics which they are using against this Government they have already used against other people, and as I said, now connected with them, and of little or no avail.

Now I start, Mr. Deputy Speaker, by reminding the House that some time before the 1956 election it may have been three months before we had a Director of Medical Services in this Island called Dr. Humby. One Sunday there appeared in the Barbados Advocate a picture of some under-nourished young children at that time residing in the General Hospital as it was called, together with a comment from Dr. Humby drawing attention to the shameless condition of these under-nourished infants, and by implication accusing the Government of doing nothing about it, and even of causing by its neglect the amount of trouble which was manifested by the picture. The Government of the day got up in arms. We know the famous remark of the then Premier of the country - "Either Dr. Humby goes or I go", and the storm of protest which, in passing, if I may say so, the Government of the country made against the improper conduct of a Civil Servant in seeming to criticise the Government which he served. That is another matter. I fully agree with the protest. What is not a different matter is this: the same Government, which quite properly protested against the improper disclosure by Dr. Humby, the same people who were accusing the then Church-warden of St. Michael of all sorts of things among which was that Cod Liver Oil which the then Church-warden was purporting to be buying for children, whether in the Almshouse or outside, was of an inferior quality and was only bought because it was being sold by the firm of A. S Bryden, aid that Mr. Bryden, himself being a member of the St, Michael Vestry, it was improper, and that not only was inferior Cod Liver Oil given, but It was grossly improper even to have done it.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I had better pause here to mate the issue quite clear, Both political Parties who have had this Government in recent years have criticised the administration of the St. Michael Vestry.

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

On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is Standing Order No. 36 (1) still in force? "The Speaker or the Chairman, after having called the attention of the House or of the Committee to the conduct of a member who persists in Irrelevance or tedious repetition either of his own arguments or of the arguments used by other members in debate, may direct him to discontinue his speech". Is this still in force?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The Chair has not called the attention of the House to any irrelevance or repetition in this discussion.

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

On a point of order, I do not see anything about cod Oliver oil in the Resolution, and that is all I am hearing all the time.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I thank the hon. and learned member for St. Thomas very much, but I would like to remind him that I am in the Chair.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I am grateful to Your Honour and I will give way as many times as they choose to rise. It is all right with me. As I said, this is the kind of warfare in which the Germans exulted.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I said I would make one issue clear, that I do not propose to defend the Government or the Minister on the grounds that the administration of the Barbados Labour Party in some respects was as bad as or worse than ours. That may or may not have been the case. I am defending on the ground that what they are saying about the Minister and the Government now, they have already said about the hon. senior member for Bridgetown's administration of the City Council and of the St. Michael Vestry, and have said it with more bitterness, if I may say so, and with more venom than could possibly be used against this side (Asides.) The hon. member is now saying this with less justification. If the hon. member is saying that the scurrilous attacks made by the Labour Party on the hon. senior member for Bridgetown were said with less justification but were still said, then the hon. n. junior member for Bridgetown who is the mover of this motion ought to question whether he has any right to be in such a Party that could admit that ten, eight, six or whatever years after that, they wantonly slandered and vilified his own father for no reason and with less justification. 3.00 p.m.

I have never heard anything like this, and I am-quite sure that the hon. member who made that aside could not be serious. Mr. Deputy Speaker, my own Party has been responsible for the abolition of Local Government in this Island. In the teeth of the bitterest possible opposition, not only on the part of those who were most nearly concerned with Local Government, but opposition with even from the present Opposition political Party, who long before we came on the political scene threatened to abolish it and my political Party has never hidden its detestation of that bad system, at least with some of its aspects, not on the ground on which it had been attacked by the Labour Party, but on easily more sophisticated and more justifiable grounds that it was a system which, the longer you kept it, made it more difficult for

you to eradicate the real causes of poverty, and this is the reason why we opposed it. We did not oppose it on the ground that it was making the hon. senior member for the City too powerful, because the arguments against the Minister, whether expressed or implied, are arguments, I submit, based on envy and jealousy of political achievement in a constituency and a part of another constituency which is going to be joined on to that one.

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

On a point of order, did not the Prime Minister say in respect of the City that if he could not take Mottley away from the City, he would take the City away from Mottley?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Of course he said it, but this is honest, above board, political fighting. Let us come now to what the Labour Party said. I have here - and I am quoting their own words against them - the Beacon of February 28, 1959, page 1, column 1. It says "This is the last lap for campaigning for the Local Government elections, and the last lap for many of those who hold office and function under the Vestry system who are now facing the electorate in opposition to the Barbados Labour Party. " Then I turn to page 4, columns 3 and 5 it is headed "Vestry one-man rule must go". It says "Same weeks ago the Mottley Conservative group masquerading as a Party but more properly a one-man band, published a Manifesto which contains some serious admissions. Among other things, it promised to institute better public health methods and better mosquito control with special attention to each area. This, mind you, emanates from a group led by that Sam Lord Mayor, Mr. Ernest Deighton Mottley. For years he had ruled the roost and had his own way on the Vestry of St. Michael, he has dominated and bossed every Board, he chaired and supervised every subsidiary body, so that no one else but himself can supervise himself. The Magistrate told himself that himself as that familiar calypso goes. " Listen, Mr. Deputy Speaker, "he has dished out public funds and largesse in a way to suggest at most times that they had come from his own pocket, he has shouted, blustered, tub-thumped, stamped, plotted, conspired and wormed his way in that body for donkey's years. The windy political creature himself, well equipped in the art of covering up any naked and barren policy with mush, he has even invaded Church and Synagogue and propped them liberally with Vestry funds so as to get votes. " It continues "While Parochial funds have been wasted, especially after Hurricane Janet, in purchasing votes for Mir. Mottley through money being dished out right and left, vital services have been neglected and our health thereby endangered. This is a severe condemnation of a vote-getting regime we have had to endure under Mr. Mottley; how could such negligence qualify him to aspire to be the first Mayor of this new Municipality? It qualifies him only for extinction, not distinction; like other Dictators he must go. " Mr. Deputy Speaker, ...

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

On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, would the Minister agree that the language differs only from the language he himself used when the Prime Minister came nearly bottom of the poll in that election in its moderation?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

That is not a point of order.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not think the hon. member really understands what I am trying to establish, and I am glad that the hon. senior member for the City is here so that he can follow what I am saying with his customary quickness. We have been opposed to him; so were they. The hon. member, as he says, is here, but look at the interesting thing about it. We have never said the things about him that they have said and written; we have fought him just as bitterly, but the point is this, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they realised that they could not beat him so they had to join him; we realise that we could not so far beat him, and we will continue to fight; that is the difference. The hon. junior member for Bridgetown, therefore, has been put in an awkward situation because he has moved a Resolution, no matter what his private views of the subject matter are, which quite frankly would have been better moved by another hon. member.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, I am not aware that my private views are different from my views expressed in the Resolution. One thing is quite clear, that somebody should advise the Minister that there is no defence to stealing known as self-defence.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

That is not a point of order; it is a point of elucidation, and a point of elucidation can only be made if the speaker gives way. 3.10 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Again, the hon. member is missing the point. I have not yet started to deal with the hon. member's accusations against the Minister seriatim; I am establishing before the House that what the hon. member, or his colleagues, or all of them together, are saying about this Minister they have already said that much-and worse-about the senior member for Bridgetown.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, Sir. I have never said anything about anybody else. I have said things about the Minister of Housing.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

That is not a point of order.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

On a point of elucidation, Sir. I have never said anything about anybody else. I have made certain statements about the Minister, and I can prove them.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

The only person who said anything about me was the Nation in Trinidad with Cox, and I made them pay for it.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think I had better tell hon. members opposite that there is absolutely no chance of putting me off my stride, or panicking me into shortening what I wish to say. There is a history behind this Resolution. Some time in March or February a conversation took place in the dining room of this House in which an hon. member on that side said to another hon. member on the same side "I have some questions to ask about Housing, and I would like you to ask them. " He was speaking to the second hon. member. The second hon. member said "Well, why do you not ask them?" The first hon. member said "I cannot; they are too scandalous. ' Whereupon, the second hon. member said "Well, if they are so scandalous, I am not going to be the scavenger of the Labour Party. "

Mr. CRAIG:

On a point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I know that the Minister is playing for time to talk out this Resolution and allow the House to go on 10 weeks recess. I should like to draw his attention to the fact that what we are concerned with this afternoon is the Resolution (a) to set up a Judicial Commission of Enquiry; (b) to...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

That is not a point of order. It is for the Speaker to decide when a member is straying from the Resolution.

Mr. CRAIG:

Sir, I am only half-way in trying to make the point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

That is not a point of order.

Mr. CRAIG:

Shall I take my seat, Sir?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

If you have something further to say on a point of order, you may do so.

Mr. CRAIG:

I think you can determine that when I am through, Sir. I would not take an hour and forty minutes, Sir. I promise you that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I will decide what is a point of order from page 467 of May's.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Very well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will continue. At the risk of wearying the House, I want to emphasise something again. The line of argument I am at the moment developing is not intended to be an attack or a criticism in any way on the hon. senior member for Bridgetown. All I am establishing is that the value of the criticisms levied from the other side against the Minister, or against this side, will shrink when it is reflected that they have said that much - and worse - about another hon. member who was at that time opposed to them, merely because they feared and felt the consequences of his political power.

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

On a point of order, Sir. The Minister is really carrying things too far. He has not said anything to show that hon. members now or ever on this side have suggested that the hon. senior member for Bridgetown personally benefitted in any way from the taxpayers' funds. The only person who has ever

said that was somebody at an annual conference of the Democratic Labour Party, and he had to pay damages for defamation. I have never heard it said, and I do not think it is fair of the Minister to suggest that it was said by any hon. member - certainly not by any member I see here now - that the senior member for Bridgetown personally benefitted or that any money went into his pocket. (Hon. N. W. BOXILL You are nefarious.)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I ask the hon. junior member for St. Thomas to withdraw that remark that the hon. senior member for St. Thomas is nefarious.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

What remark?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The hon. junior member for St. Thomas looked at the hon. senior member for St. Thomas and directed these words to him "You are nefarious. " Will the hon. junior member for St. Thomas please withdraw that remark?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I am not here to be argued with.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is no remark for me to withdraw, because I was not addressing the Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I have not asked the hon. member to argue with me; I have asked him to withdraw the remark.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

How can you ask me to withdraw something that I have not done? If I had been standing on my feet, I could have been asked to withdraw the remark; but if I am in my seat and I say something in a soft voice manner, are you saying that I must withdraw it? Mr. Deputy Speaker, you could not be right. (Asides.)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I have asked the hon. junior member for St. Thomas to withdraw that remark.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, to withdraw what remark? I was not addressing the Chair, so how could I have made a remark; I was sitting in my chair, and you are asking me to withdraw a remark.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I am asking the hon. junior member for St. Thomas for the last time to withdraw that remark. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR If the Deputy Speaker says to withdraw it, you must do so.)

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Do not tell me that.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I ask the hon. junior member for St. Thomas to withdraw from this Chamber immediately for the remainder of today's sitting.

(The hon. Junior member for St. Thomas withdrew from the Chamber at this stage.)

3. 20 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you look at the Beacon of March, 24 the second editorial portion in the second column, this is what we read. The hon. member is saying that they have never made personal attacks of this sort on the hon. senior member for Bridgetown. He himself will recall this.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, I would like to draw Your Honour's attention to Standing Order No. 26 (1) which reads as follows -

"A Member shall not read his speech, but he may read extracts from books or papers other than newspapers in support of his argument, and may refresh his memory by reference to notes."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I am grateful to the hon. junior member for Bridgetown, but I would like to draw his attention to Standing Order No. 29(2).

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I am grateful to Your Honour. It says

"Mr. Mottley has done more to demean the human spirit and debase public morality than any other person we know of. This was planned from the year when Mr. Victor Chase felt as if he would give up the ghost and dutifully gave up the Church-wardenship to Mr. Mottley, Then the Tammany Hall tactics started. He was allowed by friends in high places, especially after the hurricane, to get away with murder."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, do you want to tell me that if you say of a man in public life that he was sheltered by his friends in high places and was allowed to get away with murder that you are not denigrating his character, that you are not vilifying him? Do you want to say that when you said that or wrote that about him you had less justification for doing it? I do not think hon. members opposite can understand the enormity of this. (Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: The difference is that I was never friendly with them.) Not then. You were never friendly with them, but there is another difference, and I draw this to the hon. senior member for Bridgetown if he is talking about differences.. The other difference is that the hon. member doubted himself; so he had to align with them in order to give them an extra seat in here that they did not deserve.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

I strongly object to that. How did I align with them to give them an extra seat in here? This is not fair. What I say is that when they wrote these things I was not friendly with them. When you did what you did, I was extremely friendly with you; so one was stabbing you in the back which you knew was your enemy and the other was your friend.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

On what point has the hon. senior member for Bridgetown risen?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Again the hon. member does not understand the point I am making. Let me see if I can simplify it. The hon. senior member for Bridgetown, in his capacity as a Local Government politician, was accused of every kind of corruption and malfeasance by the Barbados Labour Party. The hon. senior member for Bridgetown managed to win every political battle that he has had with them and with us.

Mr. CRAIG:

On a point of order, am I to understand that the Leader of the House is defending corruption like this?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

That is not a point of order.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Here again the hon. member misses the point. He is asking me if I am defending corruption like this. Like what? Like what you people accused him of? I have no reason of knowing whether it is so or not.

Mr. CRAIG:

We have accused him of this and we have asked for a Judicial Commission. Please set it up and you will know whom we are accusing and stop this lot of nonsense with these Oxford tones.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

When an hon. member is addressing the Chair, any other hon. member who wants to speak must address the Chair on a point of order or a point of elucidation.

Mr. CRAIG:

Sir, I did say 'on a point of order', but you were speaking to the Marshal. I must apologise for your not hearing.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is really rich and enjoyable. Hon. members opposite are putting themselves into a sweat - and about what? Only about my reminding them.....

Mr. CRAIG:

On a point of order, the Hon. Leader of the House asked 'a sweat about what'. A sweat about \$1.2 million of the taxpayer's money;

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

About \$1.2 million of the taxpayer's money?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

At page 467 of the latest Edition of May's says "Where 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. J. C. TUDOR:

I wonder if the hon. member who has just intervened would be prepared, even before the Judicial Commission that he is pressing us to have, to cross his heart and say that he has no other motivation but the promotion of the public good in pressing this case against the Minister.

Mr. CRAIG:

Sir, I did not hear the hon. member.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Is the Hon. Leader of the House still addressing the Chair?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Yes, I am still addressing the Chair. I asked the hon. member if he would say before a Judicial - and I now add, or other Commission that he had no other motivation except the promotion of the general welfare or the public good in pressing this case against the Minister. I am Just asking him whether he would say this.

Mr. CRAIG:

No other.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Well then, if the hon. member has no other.....

Mr. CRAIG:

And I would cross my heart as he would-like.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I am grateful for that assurance. If the hon. member has no other motivation than the promotion of the public good, why is it necessary to interrupt me when I never for one moment interrupted him?

Mr. CRAIG:

Because you were not in Barbados at the time.

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

On a point of explanation, ...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The Chair is not going to sit back and have these constant interruptions under the guise of points of order.

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

This is a point of elucidation and I think the hon. member would give way.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

A point of elucidation can only be raised if the speaker gives way.

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

The hon. member has given way and I have spoken. The hon. member asks if members would prepared to tell a Judicial Commission that. If he wants to obtain an estimate of my motives, I would refer him to the hon. senior member for St. Andrew whom I do not believe in his heart of hearts thinks that my support of this Resolution is directed against him in either a personal or a political way. I think it extremely unfair to look at some of us and suggest that. I do not know for the others, but my belief is that all who have spoken on our side have been shocked by what is going on, and the Minister is doing Barbados and all of us in here no service by these time-wasting tactics designed to talk out the Resolution so that the Government would not have the stigma of having to refuse to appoint a Commission of Enquiry.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Of course, if the hon. member thinks that, he is very much mistaken. Now this is what we are up against. I was not present in this Island when this Resolution was brought to the House, but I am told by friend and foe alike that it created a tremendous sensation both in this House and outside. Now the hon. member is telling me -and he is speaking not only on behalf of himself but on behalf of his colleagues - that they have nothing against the Government J they have nothing against the Minister personally; they are only shocked about what is going on. 3.30 p.m.

If they know what is going on and it is not to their liking, or it is wrong, they would have every perfect right to be shocked about it; but so far they have not told this House what is going on. All they have asked for is a Judicial Enquiry based on a Resolution which, in its recital clauses, draws attention to certain allegations. This is all I know and this is all I can see about it. All I am saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker - and I am not going to be hurried from this point because it is very germane to this issue. You are accusing the Hon, Minister in my opinion, and, by inference, the Government, of all sorts of things. You have accused the hon. senior member for Bridgetown in the period that he controlled the Bridgetown City Council and St. Michael Vestry of worse things; you are now saying you did it with less justification; but this is what I want to draw to the attention of the House and, in particular, to hon. members opposite. Nobody, least of all, this side, believe everything that is said on that side; sometimes things that are not said are more capable of belief. Of course, you have not said that it is getting the Government that you are really interested in, and that everything you do, from now on until the general election is held, is based on a desire to get the Government, and if you cannot meet us head-on on policy because you feel that the people of this country on balance would take our policy because they have

known it for ten years against yours that they have not known since you have been out of power, and that you cannot risk fighting us on policy, I understand and I accept that you must try to turn our flanks politically, and that, therefore, from your point of view no instrument is too unworthy to be used against us. All of this is the game of politics.

I know, for instance, that in the Councils of the Labour Party they are now canvassing in their own minds a variety of tactics which they could use between now and the next election, and what we are discussing now is one of those tactics. Some of them feel that they should resign their seats by one and force a series of bye-elections on the country, so that after a time the population will feel that if the Government has lost two bye-elections in quick succession, why not go to the country to resolve the difficulties in the minds of the electorate, because the nation is delicately poised on the horns of a political dilemma. Some of them have that tactic; others feel that that is too dangerous a tactic because if they force the hon. senior member for St. James to resign his seat, and he is foolish enough to do it, and it does not turn out as they would like, the next person will not want to try that hazard (ASIDES.)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

May I draw to the attention of all hon. members that the Standing Orders have not been suspended;

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Others among them feel, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this tactic is too hazardous and that they had better do something histrionic and dramatic such as breaking the provisions of the Public Order Act, all of them together getting themselves arrested so that it would go on to the floor of the General Assembly of the United Nations that the whole Opposition of Barbados is in gaol. Mr. Deputy Speaker, whichever of the options they feel are open to them to try to harass the Government and to bring it down if they can, they must take those options; but this is the Government of the country until such time as it is time for an election. Neither this tactic or any other of the several varieties they may have in their armoury to bring out from time to time; time can wear us out or deflect us from our purpose of governing this country until the constitutional period is determined.

They will run out of this House - and, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I pause to question here the propriety of taking outside this House a matter which is still being deliberated before the House, but they thought they were on to such a good thing that they could run out of this House and hold a public meeting last Monday night. It was a good meeting, and I would not like any members from our side to believe that it was not. If I myself were not an experienced politician, when I heard the hon. senior member for St. James refer to the hon. senior member for Christ Church as the next Prime Minister I too would have panicked, until I reflected that in doing that he was rendering a great disservice to the hon. member whom I suppose he wishes to see as the next Prime Minister, because the one thing you cannot do in the Labour Party is to try to elevate anybody against those who say they are governing; and the bitterness

which that hon. member has created will be just like the famous occasion in 1934 in Germany when Hitler slaughtered all his colleagues in what was known as the famous Night of the Long Knives, but in this instance, judging from the age of one of the protagonists, it will be the Night of the Long Underwear. Anyhow, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they have elected to use this as only one of several tactics to harass and bring the Government down.

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

On a point of elucidation, the Minister was not here when I spoke and I would just ask the Minister to deal with something rather than putting these tactics into our imagined portfolios Deal with the fact, for example, that on the 4th February, 1970 there was delivered to Stan-more Lodge from the Housing Authority workshop....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

That is not a point of elucidation.

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

Deal with the com pressor delivered on the 20th March.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

That is not a point of elucidation.

Horn J. C. TUDOR:

I could even deal with the land that was not given away for nothing; anyhow, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it will keep; it is good. They said here in attacking the hon. senior member for Bridgetown "He was allowed by friends in high places, especially after the hurricane, to get away with murder; his Conservative contacts sheltered him successfully. Now he is obsessed with power, he constantly flaunts the traffic laws, browbeats the police and is threatening the Government with what he will not do and what will happen if he is not made Mayor." Mr. Deputy Speaker, I remember how when the hon. senior member for the City, according to his likes - and I have no quarrel with that, and I have never myself mentioned it because I only like to speak about what I personally observe - but I remember even in our time that the hon. senior member for the City was kind enough to invite me in my capacity as Minister of Education to see what the Bridgetown City Council was doing by way of assistance to children who had been given places in the Grammar Schools - assistance with uniforms, shoes, books and that sort of thing - and I myself by his invitation went to see the parents of the children - even at that time the Barbados Labour Party was accusing both him and the Government of collusion in using public assistance to buy votes and to influence people. 3.40 p.m.

Let us go back to the position. Mr. Deputy Speaker, what I am establishing is that it is nothing new with them to accuse political opponents of corruption. They are always doing it, and if their political opponents were like them, their political opponents would be always in a position to throw things back in their teeth. We have had a debate in this House in the 1956-61 Session - a very bitter debate - in which chapter and verse were provided in this House from this side of the House about what was said about certain Ministers in the Government then run by the Labour Party. It is in the debates and documents of this House that it was said of a certain Minister of a former Government that, with a character like him, it is better to deal with him behind closed doors.

Now, that was never said about any Minister of this Government; it was never said about any member of the Executive Committee when the Conservatives were running the country, but it was said of a Minister of the Labour Party Government that, if you wanted to deal with him, you should deal with him best behind closed doors. This may have been a very wicked and irresponsible, slander upon the Minister concerned, but it was said. A political Party which could have that said about one of its Ministers could not really look upon another political Party, or its political opponents, in the face in matters in which they are not only entirely innocent but in a matter which cannot touch them in a way in which certain other matters have touched the former Government,

There are some hon. members in this House now

- I believe the hon. senior member for St. Peter, the hon. junior -number for Christ Church, the hon. senior member for Bridgetown, the hon. junior "number for St. James - and I can remember a debate which kept this House going for something like 12 hours because a Minister of the Government could not explain why a certain amount of money voted for one purpose was used for another purpose. (Asides.) It was the so-called Spa Road debate.

Allegations have been made in previous Parliaments in this House about a man called Bannister. I do not know the man; I have only heard his name mentioned in this House in the 1956-61 Session, and I have never taken the trouble to find out who he was. I did hear it mentioned here, however, that he was an employee of the Housing Authority. It was said in this House that he was building his own house and using Housing Authority workmen. All of this has been said in this House already.

Let us go further. You want to talk about accusations of corruption, and I will turn to the general

theme upon which I started. I do not feel that because - I am saying this now because I am genuinely expressing my own point of view - the cloth for the school children's uniforms may have come from the Civic, or from any other firm in Bridgetown, that there was something necessarily wrong, even if some of the people in the Civic, or some of the people in a particular Bridgetown firm were connected politically with the hon. senior member for Bridgetown. What is wrong with this? Was the hon. member to be expected to deny his friendship with Mr. A. S. Bryden, and because Mr. Bryden was his friend not to buy Cod Liver Oil for the poor little children because somebody would say that there is something wrong?

I can say this for the hon. senior member for the City: despite all their accusations of corruptions against him, it was never said that any child in the St. Michael's Infirmary was ever undernourished, or that any of the children in that Institution looked like those children Dr. Humby drew our attention to way back in 1956. Even if the Cod Liver Oil had come from Mr. Bryden and he had not put out a tender; even if the bread had come from Redman and Taylor, or Johnson and Redman, or whichever it was - suppose the rice and pork had come from Alleyne Arthur, or A. Mayers,; or James A. Tudor -I do not think James A. Tudor got quite as much of it as other people, but he got some of it. He was not in the Vestry; he was not a colleague, but in any case he got a little of it. (Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY Some of It.) "Some could also be a little."

Now, because some of these people may have been connected in Vestry politics or Local Government politics, with the hon. senior member for the City, was that the reason why he was accused of corruption and helping his friends to feather their nests? I do not see it so at all.

I will go further. There is a man called Rupert Yarde. If that is not his name, then the hon. member will correct me because he knows what I am talking about. There is nothing that I know against him; he was, I believe, a mason at the City Council or was superintending their work. I am perfectly prepared to believe that if Mr. Yarde, outside of his City Council duties, were employed to do a job of work for the hon. senior member for Bridgetown, he was perfectly entitled to do it. So long as the City Council or the Vestry was getting his services for which they were paying him, he was perfectly entitled to do any extra work.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member is not making a correct statement. Mr. Yarde was never employed as a Supervisor or Superintendent. Each Committee gave people work to do. When the hon. member and his Government took over, they had to pay \$4,000 for jobs that we did for \$700 or \$800, and it took two months before Mr. Matthews would allow the vouchers to be signed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member does not understand the point that I am trying to establish. The hon. member does not need to go on the defensive if I am talking about the City Council or the St. Michael's Vestry. I am not attacking him. As a matter of fact, if he could but see it, what I am doing is a perfect vindication of him against them because they are doing the same things with little justification, as I have said, in his case as in this.

There are some people who believe that if somebody big, that is to say, somebody recognised is doing something - I am not talking about professional work - nothing can go wrong, because of the very name or reputation of the firm, or Institution; but if somebody small is doing something, you have to look out for trouble. Now, if Mr. Watson was Watson of the firm of Ash & Watson, no matter what he was doing he would have to be right, but because Mr. Watson is an ordinary man it is going now to be discovered that he is the worst man out, because he is not Ash & Watson; he is only 'Ash'; so all that is left for him is sackcloth and ashes. 3.50 p.m.

He is only one of a lot of small people. Jordan, Preston Holder or whoever they are, are small people. Do you want to tell me that, if it were five big people, they would be perfectly satisfied because even if you do not award tenders but had spilt up the work between them, their very prestigiousness would shield them from the temptations which according to them, would beset lesser mortals? I cannot see it so. I think that small men, little people are as honest as big people because honesty is not a matter of littleness or bigness; it is a matter of one's own outlook on life. You cannot get down on Mr. Watson merely because he is Mr. Watson, and not Watson of Ash and Watson. There is another thing much more fundamental. At the bottom of all, this is the thinking that the accumulation of property is only properly done if it is accumulated by a certain kind of people, but that as soon as black people get no more than what they started out with, something has to be wrong. Now it is true that, we did not say this, but the way we act and the way we react to certain situations means we are thinking it.

Now in what I am going to say now I really do not mean to slander the dead. In fact, I would not slander anybody, whether dead or living. I am just calling attention to certain facts and certain beliefs which were held by certain people. There was a very distinguished white Barbadian called Sir William Chandler. He was, I believe, a member of this House at one time; he certainly was President of the Legislative Council, member of the Executive Committee of this Island, Master-in-Chancery, President of the Court of Appeal and he may have acted as Governor. Now I have heard it said by people who should know that is to say, people of the same social class as Sir William Chandler - that he manipulated his position as Master-in-Chancery to know what was going on, and therefore the end-product of his being Master-in-Chancery was that somehow or other a lot of estates which went into Chancery came out of Chancery into Chandlery. Do you want to tell me that our social outlook is such that if you heard these things from people whose reputation you have no reason to doubt, you think it is all right and you do not even wonder whether they are only saying it because they know it or they are saying it because

they have heard it, but you think it is all right On the other hand you get another one with unsubstantiated, unfounded charges against somebody who looks like us, and merely because you may have known ten years ago that he was a little poor boy in Dark Hole, St. Joseph, but you see him now with 3 block of flats at Stanmore, they are too good for him? Thorpes and all the other Plantations may not have been good for Chandler, derived as they were then, but a poor black man is not allowed to use genuine enterprise and risk-bearing and business acumen to achieve anything before somebody with political motivation which at the best is doubtful says he is a Minister of Government and consequently the Government must be corrupt, because he is owning something that he did not have before he got into the House of Assembly; We cannot have that.

It is perfectly allowable, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to attack the Government and to bring it down if you can, and if you have not got policy according to the Opposition sights and likes, it may even be allowable to use any kind of tactics. That is a matter for them to decide. They have options which are open to them in destroying this country which are not open to us We have to govern it and therefore we have to preserve it. They do not have yet to govern it; they cannot govern it until the people give it to them; so anything that will bring it down is an option open to them to try. But at any rate, if you are trying any of the options for destruction, you have to 'come good' because you cannot tell me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that a political Party which has had the Government of this country, has fought all kinds of battles with their political opponents, particularly political opponents in the Bridgetown City Council can say that the Churchwarden, a member of this House, Mr. Bryden, Mr. Fred Goddard who was also a member of this House and all of them were corrupt. They have said that the very hon. senior member for Bridgetown debases the human spirit, and has done more to demean the human spirit and debase public morality than any other person we know of. When you say "than any other person we know of", you count in the persons whom you must know best and that is yourselves. And to crown it all, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you go and you hold a public meeting Before you hold that public meeting ostensibly on this same problem, you print a pamphlet to suit the intellectual equipment of Mr. Jack Dear. You say you done with thieving, you done with corruption'. Now, nobody takes into account the fact that the people of this country spent \$20 million at least this year on education, but a political Party which wants to govern the country has to demean and debase the public taste by using ungrammatical language. It does not really want St. John for Prime Minister; it needs syntax. But apart from being flippant, there is something more fundamental about this. You say "done with thieving, done with corruption. " Did you enquire from Mr. Nigel Barrow or from Mr., L. B. Brathwaite if you have committed yourself to saying so without their authority? I cannot allow that you can use people's names by inference and hold them up to public ridicule by saying you. ire finished with something when they themselves may be only half-way through. And at the risk of being accused of currying-favour, I have to defend those two members of the Barbados Labour Party against an unwarranted attack on them. You cannot say you are finished with anything until you ask the two of them whether in fact they have finished.

Now we know that it is a wrong thing to attack the characters of people who are not members of this House, and I am not going to attack their characters. I am only going to say what is known by hon. members opposite. It is known, for instance, that Mr. L. B. Brathwaite had to satisfy a Court judgment

made against him in an election case with the hon. senior member for St. Andrew. To make up'. hat money he needed \$189. Where did that money come from? It came from the funds of the Barbados Sugar Workers' Union or whatever it is called, which is the Union organised by the Barbados Labour Party, and in order that I should not give a one-sided picture of it, I have to put it on record that the Leader of the Opposition in his capacity as Chairman or President of that Union, when he heard of that Illegal transaction or that Illegal use of Union funds, put his foot down too late. I have to say that. 4.00 p.m.

If you are bringing a charge, against a Minister or against a Government, you cannot attempt to fool the House and the public that you are so interested in good government, public morality, the high level of Ministerial behaviour and all of this, because this is not what you are doing at all. If you are after this, when you yourselves had the Government you would have shown it. As I have said before, it has been down in the records of this House that it was said of a Minister of a Labour Party Government that that Minister was the kind of person who was best dealt with behind closed doors, without witnesses. I am saying this. There is another reason why we cannot take this seriously. This is, in effect, a vote of censure on the Government; but as you however rightly or wrongly or mistakenly, set down in recitals to a motion matters which themselves, if you know what you are doing, should be the evidence you are presenting - if you have it, you are censuring the Government; and we have had a barefaced interjection in here this afternoon to the effect that neither the person who intervened when I was speaking nor any other hon. member from that side who had spoken could have anything personal against the Minister or against the Government, but they only want to see good government or something like this carried on. We just do not accept this. I will tell you what, Mr. Deputy Speaker; we do not hesitate to say why we reject the idea of a Judicial Enquiry, but it must be absolutely clear why we reject it. We are not rejecting it because we have anything to hide; we are rejecting it because the hon. members opposite do not really grasp that they are insulting not only themselves in this House, but the whole due process of law and good government in this country. Far be it from me to tell them their own business, but I hinted last week that if you want to go to the Courts for them to determine any matter, it has to be a matter within their jurisdiction, one that they can competently handle; and what you are bringing before them you cannot bring or attempt to bring before uninitiated persons who do not possess that jurisdiction; so on those grounds alone it is ruled out of Court, so to speak.

We get on to another aspect, Mr. Deputy Speaker, which has got to be faced very squarely, and it is the political aspect. This Parliament is nearly four years old; so everybody knows that it is a dying Parliament; it has much less time to go than it has had already. Everybody therefore knows that from now on each political Party is going to be sizing up itself, getting itself ready for the fray, making appeals to the electorate. At a time like this, if you are a serious political Party, you should be making an assessment of the situation of the country, and in making that assessment finding out the real shortcomings of the Government and being in a position to prove to the people of this country that the Government of the country cannot advance the country one bit further than the country already is. But Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is interesting to note, of all the accusations levelled against this Government, it has never been said that it cannot carry this country any further. We have been accused of all sorts of things of being dictators, of perverting the course of justice, of allowing foreigners to come in and run

havoc with the interest of the people of this country; all of this we have been accused of - of wanting to stifle legitimate protest and things like that; but no member of the other side, either inside of this House or outside of it, has yet been able to say that our ideas for running this country are ten, twenty, forty or fifty years behind hand. Indeed, they never say this because the country has not yet been favoured with alternative ideas from them with which you can make a comparison; so they do not choose to set out to prove that our policies are bankrupt, that they would not work, that far from improving the conditions of people, our policies are doing the very opposite, they do not set out to prove this because this cannot be proved.

They have not tried to drag us down, not by legitimate disagreement and appealing over our heads to the electorate, but they believe that by attacking unfoundedly, without substance, and with not, I submit, the best kind of attitudes, that something is wrong with the administration of the Housing Authority which, after all, has done more in the Minister's time than in any other comparable year, that the Housing Authority is somehow wrong, and that this is an indication of the wickedness and corruption of the Government. Mr. Deputy Speaker., the reason why I like to fight elections is that I genuinely do not know who will win them and you have to have them because you do not know who will win. I only know whom I do not want to lose, and that is myself but I never know who will win; that is why you have to fight.

I would throw a challenge to the other side, and it is this; start from now. Any time that you feel that it can be done, bring up alternative policies, bring them before this House, manoeuvre and force us into rejecting them, and then appeal over our heads to the electorate on it and see whether they will choose between alternate policies on the basis of what is best for them. That is the only way to win elections, and that is the only way to make politics meaningful to the people of this country; but what you get instead of this - you get these vague accusations, a request for a Judicial Enquiry in the one way in which such a request could not be granted, and all hon. members who are pressing this tell you they do not accuse the Minister of stealing - they have nothing against him, they have nothing but goodwill towards him, and some of them have even said that all that they have said they have said because they have heard it of the Minister, but the Minister cannot, in my opinion, be too careful of his choice of enemies. I think that almost anybody can be your friend; but if you are going to have an enemy you have to choose him carefully, and everybody who praises you or even laughs with you and drinks with you is not necessarily a person with your best Interest at heart but that is a matter entirely for him. Of this, however, I am satisfied; if they did not fear him, if his influence and that of the Government was not formidable, and if he had not used his administrative ability, working within the framework of the Constitution and the law, to bring things to the people of St. Andrew and other parts of the country which he thought they needed, we would not have been hearing this, 4.10 p.m.

After all, what the other side likes to be able to say of this Government is that, no matter how good our policies look on paper, we cannot apply them; they will not work. They always start out by prophesying about us that nothing that we say we are going to do we can do because it will not work. Nothing makes

them so angry and embittered and leads them into such scurrility and slander as the spectacle of policies being implemented and pledges being honoured. Not one word has been said on the other side about the tremendous boost which we have made in Housing this year; of the numbers of old people to whom we have applied our welfare policy -people from the constituencies which some of them even come from, We are the Government of the whole country, and it would be a welcome thing if our policies were to be so quickly implemented that all persons in need of Housing in this country could have it within the shortest possible time; so we do not even have to make any particular virtue of the fact that somebody, who may come from a constituency in which we did not receive a vote, can get help from the Housing Authority. The Housing Authority exists to help citizens of this country, no matter how they voted. Naturally, we do not expect them to make much of that because it would be to our credit.

Sir, they are not going to tell the people of this country that the policies of this Government are so successful that all the areas of grievance which they want to exploit are becoming progressively narrower. They rely on what the Leader of the Opposition in his heyday used to call the short memories of the people. I will prove it to you, Sir. You will hear them now in the last week or so, or perhaps for another few days, agitating public opinion about the shrimp industry. They suddenly become champions of all the people who work in the shrimp industry, but last year when we were discussing in this House the application of the law in respect to fishing boats mooring in the Careenage, they took up and championed the cause of the fishermen. They said inside this House and outside: "Why do you not throw away all of the shrimp boats? What do you want them in there for to stink up the good Deep Water Harbour that the Labour Party built? They were ante-shrimp then because there were poor, fishing launches the re. That is how they work; that is how they operate. Any particular area of grievance that they can get to exploit at a given moment they will exploit it. The lesson for us is perfectly plain. It is this It is our business to give you no area of grievance to exploit. I have noticed that if we do not do anything silly, or untimely you will never have anything for them to quarrel about; but as soon as something happens, whether we are initiating a policy, or changing a policy, or the policy. is not clearly understood until we are ready with our plans, Just at that critical moment they move into that area and try to make things worse.

Sir, this is a political Party that wants a Government. There Is nothing to offer - nothing which would really satisfy the aspirations of the people, but something that is scandalous that even among their own members, as I have said one of then could say to another: "I have some questions to ask on Housing, but they are too scandalous; I cannot ask them - you ask them". The other hon. member says "Since they are too scandalous and you cannot ask them, I am not going to, because I am not going to be the scavenger of the Labour Party. " (Mr. J. M. G. M, ADAMS "Name them. ') The hon. member has asked me to name them. I will not do so at this stage. (A side J Not because thay do not exist, bur because I would rather speak of who ate the fried crapaud, or rather, who said that another hon, member ate the fried crapaud. That is what I would rather speak about.

Mr. J. M. a M, ADAMS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, The hon. member must not leave us in suspense. He has just given us some of the most irrelevant entertainment for a long time, but at least let us know his sources. I would like to know who ate the fried crapaud and who talked about it, and I would like to know who said he would not be the scavenger of the Labour Party. I would be interested to know these things, and the hon. member must not say these things without substantiating them. He must produce evidence, Sir.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I agree with you, and in producing evidence it is sufficient that I can get the evidence to rise.

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the hon. member saying that I ate fried crapaud? He must assist me, Sir. Is the hon. member saying that I said that somebody ate the crapaud? Is he saying that I said I had some scandalous questions, or that I said I would not be a scavenger? There are five separate allegations. Which of them it is intended to attach to me? I know nothing of any of them.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member says that there are five separate allegations. I have not even counted them. It is interesting that of four hon. members on that side belonging to the official Opposition, only one rose. I would have to ask the permission of the hon. member whom it most concerns whether I could repeat it. (Asides.)-I cannot, because I am addressing the House. (Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS You have my permission to repeat it) I cannot take the hon. member's permission; it does not most nearly concern him

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. Did the fried crapaud come from the Housing Authority? Was it reared in the grounds of Country Road? In other words, is it relevant to this Resolution?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Only with the permission of the hon. senior member for St. James will I answer that question.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like the Hon. Leader of the House to stop talking nonsense and let us continue with the people's business.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Is that a point of order?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is no doubt that a motion like this, though it may lead in the discussion of it, to some light humour, has some very serious undertones. When a Government is under attack, it has to defend itself and cannot be restricted to the choice of weapons used, or the terrain on which it chooses to fight, or the duration of the struggle.

The hon. mover of this motion is, I believe, the most junior member of this House, and it is his moving of this motion which, I submit, robs it of a lot of its seriousness. 4.20 p.m.

This is the kind of motion that really, if it is to be moved at all, and if debate is to be initiated on it, should be moved by the Leader of the Opposition or his deputy, but not by your most junior member because the House, which has a 'feel' for these things, knows that when the Leader of the Opposition intervenes in a matter or his deputy initiates discussion on a matter, it is to be accorded the seriousness which the prestigious position of either or both of these hon. members in Parliament command. It is not enough for hon. members opposite to palm off this kind of motion on the most junior member, indeed, of the whole Chamber, and expect this side, apart from other reasons, to give it any kind of seriousness. And even if it had been moved by the Leader of the Opposition or by his deputy, in the same terms and couched in the same terms and introduced in the same language, and if the debate after introduction had taken the same course as it has taken in this instance, this would altogether have been added reason for us to reject it. If the House is to consider serious business, such business as it considers must be seriously presented; but if you are asking the Courts of this Island to intervene in matters which do not properly concern them, then you owe it as a duty to the House of which you are a member, to the Courts whose intervention you are invoking or inviting, and to the people of the country..... (Interruption)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

May I draw to the attention of all hon. members the fact that Standing Order No. 29 (6) has not been suspended?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

You owe it also the people of the country whose welfare you are elected here to promote to do it all in its proper form. Therefore when we say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we cannot accept it, we do so on

several grounds. Indeed the reasons for rejecting this motion are so numerous that It would be almost tautologous to choose more than the best half a dozen of them, all of which I have drawn to the attention of the House in the last three minutes. But I want to bring this home to the House. You cannot have a General Election any earlier than it is due or any earlier than the person who constitutionally can make it due wants to make it due. Meanwhile the country still has to be governed and laws still have to be passed; so that it is a waste of time trying to force an issue which by its very nature is unenforceable, because if hon. members opposite choose to neglect their parliamentary duties to the extent of wanting to force the Government out of power by illegal and unconstitutional means, the law of the land applies to everybody with rigorous impartiality. On the other hand, if they want to use legitimate constitutional means to bring a General Election closer, they may try those means, and I think I can safely say they will not succeed because politics is always a game in which two sides can play, and on our part we do not have to play politics. We are the Government of the country charged with the responsibility of such, and so as we are the Government of the country, we intend to govern, and our first interest is to see that the welfare of this country is promoted in accordance with the mandate which we have been given.

I am reminded at this stage, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of the remarks of Abraham Lincoln to the representatives of the Southern States when they came to treat with him or to quarrel with him. He said "I have an oath registered in Heaven to preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States. You have no such oath or no such obligation to destroy it; so if you wish to destroy it, you make your own choice and you take the consequences.' This is what any Government can say to any Opposition If you want to fight fairly, we fight; if you want to fight unfairly, we still fight; but remember we are the Government. We cannot dictate to you all or any of the means you can use to try to bring the Government down, whatever you use we will counter them and win, because our business is to govern and to promote the interest of the people. Your business is not to govern because you have not been given that mandate, and consequently we cannot expect you to rise to that level of responsibility. Therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in rejecting this Resolution, we bear in mind that, although it has been pushed from the other side, all who have spoken have been careful to say that they do not dislike the Minister; they have not accused him of stealing anything; they only wished to see good government; but they have no positive accusations of any sort to level against him or the Government.

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

No, no, Sir. On a point of elucidation, I never said that we have no positive accusations, and it is no fair, I can make positive accusations that I have in my hands of Housing Authority equipment being delivered on specific days to the Minister's premises to be used at a building site I can make positive accusations that on March 20, a compressor, three jack hammers, four drills, five lengths of hose a bucket and funnel were delivered to the Minister's premises at Stanmore Terrace Scaffolding and other building equipments delivered on 4th and 11th February; so do not say we have no positive accusations.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR; I suppose the hon member, after he has recited that, will then tell the House that the Minister told him that.

Mr. J. M. O. M. ADAMS:

No, the Minister did not tell me that.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Or he saw that for himself, being present.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The time being 4.30 p.m., this is the end of Private Members' Business. 4.30 p.m.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Order No. 7 is the next Order of the Day standing in the name of the hon. junior member for Christ Church.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is a Resolution for the compulsory acquisition of a parcel of land near Good Shepherd School in the parish of St. James. As the Addendum sets out.

In accordance with the provisions of Section 5 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1949, the approval of Parliament is sought for the compulsory acquisition of the parcel of land described in the Schedule in order that the purpose set out in the Resolution may be effected and that the Crown may acquire an indefeasible title to the parcel of land.

The object of the acquisition is to provide an access road to this school which has recently been constructed in order to permit the students and teachers and parents attending the school easy access to the school. The plan of the land is available, if hon. members care to have a look at it, and can be inspected if they so wish. The price which has been fixed by the Standing Valuation Committee for this

parcel of land is 10 per square foot, and it is the price offered for this land. I think I have given the relevant information, and I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Order No. 1 is the next Order of the Day and it stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Finance.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the Mount 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. Deputy Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply. Mr. VERH'OOD In the Chair. SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1970-70 - No. 3

Hon. J. G. TUDOR:

I believe, Mr. Chairman, hon. members will have had circulated to them the additional sheets of paper which contain the amendments to be made to the Supplementary Estimates. We hope that hon. members would have had a chance to look at them in some detail. The first thing you have to do Mr. Chairman, is to change the figure 0, 1 the front page of the Resolution; instead of "one hundred and eighty-seven thousand, four hundred and fifty-three dollars" it will be "two hundred and sixty-three thousand, eight hundred and sixty-five dollars". When we come to deal with the individual Heads, hon. members will refer then to the sheets which have been circulated so that we can move them in, in their appropriate places.

Head 3 Parliament.

This sum of \$23,442 is explained on page 4, and you insert before Note 1 the following:

1A. The Debates Committee of Parliament has reached agreement with the Barbados Workers' Union (representing the reportorial staff of Parliament) for a revision of the salaries of the staff employed by the Committee. It has been agreed that the revision of salaries should take effect from 1st April, 1969.

It is estimated that an additional amount of \$23,422 will be required to meet the payment of the revised salaries to the end of the current financial year.

The sum of \$23,422 is accordingly required as a supplementary vote under Head 3 - Parliament, Item 22 - Reporting, to meet the payment of the revised salaries.

IB has to do with the air-conditioning units in the Other Place and this supplementary provision is required for that. I beg to move that Head 3 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that. 4.40 p.m.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, the Note tells us of an agreement reached between the Barbados Workers' Union (representing the reportorial staff of Parliament) and the Debates Committee and, as a consequence, there has been an increase in salary. If the Debates Committee has been fooled into such a situation, then it is a matter for those members of the Committee who sat there. What I am laying here now is this, It is high time that Parliament as a whole examines its reportorial staff as to their production, and it is high time that it finds ways and means of exercising some sort of control over the said staff. I want to offend every Reporter here today; I am not saying this because the Reporters cannot rise to defend themselves, but this is what I have to say. In little Grenada, one Reporter has to do, in the course of a single day, three times as much as one of our Reporters, and the question of pay is something one has to take into consideration bearing in mind that the cost of living in Grenada, in my opinion, is very much higher than the cost of living in Barbados.

I am saying that the Reporters of the House of Assembly are taking the Debates Committee and Parliament for a ride. Further, I am not prepared to say that they are all efficient. The silly position in which the Debates Committee finds itself is this. A member of the Barbados Workers' Union presents a claim based on nothing, holds out a threat based on nothing, and the members of the Debates Committee get cold feet and fall for it.

I am not suggesting for a single moment that the salaries of other Government servants were increased and the Reporters should not look for an increase in salary, but I also look at the fact that the salaries of Reporters were increased at a time when the salaries of other Government servants were not increased. What the Reporters of the House of Assembly are getting today, compared with the work that they are called to do - they are having a spree at the expense of the taxpayers of this country. I am not asking for their friendship; I am doing the people's business. It would pay Parliament handsomely if we were to decide to get three young men and send them to Duffs' College and have them trained to do our reporting. We are being subjected to a certain type of blackmail in negotiations on behalf of these Reporters and Typists. I repeat that they are not being recruited to the staff because they are efficient people. They are recruited because we are led to believe that writing shorthand, your transcription and typewriting are difficult, and that our interpolation in this House is so difficult to follow that only the few who now do the business are capable of doing it.

We have been told in Committee. Mr. Chairman, that there are Reporters on this staff that you dare not send in this House of Assembly to take notes. We are told that there are Reporters employed on the Reportorial staff that you cannot run the risk of sending in here. Why have them? I am suggesting that you get three young men and three young women; recruit them, and let them have six months training. You can give them half-pay and let all of those blackmailers go home. The one thing about it is that nobody can exercise any sort of control over the present Reportorial staff. Nobody knows when they come to work; nobody knows what they are doing; nobody knows when they leave the office, and everybody is a boss. I feel that we have to look at what these people are called upon to do.

As far as the Barbados Workers' Union is concerned, the debates in this Assembly are now no longer controlled by the hon members of this House. The Reporters are now telling us when they will work and when they will not work. That is the ridiculous position into which this Parliament has allowed itself to fall. The Reporters are telling you that they will work 12 hours or 14 hours, as the case may be. The members of the Debates Committee who carried out the formal negotiation with the Barbados Workers' Union, undoubtedly unfamiliar with such negotiation, did not, when they set about to increase the salaries, have the Union agree to a time limit or period during which this increase should hold good. That is exactly why we are now asked to vote \$23,422. For what are we paying this money?

We are hearing from the Clerk of the House, time and time again at meetings, that you cannot get the debates from the Reporters 4.50 p.m.

When you carry out an Investigation behind the back of the Clerk, the Reporters defend themselves and place the blame somewhere else, and when you go by the Government Printery there is a third party with another excuse; but the net result of all this is that the publication of Hansard is still as many miles away today as it was when I believed the Prime Minister voiced it in this House some years ago that he was dissatisfied with the production of Hansard and its late coming. You will find that all we are going on to do is to pay Reporters more and more money. Every day you see two or three more Typists about the place loitering about and doing nothing. I have been to Grenada for a few days and I have seen those people at work. I spent some time to see what these people were doing, and I am satisfied that it would pay this country dividends if a small Committee from this House - members of the Debates Committee or whoever it might be - were sent to Grenada, and I would suggest, Trinidad for a single day to observe what is going on in the Reportorial Departments of those two territories.

It will be said that I opposed the Reporters getting more money. What am I to do with that? I am defending the taxpayers' dollars this time. I am not looking for the friendship of Reporters. What we are concerned with is that the Reporters of the future ought to be responsible to somebody - a thing which is not now the case. I want to say, too, that the Reporters are supplied with too many Typists. Go to Grenada and see what is happening there. When you tell the Reporters in Grenada of the luxuries of our Reporters in Barbados, they would leave Grenada to come over here for some of the luxuries. The House of Assembly Reporters in Barbados are living like kings. I am not against them living like kings, but all I am saying is that we have got to reach a point where we can control what they will be paid in future because if you were to take into consideration the method that has been employed during the past five years to arrive at increases in their salaries, and if you were to relate them to the salaries paid to other categories of workers, we would see that something has gone radically wrong in the minds of the members of the Debates Committee. It might be that the negotiating member of the Barbados Workers' Union was able to put it over on the members of the Debates Committee; but what I am saying is that we are not now getting enough for our money, and a review of the entire situation ought to be embarked upon, and we should be told if it is necessary to have an expert observe what is going on amongst our Reportorial Staff. You should have some expert report on the standard of their work and all that is involved, and let us see what is wrong about our getting Hansard on the streets in a respectable time.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to concern myself with your note to Item 30 which calls for \$200 for air conditioning units for the Other Place, but I do suppose we are going to be told again that in the long recess there will be this grand change that is to take place where this Chamber is concerned. We will also wait and see how long that is going to take. I am awfully sorry that the opportunity is not now afforded to enquire of the Leader of the House if they really intend to set up a printery that we can get Hansard out at a respectable hour when we get the Reporters going into full production, or if we are going to merely talk about that year after year and do nothing more.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

When next week we are debating the Bill of which we have given notice today, the hon. member will see that one of the provisions in that Bill is to give Parliament the option of having the Government Printer or any other person print and publish the debates of Parliament by contract.

The question that Head 3 - Parliament - stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head "6 - Legal - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order provides for a certain staff structure in the Legal Department. This was laid today. It is now necessary to provide furniture and equipment for that additional staff and we have to provide the money for it.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

If I may just explain to the hon. member, I was asked whether it would be proper for us to pass the money before we have approved the Order. According to the Civil Establishment Act - I have made the Order already - at any time after the Order has been made and gazetted, the House can be called upon to vote the money for the posts, and this is one of those types of subsidiary legislation in which a negative Resolution is not called for, but an affirmative Resolution. 5.00 p.m.

As far as the law is concerned, as soon as I sign a Civil Establishment Order, it is passed and established. I do not know if that is the question which the hon. member was asking.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Mr. Chairman, I bag to move that Head 6 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

We go back to the printed Resolution for Head 9, Item 18 - Furniture And Equipment, \$900 and Item 19, \$2,500, The notes to these are already printed and I refer hon. members to notes 1 and 2. I beg to move that Head 9 stand part.

Hon. C. 1, TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 11 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, we have been hearing a lot about these Church Officers from time to time, and I am to wonder exactly which category of Officer is now involved in this; who are they? Bell ringers, Sextons, Organists - who are they?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Again, this is a sum which was fixed by law and not put in the Estimates. In section 12 of the Disestablishment Act, provision is made that gratuities will be paid to those persons who were employed whether they were Curates, Sextons or Organists. My recollection is that between the Suspension Act and the time when the Disestablishment Act came into force, specific provision was made for all to those people that they should receive pensions as if they were public officers. The people who were employed in between were not entitled to pensions and these are the people to whom this refers.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, we are not denying that; we are just asking if they are Priests, Bell ringers, Sextons or what.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

There are five other persons for whom gratuities have not been computed; four of these, due to lack of information which has not yet been supplied by the Ministry of Education -Revds. L. D. Burke, J. L. Springer, W. D. George -I think he is dead - R. T. Brome and Rev. N. R. Sparks because he may be eligible for retiring benefits under the Pensions Act 1947, subject to further particulars being supplied by the Bishop. What we are doing here in this Resolution is taking the opportunity to make provision for the payment of gratuities to these five persons immediately after the computations have been made; so the total number of persons is 33. The names of the other 28 I do not have here, but they are persons who were appointed to some kind of Ecclesiastical office or post, and this does not necessarily mean Curate or a Vicar or Rector or anything like that, but it is something to do with the Church. It would have been a pensionable office had it not been for the Suspension Act 1955. Sextons and Organists, if their posts were pensionable would be Included; if their posts were not pensionable they would not be included. There are also some persons the Local Government used to look after; so when we took over Local Government responsibility we had to take over their commitments.

Mr. HINDS:

Now since you say Sextons and Organists will be included, will those pensioners receive the recent salary increase of \$25 on the pension?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

These are not pensions; these are gratuities in lieu of pensions; so the computation would have to be based on their entitlement at the time when they retired. You do not give a gratuity to a man who is still working; if a man was preaching at St. Mark's, although he was in the interim period between the Suspension Act and the Disestablishment Act you do not give him a gratuity merely because you disestablished the Church. If in the interval of time between the two he retired, then he is entitled to a gratuity in lieu of pension because only up to the time of the Suspension Act are we recognising our responsibility for pensions; after that it is the Church's responsibility, 5.10 p.m.

This was clearly stated. Now, we pay them on a diminishing basis about \$35,000 a year from \$133,000

down to \$10,000 over a period of 9 years. The Anglican Church will only be getting \$10,000 from the

Treasury, but we are still responsible for gratuities for those persons who, in the interval of time, were taken on. The Suspension Act was round about 1955, and it placed everything in a state of suspended animation like Mohammed's coffin, between heaven and hell, poised in mid-air.

Everybody who was working with the Church before that day will be entitled to a gratuity and pension and/or both under the Disestablishment Act, 1969. They still had to fill vacancies in between those years. For a period of 14 years they had this thing in suspension; we paid them a gratuity, and they would not be entitled to any \$25 or anything like that, because that would be a monthly increment to their pension. In other words, their gratuity would have to be calculated on the emoluments they were drawing at the time of their retirement, and it would have no thing to do with the Budget of 1970 or any other year.

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

HEAD 14 - INLAND REVENUE Head 14 - Inland Revenue - was called.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 14 - Inland Revenue - \$4,078 - stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

HEAD 17 - PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE Head 17 Prime Minister's Office was called.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Chairman, Head 17, Item 13 - Ex-gratia payments for compensation. In the last column the figure should be \$5,356, We have added on \$556, and this amount is in respect of an Ex-gratia payment for a Minister travelling for which we can find no authorisation. (Asides.) I do not run this Government by

conspiracy. If you ask me a question, I will answer it. The \$556 which we are moving - in is in respect of a Minister travelling by Pan American World Airways. We can find no authorisation in the Minutes for this travel, neither can B. W. I. A. produce any requisition for the travel, but B. W. I. A. paid in good faith \$556 for the travel of the Minister. Note (c) states

"The sum of \$556 is required as a supplementary vote to make an, ex-gratia payment....."

We do not accept any legal liability for payment of this money, but we feel that we ought to pay B. W. I. A. the money although the travel does not appear to be authorised. If they had not paid out the money to Pan American World Airways, I would not have asked the House to pay this money at all, and they would have to get back the money in the best way they could. (Asides.) Do you want to ask me a question? I have made my position clear; I do not run this Government by any conspiracy. I am not paying B. W. I. A. any money because I can find no legal authority for it except to ask for an ex-gratia payment. Have I made my position clear?

Mr. HOPPIN:

Mr. Chairman, I heard the Prime Minister make a statement regarding a Minister and mentioned that the sum of \$556 has to be paid for his travel. Is he a Minister of this Government? I would really like to know.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I said it was a Minister of Government. Do you really want a reply to that?

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

I asked about this in here before you came into power. (Asides.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

This sitting is not yet suspended.

Mr. HOPPIN:

Mr. Chairman, I asked a question, and I have not received an answer.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

All I can say is this I am Minister of Finance, and I have to clear my position. wrote a registered letter and asked the Minister in question to try to explain what the travelling was for and he declined to reply. The B. W. I. A. having paid out the money, I can only come and ask the House to vote it. (Asides.) The age of the Minister is over 70. I am sorry the Leader of the Opposition is not in his place, because he might be able to assist the House. He would not reply to my letters The Leader of the Opposition did not reply to my registered letter, and I have to come and ask the House to vote the money. (Mr. HINDS Those are my instructions.) Are you the Counsellor for the Leader of the Opposition?

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Has the hon. member moved that Head 17, as amended, stand part?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I beg to move that Head 17, as amended, stand part, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

HEAD 21 - CIVIL AVIATION

Head 21 Civil Aviation was called.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 21 - Civil Aviation - \$1,485 -stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved In the affirmative without division,

HEAD 25 - MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS Head 25 Ministry of External Affairs - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, there is a move-in here from the printed sheet. At Item 32 the figure is now \$18, 858. There have been no changes in the rates of salaries of the non-established staff of the Barbados Mission at New York since its establishment in 1967. These salaries have now been reviewed since in New York itself there has been a general increase of the level of wages. The following information is furnished in order to support the claim. If hon. members turn over the leaf, they will see the supporting information.

I beg to move that Head 25, as amended, stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

HEAD 26 - MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

Head 26 - Ministry of Home Affairs - was called,

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 26 - Ministry of Home Affairs - \$8,000 -stand part. This sum is required to remunerate the Chairman and members of the Fire Enquiry. 5.20p.m.

The Report has been laid before Parliament today and hon. members will see on page 2, note 10A - the Chairman, 20 days at \$150 per day; three members, 20 days at \$100 per day; Secretary \$1,200; honorarium to four stenographers, honorarium to messenger, stationery, copying of documents, travelling for Secretary, making up a total of \$11,449, 36. This was the Fire Enquiry Commission under the Chairmanship of Sir Stanley Gomes, a former Chief Justice. As I said, the Report is now the property of the House.

I beg to move that Head 26 - Ministry of Home Affairs - as amended stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Not that I am objecting to this, because I think workmen are worthy of their hire, but I want to make a comparison with what you are paying here to what the Chartered Accountant who sat with the Judge in the Telephone Enquiry got per day. It was less than \$25 per day and that was a lot of work to sit and advise a Judge. He got less than \$200, and I think the Government should do something about that. I make this appeal. I am not objecting to this because in these enquiries people are deserving of their payment, but certainly I think the Leader of the House should make a note and do something about the Chartered Accountant who, I am now advised, got \$15 a day for advising and working with Mr. Justice Hanschell. Now that you realise it is so, I hope you will try to remedy the situation and reimburse the young man accordingly by giving him an honorarium.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Leader of the House is in a position to tell us if this sum of \$11, 449.86 is all the money that has been spent or is to be spent in connection with this Fire Enquiry, or if there are other outstanding commitments in this respect.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

In so far as we know, this is the cost of holding, the Enquiry. The hon. member would not, of course, mean the cost of printing the document now, because this is a public document and will be printed in the ordinary course of the debates as a document of the House. If you do not mean that, I think I can safely say that, so far as we know, no other expenditure has been committed or is anticipated.

Mr. HINDS:

You know that a certain amount of advertising or Government notices were run in the various newspapers. Does this amount take these sums into consideration, or have you other provision for paying for that?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Surely that would come under the Home Affairs vote. You know we put in the Estimates every year a large sum of money - I think \$50,000 or whatever it is - for Government advertising, and that would be a proper charge on that vote.

The question that Head 26 - Ministry of Home Affairs - as amended stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 31 - Prisons - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 31 - Prisons - stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Head 33 - Ministry of Agriculture, Science and Technology - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, we have to add certain items from the supplementary to this. Item 69 - Labour - General - \$4,133; Item 111 -Furniture & Equipment - \$1,283; Item 115 - Chemicals, - Apparatus and Equipment - \$1,900, and Item 116 - Motor Vehicles - \$11,000, and the notes follow underneath.

I beg to move that Head 33 - Ministry of Agriculture, Science and Technology - as amended, stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Head 41 - Ministry of Health and Social Welfare -was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, we insert here \$210 and after note 15 the following

"15A. It is proposed to supplement the nonrecurrent estimates under Ministry of Health and Social Welfare Head 41(2) Health Services - Item 258 Furniture and Equipment by the sum of \$210,00 to provide furniture and equipment for the office of the Drug Inspector which has been recently created. "

I beg to move that Head 41 - Ministry of Health and Social Welfare - as amended, stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Head 43 - Queen Elizabeth Hospital - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 43 - Queen Elizabeth Hospital - stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Head 44 - Mental Hospital - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR; I bag to move that Head 44 -Mental Hospital - stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

1 beg to second that.

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

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I would just ask that Head 44 be recommitted to make an observation.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I bag to move that Head 44 be recommitted.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, we very well know that when the Mental Hospital acquired the services of two Registrars, it is in keeping with the pattern of bringing the Institution up to a teaching Hospital. Now, at the same time there is a situation obtaining which I am sure the Minister would like to address his mind to, in that there are a number of people who have been recruited there as Nurses Assistants from time to time, and I am sure that the Registrars would not themselves as soon as they take office start what is happening now. These people, some of whom have never attempted to look at a book in years - and the type of work they are called upon to do in the Wards, I may say, does not necessitate this -with less than fifteen days¹ notice will be called upon to sit an examination, I am sure that if the two Registrars were present on the jobs, they would re commend that these people be given some sort of coaching for, at least, six to eight weeks and then ask them to sit the examination; but to call on people who have been working for six, seven or eight years on the Wards to take an examination in fourteen or fifteen days is not fair. 5.30 p.m.

If you want them to sit an examination, give them a little coaching for a few weeks before; but do not take them out of the blue and ask them to take an examination; it is not fair to them.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I will promise the hon. member to look into this matter, I agree with his suggestion that it is not fair and equitable to expect people to sit an examination just off-hand like that. The question that Head 44 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Resolution, as now amended to the figure of \$263,865, do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that this concludes Government Business for today's sitting. Before the adjournment, I would like to draw Your Honour's attention to the fact that the Select Committees which have recently been appointed have completed their labours and reported to the House the necessary action which needs to be taken, and that these Committees could now be discharged, The Committee, for instance, to consider, review and revise the salaries and emoluments of the Members and Officers of the House; the Committee appointed to confer jointly with Select Committees of the Senate re re-organisation of the offices of Parliament; the Committee appointed to consider and report on the Bill to authorise a readjustment of parts of the roads aid sidewalks forming the boundaries of the building known as No. 1 Broad Street; and the Committee appointed to consider and report on the Bill to make provision for regulating the carrying on of insurance business in Barbados, I will suggest to Your Honour that all four of these Committees might be discharged.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The following Committees are discharged with the thanks of the House - the Committee to consider, review and revise the salaries and emoluments of the Members and Officers of the House; the Committee to confer jointly with Select Committees of the Senate re re-organisation of the offices of Parliament; the Committee to consider and report on the Bill to authorise a re-adjustment of parts of the roads and sidewalks forming the boundaries of the building known as No. 1 Broad Street, and the Committee to consider and report on the Bill to make provision for regulating the carrying on of insurance business in Barbados,

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next at 12.00 noon, I would like to draw the attention of the House to something; I believe it would be convenient for all hon. members if the House rose next week for the customary August recess, and I am suggesting that this recess might be taken until the third Tuesday in October, whatever the date is. This will enable the refurbishment and the rehabilitation of this Chamber to be done, which they so long had been promised and which has not yet been done. I do not think it would be proper for the House to rise without concluding all its outstanding business; it may be possible for us then to meet on another day, on the Wednesday perhaps, in order to clear up outstanding matters.

One other point, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Under the terms of the Bill which the House will discuss next week and the terms of the joint Select Committee, there will have to be a new Debates Committee, because I think, as soon as this Bill becomes law, the re-organisation of Parliament is, in fact, in operation. The House may wish to consider whether it would like to proceed with the appointment of the new Debates Committee before it disperses till October, or whether it wishes to wait till October; but I should like to point out that if it does not take action until we re-assemble, it will be virtually impossible for the new Act to come into operation, because there will be no competent body authorised to arrange for the appointment of the new Officers of the House.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr Deputy Speaker, there is this small matter, to learn if at all possible from the Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology if he is in a position to give this House any sort of assurance as to the future of the three hundred odd workers formerly employed by the Barbados Sea Foods Co. 5.40 p.m.

Our information is that the Barbados Seafoods Company have recently negotiated with people calling themselves the International Foods to dispose of their equipment, and that in itself must make the workers become more uneasy than ever.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Of course, I know the hon. member is aware that there is a Motion for adjournment before the House.

Mr. HINDS:

I am seconding that motion, Sir. I should like to hear from the Minister If he has any information with respect to the future of those workers.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I am afraid the hon. Minister cannot give you any information at this stage. I can only entertain speeches now on the motion for the adjournment.

Mr. HINDS:

The Minister would be in a position to give us all the information that is necessary at the next sitting of the House of Assembly. What we find is that Barbados Seafoods have found out that having to transfer their Association to Trinidad.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

May I remind the hon. member that he can only address the Chair on the motion for adjournment.

Mr. HINDS:

I am seconding the motion for adjournment, Sir. We will hear what the Minister has to say.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Point made. (Aside.)

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker, is Order 29(6) still in operation?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I thought the hon. senior member for St. Thomas was the Whip.

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

I think the hon. senior member for St. James drives us on with goads and spurs; he drives on the

Leader of the House, evidently. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we in the Opposition appreciate that consideration is being shown to us by telling us that we will get through the business next week with a view to adjourning to October 13, or what - ever day was mentioned by the Leader of the House, but he has not indicated what volume of business we are going to face next Tuesday. I understand that there is the Parliament (Privileges, Immunities and Powers) Bill to be dealt with, and members of the Opposition are not quite clear of its fate. I also understand that the Standing Orders Committee had taken a decision on this matter, and I should like the Leader of the House to give us an explanation on this matter before we adjourn. This must be regarded as part of the unfinished business of the House that he wants to complete at the next meeting.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am grateful to the hon. member for giving way, As the hon, member knows, the Government Is responsible for arranging its own business. So long as the hon. member has not heard me say anything about it, he must, not anticipate me. When it is intended to proceed with it the hon, member will know about it. As long as he does not hear me say anything about it, then it will not be dealt with.

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister's lapse into graciousness has taken me by surprise. He ought to be well aware that I was not in the House when the Report of the Select Committee of which I was a member and never even saw the Report before it was presented or laid on the Table of the House - nor was I present at the start of Government Business today. I heard the Minister say that he wishes to clear up the Order Paper, and the Order Paper says "to resume the debate on the Bill to amend the Parliament (Privileges, Immunities and Powers) Act. " If I wanted to be pedantic and silly, I could say that the Minister has said he is going to proceed with the Act next week. He says he is going to clear the Order Paper and it is on the Order Paper, I would be obliged to the Minister for, an unequivocal "no" in respect of that matter.

APPLICATION FROM MR. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY FOR LEAVE

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should like to ask for 6 weeks' leave from the House as from the 1st August, 1970.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The hon. junior member for the City is asking for 6 weeks¹ leave of absence from the House. If there are no objections leave will be granted. There being no objection, leave is granted.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next at 12 noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

5.50 p.m.