

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1966 - 71

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

THIRD SESSION OF 1966-71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 10th March, 1970.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.10 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

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

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER:

Again I have to report to hon. members that there are no Minutes available for circulation.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I want to offer an excuse for the Hon. Leader of the Opposition who is recuperating, and also for the hon. senior member for Christ Church and the hon. junior member for Bridgetown, both of whom are away on business of the legal profession.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Noted.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I am to state that it is my duty to lead the Opposition today, even if there is only one member present.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is also noted. Mr. YEARWOOD entered the House and took his seat.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Prime Minister I am commanded to lay the Report and Statement of Accounts of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation for the year ended 31st December, 1968, and on behalf of the Minister of Finance, the Draft Estimates 1970-71.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$700,000 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1969-70, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1969-70, No. 74, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Prime Minister I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$48, 344 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1969-70 Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1969-70, No. 75, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Also, on behalf of the Minister of Finance a Resolution to approve, under section 10 of the Barbados Harbours Act 1960, the Annual Estimates of the Port Department for the year 1970-71,

Also on behalf of the Minister of Finance, a Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Consolidated Fund and to appropriate the same for the service of the Island for the year ending on 31st March, 1971.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

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

A Resolution to grant the sum of \$1, 250 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1969 -70, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1969-70, No, 76, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to approve the Amendment of the Waterworks (General) (Amendment) Regulations 1970,

I would also like to ask permission to deal with the Money Resolution, notice of which has just been given, later today, since it is a matter of urgency.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 73 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Peter is ready.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, I also beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question, No. 79 asked by the hon. junior member for Bridgetown is ready.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Inasmuch as the hon. junior member for Bridgetown has been excused from today's meeting, I will let that Question go over until next week.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I believe a Resolution for \$700,000 has been circulated to hon. members, and there are two other Resolutions, one for \$48, 344 and another for \$1, 250, copies of which have been also circulated. I am asking for leave for them to be dealt with in Committee of Supply at today's sitting. 12.20 p.m.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. senior member for St. Joseph; his notice in connection with roads in St. Joseph.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, WHEREAS the residents of Fruitful Hill, Prizers, Vaughans Land, and Joes River in the parish of St. Joseph, due to the lack of proper roads in these districts, are put to great hardship and inconvenience in reaping and marketing their canes, in getting to Church and to market;

AND WHEREAS these same bad roads are part of the reasons why an electric service is unavailable in these districts;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House request the Government to have these roads in St. Joseph repaired as soon as possible.

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Select Committee has reported in connection with the emoluments of Members and Officers of the House. They have completed their labours, but the Report has only a very short while ago been presented to me for my signature, and I have to take a reasonable opportunity to peruse it later on. I understand that the Hon. Leader of the House is willing to present it.

BILLS FOR FIRST READING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Consolidated Fund and to appropriate the same for the service of the Island for the year ending on 31st March, 1971, 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.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the suspension of Standing Orders 5, 14, 16, 18, 19, 40 and 45 for the remainder of this day's sitting. Question Time and Private Members' Business will be taken at their appropriate places and for their appropriate duration of time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

BEHAVIOUR OF "SLIMS" IN THE CHAMBER & DINING ROOM

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, before we proceed with Government Business, I would like to draw to the attention of this House certain malpractices that are functioning in this House. Last week "Slims" went into the dining room, ate food there, and then demanded a beer from the caterer. In view of the fact that he was not given a beer, he became very abusive; he left the dining room, walked into the House, and started to sleep in this Chamber.

I have pointed out to this Chamber that some years ago Mr. Clennell Wickham, a man who had contributed a lot to this community, was put out of this Chamber because he came in here dressed in a white suit. The Marshal of this House was put out of this Chamber on one occasion because he sat and smiled at something that had been said. If we are going to have these sub-standard practices in this

Chamber nowadays, then the people in the Gallery will soon come over here and get involved in the debate staking place in this House. This nonsense must stop. This sort of thing has been going on for a long time.

Mr. Speaker, when the white people used to run this country, certain people could not risk to come up here to hear the debates. Since we have been in this Chamber, I have noticed that the standard is going lower and lower. I am asking, therefore, that Your Honour, as Speaker of the House, should give the Marshal a directive that "Slims" and his group, who want to come in here and misbehave themselves, should be forbidden from trespassing in this Chamber. (Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: You cannot do that.)

Mr. Speaker, the last time when the Marshal was going to put "Slims" out of this Chamber, the Leader of the Opposition and the senior member for the City said that we could not.....

Mr. SPEAKER; I do not want a debate on this matter. The hon. member has made his point. It has been noted, and I shall direct Mr. Clerk to conduct an investigation and to report to me so that appropriate action can be taken.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I cannot agree with the hon. member who has just sat down more when he says that "Slims" had no right eating in the dining room and misbehaving himself in there and in here, but I do not agree with the hon. member when he said that I got up and talked a lot of nonsense. That is really untrue. I Was merely observing the Rules of the House when somebody called on the Marshal - not you, Sir -to put somebody out of the House. I did not know it was "Slims" at the time, and I said that it could not be done in that manner.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has made his point.

Hon. N. W.BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, I did not mean to be offensive to the senior member for the City. I just wanted to point out what he had said, and to mention that the Leader of the Opposition joined him. The Leader of the Opposition said that he had never seen it happen. I am sorry that the senior member for the City took offence to what I had said.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

When someone called on the Marshal to put somebody outside, I said that it could not have been done in that manner. I did not know that the Chairman had already ordered that a man should have been put out of the Chamber for the balance of the day. In the absence of that, no Marshal, or Prime Minister or anybody else could have ordered the Marshal to put anybody out of this Chamber. An hon. member could draw the Chair's attention to strangers in the Gallery. I cannot see how "Slims" could have demanded a beer from somebody in the dining room and nobody thought of throwing him outside.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I think the points of both hon. members are almost ad idem, and we may now proceed to Government Business.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative. 12.30 p.m.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, before the business of the House is proceeded with, I would like to draw to the attention of this House a matter which, if not checked immediately, can very well undermine the security of this country to some considerable extent. I speak, Sir, with reference to a matter affecting some 300-odd workers employed at the Barbados Seafoods Company in this Island. I want to say on this matter, Mr. Speaker, that the Barbados Seafoods Company has been functioning in this Island for a considerable time, and there can be no doubt that it has brought considerable financial assistance to this country. I can say that it has conveyed.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

Does the Hon. Acting Leader of the Opposition propose to raise this matter on the adjournment?

Mr. HINDS:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER:

In that event, I will accept that notice has been duly given.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure this is a matter for you in the Chair, but I am sure the Leader of the House will consider this a matter of urgent public business which may undermine the security of this country and it can be raised in this House by any hon. member, provided Your Honour permits. I am absolutely sure that Your Honour will permit when you realise that the urgency of the matter must not only be of urgent public business, but of urgent public importance. I consider it of urgent public importance where 300 people are being thrown.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member cannot make a speech now. I have intimated to the Hon. Acting Leader of the Opposition that the matter can be raised on the adjournment.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

I do not suppose the Hon. Acting Leader of the Opposition is as quick as I am to get out what he wants to say.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I doubt that very much. That is not fair to the Hon. Acting Leader of the Opposition. I am disposed to ask the hon. senior member for Bridgetown to withdraw.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

I withdraw it.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have given a certain assurance to the Hon. Acting Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Hon. Leader of the House is disposed to do it now.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let the position be regularised and not pressurized. The motion which was last carried was that Government Business be now taken. Will the Hon. Leader of the House intimate what Government Business he Intends to proceed with?

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply, and that it be an instruction to the House while in Committee to deal with the three Resolutions of which notice has been given today.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1969-70 No. 74

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, the Addendum in this case is very comprehensive and explanatory. I presume hon. members have studied the bulk of the information, but I will attempt to give some extra information. As the Addendum sets out, these funds are required to meet the cost of the revision of salaries and wages of officers and employees who were affected by the transfer of Local Government Services on 1st September, 1969. The revision involves staff of

The Interim Commissioner for Local Government;

The Housing Authority (Day Nurseries, Community Centre);

The Salvation Army (Food Centre); The Child Care Board; The Sanitation and Cemeteries Board; The Central Government.

It is proposed to revise the salaries on a basis similar to that which was applied to Civil Service salaries, that is, on a basis ranging from approximately 20% in the upper salary grades to 33 1/3% in the lower grades. However, wherever the duties and responsibilities are similar to those of posts in the Civil Service, the comparable Civil Service salaries will be adopted.

In cases where the duties and responsibilities of posts remain similar to what they were before the transfer, the existing salaries will be revised with effect from 1st April, 1969. In cases where the officers were transferred to different posts and in cases where the duties and responsibilities of posts were reorganised or expanded at the date of the transfer to such an extent that the officers are not regarded as holding the same offices which they held prior to the transfer, the salaries will be revised separately for the periods 1st April to 31st August, 1969 and 1st September, 1969 to 31st March, 1970. 12.40 p.m.

In order to effect payments before the end of the current financial year, that is, before the end of this month, provision to make overtime payments to staff engaged in the preparation of the relevant pay

sheets has been included. The position, Sir, is briefly this, that certain negotiations have been going on between the Government and the Barbados Workers' Union for the last few weeks, culminating in this letter which I will read for the benefit of hon. members:

Barbados Workers' Union,

9th March, 1970.

Permanent Secretary;

Ministry of Health and Community Development;

Dear Sir,

In reply to your letter No. 80L/83 dated 7th March, 1970, and the accompanying list of revised rates and salaries for employees who have been transferred from the service of the Interim Commissioner for Local Government, I am to inform you that the Barbados Workers' Union agrees generally to the proposals of your Ministry.

I have also been directed to inform you that the Union would accept a 33 1/3% increase on the existing rate which is paid to grave diggers in the various parishes. In cases where the grave digger is paid a small retainer fee, then the percentage increase should be added to his rate for digging a grave.

It should be pointed out that the Barbados Workers' Union is prepared to settle any other issues relating to these grave diggers at a mutually convenient time in the near future.

Finally, the Barbados Worker' Union would like to impress upon your Ministry that the payment of these new rates is a matter of urgency, and wishes to have these new rates paid not later than the pay day

in the week ending 21st March for the weekly paid employees.

In so far as the grave diggers are concerned, you know the usual principle adopted. There are two different ways mainly; there are some grave diggers who are paid directly by the people who have the funeral involved, and there are others who are not paid on that basis. The Government proposes to pay whatever difference there is, so that all back pay and all fees will be settled, and they will be given the 33 1/3% increase with the back pay.

As far as the Union is concerned, the Union has accepted, since we have had negotiations going on now, straightening out everything, and as far as the Sanitation staff is concerned, that has been settled satisfactorily and accepted by the Union, and they are working out arrangements as far as the Day Nurseries staff is concerned.

Each category of workers has been gone into, and the Union has been involved in all exercises. As far as the workers at Children's Homes are concerned, on my present advice we are not quite clear if the Union represents the employees here, and that is being gone into; but the fact remains that the increase of wages and salaries for all employees on the basis which I have just enunciated will be done; in other words, in so far as the ones in the higher bracket are concerned, a 20% Increase will be given, and the ones in the lower bracket will get a 33 1/3% increase comparable to the rates of increases paid to others in the regular Central Government Service, and it is that that the Union asked for, and that is what we agreed to do. The original letter from the Union is dated the 28th January, 1970; so these negotiations have been going on between the Union and the Chief Establishments Officer who represents the Government in these matters, and my Ministry is also involved - the Permanent Secretary and other Secretaries. But all I want to tell this Committee is that these negotiations have been going on for quite some time. The letter from the Union dated 28th January 1970 makes this big point which is the guiding principle in the entire transaction, and the last paragraph states:

"It is evident from these negotiations that the Barbados Workers' Union agrees with the Central Government that the Local Government employees should be paid increases comparable to those given to the Central Government employees, and that they should be effective from 1st April, 1969. I am therefore directed to inform you that the Barbados Workers' Union submits that an effective settlement should be reached on all of these matters, and payments made to the workers concerned before 28th February, 1970."

It is quite an easy matter to say that payments should be made before 28th February, 1970, but there are so many computations and so many calculations to be done, that it was not physically possible to do

this by then. The Cabinet has given a recent decision to pay the increase up to 33 1/3% as was explained, and to have all the payments made before the end of March - so much so, that the people involved - the Accountants both in the Ministry and in the Treasury of the Local Government Departments - are working overtime in order to get these increases paid as from the date quoted by the Union; in other words, before the end of March. Their salaries and wages will be revised before the end of March, and they will receive an increase in wages before the end of March; but as far as back pay is concerned, everybody will get theirs by the end of March.

I do not think there is very much more I can add, but I would like to say that sometimes when you go 'all out', at least to assist and to do what you think is right and fair to the workers, some misunderstanding still seems to come down the line. We had a little dislocation. The Scavengers in Christ Church never made any dislocation; they accepted what was told to them. But the City workers attempted a strike and were out for an hour or two, the Minister of Labour intervened - and I thank him for Intervening at the necessary stage - and gave the necessary assurance, although this assurance was given by Civil Servants previously, but it does not seem that the words of the Civil Servants are accepted to the fullest.

12.50 p.m.

I want to point out to the Committee that several senior Civil Servants and other people involved had spoken to the Scavengers and, in spite of a directive signed by me and circulated to the Manager of the the Scavengers' section and to the various Boards, etc., the Scavengers still misinterpreted-what was said. They said that they would only get money in June. In any case, they would have got the money by the end of the financial year, and that is the end of this month. It was made quite clear on paper that they would receive the revised salaries and back pay by the end of March. I went to the Chief Welfare Officer in order to check things, and they still went on strike. I cannot do more than I have done.

We have now come here with a Resolution for \$700,000 and we are asking you, if you have the interest of the workers who have been transferred from the Local Government to the Central Government at heart, to pass this Resolution today and let them get their money, say, on the 19th March. If you do not want them to get the money, you can talk out the Resolution.

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

I beg to second that.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Sir, I do not think it was necessary for the hon. member to speak so long on this Resolution. As a matter of fact, if I did not appreciate the urgency of this Resolution I might have asked for a breakdown of this amount. There is no necessity for that, however, because I realise from my experience what is necessary. There is only one thing I should like to draw to the Minister's attention. He should let it be understood in his Ministry that the people who do scavenging are not of the highest mentality and, therefore, when they hear that people in another Department, who were employed by the Local Government, have received money two or three weeks ago, then you must expect them to stop working or something like that. That is their only weapon to show you that they are dissatisfied. I have had experience in this matter, and I know that the figures will have to be worked out by Civil Servants and so on.

Sir, there is still a feeling going around - and I do not know where it came from - that the people are going to get back pay from September - from the time the Government took over - down to February. If it is \$10;00 a month or \$10.00 a week they will get that increase. I understand that somebody in the Ministry is telling the people that they will not be paid from April to September at, say, \$40.00 or \$50.00 per month, because if they had been in the Local Government Service they would have got \$X and so on. (Asides) I can stand on the floor of this House and state categorically that this is true. I warn the Minister that he is going to get trouble if the figures are not worked out in the same manner as the figures for other Government employees were worked out. When the Central Government is giving an increase, then the figures should be worked out in the same manner. You have to give the usual increase as well as back pay.

Sir, there is a feeling going around that the people who were transferred from the Local Government are going to get this and that. I am glad the Minister has taken the bull by the horns and has avoided further dislocation of the Scavenging Department. He must always remember that the people who do scavenging are not of the highest mentality, and, whenever they hear that somebody else has already drawn back pay and for three or four weeks they have not drawn anything, they will become dissatisfied. The Minister must not hold that against them.

Sir, I have had dislocations in the Scavenging Department about six or eight times during the 25 years when I had something to do with the matter. On one occasion I had to go and speak to the Prime Minister on a matter. At the time the City Council used to give six weeks with full pay to Scavengers. I am of the opinion that a Scavenger is as important to the health of this community as the Chief Medical Officer. That has always been my point of view. However, when the six weeks' full pay were reduced to two weeks it caused a dislocation of the work. I spoke to the Prime Minister at the time, and I told him that it was wrong to reduce the time. In those days I could have spoken to the Prime Minister, but I cannot do it today. A similar thing happened with the grave diggers at the Cemetery.

I am glad the Minister has realised that he should go there himself and take the bull by the horns and see for himself what is happening. I understand that the Minister of Labour went down, saw the people, discussed the matter and he was favourably received. I congratulate the Hon. Minister of Community Development for the stand that he has taken in this matter and for the urgent manner in which he has dealt with it in bringing it here.

Sir, I want the Minister of Community Development to tell me whether all of the employees who will benefit from this \$700,000 will be treated in the same manner as those in the Central Government. Will they get the same treatment as the employees at Highways and Transport? I will support this motion.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I have at long last seen what Scavengers can do - they can even pressure Parliament. We appreciate the points raised by the hon. senior member for Bridgetown. He has spent almost his entire life in Public Health affairs. The Minister of Community Development touched on a very salient point when he said that Civil Servants could not be understood by Scavengers.

1.00 pm.

Now the Minister knows what I am saying to be true. He has an eminently qualified officer working in his Department, but the trouble is that his officer is a bit too qualified on Public Health. He is an expert at expertness when it comes to the matter of Public Health, and would not allow people who have been trained in Public Health to function. It is Pope who said;

"A little learning is a dangerous thing; Drink deep or taste not the Pierian Spring. The shallow draughts intoxicate the brain, And drinking largely sobers us again."

That is applicable, to the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Health. He would not allow the doctors who have been trained in Public Health and other officers to function properly. He knows too much about Public Health because he had a little observation for two months abroad. That is one of the difficulties, and that type of officer cannot communicate with Scavengers. The Minister of Labour is a man from among the people, and he did what was right by approaching the Scavengers in person and putting his case, and he was understood.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, just for the record, my Permanent Secretary is highly qualified, as I intimated here earlier. He is fairly well versed in Public Health matters in that he pursued a Fellowship Course or Seminar for nine months, and a two-year Course dealing with administrative matters affecting the Ministry of Health and Community Development. So he has a degree and a lot of experience in all the various Ministries, Education and so on, and he was the Permanent Secretary to a former Premier of Barbados, for which he had to be a competent person. He is well versed in these matters and has not picked up his knowledge by chance. He is not like a politician. I have not been trained and I do not claim to be an expert. I know about other things, and I have picked up a certain amount by dealing with the matter because I have been there long enough, but I do not claim to be an expert in Public Health,

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

That is no point of order. Let the hon. junior member for St. Peter proceed.

Mr. HINDS:

The Minister very well knows that we have some people who have their Master's Degree in Education, but they cannot teach in any Form in the Schools in this Island though they are as highly qualified in Education as anybody else in any part of the world. That is one of the difficulties with this Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Health. You will find, Mr. Chairman, that it is the Scavengers who have brought us here today to be discussing this matter and the action they took. Let us look back for a single moment to see that here is a case where the Central Government intimated its intention to take over all the services formerly administered by Local Government at one stage on 1st April, 1969, Now we have got to look at things realistically. An employee of Local Government at 1st April, 1969, could not be held responsible for not being transferred to Central Government until September, 1969. In other words, when the Government intimated its intention to take over all the services and all the liabilities of the Local Government Commissioner at the 1st April, 1969, there was not a single employee of the Local Government Commissioner who could have offered any resistance. They were all prepared to be taken over lock, stock and barrel. But when it was found physically impossible for the Central Government to take them over on 1st April, I think another indication came that this would come into effect about the end of June. Here you will find that an officer who had the Intimation that he would have been transferred from Local Government to Central Government on 1st April found himself waiting until the end of June to learn just before then that he would not be taken over until September. It was no fault of the officer. But you have a Resolution here today which does not make provision for paying these officers retroactively from 1st April, 1969 when the Government first intimated its Intention to take over. You will find that attempts are being made to pay some officers from 1st April to 31st August, some from 31st August to 1st September and some from 1st September to 31st March, 1970. I am asking the Minister not to let us proceed from the point that we do not want the Scavengers to go on strike again. The Government must accept the blame as the hon. senior member.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, in the case of Scavengers in particular who have not received an increase from

1st April, 1969, they are allowed a 33 1/3% increase in wages as from now with back pay effective as from 1st April, 1969. Why try to confuse the issue? All that is being done is a lot of confusion.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that the Minister does not mean I am trying to confuse the issue. I am trying to unravel the crime. I had no intention of getting warmed up this much. How does the Minister explain that salaries will be revised separately in respect of some officers for the period 1st March to 31st August, 1969, and 1st September to 31st March, 1970? That is what is in the Addendum and that is what I am dealing with. What the Minister is doing is holding up a flag before the Scavengers and telling them that they are going to get a 33 1/3 per cent increase from April, 1969. That is all -right; but what we are saying is that the Minister has not yet told us that all those officers now in the Central Government who were employed as Local Government officers on 1st April, 1969, are going to receive retroactive pay from 1st April, 1969. 1.10 p.m.

It is no fault of the officer that he was not taken over until September; so when you are saying you are going to pay some back pay from 1st September to 31st March, this is not fair to the officer.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, I will try to assist the hon. member. What I would like to draw to the hon. member's attention is that there are various categories of employees, and there are some officers whose salaries have been revised and they are getting a higher salary now than they were receiving in April 1969, because you cannot have an increase now on a salary which has already been increased. As far as the category of workers that you are worried about is concerned, the Scavengers, I will tell you categorically that the Scavengers will be given the 33 1/3% increase retroactively from 1st April, 1969 and there is no trouble with them at all.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, the Minister is inviting fatigue. I heard the Minister read some letter from the Barbados Workers' Union, and the Minister will have to admit now that all rates have not been agreed upon for Scavengers with the Barbados Workers' Union; I challenge the Minister to deny that. If you want me to sit, I will sit.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, we will have it out. I gave you the assurance which had been given to me about half an hour before I came in here today. I had this checked, after leaving the Cabinet office, about 11.30 a.m. in my Ministry in order to bring the final information which I incorporated in my remarks. In so far

as the Sanitation workers are concerned, a final and definite rate has been arrived at with the Barbados Workers' Union, but as far as the staff of Day Nurseries are concerned we are trying to find out whether the Barbados Workers' Union really represent them or not, because as far as we are aware at present, the Barbados Workers' Union is not representing employees of the Children's Homes. As far as the grave diggers are concerned, I gave the assurance that Government will see that back pay is given to these people at a rate which seems fair and equitable.

Mr. HINDS:

Now, Sir, the Minister made mention that salaries of some employees have already been revised, and as such you could not now go and give them an increase on an already increased salary. The Minister has got to go back and look at the history of Local Government in this country; he has to go back to the days of the Vestries, and one must bear in mind that at all times, whenever there was a salary increase by the Central Government, the salaries of the Vestry employees and the Local Government employees were also increased, but they were always at a point or two in the scale below Central Government employees. So the Minister has now got to go and learn something about the whole exercise for the simple reason that even when you increase the salary of a Local Government worker it did not measure up exactly on the same scale as the Central Government worker, although in many cases he was discharging a duty that was ten times more valuable to the community than that of the Central worker, and that is a sacrifice that the Local Government workers have made throughout all the years in this country. This brings me to the point I want to make, that it was the duty of the Minister to have called on these former Councils to have proposals made to the Central Government on which to base these salaries.

The Minister has come here for an amount of \$700,000, and I am telling the Minister now that he cannot explain to this Committee how this \$700,000 has been arrived at, because you will find that they have made provision here even for an overtime payment so that the staff can prepare these pay sheets and the like. I wonder exactly what arrangements, what rate per hour is the Minister going to pay these workers who are going to put in this extra time to prepare these pay sheets; I would really like the Minister to tell us at this point because I would not like to waste time on the Resolution; I would not like to raise points that the Minister could readily answer. But if the Minister can give the Committee any idea as to the amount of money that they are going to pay to people working overtime, I will be glad. These are people who are going to put in a normal working day, and then these people are going to continue working overtime to get these pay sheets done if this Resolution is passed today; so undoubtedly the Minister would have met these people, or the Chief Establishments Officer or somebody would have met these people and would have arranged some fixed amount which each officer would get.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister is in a position to tell the Committee at this stage what arrangements he has for paying these overtime workers. It would seem to me that the pressure from the Scavengers got quite a lot of people confused and they do not know what to do. This Resolution has

come before us today only to satisfy the Scavengers; I am warning the hon. Minister that with passing this Resolution here today merely to make Scavengers feel that from tomorrow or the next day they are going to get this money, if the Minister knows that they cannot get it, he is worsening the situation.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, again a misleading statement has just been made. I never said 'tomorrow'; I said 'before the end of the month'. 1.20 p.m. It is a good thing to quote people accurately.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, what the Minister does not seem to understand is that immediately after this Resolution is passed, the Scavengers are going to be queueing up looking for their money, and that is going to create an additional amount of pressure and confusion on the people who are trying to get the pay sheets in order. A Scavenger does not possess the mentality of the junior member for Christ Church. This Government always starts before it is ready. That is one of the characteristics of this Government. People like Scavengers ought to have received their money before the Civil Servants. You should have satisfied that type of worker first, and then given the Civil Servants the lot of money for housing allowance and so on. That is the point I am making here.

What the Minister is not prepared to deny is that the rates have been agreed upon for Scavengers. You must not fool the Scavengers because the work that they are doing no Minister is going to do it, or would not be expected to do it. Do not fool the Scavengers by just running here and passing this Resolution for \$700,000. How are you going to pay the people who are working overtime preparing these pay sheets?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is very anxious to see the Scavengers paid. We, too, are anxious to see the money paid out, and the machinery to work out these figures has been in process for the last two weeks. We want to make sure that we have the money to pay the people. We are going to pay the people at the regular overtime rates. Do you want to inspire and confuse them, too, so that they will not make out the pay sheets? The Civil Servants are satisfied with the regular rates paid to them.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, the Minister ought to know that, the moment an hon. member can come here and raise this question, the people are not satisfied to work for \$1.20 an hour. After a man has worked for a whole day he is tired, and you cannot expect him to work for \$1.20 an hour as the rate of overtime. He may have to pay \$6.00 to carry him home at night. Those people are dissatisfied, and you are going to have

further trouble on your hands. You will have dissatisfied Scavengers and dissatisfied workers. The Minister ought to be ashamed to offer those people \$1.20 an hour overtime I

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I am aware of no dissatisfaction. No representation has been made to me at that level, and such dissatisfaction does not seem to exist. What the hon. member is saying is only known to him.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, let the Minister deny that there is an amount in this sum of \$700,000 to pay certain workers to prepare these pay sheets at \$1.20 per hour working overtime. He decided to pay the workers \$1.20 per hour, and the people are dissatisfied. The workers would prefer to be given an honorarium instead of \$1.20 an hour. You are really putting them a standard below the Scavengers by offering them \$1.20 an hour overtime.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is trying to give the public the impression that I am responsible for fixing overtime rates. I have nothing to do with the fixing of overtime rates. When that matter comes before the House in the Estimates he can deal with it. The fixing of overtime rates is a financial matter.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I am not concerned with who has to fix the rates. It is a matter where workers are involved, and I am saying that they are entitled to a rate of pay commensurate with the type of work involved. In this case the time factor is important. The Minister has made it abundantly clear that the calculations and computations have been going on for weeks. I can tell the Minister that all the calculations and computations that have been going on for weeks have been brought to a halt almost suddenly, and after we pass this Resolution the Civil Servants will have to begin working on this \$700,000. They did not have this figure before, Sir.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, it was \$675,000, and in order to pay officers overtime we had to increase the amount to \$700,000. If we had not increased the amount to cover overtime, then the hon. member would have had something to talk about. Does he want to create confusion in the minds of the people who are making up the pay sheets so that the Scavengers would not get the money in time? I thought he wanted to see the Scavengers get the money quickly I

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, it is strange that the Minister did not know the Scavengers wanted the money urgently until yesterday. Only yesterday I was sent a copy of this Resolution. As soon as the Minister became aware that Scavengers were people who wanted money like anybody else, he rushed in here with this Resolution.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I should like the hon. member to know that in 1946, when he knew nothing about politics, I led a hotel strike. You can calculate that and see how long I have been in this business. When you were not interested in politics, I was interested in hotel workers.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

No point of order.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, is the Minister now reaping what he has sown? He now has a strike on his hands. The Minister who once led a strike is now being crippled by strikes, and that is the situation before us. He led a strike in 1946, and in 1970 he is now faced with a strike. The provision of \$5,000 to pay overtime can only be based on the fact that we are going to have X number of workers employed for Y number of hours to do the job. 1.30 p.m.

How does the Minister know how many hours and how many officers are involved in this? He must know what is involved before he can say that \$5,000 will do. In truth and in fact, when the Minister is willing to admit that this sum of \$5,000 was arrived at at the rate of \$1.20 a day or whatever the amount is, it is a fact that some dissatisfied people apparently have complained to the Minister; but they have complained to me, and I am challenging the Minister to deny that the amount set aside for paying overtime is based on paying them the paltry sum of \$20 for working until 10 o'clock, 11 o'clock and 12 o'clock, and some have decided that they live so far that they would prefer to work until morning because the Scavengers are terrible people.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, in the first place let us try to calculate more accurately. The Resolution which we have before us and which makes provision for the payment of overtime at the rates fixed by Government provides a differential of \$25,000. The difference between \$700,000 and \$675,000 is \$25,000; so the hon. member cannot call that \$5,000. If the amount of \$1.20 per hour for overtime as fixed by

Government for that category of worker is not ample, I will try to Investigate the matter, and the question of an honorarium for those who did a good job will be considered, because we have \$25,000 to pay them what is fair, equitable and right.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, if what the hon. member has said is correct, I appeal to the Minister to calculate it. We know that the wages which the Scavengers have been receiving were nearly \$50 a week. I take it that you have a lot of high rank-Ing officers getting \$400, \$500 or \$600 for working this out, and at \$1.20 an hour ordinarily eight hours a day would put them at less than \$50 a week. How can you offer a man \$1.20 an hour for such work? Carpenters receive more than this. I hope the Minister will look into this because \$1.20 an hour cannot be right, and if they refuse, you cannot fire them. I think the Minister should decide to straighten the matter out by going into it carefully.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I will give the hon. member the assurance as I have already done. The hon. senior member for Bridgetown who has had so many long years' experience should know that the Ministers as such do not get down to these little details. The financial people, accountants, clerks and secretaries down the line see after these matters. To be candid, I am not quite clear on what the exact rate is. If it is \$1.20 I will check on it, and I give the assurance that we have enough money that apart from the \$1.20 an hour we can give an honorarium for the services rendered.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, one has got to bear in mind that there are over 1,200 people involved in this exercise, and when the Minister himself admits that they have set aside \$25,000 for paying overtime, it means that the Minister is already aware of the magnitude of the job. What we are paying the \$25,000 for is the incompetence of the Government. In other words, when the Government decided they would have taken over from 1st April, 1969, Scavengers were not people too, according to the Government. We have recently heard the Prime Minister say that we have fishermen and human beings; so apparently it is the attitude of the whole Government that we have Scavengers and human beings. That is the price we have now got to pay. What we have got to concern ourselves with is that this is not an easy run-through Resolution as some people might feel. Nobody is trying to obstruct the Government, but we have to put the case for the unfortunates. In the days of the Local Government, Mr. Chairman, people became attached to the staff of the various Councils, and they did not in every case possess the requisite qualifications for entering the Civil Service of this country. What I would like the Minister to deny is that they plan doing away with the services of a number of persons whom they took over from the Local Government, Let the Minister deny that people who were recruited to the staff in an acting capacity of the Bridgetown City Council, the Northern District.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

The hon. member struck the note. There were people acting for others who had permanent posts, and when the substantive holder resumed, the acting appointments as such could not continue. It is a good thing the hon. member corrected himself when he said that.

Mr. HINDS:

The Minister will also admit that there were people who were acting for others who had permanent posts, but the Councils were frozen for quite a number of years from 1964 and did not have an opportunity to appoint some of the people. But there is a case where people have been serving these Councils for three or four years satisfactorily. 1.40 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, how would the Minister feel knowing that he had been serving in an acting capacity in any post in this Island for three years, giving utmost satisfaction to all concerned, and merely for political reasons - that is all it can amount to - you are going to dismiss people who have served you three or four years satisfactorily?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Again, Sir, the hon. member has asked so many questions that I have to answer him in stages. There is a point made that certain people have been acting for sixteen to eighteen months, and I have had one or two interviews with people who have been laid off, and some have been asked to come in for interviews in order to try and place them permanently; so it is not that we are ignoring these people; we are trying to sort it out as best we can and are trying to put those under 60 years of age in jobs. In so far as the older ones are concerned, we are allowing them to continue until they reach the age of 65. It is not a question of political intrigue; I try to be fair and right to everybody; and if a man has done useful service, irrespective of what Party he belongs to, he will receive the utmost consideration as far as I am concerned.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, the Minister has got to bear in mind that many of these people have been acting in posts that were vacant, and the Minister has also to try to find out that some of these people were sent to the Local Government Commissioner with recommendations that they should be appointed and they have been refused; they have not been appointed. My duty is to say here and now that the most that should have been done for those people who have given three or four years satisfaction, was to appoint them even at the lowest scale, provided that it does not fall below the salary they are receiving at the present moment, but that in the future you can then stipulate what qualifications you require for entry into the Service, because it is not fair. Nobody can suggest that it is fair.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, again I interrupt the hon. member. Is the hon. junior member for St. Peter unaware of our Public Service Commission? Is the hon. junior member for St. Peter unaware of a Local Government Service Commission and so on? I have no jobs in my hip pocket to give away; I can only help to some extent; but it is the Local Government Service Commission who makes these appointments.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Hon. members not addressing the Chair must observe the rules and speak only in undertones; let the hon. junior member for Christ Church proceed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I was just reminding the hon. member that there is a Public Service Commission dealing with appointments of the regular Departments, etc.; so do not come in here and try to give the impression as though I have these Jobs. I have no jobs, not even the one the electors gave me for a short time, but I have a job outside to earn a living; so do not come in here and give the impression that I have jobs and am being unfair to people. I can just recommend to various bodies or various authorities, because Ministers as such cannot appoint, fire, discipline or give jobs; that is not fair to me.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, to set the record straight, the Minister has no jobs in his hip pocket to give to anybody. That is understood; but what I want the Minister to get about and try to find out something about is that there are people employed by the Bridgetown City Council or whatever you care to call it now, there are some employed by what was originally Northern and Southern District Councils and who are now under Central Government, and it was decided that the Central Government would take over the liabilities. What we are saying is if the Central Government decides to take over the liabilities, why cannot they decide also to take over the assets? Here is it you find that the City Council has a staff member who has served most efficiently for five years, is still acting, and she has Advanced Level certificates, she was recommended by her immediate senior; not only this, when the City Council was functioning, the City Council recommended her for appointment, and now the Board has taken over, they have recommended her for appointment, but nothing has been done so far.

Mr. Chairman, I have the knowledge that there is a Minister on that side who has brought about the transfer of many a young woman in the Public Service because she did not co-operate; what she did not co-operate with I am not prepared to say, but the Minister is now smiling broadly and I am saying here and now that it is not fair to these people. I believe there are some people who are not particularly concerned with which Party is served; they are just here to do a job; and in the case of this young lady

who is now focussed in my mind, she is just a good worker. I do not think she is concerned with which Party is or is not in power; she is doing a job which is put before her to do to the best of her ability. I understand she graduated from the Federal High School, much to the credit of the school; but why punish her? Are we being asked to pass a Resolution for \$700,000 to have a punitive effect upon the type of qualified person we are thinking of?

Mr. Chairman, earlier I said that the Local Government was frozen since 1964; I should correct that and say that this was done from 1966. It is all well and good for us to decide we have got to do something speedily to allay the fears of the Scavengers. This is the time that everybody is looking for money, the reason being that the cost of living is rising steadily and the demands are becoming greater and greater. It is for this reason that we cannot conceive that Government even at the hour when they have decided to pay back pay - that you still find that all and sundry will not be receiving back pay from the 1st April, 1969. I tried to point out to the Minister already that there were some persons in the Local Government setup who had salary increases, but there WES no comparable point in the Civil Service as such; so what was done was to convert these salaries at the nearest point in the Civil Service scale. 1, 50 p.m.

What is the Government doing? It is only paying that type of individual back pay from September. That is not fair. It is not the fault of these officers that they were not taken over on the 1st April. We are maintaining here that this provision is to pay salaries from 1st April to 31st August, 1969, and it is unfair.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, Sir. It is just a question of setting out the period when the Local Government Commissioner was in charge. In other words, from the 1st April to the 31st August the total transfer had not yet been effected; therefore, for working out certain categories it had to be done by the Local Government Commissioner. A lot of people are involved in this matter. From the 1st September they were taken over, and it is a question of setting out things in detail. I gave the hon. member the assurance already that all categories of workers, and Scavengers in particular, will be paid 33 1/3% as an increase in wages from the 1st April, 1969. He has gone back to the same old point which has been cleared up already.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I have not gone back to any point which was cleared up. The Minister does not seem to follow the point I am making as clearly as I would like him to follow it. I am saying that certain officers were taken over from the 1st September; they were then receiving a certain salary, but there was no point equal to that in the Civil Service scale to which they could have been converted. It was, therefore, necessary to convert the officers salaries as from September to the nearest point in the Civil

Service scale of pay. The Government is now going to pay these officers as from September, but my contention is that since the officers were due for pay from the 1st April, 1969, had they been taken over, then provision has not been made to pay these officers.

Mr. Chairman, I have before me figures to bear out my point, but my reason for not quoting them is that some wicked or malicious person may compare the figures with the pay sheets and arrive at the persons who have complained to me about this matter. I repeat that in September they were not then at the salary scale at which you could find a comparable one in the Civil Service, and they had to be put at the nearest scale in the Civil Service. The officers received an increase in salary as from the 1st September, The Government is not saying that it is the Government's fault for not taking over these officers as from the 1st April, and the Government is only giving the officers back pay as from the 1st September 4

Hon. A. DaC, EDWARDS; Mr. Chairman, that is not the case. The position is that the officers received an Increase in pay as from the 1st September because the Government wanted to bring them on a level with the necessary scale. For instance, if an officer received \$X in April and he got \$X plus Y in August, his revised salary would now be at 1.33% of what he was getting in April. Whatever the deficiency was, it means that he ought to be getting \$X plus Y in April in order to be in line with other Government Officers in that scale. He would be getting 1.33% on what he would have been getting in April. He is then in line with a Civil Servant.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Will the Scavengers be getting that 1.33%, too? That is the point he is making.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

If he is placed on the scale with certain key-scale workers or clerical officers in the Government, then his basic salary will be on par with what an officer in that particular scale is getting. If a man worked for \$90.00 in the Local Government, and after the change-over it would seem that the nearest point in the scale of an officer comparable with him was \$100.00, and he would be paid \$100.00 a month from September. It means that Government has accepted that the officer ought to have been getting \$100 a month from April; therefore, if he gets a 25% increase, it means that he would get \$125.00 a month as from this year. It means therefore, that a person who was getting \$90.00 and was drawn up to \$100.00 would be able to get \$125.00 a month from the 1st April. As a matter of fact, all of these people stand to benefit, and if anybody calculates it otherwise, that person is wrong.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, we are suffering from an over abundance of Ministerial ability which cannot help us in

the House. I am saying that an officer who was taken over by Central Government in September at a salary which did not have a corresponding scale in the Civil Service..... (Asides)

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

Hon. C.E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I was wondering how much longer the hon. member will be.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER who resumed the Chair and reported accordingly. 2.00 p.m.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for one hour.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

On resumption:-

QUESTION TIME

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am advised that a Reply to Question No. 49 asked by the hon. junior member for Bridgetown is ready. In view of the fact that that hon. member has been excused earlier today from his duties in attending the House, I will not require the Reply to be laid. That may stand over until the next meeting of this House.

Question No. 73 stands in the name of the Hon. Acting Leader of the Opposition.

QUESTION re REFUSAL OF ADMISSION TO WARD C. 12

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, the Question reads as follows -

To enquire of the appropriate Minister: -

Is it a fact that a female ordered to be hospitalized at Ward C. 12 (The Tuberculosis Ward) at the

Hospital on 6th June, 1969, was refused admission when taken to the Block?

2. By whom was she refused admission, and why?

3. Was the same patient admitted to Ward C. 6 on the same date?

4. Who was the Doctor who ordered her to C. 12 on 6th June and who was the Doctor who again ordered her to be transferred from C. 6 to C. 12 on 17th July?

5. Is it a fact that the patient informed the Doctor she would go home rather than be transferred to Ward C. 12?

6. Was the patient discharged in 22nd July, 1969?

7. Is it a fact that a van conveyed a Nurse to this patient's home to vaccinate her family following her hospitalization? Did such vaccination take place?

8. Was this patient a Koch I Infection?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows-

"No evidence has been traced at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital that a female was refused admission to Ward C. 12 on the 6th June, 1969. The other aspects of the question therefore are not applicable."

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, is the Minister saying that the patient was not refused admission on 6th June but that she was refused admission on another date?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

The Information of the Hospital Director who has investigated the matter stated that no female was refused admission to Ward C.12 (the Tuberculosis Ward) on 6th June, 1969. Standard procedure regarding the admission of T.B. suspects is that they are admitted first to the General Medical Wards and transferred to the T.B. Wards only if further diagnosis confirms that the patients are suffering from T.B. One patient from Grazettes Landing Scheme was admitted to the General Ward C.6 on 6th June, 1969 and was discharged on the 11th June, 1969. Her case was diagnosed as epilepsy. Another patient was admitted to Ward C.6 on 16th June, 1969 with tentative diagnosis of pulmonary T.B. and subsequent examination did not substantiate this diagnosis. The patient was treated and sent home on 28th June, 1969 and an appointment was made for her to attend the medical Outpatients clinic in six weeks time, but she did not attend. The Ward census returns at the Hospital show that there were no transfers from Ward C.6 to Ward C. 12 on 17th July, 1969, and that no patients were admitted to or discharged from Ward C.12 on 22nd July, 1969.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, would the Minister tell us if the patient who was admitted to Ward C.6 with suspected pulmonary T.B. is the same patient who was discharged on 22nd July?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I gave the hon. member all the information I have, unless he wants me to read it again. The matter has been investigated and that is the entire information as a result of the investigation.

Mr. HINDS:

I would like to ask the Minister who carried out the investigations.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I said that the Hospital Director has investigated this matter.

Mr. HINDS:

Did the Hospital Director interview a Dr. Lofters or a Dr. Draper in respect of this matter? And did he interview a Dr. Johnson in connection with this matter?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member has any other information, he could perhaps give me the particulars and the name of the patient and I will be able to investigate it on that basis.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, if the Minister caused an investigation to be carried out, should he now be asking for the name of the patient? Did the Minister not discover in the course of his investigations that the patient referred to is a Nurses' Aide presently attached to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and that the same Nurses' Aide had been attending on Ward C. 12 and in the course of a matter of seconds had to be admitted to the same Ward C. 12, the T.B. Ward, and she refused to go in?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

If the hon. member had in the first instance embodied in his Question that the patient referred to was a Ward Assistant working there and had indicated more clearly the precise case, I would have been in a position to give him a more precise reply; but I have carried out the regular investigation which was done by the Hospital Director, and that is the information I have. As I said a few minutes ago, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member had provided further information as he has just done, perhaps we would have given him additional Information.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I must ask the Minister if the Hospital does not keep records. We know that the records are in a state of confusion, but does the Hospital not keep records of people admitted to Wards and when they are dismissed?

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Chair does not want to intervene in this, but I wonder if privately the name might not be mentioned to the Minister, and the Minister might search his records to see whether such a name appears and answer without referring to any name. 3.15 p.m.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I am willing to assist the Minister as best I can; but if the Minister is telling us that the Hospital Director carried out investigations, I must ask what kind of investigations he carried out when he was given a date, the 6th June, 1969. Did the Hospital Director go through all the admissions for the

6th June, 1969 or did he take out two or three cases and say that as it did not apply in the two or three cases, so it did not apply at all?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I already said that one patient from Grazettes Landing Scheme was admitted to the General Ward, C 6, on 6th June and was discharged on 11th June, 1969 and her case was diagnosed as epilepsy.

Mr. HINDS:

Did the Minister or did the Hospital Director investigate the case of a lady who was admitted on the 6th June, 1969, not from Grazettes, but from the Deacons Road Farm Housing Area?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Again, Mr. Speaker, the Hospital Director has investigated this matter and has established that no female was refused admission to Ward C12, the Tuberculosis Ward, on 6th June, 1969. As to the procedure regarding the admission of TB suspects, they are admitted first to the General Ward and transferred to the TB Ward only if further diagnosis confirms that the patients are suffering from TB.

Mr. HINDS:

Is the Minister saying that the Ward Sister attached to C12 did not tell the patient "I cannot have you in here. Just during this very day you had been attending to people in this Ward and I cannot take you in here to be lying down; therefore I refuse to admit you"?

I will ask the Minister another question. Is it the custom to admit TB patients in Ward C6 at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I have just answered that. Again for the third time, the Hospital Director has investigated this matter and has established that no female was refused admission to Ward C 12, the Tuberculosis Ward, on 6th June, 1969. As to the procedure regarding the admission of TB suspects, they are admitted first to the General Ward, and transferred to the TB Ward only if further diagnosis confirms that the patients are suffering from TB.

Mr. HINDS:

The Hospital Director has admitted that there is no evidence that a female patient was refused admission to C 12, and I accept that. Is the Minister now saying that the same patient under reference was not admitted to C 6 on the same day? We are dismissing the refusal to C 12; is the Minister saying that the same patient was not admitted to C 6 on the same day?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I should like to draw your attention once again to the Standing Orders of the General Assembly of Barbados, Standing Order No. 12 dealing with the contents of Questions, and No. 14 dealing with the manner of asking and answering Questions.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am indeed grateful to the hon. member.

Mr. HINDS:

I am prepared to dismiss the idea of a patient being refused admission to C.12, but I am asking the Minister if he is saying that the patient was not admitted to C 6 on the same day.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Again, Mr. Speaker, one patient from Grazettes Landing Scheme was admitted to the General Ward, C 6, on 6th June, 1969 and was discharged on 11th June, 1969; her case was diagnosed as epilepsy. Another patient was admitted to Ward C 6 on 16th June, 1969 with the tentative diagnosis of pulmonary tuberculosis, and on the substantive examination the patient was treated and sent home on 26th July, 1969. An appointment was made for her to attend the medical Out-patients' Clinic at a later date, but she did not attend,

Mr. HINDS:

Can the Minister tell me the name of the doctor who diagnosed the case he just referred to?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I am afraid, Sir, I cannot give the name of the doctor.

Mr. HINDS:

How can you investigate a case of a patient if you have no reference made to the doctor? I am asking if it would not be in the best interest of the Minister to carry out further investigations into this matter in the light of the fact that the same patient who was refused admission to C 12 was later admitted to C 6 suffering from a Koch Infection; that is what was written on her card.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, what was the number of the patient's card?

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am afraid we cannot have questions coming from the other side.

Mr. HINDS:

What I can tell the Minister is that the patient was admitted and she was suffering from a Koch infection, and I would urge the Minister to carry out further investigations into the matter. Does the Minister know that the patient referred to has been re-employed at the Hospital as from the 6th August, 1969?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I was about to address the hon. junior member for St. Peter.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Just a moment, Sir, I would like to say something which is.....

Mr. HINDS:

Have him sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I do not deem the last question by the hon. junior member for St. Peter as a proper supplementary and, I declare all further questions on this matter closed.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

But what I want to draw your attention to is that I got up just now to address you and I heard somebody in the gallery say "sit down."

Mr. SPEAKER:

Is the hon. member drawing my attention to strangers?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

This is for you to hear, not for me to draw to your attention because you should see them. 3.25 p.m.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Private Members' Business be taken until 4 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER:

Will the hon. Acting Leader of the Opposition intimate what Private Members' Business it is proposed to deal with now.

Mr. HINDS:

(Sitting) Mr. Speaker.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

Will the hon. member rise when addressing the Chair?

Mr. HINDS:

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

RESOLUTION re DAY NURSERY AT SPEIGHTSTOWN

Mr. SPEAKER:

Item No. 11 stands in the name of the Acting Leader of the Opposition, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution re the establishment of a Day Nursery at Speightstown, and it is to be found at page 14, right hand column.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is for the establishment of a Day Nursery at Speights town, St. Peter. I do not think for a single moment that there would be any necessity under any circumstances for me to have to make a speech at any length on a Resolution of this sort. We are well aware of the fact that in Speights town, a thickly populated area, there are many mothers who have the most pressing need for the services to be obtained from the establishment of a Day Nursery in that area. I am sure that hon. members on the other side will bear in mind what has been our experience with mothers having to go to work to earn a livelihood for themselves and their children, and having to leave their children unprotected at home. We have had cases where mothers have been known to leave children less than one year old at home by themselves, and very often they have to depend on a neighbour, when it suits him or her, to look over the half-door to see what is happening to the children.

Sir, in the year 1970, we do not think this sort of thing is good enough, and we feel that a Day Nursery should be established at Speightstown at a suitable site in order to relieve the uneasiness that plays havoc with young mothers while they are out working. One must bear in mind the fact that a mother

who has to leave her children and go to work cannot give her best services to her employer when she knows that whilst she is catering to the needs of those who are paying her for her services, she has left her children uncared for at home because of the circumstances under which she is forced to live. Mr. Speaker, I think that is all I need say in the circumstances.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass. Mr. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER:

It has already been seconded.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Speaker, I could not imagine that this motion had been seconded because, as soon as the hon. junior member for St. Peter had dropped his voice, I was on my feet. Certainly the seconder's voice was not audible and, if he seconded the motion, he must have nodded his assent. If that is a new method of seconding a motion in this House, then it is a very decorous one.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am advised by the Clerk at the Table that the motion was seconded by the hon. seconded by the hon. senior member for St. James and that it is so recorded.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Speaker, I wish that the method employed in seconding a Resolution was one not only to be seen but to be heard. A member of the Government does not move Resolutions himself. A Resolution is moved in the House and in the normal passage of things its execution depends on the Government; so I could not be expected to be objecting to a Resolution which Involves..... (Mr. CRAIG Sit down, sit down!) Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. James has Just shouted "Sit down" twice, and I should like you to quote the Rule to him and make him understand that in Parliament he must learn how to behave himself.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Will hon. members not addressing the Chair observe Standing Order No. 29 with all its implications as well as other Standing Orders? Let the hon. senior member for St. Peter proceed.

Hon. K.N.R. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Speaker, I understand that there is a proposal to implement such a Resolution. It is already the intention of the Government - it is not subsequent to now - to provide a Day Nursery in the parish of St. Peter and within the proximity of Speightstown. Hon. members will recall that there is already one at Indian Ground in the hilly part of St. Peter. (Mr. HINDS They are closing that down.) I do not think they are closing that. Only yesterday, not last year, I was discussing that Day Nursery with a prominent member of my parish who is very interested in the running of that Day Nursery.

I do not know if the Social Welfare people have any intention of closing that down in the hope of opening one at Mile-and-a-Quarter or anywhere else in the parish, because there is really a considerable distance for one to walk from Mile-and-a-Quarter to the Indian Ground district. 3.35 p.m.

I do say that in Speightstown there are some mothers who might stand to benefit by the erection and provision of such an institution. I do hope that this Day Nursery would not only be provided, but after being provided, the running of it will fall into capable and non-political hands, because as I understand, there have been people in charge of these institutions who really did not manage them in any exemplary fashion, and instead of being of benefit - which is the intention - much harm is done to the children of the district. I do hope that with future Day Nurseries it will be possible to have them run and managed by capable individuals who really understand not only the caring of children, but to some lesser extent inculcating discipline in the minds of these very young children. There is no need for me to speak further because it is as though I am talking to myself being a Minister. As I said, the assurance is given that this institution will be erected.

Hon. A. DaC, EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, I have from time to time enunciated the Government's policy in respect of Housing. The policy of Government in establishing any Housing area is to provide a Community Centre and Day Nursery. Tomorrow we will be meeting at Speightstown to visit a site for the purpose of acquiring it to establish a Housing Development Scheme and possibly a Playing Field, Community Centre and Day Nursery. This is a site on the border of Speightstown. The hon. senior member for St. Peter has been hard at work looking for a site. He has advised my Ministry that he has found one and we are going there tomorrow to see the site with a view to acquiring it to establish a Housing area, and provision is made in the Draft Estimates which were laid on the Table of this Chamber today. In the Capital Estimates provision is made to satisfy this type of development in Speightstown. Leaving Speightstown, there is another area which we will go to look at to establish a Day Nursery, Community Centre, Playing

Field and Housing area, and this will be in some part of St. James. The hon. member therefore knows that in densely populated areas he does not have to ask for the establishment of a Day Nursery, because it is the policy of the Government that in all thickly populated areas, whether or not we establish a Housing area, we will establish Day Nurseries. This is the first Government to adopt this policy and to make available staff as was not done in the past as at Gall Hill Housing area where a building was constructed as a Day Nursery and it was left to voluntary effort to run it, and on many occasions funds were not forthcoming for the proper running of the Nursery.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter struck a salient note when he said that he hoped it would fall into proper hands and not in political hands and the hands of people who know nothing about it. He need have no fear about this because this Government has embarked on a programme of establishing Day Nurseries throughout the country and we have not left them to any organisation or political group. We have put them under the control of the newly established Child Care Board which looks after all these Nurseries. The staff of the Day Nurseries are not paid by the Child Care Board, and they are not appointed unless they are well trained. Courses are carried on from time to time so that the employees are themselves trained in child care, and no one at these Day Nurseries gets an appointment unless she had the amount of training. Even if they are appointed temporarily, they are sent to training before they are given a permanent appointment. This Government has not made a building available and forgotten that the Day Nursery existed or gave \$150 a year. We can be proud of the Day Nurseries we have today. There is one at St. Matthias, there is one at Belle-plaine and in other parishes, and we can be proud of all. The one at Belleplaine was started by a private individual and handed over to Government. The hon. senior member for St. Michael has made representation in here in respect of Day Nurseries, and the Minister of Community Development has referred it to the Welfare Department to make certain recommendations. I am thinking of the Day Nursery at Hothersal Turning which had to be closed recently. Consideration is being given to do something about that because we are satisfied there is need for this Day Nursery. When we have them established, they reduce the incidence of infant mortality as a result of malnutrition; therefore it is in the interest of the working-class people of this country to have Day Nurseries established and the Government is in favour of it, and anyone bringing a Resolution about a Day Nursery is preaching to the converted. It is the set policy of Government which we intend to carry out in every densely populated district in this country.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I happen to be the appropriate Minister and I hardly have anything to add. It is the well known and settled policy of Government to establish Day Nurseries on the basis enunciated by the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I agree that a large and important area like Speights-town should have a proper Day Nursery, whether or not a Housing Scheme goes there. The fact remains that provision has been made for the establishment of a Housing area in the Speightstown district in which a very up-to-date and large Day Nursery will be provided, comparable to any of the new ones we have built at the Farm Housing Area or at Pleasant Hall which can accommodate 70 to 80 children. As the Minister for Housing has just explained, the Child Care Board which operates and administers these Day Nurseries will see to it that the employees are trained, because we have courses to train them from time to time so that the little children can be better taken care of. 3.45 p.m.

The interest of the children is of paramount importance, and that is our policy. I am glad the hon. member has made the motion because it has confirmed in our minds that we are doing the best thing.

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

Mr. SPEAKER:

I would be much obliged if the acting Leader of the Opposition would intimate what is next proposed to be done.

Mr. HINDS:

Item No. 8, Sir.

RESOLUTION re PROVISION OF RECREATIONAL

FACILITIES IN CERTAIN DISTRICTS OF

St. PETER

Mr. SPEAKER:

Item No. 8 also stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter and is to move the passing of a Resolution re provision of recreational facilities in certain districts of St. Peter.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I have little fear that this Resolution would find the favour of hon. members on the other side in the same manner as the Resolution which has just been passed, because I feel I can say at this stage that we will again hear what is Government's policy, and we accept it; however, we may find it

necessary to amend it here and there. We feel that Government might have a set policy on the provision of recreational facilities and the like for the youths of the nation, but it is the duty of individual members of Parliament who are in daily contact with their constituents to be able to bring to Government's attention those areas that deserve priority treatment in the question of establishing these Playing Fields and the like, and this Resolution seeks to urge upon the Government the necessity to implement in stages the development of Farley Hill National Park, to meet the demands of the growing number of youths in the Indian Ground, Four Hills, and the neighbouring districts, and in like manner to acquire lands at Boscobelle from such residents that are disposed to sell or from the Spring Hall owners in order to provide a Playing Field and such other amenities as are necessary for the benefit of people living at Gays, Castle and the neighbouring districts, and in like manner to provide a Community Centre or Playing Field for the Ashton Hall area.

We may hear again that with Government's decision to establish a Playing Field at Mile -and-a Quarter, that decision might also embody the broader aspect, and things like a Community Centre, Playing Field etc. might also be established in the immediate vicinity. Whatever is the plan of Government, as long as it is to provide recreational facilities for the youth of the nation, we welcome it, and it is for this reason that I see no necessity for me to stress any further the needs of the people of these areas because there are all well known by now to all hon. members of this House, and I can see no reason why there would be any attempt by anybody to seek to deny the residents of St. Peter or of any parish, for that matter, of any of the facilities sought in a Resolution of this sort, Mr. Speaker, I should only move at this stage that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Speaker, very audibly now you hear a seconder. Many, many years ago, nearly 20 years ago, I have been moving Resolutions dealing with Playing Fields, Community Centres, etc., etc., and it will be another 20 years too, if I can hope to live so long, before we can hope to see what is already being planned. Indian Ground, Four Hills, Lonesome Hill, French Village and all these areas I have visited on some Sundays and have seen the need for Playing Fields in these areas; as a matter of fact the boys are trying hard to play on inaccessible grounds, but there will be another 20 years before Playing Fields become a reality in such districts. I do not have to go into details at this stage to say how things are progressing, but I do know that I have already made some of the most important contacts in order that Playing Fields may be provided in Boscobelle, and it will not be another 20 years for this to be fulfilled. It is not that we are just saying things; the hon. member said he would probably hear the same type of reply, and it takes some time, as all hon. members know, when it comes to land acquisition; but I will not dwell on that point. In the Black Bess area there is need for a Playing Field, and there is a plot of land adjoining the school that can be easily converted.

When it comes to Playing Fields, I will spend a lot of money in trying to develop and encourage recreational facilities in St. Peter, and I have been trying to do this long before I ever begin to try to enter the House of Assembly. I do not wish to prolong this Resolution; therefore in seconding the

Resolution I believe that the time is ripe and I believe that in the not too distant future all this will be accomplished.

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

3.55 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I should be grateful to the Hon. Acting Leader of the Opposition if he would intimate that which he now seeks to proceed with.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I move that Item No. 9 be the next Order of the Day.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, before the question is put, I would like to ask a question. You have been making reference all the time to the Acting Leader of the Opposition. Did you get a letter to that effect?

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am afraid the Chair may not be interrogated, but it was officially intimated to me in Parliament that the hon. junior member for St. Peter was this day acting as Leader of the Opposition, and that has not been questioned, challenged, or disputed and, accordingly, I have accepted it as a fact.

Order No. 9 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. James, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution re local secretarial schools.

RESOLUTION re LOCAL SECRETARIAL SCHOOLS

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, let not the other side be confused about who is Leader of the Opposition, Deputy

Leader, or Acting Deputy Leader of the Opposition on this side. We will take care of our bat-ties. We are not worried about these things. They cannot bring any more arguments between us.

Sir, this Resolution reads as follows:

" Whereas students, after qualifying from lo -cal secretarial schools are finding it difficult to obtain employment due to the very low standard of instruction associated with these secretarial schools;

And whereas competent stenographers and secretaries are vital for the expansion of trade and industry in Barbados;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Government be asked to carry out a full investigation into the curriculum Reaching methods , and general policy of all local secretarial schools.

Sir, this Resolution came here as a result of a Question which I gave notice of some months ago. I think I am safe in saying that I was not surprised at the reply I received. It was the most unusual reply ever given in Parliament in any part of the Commonwealth. The reply was to the effect that unless I could substantiate what was in my Question, the answer to that was to look at.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am afraid that the time for Private Members' Business has now expired.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Hon. Leader of the House will allow an additional 15 minutes for me to get through with this Resolution. I am confident of that, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am afraid I am not concerned with.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that we revert to Government Business.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER:

When the House was last dealing with Government Business it was in Committee of Supply, and thereunto it shall revert.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1969-70 No. 74

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

When the House was suspended, the hon. junior member for St. Peter was addressing the Chair. He may continue, if he so wishes.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, perhaps we can content ourselves with saying that we have run the gamut in dealing with this Resolution. That is to say that all of the ground that would have caused fear in the heart of the Minister responsible for the Resolution has been covered in a very considerable measure. Really and truly, I do not like for a single moment to embarrass any Minister; but when you have a Resolution for \$700,000 it is within our rights on this side of the House to ask the Minister to give us a breakdown. Of course, I understand that he is not in a position at the moment to do that and I am not pressing him; but I would very much like to hear from the Minister exactly how \$700,000 was arrived at.

Surely, it cannot be denied that a considerable amount of accounting staff had been put to work during the period enunciated by the Minister earlier, and when it is found that all the labours of the accounting

staff must not be seen to have gone in vain and a figure of \$700,000 arrived at and rushed before the Legislature, we must ask the Minister if he can possibly give us a clue as to how this \$700,000 was arrived at. Further, this revision involves the staff of the Interim Commissioner for Local Government; the Housing Authority (Day Nurseries, Community Centres); the Salvation Army (Food Centre); the Child Care Board; the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board; and the Central Government.

Now what must come before the Minister's mind is whether he is in a position to tell this Committee whether this is the last Resolution to come before this Hon. House for any of these workers. Is the Minister now sure beyond doubt that no employee has been left out? I remember that when the Resolution to pay Church Officers came before this Hon. House, I knew that all categories of workers involved had not been provided for, and I caught the Minister in a trap by asking him then if all of the workers had been provided for. The Minister said that he was certain that everybody had been provided for, but here it is; although he said that everybody had been provided for, the Government now finds itself having to provide \$700,000 to pay other people.

4.05 p.m.

Now I do not think the Minister at that stage meant to mislead the House; he was acting evidently on such information that had been given him by his Ministry, and I am asking the Minister to tell us on this occasion whether we have now come to the end of things, because the greater part of what we are doing here to day is what should have been done prior to April, 1969. If these officers had been taken over then, there would have been some re-adjustment of salaries, but it did not come about then or in June; it came about in September. What we are saying now is that if it was not done prior to April, it ought to have been done prior to September, and then when the revision of salaries took place in January, there would have been enough that everybody could have been completed in that case. We have in this Resolution these little matters which we referred to earlier in the day, and we have the assurance, I think, from the Minister that he would not be dismissing any of those persons who were employed by the former City Council and Northern and Southern District Councils in acting posts. I want to make a last minute plea on behalf of these workers that in view of the fact that they are people who have given satisfaction for three or more years, it is beastly unfair and unreasonable to turn them off through no fault of their own. One has got to bear in mind that when the services of an officer have been dispensed with, it is not the officer alone whose mouth had to be fed from his earnings. He might often be the bread-winner, with a family of four or five depending on him. I am asking the Government to take all these things into consideration on behalf of these people. I agree with the Government in making the stipulation that in future certain qualifications must be met before people can be recruited to the staff of a Government Department; but when we look at it again, Mr. Chairman, since Government has seen it possible to relax the educational requirements for entering the teaching service, these things have got to be taken into consideration; and if some of these people have been recruited to the staff of the various Councils in the past and have been transferred to the various Boards and were not people of any outstanding scholastic Achievement, nevertheless three years of drilling and service would at this point give them some claim to an appointment. It would be well if they could all be re-examined or have an interview arranged, not by people who are so politically charged as to get rid of those who do not fit into

their political pattern. We are now criticising the Public Service of this country which is a very bad thing, because we have got to bear in mind that each officer recruited into the Service is an officer expected to serve, whether my Party or your Party is in power, and the sooner we can get around to realising this, the better it is for all concerned.

I am glad to learn that some of the Boards who inherited some members of staff in this way have themselves made recommendations for the appointment of some of these people to the various posts. I am asking the Minister to give these things all the consideration they deserve, and, for Heaven's sake, under no circumstances dismiss a person unless it is found impossible to place the officer somewhere where he can still continue to earn a livelihood. As I have said, you might even place him at the bottom of the ladder, fully realising that there can be no promotion for him since today it is so difficult to find employment. I am appealing to the Minister not to dismiss people from a job which they have been doing and giving satisfaction for three and, perhaps, more years.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw to the attention of the hon. member and the Committee that all the employees who were taken over on 1st September and who worked formerly with the Councils will have a conversion point in salaries or wages comparable with similar posts in the regular Civil Service, and in the case of casual employees and others, they are being put at a point even a little above what they were getting, and nobody stands to lose as a result of the take-over. I agree that the take-over was delayed on two occasions due to the volume of work involved, so that the take-over which was intended for 1st April, 1969, was deferred until 1st July, 1969, because of the volume of legislation to be prepared apart from the physical problems -personnel and so on. It was a voluminous task involving the taking-over of the employees and services of the City Council and Northern and Southern District Councils; so in my Ministry that alone is a portfolio, in itself.

We were asked for a breakdown. At the present I am afraid I am not in a position to give an adequate reply, but this amount of \$700,000 was not hatched up by chance. About two weeks ago a Resolution of this nature would normally have been brought down; so this is not brought as a result of the tentative strike or whatever it was.

Mr. HINDS:

The Minister is admitting how unfair his Ministry has been to members of the Opposition because we only received copies of this yesterday, and the Minister is saying that over two weeks ago they had it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

That is no point of order.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, what I did say was that in the normal course of events a Resolution of this nature would have been brought down two weeks ago, but it was felt that a similar amount embodied and incorporated in the Estimates would have served a similar purpose, and as the Estimates were coming down today we sought to embody the same block vote, and everybody would have stood to benefit precisely the same way. In order to expedite matters even faster, we thought it fit to bring down this Resolution today - separate and distinct - so that the payment of wages could start running as from 19th March and all the back pay paid before the end of March. In any case they would have got the back pay before the end of March. As I mentioned already, some misunderstanding crept into the whole matter and certain workers were made to believe that they would not get their back pay or salary until the Budget in June. This is therefore to clear the air and avoid any misleading statements or misunderstanding. This is a question of doing something now; so nobody can say that not until June will they get their money. They were misled. I would not care to say by whom, but we have all the facts. 4.15 p.m.

Overtime will be paid at the rate of \$2.00 per hour, the standard rate, to the people who are preparing the pay sheets - the clerical officers; but I want to make it abundantly clear that the overtime rate is \$2.00 per hour and not \$1.20 per hour. As far as the \$700,000 is concerned, this is a rough calculation based on approximately 11,000 employees who will each receive, roughly, \$60 per month more than they are getting now. As far as the Church workers are concerned - I have enough ability to reply to any question; try and remember that - but the hon. member is insinuating that all the categories of workers taken over from the Local Government Council have been dealt with. I never said that; so it is wrong to suggest that I at any time said that all the Local Government employees who were taken over from the 1st September had been dealt with. I could never have said that. I think that provision is being made - I am not the Accountant General nor an Accountant, nor the Financial Secretary - but my instructions are that the \$700,000 which we are dealing with today covers the entire lot of employees taken over from the 1st September, 1969. I believe that that is so.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, there is only one point I would like to raise, because I do not like to see the hon. Minister who has just sat down go wrong, but I would like to know who told him that there were 11,000 employees.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I am sorry, the number is 1, 100.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the Minister that there are 1,200 employees; check your figures. What I want to ask the Minister is, is he going to pay some senior officer \$2.00 per hour and the most Junior clerk \$2.00 per hour as well? Are you going to pay people in the category of Mr. Pearson Scott \$2.00 per hour and the most Junior officer \$2.00 per hour?

Hon. C. E. TALMA; On a point of elucidation, I refer to clerical officers. I agree that the senior men should be adequately compensated over and above the regular rate. I will look into that matter and the necessary adjustment will be made.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1969-70 No. 76 A Resolution for the sum of \$1, 250 was called.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Chairman, the matter before the Committee is a similar one to the one we just dealt with, only for a smaller amount. This is to pay overtime at the rate of \$2.00 per hour for six clerks at the Waterworks Department. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, nobody would want to hold up the passing of a Resolution of this sort, except that we are somewhat shocked to find that Government now finds itself as if at the end of its tether and being rushed upon to make available to people money that we know to be long overdue. Why is it that Government now finds itself having to pay so much money overtime?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

The reason is simply that there was never any money in the Estimates to pay overtime for this kind of

work. You do not pay increases of rates every day; so we will have to get money to pay these increases. If you do not want us to pay the people, say so.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, it is silly on the part of any Minister to talk about not wanting people to get paid. What we are saying here today is that this is incompetence on the part of the Government. Here is a Government that is going to increase wages for everybody and have not taken into account the mechanics of the effort involved. It is the lack of planning; they have too many people about there who do not know what they are about, and we are now being asked to pass money to do a job that can be done in normal working hours.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

On a point of order, , , ... Why does he not go outside?

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Is the hon. member addressing the Chair?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Chairman, I cannot address you because I am being interfered with by a gentleman in the Gallery, and I am not going on until he has been removed from the Gallery.

4.25 p.m.

I got up on a point of order. The point of order is that the hon. member keeps saying "That is not true." He says that the Government is not planning. Sir, this is something that does not happen every year, and you do not have to plan for it. We had three Increases in wages since this Government came into power. If you were to leave things to be done in the normal working hours, the people would still get their money. If your father, who was sending you to school all of your life - if somebody told you that your grandfather had died and left \$5 with your father for you, you would go and ask him for the \$5 although he was sending you to school all the time. (Asides)

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I should like hon. members to understand that there are Standing Orders.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

It is not really true for the hon. member to come here and say that. He wants to score a point, but he cannot score a point with me. We have only come here to ask for overtime because the people want their money urgently. The officers could have done this work in the normal way. These six people agreed to return and do overtime so that the people could be paid early. (Asides) The hon. member is only wasting time. There are 6 clerical officers at 14 hours per week for 7 weeks at \$2.00 per hour, and 1 Messenger at 75 per hour. The officers are only working 2 hours during the week days and 4 hours on Sundays. They have to go home and look after their families, and you cannot make people work longer than that.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY rose.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

There are two hon. members on their feet.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. junior member for St. Peter had given way to me.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

You are confusing this question about a point of order; the House is in Committee and I can speak as often as I want to. I am supporting the \$1, 250. It just goes to show the odd manner in which the Government arrived at the increases for the people when the figures were not actually worked out. The Ministry of Finance and the Cabinet should have made decisions to increase wages by, say, 10% and so on, and then the matters should have been sent to the various Departments for the various Accountants to supply them with the number of persons employed, how much they worked for, and what would have been their overtime. I can appreciate the difficulty of the Government in making recommendations for overtime for certain employees; but where Government employees are concerned, I do not appreciate it. I cannot see why this should be done. I am going to vote for it, because the Government is in this difficulty now. The Government was in difficulty with the Scavengers; it was necessary to come here for this \$700,000, and the Government had to get people to work out the figures. I appreciate all of that. The Government had an ultimatum and money must be paid on time.

I am sure the Minister will agree with me in this. You have people working at the Waterworks

Department a Government Department. If the Minister of Finance went to the Cabinet and decided to give the people 25%, 10%, 33% or whatever the case may be you would circularise your Heads of Departments in connection with the matter. The Addendum states:

"It has been found necessary for the clerical staff of the Waterworks Department to work overtime in order to ensure that paysheets for the payment of arrears of wages to the unestablished and casual staff are completed before the end of the current financial year."

Now, when the members of the Cabinet made their decision, they would have known then the number of persons or casual workers employed as from April last year - I think this is going to be from April last year - therefore, this is a sort of sloppy planning to come here with a Resolution for \$1, 250. I will vote for it despite the fact that the hon. Minister will say that nobody wants to vote for it on this side. That is just a joke. (Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I never said that You said "unless they do not want to vote for it." That does not matter so far as I am concerned, but this is not the correct procedure in which we should deal with this matter. I have been in this House for a long time, and I have never seen a matter of this sort.

Sir, the Minister knew that he was going to increase wages from April last year. Of course, the Cabinet knew since January that there was going to be an increase in wages. The Cabinet had to know that before members of the House knew anything about it. Some people received their back pay in January; so the Cabinet must have known about it in December; therefore, the Ministry of Communications and Works should have found out from the people what the figures were at the time. This is not the correct way, in my opinion, to deal with this matter. You have just decided to give so much money. Why did you not come here for money to pay the Treasury Department overtime? Why did you not come here to ask for overtime for other Central Government Departments? You did not come here for that, because they had the figures worked out and presented to you, but you had to come here for this. I support it because I want the people to get the money.

I can quite appreciate the Minister's position so far as Scavengers and employees of the Local Government are concerned, because the Government took over everything before it was ready. Any proper Government would come to the conclusion, after making a decision, that the clerical staff should work out the figures and give them to the Minister before he comes here with a Resolution.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is not right. What he is saying could happen when you are dealing with the established staff, but we are now dealing with unestablished and casual staff. A casual worker

may work today and not tomorrow, and he may not work for the next two or three days; so you cannot really plan and say what the position would be. He says that we do not have to come here for overtime in so far as other Departments are concerned. That is axiomatic, because the people would be getting so much, you would add the percentage and arrive at what they should get. So far as casual staff is concerned, sometimes the Waterworks Department employ X number of people in one month and in another month they might employ more or fewer casual workers. 4.35 p.m.

The reason why we are coming for this money is because we want to pay these people before 31st March. If we do not do this, the money will lapse and we would have to start all over again, and you know how restless people can get when they are to get a few cents. A lot of them might have made arrangements already for spending this money. I cannot blame them. I do not know how the hon. member expects me to accept what he says. It would be easy with the established staff because you have X persons working, but it is somewhat different with casual staff. People who might work for three days this week, not at all next week, and so on.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

I have not asked the hon. member to accept anything. I hope what the hon. member is saying is not how the Waterworks are keeping their books, because this shows that something is wrong. Whether they are casual employees or established staff, you have to keep the names and the amount of days they work and they have to sign; so the hon. member would not be able to tell me anything about this. I am only saying that if the Government had decided upon this and they knew what increase they were going to give to the unestablished staff, then this could have been done in the normal working hours if they had done it the correct way.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, we are hearing from the Minister that he wants to see these people getting their money, but we hear that only six officers are working on this matter and they are working for a seven-week period. If you have put six people to work for a period of seven weeks, it means at least that these officers have completed at least four and a half weeks of work. I wonder if the Minister can throw any light on this.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

The normal work of the Department includes the expansion of services which now exceed 40,000 and the laying of mains for Government, and private development which employs over 500 casual workers. Accordingly, this Department is not geared to undertake the task of repairing and the arrears of wages is for the unestablished staff and casual employees that work overtime. Such arrears of wages must be paid before the end of the financial year. At present approximately 750 persons are employed on the established and casual staff of this Department. It is therefore proposed that six clerical officers would

work two hours for five evenings a week and four hours on Sundays. At this rate it is expected that the work will be completed in about seven weeks.

Mr. HINDS; Since some of these officers are now working on Sundays, are you paying them the same \$2,00 an hour on Sunday? What is the Civil Service Association doing about protecting these people?

The question that the Resolution for \$1, 250 do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without di-vision,

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1969-70 No. 75

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, this supplementary is requested in respect of Head 2 - Service Commissions - under several items Payment of Passages, Acting Allowances and Payment of Substitutes, Incidentals, Travelling, and Furniture and Equipment. I believe that the explanatory notes in the Addendum are full, but perhaps I ought to say something about the appropriation requested under Item 13 - Acting Allowances and Payment of Substitutes, that being the largest amount. From the current provision in this year's Estimates of \$300,000, it was estimated that the average expenditure per month for the payment of Allowances to Substitutes would be in the region of \$25,000. So far there is an expenditure of \$139,000 and this is an indication that the allocation might be inadequate. This, of course, was at the time when the Estimates were prepared. The current balance of \$160, 956.61 is therefore insufficient to meet payments for the remainder of the financial year. In addition, provision has to be made for Acting Allowances and Payment of Substitutes in respect of additional staff added to the Public Service through transfer of the Local Government Service to certain Ministries, for instance, Health, Finance and Home Affairs,

4.45 p.m.

.....and of course we must also bear in mind that substitutes are also eligible for incremental credits. If hon. members would like to see and judge the expenditure of this Item over the last three financial years, the figures might seem interesting. In 1966-67 the original provision was \$200,000, the supplementary provision was \$39,000, making a total of \$239,000; the actual expenditure for that financial year was \$288, 488. In 1967-68 the original provision was \$220,000, the supplementary provision was \$85,000, making a total of \$305,000; the actual expenditure for that year was \$302, 764. In 1968-69 the original provision was \$275,000, the supplementary provision was \$54, 633, making a total of \$329, 633, and the

actual expenditure was \$329, 179.59. This shows that even when we have, as a result of a single year's experience, put in what we thought was adequate supplementary provision in each case in the following year we have had to Increase the original provision and still supplement because of the difficulty of knowing at the beginning of a financial year how many substitutes would be needed in various Ministries and Departments, and of course how many acting allowances you might have to pay. I do not know if there is anything else hon. members would wish to know; I will be pleased to answer any questions. I would like to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, from the mouth of the Leader of this House, this Resolution beckons trouble. Nowhere in the Addendum is it shown that one penny is needed to pay salary increases, but the Minister still tells us that these people are eligible for increases.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

The hon. member is confusing what I said; I said incremental credits.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I have to refer to the notes from the Reporter. The Minister made reference that the substitutes are eligible for increases of salary like everybody else; those are the exact words of the Minister.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

The hon. member must not generate more indignation than is either warranted by the circumstances or that is worthy of a better cause. If you have substitutes acting and they are acting for a year or more, they have to get the same incremental credits as anybody else, and this is what I mean.

Mr. HINDS:

I believe that can be taken as what the Minister meant, but it is not what the Minister said originally. Now Mr. Chairman, I will appreciate the fact that this Resolution for \$48, 344 was handed to hon. members during the course of the day, and we have not had time to carry out the normal research; however, we have here an amount of \$3, 116 required to meet the cost of passages and baggage

expenses of officers recruited from overseas. This amount is required because more officers have been recruited from overseas during the financial year than had been anticipated.

Mr. Chairman, it is particularly interesting to us on this side to hear from the Minister who are the officers who have been recruited; it might be interesting to know, of these officers who have been recruited from overseas, how many are Barbadians - in other words, how many answered the call to come back home. Now that we have an opportunity here to see that such a large amount of officers - much more than you had anticipated - have been recruited from overseas, let the Minister tell us how many of these are Barbadians.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I hope the hon. member will not press me about their names; I can tell him the number. There are eight of them.

Mr. HINDS:

There was a provision of \$30,000 under this Head.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

If the hon. member would give way, to the 31st January the amount spent was \$29, 776, with an outstanding balance of \$148.90 and we have to meet the payment of a further amount for the recruitment of these officers.

Mr. HINDS:

Recruiting these eight officers from overseas, paying their passages and the cost of their baggage freight, is this going to cost this nation \$33, 116? Where are you importing them from? Are there only eight officers?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I will repeat, do not produce more indignation than is warranted by the facts. The provision under this item for this year is \$30,000 and the amount spent at 31st January, 1970 was \$29, 776; there is therefore a balance of \$148, 90, and obviously more officers have been recruited from overseas than had been anticipated. I understood the hon. member to ask me how many Barbadians are among them.

Mr. HINDS:

I asked how many officers were being recruited and how many were Barbadians.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I do not have that number, but there are eight more to be brought in before the end of the financial year.

Mr. HINDS:

But, Mr. Chairman, can anybody accept what the Leader of the House is saying in toto when he can come here with a Resolution to tell us that \$30,000 was allocated, so much was spent and \$148.90 remains?

4.55 p.m.

He now knows that there are 8 officers to be brought in before the end of the financial year. Are you going to tell me that a Minister, who has done his work, should not arm himself with information to be in a position to tell the Committee that the \$29,000 has been spent on so many officers? Why did the Minister interest himself in knowing that 8 more officers would be coming in at the end of the financial year, and he did not find out how many had been recruited out of the \$29,000? Is the Minister earning his salary when he does this kind of thing? I do not think so. Surely, the Minister should have in his files how many came in already, just as he knows how many will come after. He should have been in a position to tell us how much it costs to bring in the first 88. This is not the way in which a Minister is expected to do his work. We cannot be asked to accept this kind of reasoning on the part of the Minister. He must have it in his files that \$29,000 of the \$30,000 was spent on the baggage and the cost of passages of X number of officers who have already been recruited. Inasmuch as you now expect to bring in another 8 officers by the end of the financial year; it will require an additional \$3, 116 to add to the \$148 that remains.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot believe that the Minister is serious in saying this. I am sure he will search his files and give us all the information there is available. Now, there is an amount of \$44,200 that is required to meet the arrears of acting allowances due to officers. This sum is required merely as a result of increased acting appointments consequent on the transfer of staff from the former Local Government Service to the Ministries of Health and Community Development, Finance, and Home Affairs and the decision to award annual increments to substitute officers. Nobody would want to deny a substitute officer his right to an annual increment. We would be glad to see the people getting money and feeling happy. What we are concerned with is merely this. The Minister ought to be in a position to tell us how was this \$44,200 arrived at. How many officers have been transferred from the Local Government

Service to the Ministry of Health and Community Development and the Ministry of Finance? We ought to be told something about this matter, and the Minister ought to have armed himself with this information.

Now, we come to the sum of \$496, and this is needed to meet the cost of urgent repairs to type-writers. Mr. Chairman, during the past two months or so this House has been plagued with requests for money for repair to typewriters chins. What has gone wrong in the Civil Service? Are we employing people to use these machines who are not sufficiently familiar with the machines who these machines arid are destroying them? Have you discovered that you have been buying the wrong type of machine? How old are these typewriters and duplicating machines that they now require these urgent repairs? Have machines already been repaired? Have they been brought back into the office and put into use, or is it a case where the work of the Ministry is held up and we cannot go backward or forward because of the lack of these machines?

I have already given the Minister the benefit of- my knowledge of the situation here in respect of employing certain mechanics to repair typewriters and other machines in the past. I refer to one of the reputable firms in Bridgetown. We are now asked to vote \$480 to meet the urgent repairs to type-writers and adding machines. Let us ask ourselves this: how many typewriters a Involved in this state of disrepair? Is it a case where the typewriters suddenly decided that all of them should go bad in one day, week, or month? Is there any agreement between the typewriters and the adding machines that they all go on strike at the same time or something of the sort? How can it be that we now have typewriters, duplicating machines and adding machines all going bad at the same time? How many machines will this \$496 take care of? How old are these machines? If it is a case of these machines continually breaking down, why not have a Board of Survey and decide whether you should have replacements? It is not good enough merely to tell us that typewriters, a duplicating machine and an adding machine need repairs. You have already repaired these machines. This is what the Addendum tells us; so where is the urgency for the repairs?

The Addendum tells us that repairs had to be carried out recently. I wonder whether the Minister has noticed that. If the repairs have been carried out recently, what are we to understand by saying "to meet this cost of urgent repairs"? The repairs have already been carried out. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Must we not pay for them?) Nobody can deny that the cost of repairs must be paid for. The truth is that this Resolution is for money, and the Minister has not been properly briefed as to the true position regarding these typewriters, duplicating machines and adding machines. Will the Minister please tell us how many typewriters are Involved, and at what Ministry or Department these typewriters can be found?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I know the hon. member is having a field day, and I do not want to deprive him of his

enjoyment. Perhaps he would not mind my drawing his attention to the fact that the sum of \$496 is required to meet the cost of urgent repairs to typewriters, a duplicating machine and an adding machine which will have to be carried out. 5.05 p.m.

This is also to meet the cost of toilet requisites and other incidentals. So far as I can see, there have been two typewriters to which repairs have been carried out as well as a duplicating machine. (Mr. HINDS: For which Department?) This is "Service Commissions". This is P.S.C. and Ministers dare not go near P.S.C. If I told the hon. member that I do not know anything, he can excoriate me in respect of any Government Department for not knowing; but if I tell him I do not know what goes on in P.S.C., I implore him to believe me.

One more thing before I sit down. The hon. member asked about the numbers. I told him I could only deal in numbers and not in names. There were 27 officers up to the end of January and these additional eight will bring the number to 35.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I am not at all good at arithmetic, but I only want to hear from the Minister, not the names of these officers, but from what territories were they recruited, because hearing that we have eight that must now cost \$3,500 or thereabouts, when we have had 27 costing us \$30,000, one must ask from what part of the world these officers were recruited. The Minister should have this information at his disposal.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the hon. member that quite frequently when the hon. member gets into a jostle with Ministers over these Resolutions, he accuses Ministers of not knowing this and for not having done their homework. I am willing to admit this; but I do not know half of what the hon. member knows, and I do not have at my disposal one-tenth of the information about Government which the hon. member has; so this is why I can only say, if the hon. member asks me a question, that I do not know. This is a Service Commissions matter. I can give any amount of figures he wants, but I cannot give any breakdown about individuals or the territories from which the respective Government officers were recruited. I just do not have that Information here, and if I may with respect say this, while it is always a good thing to know as much as you can, this kind of information is not really relevant to this exercise.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, what kind of information is not relevant? If you spend \$29,000-odd in bringing 27 officers, are we not to ask what part of the world you brought them from?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Surely you may have to recruit somebody for the Ministry of Agriculture from as far away as Pakistan or Malaya, and the cost of bringing him and his wife here may be more than the cost of recruiting two other officers from somewhere in the region. I do not know who the individuals are, and I never thought to enquire.

Mr. HINDS:

The Minister is coming around to the point quite slowly, but nevertheless he will reach there. We quite agree that you might have to recruit an officer from India or somewhere else miles away, and the cost of bringing that officer and his family could very well meet the cost of recruiting three officers from nearer home; but we still feel that the Minister should find in his files that two officers were recruited from this particular area, one officer from another place, and he should also have the names of the officers. We are not concerned with the names of the officers, but the Minister should be able to tell us that there are six from India, four from Malaya or wherever it might be. Of the 27 officers we now have, 8 are Barbadians, but you are now to spend \$3, 264 to bring in another six. If you are going to bring six officers into the country before the end of the financial year and it is going to cost so much, should the Minister not be armed with the information as to where these officers are coming from?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I do not want to be facetious, but I myself would be grateful if the hon. member would tell me.

Mr. HINDS:

I do not want to hold up the Resolution, Mr. Chairman, but the Minister would be surprised to know that this Resolution was handed to me since I came here and I spared myself time to find out where the six officers they expect to bring in are coming from. The Minister is right when he asks me to tell him where they are coming from, because I put myself to the trouble to find out. This is an admission on the part of the Minister that he has come to this House and is asking for money and is not interested in finding out where these officers are coming from.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

It is a different admission. The real admission is that who would tell you would not tell me.

The question that the Resolution for \$18, 344 do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative

without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1969-70 No. 57

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, there is quite a lot to do and I would suggest that this Resolution be postponed in view of the absence of the hon. senior member for Christ Church.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

The hon. member is asking me not to proceed with the Resolution for the Printery in the absence of the hon. senior member for Christ Church. I am not taking advantage of his absence to press it, but the point is that any points the hon. member now absent or the hon. members now present wish to raise on it, they have a whole Head in the Appropriation Bill in the Estimates next week to go over the whole argument on the Printery. This is to pay overtime. We postponed it because the hon. member said one or two things. The hon. junior member for St. Peter and the Minister of Home Affairs are in contact with one another over the matter. If anything new emerges, when we are doing the Head in the Estimates next week, we can resume that debate on what is going on in the particular Department; so we are not shutting out the hon. senior member for Christ Church from anything.

5.15 p.m.

If we do not make the appropriation today, we cannot do it at all because the Governor-General is not going to assent to anything after the 15th March, anyhow. The hon. senior member for Christ Church will have his opportunity next week when we are doing the Estimates.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I am still to ask the Leader of the House to bear in mind one or two very small points. This particular Resolution is one which caused considerable concern in Opposition circles, and it had caused the Government itself some concern. On the occasion when we were debating it, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was in his place, and other hon. members of the Opposition were in their places, and we took the decision in Opposition on this particular Resolution. Believe me, Sir, I do not want to feel myself guilty of agreeing today to proceeding with this Resolution in the absence of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and other hon. members from this side. I appreciate the point made by the Leader of the House that if it is not passed today, some further difficulty can be created when the question of appropriation comes; but if the Leader of the House had indicated that to the Leader of the

Opposition two days ago, I would have been in a better position today to tell the Minister what our feeling on the matter is now, and believe me, I would not like the Resolution to be proceeded with without the Deputy Leader of the Opposition being present or having been told of our decision to proceed with it today. I really would not like it to be felt - I appreciate the fact that in the Estimates we will have an opportunity to debate this, but I would still like the Minister to appreciate my position today, and today of all days.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Again, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is really in no difficulty; the Resolution asks for certain provision for overtime and other things for a Department. When we were discussing it, the hon. member made certain structures against the Department and indicated a certain course of action. The hon. member and the Minister of Home Affairs are in contact on this matter; but what I am saying is this. If we do not pass this money today, there is no point in my coming next week and asking the House to do it; the people will have to wait until the beginning of the financial year for the new appropriation from which they can take the money and then it will not come back to the House at all. But I still repeat that in the Estimates which we are going to debate at length next week, there is a Head called Printing Office, and there will be full scope in Committee of Supply for the hon. member and other hon. members, to join issue with the Government on any aspect of any Department's working. I am not putting anything over anybody; the alternatives are not between doing it today or doing it next week; the alternatives are between doing it today or not doing it at all.

Mr. HINDS:

I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, that what has just been said by the Minister was not said last week or the week before. In other words, since further consideration was postponed, all of the avenues that are now open to the Leader of the House were available to him, and the Leader of the House did not take advantage of the opportunity to apprise hon. members on this side that he was going to proceed with the Resolution. I am not to be blamed if the Leader finds himself in a sort of predicament. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR I am not in any predicament.) He is not in a predicament because he has his numbers.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

If the hon. member would give way, he asked me why I did not bring this up last week, but did we not devote the most of our time to an Opposition motion which both sides regarded as being important, and we did that to the exclusion of any other business, almost? There will be opportunity next week in the Estimates for a full scale debate on it, and no hon. member would lose his opportunity because we would be in Committee of Supply.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Chairman, what I understood from my hon. colleague is that he is not prepared to be held guilty

of not carrying out the duties which have been more or less delegated to him. He is appealing to the Leader of the House to assist him in this. I will tell him, however, that there is another way of getting out of this; vote against it and I am prepared to give him my wholehearted support. I am prepared to vote with him and divide on it too, and on that score he will not be guilty of by-passing anyone.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

The question is that Head 31 stand part.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, on this question of overtime for the Government Printery.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

For the benefit of the hon. junior member for St. Peter I understand that Head 31 was postponed for further consideration and that is what we are now dealing with.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, we are not dealing with whether or not we should proceed with it; the Leader of the House and myself are trying to find the best way to iron out this matter. 5.25 p.m.

It is not being proceeded with.

Mr. Chairman, before you put the Resolution, or attempt to do anything, I should like to hear from the Leader of the House what plans he has for dealing

with the Resolution. Is he postponing it further? My reason, Mr. Chairman, for making this intimation is to let you know that I intend to speak on the matter if it is proceeded with today.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution be postponed for further consideration.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

We have already passed Head 15 and Head 16, and we are now proceeding with Head 31. It has already been moved and seconded, "That it do now pass." Is the hon. senior member for St. James arising to address the Chair?

Mr. CRAIG:

Yes, Sir; I am having a consultation with the Clerk of the House.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The point is that we are doing the Resolution. Is that okay? We are doing the Resolution, and if they want to talk on it, they can do so. The Opposition cannot tell the Government when it should proceed with a Resolution. When they get in Government they can decide what Resolution they want to do. They do what they want to do under Private Members' Business, and we do what we want to do under Government Business. We are now dealing with this Resolution; let them talk until tomorrow and we are still going to do it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

The question is, "That Head 31 stand part."

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, during the debate on this Resolution some time ago, I gave the House the benefit of knowledge which was at my disposal which could have helped in bringing about a healthy situation at the Government Printery. It was not acted upon at the time when it ought to have been acted upon, but since then, and I must say fully two weeks or more after laying the charges that I laid in this Hon. House, I received a letter from the Minister of Home Affairs. The letter, to my mind, is insulting to any hon. member of this House. The Minister is asking me, as a member of this House, to supply him with the names of persons employed by the Government Printery who have carried out the type of business; that is, persons engaged at the Government Printery and carrying out work for private enterprise.

I told this Hon. House on the last occasion that I was prepared to put at the disposal of this Committee, or any officer concerned, all the information that there was at my disposal, and if the Minister of Home Affairs wanted to be honest, he would not have delayed his request to me for the length of time that he did. I am charging the Minister of Home Affairs with being a party to all that is going on at the Government Printery by giving the culprits an opportunity to hide everything that would have led to the

detection of their crimes. That is what he did.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Home Affairs delayed his letter to me for weeks so that whoever at the Government Printery was involved in any-thing would have been able to get rid of the evidence. That is the type of thing you get. I remember that I called on the Leader of the House and said: "If you want to prove anything, send to the Government Printery and. close it; let us go up there....."

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

For the Information of the hon. Junior member for St. Peter, I think that I have heard this over and over from the hon. Junior member on a speech on this Resolution on this Head, and I am not going to entertain repetition on the part of any hon. member in this Chamber. Now, Standing Order No. 36 states

"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.

If this continues, I will have no other alternative....

Mr. HINDS:

Were you reading to me.Mr. Chairman? You had better learn what is the meaning of the word "tedious". Are you going to tell me that what is going on in the Government is tedious?

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I do not have to learn anything. I have already ruled that the hon. member is repetitious in this debate.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. In accordance with the Standing Orders, I beg to move, "That the question be now put."

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

That is not fair. The Government must never be afraid.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

I beg to second that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Under Order 32.....(Asides.)

The Chair is now speaking. There is a motion before the House,

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

It has not been seconded.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

It has been seconded, and it is in order. Will the hon. senior member for the City take his seat.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I will take my seat in accordance with your Ruling, but I still maintain that it is not fair to try to bring about the closure of the motion. 5.35 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Will the hon. senior member for Bridgetown please take his seat?

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, ...

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Will the hon. junior member for St. Peter please take his seat?

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Chairman, ...

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

There will be no debate. Under Standing Order No, 32 "after a question has been proposed, a Member rising in his place may claim to move "That the question be now put"; and, unless it appears to the Chair that such motion is an abuse of the Rules of the House, or an Infringement of the rights of the minority, the question "That the question be now put" shall be put forthwith and decided without amendment or debate notwithstanding that the Mover has had no opportunity to make his reply."

In my opinion quite sufficient has been said on this Head, and the question now is that the question be now put.

The question that the question be now put was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:-

AYES:

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS; Mr. LOWE; Mr. SPRINGER; Mr. CORBIN; Mr. HOPPIN and Hon. N. W. BOXILL -10.

NOES:

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY;

Mr. HINDS:

(On being called to vote.) Mr. Chairman, this is an occasion upon which I feel that the rights of the minority are being trampled. Under no circumstances should any member of this side be requested to cast his vote one way or another, and we are to appeal, Mr. Chairman, ...

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I would like to inform the hon. junior member for St. Peter that unless during a division a question of order arises, the Chairman will not permit any member to speak other than to answer "Aye" or "No", and that is what I am expecting from the hon. member.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, am I to understand that I cannot speak on this occasion?

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Will the hon. junior member for St. Peter either vote "Aye" or "No"?

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I must vote. If you would tell me what is before the House on which I am asked to vote, I will answer.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. member has to vote "Aye" or "No" that Head 31 stand part. I am sorry -"that the question be now put."

Mr. HINDS:

Which is right?

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

"That the question be now put." Mr. Clerk, please register a vote of "No" for the hon. junior member for St. Peter.

Mr. CRAIG:

(On being called to vote.) Sir, I am not going to attempt to challenge any Rulings of yours. What I am saying is that you permit me to follow convention as set in older Parliaments than this where it is a known fact that members of Parliament can remain covered and speak during a debate.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Only if a question of order arises. I will not permit the hon. member to speak during this division.

Mr. CRAIG:

What I am saying is that you have denied me the right to speak on this motion which was before the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I will ask the Clerk to record your vote.

Mr. CRAIG:

My vote remains "no", but time and history will tell the truth in this.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I am advised that ten hon. members voted "Aye" and three hon. members voted "No". I therefore declare the "Ayes" have it.

The question that Head 31 stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:-

AYES:

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Hon. J. C.. TUDOR; Hon. C.E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS; Mr. LOWE; Mr. SPRINGER; Mr. CORBIN; Mr. HOPPIN and Hon. N. W. BOXILL - 10.

NOES:

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY; Mr. HINDS and Mr. CRAIG - 3.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee

dividing as follows:-

AYES:

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS; Mr. LOWE; Mr. SPRINGER; Mr. CORBIN; Mr. HOPPIN and Hon. N. W. BOXILL - 10.

NOES:

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY; Mr. HINDS and Mr. CRAIG - 3. 5.45 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1969-70 No. 72 A Resolution for \$1,070 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1969-70 No. 73 A Resolution for \$8, 799 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I feel that the Government of this country is selling itself cheaply to the Trade Union movement in this country. You will find that every now and again this Hon. House is pressured into doing this and doing that because the Trade Union says this and the Trade Union says that. Until now, Mr. Chairman, we have not had anything from the Minister or the Government to tell us that a survey has been carried out as to the requirements of Postmen when it comes to the question of delivering mail and doing other duties related thereto. We have it before us that Postmen are to do a 44-hour week and they have been doing this from 15th September, and as a consequence the routes of Postmen have had to be revised. When we look at the number of additional staff that this revision of Postmen's routes has caused us to employ, we must tell ourselves that this is a case where the Government is allowing the tail to wag the dog, and not a case where consideration is being given not merely to the hours of work Postmen must be called upon to perform. We undoubtedly favour that they have a 44-hour week like any other worker; but let us ask ourselves with the present complement of Postmen when the 44-hour week is introduced, to what extent is the community life to suffer as a result of this 44-hour week for Postmen and the paltry additions that we see made to the staff. It is about time that a survey be carried out, and this survey cannot necessarily be determined by the volume of mail pouring into the Post Office; that in itself must be considered, but there are other relevant matters. We have got to see that these routes in themselves cover houses or households that are very remote from other houses when it comes to certain areas in the country districts. One must bear in mind that if Postmen are to perform for eight hours a day and eight hours only, it would mean that in reaching some of these homes much of his eight hours is going to be absorbed. What we are saying is that we do not see anything amongst these figures here where 12 auxiliary Postmen have been employed, four additional clerical officers and 28 Postmen - we do not see that when you check what the former staff of Postmen had been doing over the years, the distances that they have had to cover from time to time, particularly in the country districts, and relate it to the fact that when you knew that those Postmen used to work until 8 o'clock and 10 o'clock at night - in other words, that after leaving their Post Offices some of them used to put in eight hours alone in the evening.

We are not now advocating that these Postmen must put in more than eight hours; we agreed to the 44-hour week; but we are saying that until and unless a survey is carried out to know the requirements of the Postmen, exactly how many Postmen we need to service the Island as a whole, we are going to have supplementary Resolutions to pay this and to pay that and from one thing to another. The truth is we can either afford to pay our full staff of Postmen or we cannot, and this ought to be regulated by the turnover of the Department concerned. The Post Office in itself is somewhat revenue-earning, and when one looks at all that is involved, there has been an upgrading of some Postmen to supervisory staff. That in itself is good; but are we having enough of these people of the regular run of Postmen to service the routes? I wonder if the Minister is in a position to tell us whether or not a survey has been carried out, or if it is a case where the staff is being brought up to full strength or is being phased over a period of time.

5.55 p.m.

Something has to be done. We appreciate the fact that things will cost money, and it may not be that it could be found to measure up with the cost of all of these things at once. Nevertheless, we would like to be told what is the Government's plan in this particular respect and if, in the meantime, there is any delay in the delivery of mails to any particular area and, if so, what Government intends to do to relieve the situation.

Now, I cannot see how planning, as in the case of our Postal Services, could be of any account when we see here in these Notes that this expenditure could not have been anticipated. I do not understand what is meant by that, and I would certainly like the Minister to explain this point. Before you took a decision to let Postmen work a 44-hour week, it was necessary to take all the circumstances surrounding the matter into consideration. If you have X number of Postmen doing so much work and working so many hours, when the same amount of work has to be done by shortening the hours of those Postmen, then how many additional Postmen would be required to execute that amount of work, all working at 44 hours a week?

Mr. Chairman, this matter has not been gone into properly, because you will see that if you have to recruit an additional number of Postmen, you will have to plan and to go into full details as to the cost over a period and up to the end of the financial year. It is known that during the months of November and December the workload on all Post Offices must be heavier than at other periods during the course of the year. Surely, the Minister and his Department would have at their disposal the benefit of their experience gained in previous years. If they found that, by recruiting during that heavy period, an additional 28 Postmen or whatever number they recruited last year was inadequate, they could, from the volume of work and the extra amount of hours that the Postmen were called upon to work, arrive at how many Postmen should be employed when a similar period presents itself. I am sure hon. members will agree that it is not good enough to say that it is therefore necessary to supplement this vote further as this additional expenditure could not be anticipated.

Mr. Chairman, there is the question of a cycle allowance for Postmen. We see here that it is difficult to forecast accurately the amount required under this Item. That sounds more reasonable, because a Postman might set out today to go on foot or by bicycle, but he finds after a month or two at it that he requires speedier or more easily negotiable transportation and he moves up to a scooter, an auticycle or a motor cycle, as the case may be. I think that, even in this particular respect, it is about time that a review of the allowances given to these Postmen be carried out. I see here that Postmen are given in the case of bicycles, autocycles, scooters and motor cycles \$3.00, \$7.50 and \$10.00 respectively. I take it that this is a monthly allowance.

Now, in the case of a Postman riding a bicycle to cover his route, exactly what in terms of today can \$3.00 do to that bicycle after it has been ridden by a Postman for one month? In terms of today's money

values, the least a Postman should be given as a bicycle allowance is \$5.00 a month as the minimum. Sir, \$3.00 means absolutely nothing to a Postman today. What can \$3.00 buy for a bicycle? If we were to decide on \$5.00 as a minimum for those who ride bicycles, then we could arrange a grading accordingly for those who ride scooters, autocycles and motorcycles. I am sure we would find ourselves with figures beginning at \$5.00, \$10.00 and even going to \$12.00 to \$15.00 for those who ride motor cycles, because the cost of repairs to bicycles, motor cycles or autocycles is not what it used to be in years gone by. Therefore to give a Postman, who rides a bicycle, a monthly allowance of \$3.00 is to give him nothing whatsoever to look after the wear and tear of his bicycle.

Now, I see here in the Parcel Post Department that there is a very bad breakdown of an adding machine. They say that repairs have been frequent and it is estimated that the repairs now required will cost \$180.00. The absence of this machine is creating undue hardship in a branch where figure work is a constant feature of its activity. We have heard that a Board of Survey convened by the Ministry of Finance has recommended that the machine be replaced. A new machine will cost \$360.00. 6.05 p.m.

It is recommended that this machine should be acquired as soon as possible so as to avoid delays in the processing of documents for the release of goods. The last sentence says that such delays might very well lead to public criticism. At long last we find that Civil Servants who prepare the Addenda are coming around to appreciating the fact that public criticism is something to be taken into account. I would like to hear from the Minister as regards this adding machine that is frequently breaking down what make machine it is, how old it is, if the machine has not served the length of time one considers it ought to have served, bearing in mind the pressure that it is put through from time to time, if Government is now seeking to replace the machine by one of a similar name, or whether it is a case where Government is trying to put itself in the position of bringing in a new machine from one of these firms that tells Gov- eminent that it can supply the machine but cannot guarantee servicing it. These are points I would certainly like to hear the Minister give an explanation on.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Chairman, I want to direct my attention to the Post Office particularly, If there is a service which I believe is still not in keeping with the 1970's, it is that of the Post Office. It is no wonder that yesterday evening at the Parcel Post a young Civil Servant suffered embarrassment at the hands of a man called Henderson who lives at Hastings when the young Civil Servant asked him to open a package which was supposed to have contained worn clothing, and I hope the Minister will look into this. I am sorry the Leader of the House is not in his place because he always asks to bring these things to the attention of the Government. After the boy had charged him \$1.49, he took the paper in which the clothes were wrapped and struck the boy in his face with it. When I say that we are selling this country to foreign vagabonds, members on the other side say that investors in Barbados would not get up. This is only one instance of what you are going to see day after day in this country. The boy took the same piece of paper and put a paper weight in it and threw it half-heartedly at the man, and this American villain walked through the door. I am sorry I was not close enough at the time it happened. (Mr. CORBIN To show

your black power!) Sir, I would like to be in a rum shop to really curse him because that is the only language that nuisance can understand.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Members not addressing the Chair must observe the Standing Orders.

Mr. CRAIG:

I remember that during the Estimates the Hon. Minister said he was going to change the uniform of the Postmen. One would have thought that you would now see them in a light uniform in keeping with a tropical country, but I have seen them looking like an old Sergeant-Major with a Salvation Army cap. I would like to know where the Minister found the people who recommended this type of uniform. You talk about getting away from the Colonial days, but the Postmen are still wearing black pants and khaki shirts, and many of them are in the unfortunate position of not being able to spell or read properly. I experienced this at my office. I am not saying it is any fault of theirs. I have had a postman bringing letters to my house that reminds me of a man called Worrell who is always around the lawyers' offices in James Street who brought a letter to me and asked if I was the person, and when I looked at it it was addressed to Marcus Jordan. He apparently was told to take it to where Craig works. I hope the Minister will look into the whole structure of the Post Office.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand how it is possible that a letter can take two or three days to get from America, and it sometimes takes two days for a letter to get from Bridgetown to Enterprise. I drew this to the attention of the Minister who told me that he was very dissatisfied with conditions at the Post Office. I do not know if it is a lack of space. We heard Government was to build a new Post Office, but we have seen no signs of it. We know that one was built at Eagle Hall, but of course the mercantile community will know of these things before members of Parliament. However, I am hoping that the Minister will at least tell us what plans Government has for re-organising the Post Office in which people's mail can be delivered in a time that is in keeping with this age, I remember, too, applying to the Post Office for a post-box and being told that it would take me very nearly two or three years before I could get one. You have 250,000 people in Barbados and many Industries are coming in, and yet the Post Office remains the same, and Postmen dress as in 1937. We know there is a shortage of post-boxes and a delay in postal deliveries, and I feel that we can at least remove the cap from the Postmen's heads and give them something which is in keeping with modern trends.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, when the Minister gets up to reply, I should like to hear him explain what is responsible for the repeated shortage of certain denominations of postal stamps. 6.15 p.m.

Every now and again you cannot get a 4 stamp that is very regular in demand. Just a few days ago you could not get penny stamps, and this has been going on now for some weeks, and is happening just a bit too often. Something is wrong somewhere; there are other denominations of postage stamps that are very much requested for the mailing of certain letters overseas, but exactly what is wrong?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Chairman, I will deal with the last speaker first. He said that some bully went into the Post Office and hit some youngster in his face.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, the Minister said he was replying to the last speaker first. I was the last speaker and I did not say anything of anybody being struck in the face. The records must be put straight. (Hon. N. W. BOXILL I was not talking about him.) I rose on a point of order to correct something he said.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. junior member is on a point of order.

Mr. HINDS:

The Minister said he was replying to the last speaker first. I was the last speaker, and the Minister went on to say that this last speaker had said that somebody had struck somebody else, but I never said so.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member got up just as I was about to speak and said that before I replied he wanted to say something; so in my opinion he was not the last speaker. I said I was dealing with the last speaker first who spoke about some American vagabond striking somebody in his face; but one day somebody gave me a cuff in my stomach and he was not an American. I hit back the man and he was sorry. If this thing took place in the Parcel Post, I am sorry for the youngster; but these youngsters, instead of trying to be helpful to some of us who look like them, they get very rude. I am very sorry it happened, but I would not accuse any nationality for this because you get vagabondism all over the world, and there is no maybe about this, There are quite A number of these people who come down here, and some live among us who have no respect for us; we cannot question this because right inside this Chamber we have no respect for each other; and you hear some of the worst things being said on the floor of this House; so what do you expect? I will try to carry out an Investigation, but it is time that some of these youngsters, instead of being fresh, try to be more courteous to the public, Anyhow, this is

by the way, and as I told the hon. member, I will try to investigate it.

The hon. member went on to talk about the Postmen's uniform. I do not work at the Post Office. I am a Minister, but the Postmen themselves are the people who asked for this uniform, and it is not true to say that they have gone back to the same old thing, because they are using polyester. I do not find anything wrong with the peak cap; they asked for it too; I think they look very smart in it. I do not accept that there is too slow a delivery of mails; I myself have got mail delivered to me long after the time at which it should have been delivered, but I can say this for this Post Office that it is one of the most up-to-date Post Offices in the entire world. I looked at the record when I was in Japan, and I saw that Formosa was first, then the United States and then some of the other countries. They grade the performance of the Post Offices according to the population, and they allow one Post Office for about 500 people. But Barbados is way above the other West Indian countries, and anyone who wishes to pay a visit to the Post Office can let me know and I will be willing to show them the kind of work that has to be done.

We must be realistic; Barbados is the only country in the world where the Postmen have to find people by their names. All over the world numbers are used and this is a great help to Postmen; but the Postmen in Barbados have to stop at every house and ask for the person whose name is on the envelope. People like to make complaints against the Postmen, but imagine that somebody made a noise because a letter was posted from England and they got it in three or four days' time - and that was a big thing for them, which is nonsense, because they did not even know if the letter was delayed in England!

The hon. member went on to talk about the shortage of Post Office boxes, but the whole gist of this thing is that we all know that the Post Office has outgrown itself. The reason why you cannot get Post Office boxes is that we do not have the facilities to put these boxes up, and this is why, when we are building the new Post Office, we are going to put in a number of boxes. If I had my way, the Post Office would be finished ever since, but the site we had for the Post Office is too small. In order to accommodate the general public, the Post Office must be a ground floor building because if you have a building with storeys you will have to mechanise the operations, and there will be a lot of trouble and confusion at any time when the electricity breaks down. If you have a building with at least one storey, the top floor may be reserved for the office for the Postmaster General and others.

6.25 p.m.

I am asking the hon. member to bear with me, (Asides)

Mr. CRAIG; On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, The hon. member said that the site which was

originally selected for the new Post Office is too small. He also said that they will build a new Post Office in the coming financial year; then they must have plans by now as to where they are going to put it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

That is no point of order. Mr. CRAIG I am not finished yet, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

That is not a point of order, and I so rule.

Mr. CRAIG:

How can you determine that before I have finished making my speech?

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

That is not a point of order; let the hon. junior member for St. Thomas proceed.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is wrong and, therefore, he must accept the Ruling of the Chair.

Mr. CRAIG:

On a point of order, Sir, Will the Hon. Minister state whether it is possible.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

That is not a point of order. Will the hon. junior member for St. Thomas proceed?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Chairman, everybody gets up in here on a fictitious point of order, but I would not say "fraudulent". What the hon. member has not been fully cognisant of is that you can only get up on a point of order if a member misquotes something and you get up to correct him. What he wanted to rise on was a point of elucidation. Mr. Chairman, the new Post Office was to be sited somewhere below the

Market. (Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY You are in the Cabinet and you do not even know where it will be put!)

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Hon. members not addressing the Chair!

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Chairman, I am the Minister of Communications and Works; so I must be a village idiot. The hon. member asked me a question, and here comes an interrupter to tell me that I do not know about it. I said that it was expected to be placed below the Market. (Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY No, They have changed that decision, and you do not even know that!)

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Is the hon. member addressing the Chair?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Yes, Mr. Chairman, but do you mean that I cannot listen to anybody? I have two ears; I am giving you one and using the other one over here. Coming back to the junior member for St. Peter, he is an authority on every subject except how to make a bake. He said something that was not true. He said that there was always a shortage of denominational stamps, but that is not true. There is a shortage of 4 stamps right now.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. On the question of the shortage of these 4 stamps, I buy quite a number of 4 stamps weekly. I sent my bearer to the Post Office and he cannot get them. I had to ring the Postmaster about the matter. The Postmaster told me to send to him personally and he would go around somewhere - I do not like that sort of thing. You either have them for sale or you do not have them for sale.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Point made.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

What the hon. member and most members on that side do not seem to understand is that we do not print stamps. The stamps are printed in England. I was pointing out to some person today that the big concerns are not going to leave off printing sixty million stamps for Britain or France to print five million stamps for Barbados. Very often when we send up an order for stamps a strike may take place, and we have to wait until the stamps arrive. When we are not selling stamps we are losing money. Do not let anybody get the idea that the Postmaster General has stamps hidden away in his pockets. I do not want the hon. member for St. Peter to get in here and give the impression that he went to the Postmaster and he got stamps for him.

Mr. Chairman, what we are now doing is to overprint some of the stamps in order that we may have enough of a particular denomination to sell to the general public. (Asides)

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be tedious or fastidious, but I just want to point out to the Committee that when hon. members, especially the junior member for St. Peter and a few others, are ranting or raving..... (Asides) If you think the words are unparliamentary, then I beg to withdraw them. (Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Right, go-ahead now.) I want to explain to this Chamber how the hon. junior member for St. Peter likes to take things out of context. Now, this is what the Addendum says

"An amount of \$60, 575 was originally provided under this item to meet payment of salaries to Auxiliary Postmen and allowances to Postmen for extra deliveries during periods of pressure and substitutes for Postmen on leave; also to pay for clearing certain rural posting boxes. Following the decision to introduce a forty-four hour week for Postmen from 15th September, 1969, it has been necessary to revise the Postmen's routes and also employ four (4) additional Clerical Officers, twenty-eight (28) Postmen and twelve (12) Auxiliary Postmen. Supplementary provision of \$15, 246 was Included in Resolution No. 57/1969 to meet the payment of salaries to the 12 Auxiliary Postmen to the end of the current financial year. Total provision under this item to date is therefore \$60, 575 plus \$15, 246 making a total of \$75, 821."

Now, when the hon. member got up to speak I did not want to stop him, Mr. Chairman, because I thought you would have done so. The hon. member was reflecting on a vote of the House already taken some time ago. This is true; but I did not want him to believe that I wanted to stop him from talking and I allowed him to do so. He was debating something that has already been debated in the House. (Asides) Look in your Standing Orders and you will see the position. Apparently, the hon. member does not understand what I have read. The matter was dealt with in Resolution No. 57 on the 22nd December, 1969.

The Addendum goes on to state:

"Pending establishment of the additional posts of 28 Postmen referred to above - which became effective on 22nd December, 1969, it was also necessary to meet payment of these salaries from Item 14 - Auxiliary Postmen. It is therefore necessary to supplement this vote further as this additional expenditure could not be anticipated and was not included in the provision under this item."

The hon. member went on to say that we do not do proper planning, because we come in here haphazardly. How in the name of good government can anybody know that the people in England, Canada and the United States were going to send more letters to Barbados? How would we know this? Only God would know this.

6.35 p.m.

What the hon. member was saying is not true. He was trying to score a point, but he failed because we could not know and plan for it. The hon. member further said that the Government is always willing to acquiesce to the Union. I myself as Minister of Communications and Works thought that Postmen here were working a bit too hard, because I saw them on Saturdays delivering letters at 3 o'clock and 4 o'clock in the afternoon when other workers had gone home. I thought this was not fair to them because they are human beings and deserve time off like the other workers; so when the Union came up with the suggestion of having, the system revised to a 44-hour week where delivery in Bridgetown would end at 2 o'clock, I thought this was extremely reasonable and the hon. member thought so too; but he wants to get up in here and say something. As the Leader of the House said, today is the hon. member's day. The cats are out; so the rats are taking possession. The hon. member went on to talk about the bicycle allowance and I knew he was groping in the dark. He did not have much to say, but he wanted to prolong the agony. What he does not understand is that the Postmen are from among us. The hon. member thought he was going to say something because tomorrow or maybe Thursday you would see a blown-up picture in the Advocate that the Opposition has been doing this and the next to the Government. (Mr. HINDS; What is wrong with that?) The hon. member asks me what is wrong with that. It is Inherently dishonest.

Before I conclude, the hon. member wanted to know something About the adding machine, but I think he will be satisfied if I gave him the reply later.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1969-70 No. 63 Head 16 - Prime Minister's Office - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, when we left off discussion on this Resolution, we were considering the appropriation for the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation, and two things emerged in the discussion so far as I can recall, the more important of which was that hon. members asked for the accounts which have subsequently been laid. I do not know if any question arises out of hon. members' perusal of these accounts.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, we have the Annual Report and Statement of Accounts for the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation. In the Report on finance, it says that on March 30, 1968, the Corporation obtained a loan of \$2, 100,000 from the Government of Barbados and they used that loan to repay loans from the Port Authority and the Bank of Nova Scotia. The Report goes on to tell us other things and to provide food for thought, and we have got to be very careful with these Resolutions that come before us for these Corporations, because however one may look at it, whenever C.B.C. finds itself in financial difficulty, the taxpayers of this country through the 24 members of the House have got to bail them out, so to speak. The Report tells us that this loan carries interest at prime bank rate, payable monthly, and the principal sum is repayable in quarterly instalments commencing on March 31, but they now give us early warning that the amount that will be -come payable on March 31, 1970, will be \$52,000 and that they do not have the money to pay.

Now Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation have a net loss for the year ended 31st December, 1968, of \$306, 416. The expenses for the year were \$404, 765 on programmes. I do not refer to the amount of \$141, 693 on engineering, but I wonder if the Minister is in a position to explain why their sales expenses happen to be as high as \$30, 698. In the year 1966 the amount was \$29, 149, and in 1967 it went up to \$33, 975, and now for the year 1968 it was \$30, 698. 6.45 p.m.

The Minister ought to be seised with the facts surrounding this: that is, what caused the amount that was spent in 1967, and similarly the amount which is just about \$3,000 less for the year 1968 on sales. I wonder if the Minister is now in a position to tell us exactly how much money has been paid to the Thomson organisation or a kindred organisation in which Thomson or a group of people might have an interest, because we want to see exactly where you are spending too much money, what is carrying up your net loss to \$306,000 on a revenue-earning concern. Nobody wants to question the \$184, 858 that is spent on administration; but when you look at the Report, it is telling you that the expenses of your

valuation costs increased by \$58,000, thereby reflecting the high rates that have to be paid, and this very high interest expense highlights an inherent weakness in the Corporation's capital structure. Mr. Chairman, this is a very, very serious admission and yet a warning to this Hon. House, because when you are told that the capital structure of the Corporation is weak, and that the high rates of interest are reflected in this, this is a very, very serious matter; and when it tells us further that consideration will have to be given to re-organising the capital structure so as to reduce or eliminate this heavy interest burden in the future, we have got to be very careful.

We have seen from these figures that the Corporation is making it abundantly clear that it is incapable, so to speak, of earning enough money to put its own house in order, to strengthen its capital structure. If that is the case, why do we not see here reflected in the Balance Sheet figures which point out to us where these serious losses are that are weakening the capital structure of your organisation? It is not easy for people merely to put something down here that could have no meaning. I do not accept it at all, and the Minister ought by now to have an explanation of these points I am raising here today. To look at this Balance Sheet the only thing that has saved the Corporation up to now is the depreciation that has been allowed by law; if not it would have gone under, because when you depreciate the value of your equipment, you still have it there. I am tempted now to look back on the amount of money that has been spent on administration, and we find that in 1967 \$211, 461 was spent on administration; how does the Minister account for spending less on administration? Did you dismiss staff, or did you not replace somebody who left? What is responsible for it? Obviously, Mr. Chairman, these things must mean something to the Minister.

In this Report, signed by Mr. Hunte as Chairman, it admits enough to call on the Government to dismiss the whole Board at the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation. It says here in the penultimate paragraph: "It is also determined, by careful planning and selection, to broadcast programmes on both Television and Radio that are a credit to Barbados and reflect the talent and culture of the country, " Is that an admission that they are not doing that now? If they have not been doing what they ought to have been doing, and cause us to find that they have a net loss of \$306, 416, where else in the world could these people find employment? They should have been sacked long ago; but one of the troubles with the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation is that the majority of appointments to this Board are political appointments, and we do not attach enough Importance to this fact that having appointed your own friends, politicians or associations, whatever they might be, when the affairs of the institution or the Corporation get into the red, we have got to take taxpayers' money and put it back in order. These are things we have to address our minds to. Can the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation account for the loss of \$306, 416? What has gone wrong? I would like to see if the Minister is in a position at this stage to throw any light on any point that I have raised.

If you were to look at the Balance Sheet, before cutting off the depreciation which stands at \$191, 328.33, before writing off the depreciation, they were losing \$190, 184.72. As I have said earlier, the only thing that has saved the Corporation is the right to write off this depreciation, so that they have an

operating loss of \$387, 513.05. This is murder to the poor taxpayers of this country, and nobody at C.B.C. has to care. This is preposterous. What is it that CBC is engaging in? How much money are they paying Thomson people? How much money are they paying by way of commission on their sales? Are they paying away too much there by paying people a commission for telling them where they can get cheap films of a roguish nature? These are things that the Minister must tell us about, because after all it is not good housekeeping. There is nothing in this Statement of Accounts that shows us that any member of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation, if he knows anything about business administration, has applied his know-how to help the Corporation -nothing whatsoever. 6.55 p.m.

It would mean that they enjoy the prestige of sitting on this Board because they have been appointed by the Government. We are concerning ourselves with the fact that it is all taxpayers' money that is being used in this matter. It is not good, and I would certainly like to hear the Minister tell us something about what has gone wrong with Carib-been Broadcasting affairs. We do not expect the Caribbean Broadcasting Company to make a profit, but if they would even attempt to balance their budget we would be glad. There is nothing in this Statement of Accounts to show that they are trying to balance their budget. This is not good housekeeping and it is not good business. Something must be done about this matter.

Mr. Chairman, if the Minister has something to say about this matter, we have \$404, 765 spent on their programmes; let us hear something about how the money is spent and where we are losing money.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I do not think I can reply between now and when the break comes, and I suggest that we take the break now.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress... (Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

No. You can go on.) Well, Mr. Chairman, I have been invited by hon. members to reply. I will try to condense what I have to say in the shortest possible time, but still do justice to the points raised by the hon. member. First of all, I should like to point out that this Statement of Accounts deals with the financial year ended 31st December, 1968, and all that is reflected here would, of course, be the financial position of the Corporation as of that date.

I understand - I do not know in what detail -that the following Financial Report - that is to say, the one for 1969 - will show a slight improvement in some aspects. I do not have the details of this, because the Report for 1969 will not come before the Cabinet until probably April or May this year. You will see

here in respect of this one that the Chartered Accountants have dated the 1968 Report the 1st April, 1969, and assuming that this is the earliest possible time that they will complete it, I am saying that the Corporation will not receive the 1969 Report and Statement of Accounts until 1970 in April or May.

May I just point out some of the difficulties of the Corporation. Up to 1968 - that is to say the year after we refinanced the Corporation by a Resolution of this House - rather in the same year March, 1968, we refinanced the Corporation and, therefore, these Accounts reflect the state of affairs in that same year, and in that year and up to that year the Corporation was still bound in some way to pay the Thomson Enterprises certain commissions on sales, management fees, and so on. This has been discontinued since 1968, and this is why I say that the 1969 Report will show a difference in this respect in that it will show the discontinuance of that. After 1968 we have not paid Thomson anything. (Asides)

Mr. Chairman, I cannot give the hon. member the amount now; I really cannot do so. After 1968 we have discontinued paying Thomson Enterprises and, therefore, there will be an improvement in the operating capital position in 1969.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the House is basing his projected improvement from the amount to be saved from not having to pay the Thomson organisation. If he is basing it on that, then the Minister ought to be able to tell me how much money was paid to Thomson in 1968.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

That is not a point of order.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, it is better for me to say that I cannot give him the figures than to hazard a guess and be proved wrong. I will stick to what I said that it will show an improvement. Secondly, I want to tell the hon. member that another improvement he will notice when he sees the 1969 Report is that the revenue from the T.V. licences will be much in excess of what is shown here for last year. Last year there were about 17,000 or 18,000 and at \$10.00 it should be about \$170,000, whereas in the previous year, I think, we only collected about one-third of that amount. With those two things the cash position is bound to be better.

The question that Head 16 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for one hour.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

7.05 p.m.

On resumption:

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I observe there is no quorum and ask that you direct the Clerk to ring the Bell.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I thank the hon. member. Let the Bell be rung.

The Bell was rung and a Quorum was obtained.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER:

When the sitting was suspended, the House was in Committee of Supply. To that it now reverts.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1969-70 No. 63 (Cont'd.)

Head 36 - Waterworks - was called.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 36 - Waterworks - stand part.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, we have in this year 1970 the sad plight of people still having to depend on water being carried to them by motor lorry. We have had geologists of some note who told us that all that was necessary in the case of Barbados was to pump the water out of the belly of the earth, We have on the other hand seen or heard nothing which is contrary to what was told us by Professor Senn in this respect, What you will find, Mr. Chairman, is that the need, if it does exist in truth and in fact, for carrying water from time to time to people by motor lorry is something which could perhaps be placed not in the movement of things in the year 1970, but that we need a proper approach to the area of water that is imbedded beneath, and a more comprehensive approach towards bringing it to the surface, We do not know what surveys have been carried out to carry water to the several villages after bringing it to the surface, especially in those areas that are now served by the motor lorries. I am willing to admit that there are certain areas in each parish where in another fifty years you will find it difficult to carry pipe-borne water to these people. As time goes on, we will find people coming around to the idea of having to remove from these remote areas to occupy better sites where community services can be made available to them. With our likes and dislikes in matters of this sort, we must of necessity in our daily rounds educate our people into appreciating this because any Government can have a plan for carrying water into the homes of every householder in the community, but a lot more will have to be done to put this into effect in its entirety.

Now there are to be found, Mr. Chairman, still a number of people who are living in areas which have been supplied with water, but we must say that the effort was not what it ought to have been. I speak now with particular reference to Mangrove Tenantry, which borders on Black Bess in St. Peter. This is a case where a small galvanised pipe has been used for perhaps a convenience to convey water to residents in that particular village. I must say that the number of people in that village has been increasing rapidly over the past six or seven years, but today you will find that the demands on the one standpipe in the area are so great that the amount of water that flows through that small bore is insufficient to meet the needs of the people. I am to ask the Minister responsible to see if something can be done to ease the situation for the people in that village. There are many other areas in the parish of St. Peter where the people are crying out for a better service. At Rock Dundo in St. Peter there is a need for more standpipes, and something has got to be done. If a pipeline of good enough size is carried into these areas, there are people who would be glad to tap the service and have it direct to their homes; but with the pipeline being so small, it just cannot work. I am asking the Minister to see whether he can use his materials or whatever is available to him in these, areas. I ask him not to do it on the regular Party basis of looking into those areas that support them. We do not want to see this motor lorry system in operation throughout 1970, if possible. We would like to know that the requirements of the people are met wherever possible. We cannot expect the impossible in a matter of this sort because we have got to bear in mind that money is involved in carrying water to people in the various villages, and whilst some of the money is in itself repayable by the people, we would like to know that something is done to improve this system.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to hold up the Resolution. I see there is an amount required in the case of plumbing, I believe that the Water-works Department is suffering through the lack of enough plumbers to cater to the needs of the people who want services installed. I think I am right in saying so because

private contractors are themselves finding it difficult to get plumbers, and I urge upon the Minister responsible to call upon the Government to institute instruction through the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic where they can train plumbers. I can say that during the past year I know that nearly forty young men and a young woman went overseas to study plumbing. If we are going to have our Polytechnic, it should be catering to needs of people in things that really matter.

8.15 p.m.

Plumbing is an exercise that should be taught at the Polytechnic without any delay whatsoever, and if that is done for a few months, I feel that the Waterworks Department would benefit greatly. We need this type of training because quite a lot of plumbing is going on in our building enterprise and something should be done about it.

The question that Head 36 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 45 - Item 43, Clothing and Bedding, stand part.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported

the passing of seven Resolutions in Committee of Supply and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

RESOLUTION re. COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT COVERLEY, CHRIST CHURCH

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

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

RESOLUTION re COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT FAIRCHILD STREET,

BRIDGETOWN

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER:

Order No.5 stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to provide for the control, maintenance and development of the public parks and beaches of Barbados.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I would like.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

Is the hon. member moving the second reading?

Mr. HINDS:

I would like to confer with the Leader of the House on this. This Bill is not as simple as it looks, and it is a Bill certainly on which the observations of the full Opposition should be invited.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

As a matter of fact, I repeat what I said earlier on that matter. Money has to be provided in the Estimates for this, and as a matter of fact we will have to move in a sum for this because we could not put in money before we had passed this Bill; so we have to clear all this work to proceed with the Appropriation Bill. We are trying to clear all this tonight and I am asking the hon. member to allow us to proceed with it. If the hon. member wishes to raise any points I will answer them.

Mr. HINDS:

This Bill in itself.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time, but the point the hon. member made about having the presence of the full Opposition - when the hon. senior member for Christ Church intimated to me that he would not be here this week, I raised with him two or three matters -not the Printery matter. I asked the hon. Deputy Leader of the Opposition whether he would be willing to come back a second day last week, Friday, and both he and the hon. junior member for Bridge-town said "No"; they were not willing to come back on Friday. If we had had the second meeting last week, if we had finished the

Development Plan, all of this would have been done then; so I am not taking any advantage of the hon. members' absence. We have to do the Estimates next week; so we have to clear all this before then.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

It is alright to say that there is nothing wrong with it. 8.25 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to establish a Commission. I am sure that the Reporters are going to cry out before this Bill is finished tonight. I am asking him not to proceed with this Bill. The speech that I am going to make will take up more than two hours, and you are going to run into difficulty. (Hon. J. G. TUDOR: You doubt yourself.) It is not a question of doubting myself. This is a Bill Which needs the careful examination of every hon.member on this side of the House. It is not a foolish Bill. (Asides.) This is not selling yourself for money! (Hon. J. C, TUDOR I beg your pardon.) i am not replying to you. What are you doing about this Bill?

Hon. J. C, TUDOR:

Mr .Speaker, could not the hon. member make his speech and condense it by referring to those points he wishes to make and not take two hours? The hon. member is capable of saying what he wishes to say as effectively as he can in the shortest possible time.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Acting Leader of the Opposition gave way, and he is entitled to proceed.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks, among other things, to establish a Commission to be known as the Parks and Beaches Commission. It will have the directions of the Minister responsible for land, and the Commission will in itself be responsible for the maintenance and development of parks and conservation areas in the Island. I would have been glad in the first place, Mr. Speaker, if attached to this Bill there had been a Schedule which would have contained all such areas that are considered conservation areas in this Island. This is a Bill which is going to have complete control of the maintenance and development of beaches in this Island.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the question of beach development, this borders on the prerogative or the right of the Town And Country Planning Department, because it is land development. Beach development is also land development, and you cannot get away from that. It is part and parcel of the Town And Country Planning Department's function. It also goes further where we are going to find that some of the community services now provided by the Jaycees will be taken up, because this Commission is going to be responsible now for the Life Guard Service at beaches. I do not for the life of me see, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to have the Jaycees operating a Life Guard Service and the Beach Commission operating a Life Guard Service. They must all be incorporated into one Service.

Mr. Speaker, here is a case where we should find provision for the money now being spent by the Jaycees in the Life Guard Service to be thrown into the coffers of the Beach Commission for effecting the Service. Now, we have had evidence that the Life Guard Service ought to be extended very much further around the Island than we have seen it in the past. This in itself might be the result of (a) not sufficient planning, and (b) lack of finance. We are glad to see that the Beach Commission is to be established, but what one must be very careful about is to see that the Beach Commission does not use the powers given to it in this Bill to encroach upon the rights and privileges of owners of private property in this Island. (Asides.)

Mr. Speaker, I see the Leader of the House shaking his head and saying that that will not happen. I wish I could accept what the Minister is trying to convey to me, but there is nothing to prevent that. For instance, this Beach Commission is going to advise the Minister on certain functions, that is to say, for the erection of groynes, recreational facilities at beaches and so on. Honestly, Sir, I am speaking on this Bill, but it is a Bill of such far-reaching consequences that I would have preferred, even at this stage, for further consideration to be postponed. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: After the second reading.) I understand that we will pass the second reading of the Bill and stop there. I will make a third reading speech.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that further consideration of the Bill be now postponed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

8.35 p.m.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT
SPENCERS AND HOPE FIELD
PLANTATIONS

Mr. SPEAKER:

Order No. 6 stands in the name of the

. Hon. Prime Minister and it is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of a parcel of land situate at Spencers and Hopefield Plantations, Christ Church for the purpose of erecting a Radar Station.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of this Order.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to take charge of the Resolution, and unless there is any objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted the Hon. Leader of the House.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, this is part, of course, of the general development of Seawell. The amount of land required for it is two acres or thereabouts, and this is going to be done in conjunction with the Canadian Government, with the Bellairs and Brace Experiments Institute as well as the HARP project. I do not know how much more hon. members wish to know about it.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass. Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, Order No. 7.

THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1970

Mr. SPEAKER:

Order No. 7 stands in the name of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister and it is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1970.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of this Order.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to take charge of this Resolution, and unless there is any objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted the Hon. Leader of the House.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I think there is a wealth of detail setting out the purpose of this particular Resolution. I do not know if there is anything else hon. members would like to know.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE REPORT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I think at this stage, before we come to the end, I should like to present this Further Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider, review and revise the salaries and emoluments of the Members and Officers of the House.

"The Select Committee appointed to consider, review and revise the salaries and emoluments of the Members and Officers of the House, have the honour to present the following further Report:-

The Committee held a meeting on Wednesday, 4th March, 1970, at which the following Members were present:-

His Honour the Speaker, Sir Theodore

Brancker, Q.C., M.P. Hon. J. C. Tudor, C.M.G., M.A., M.P., Hon. N. W. Boxill, M.P., Mr. E. D. Mottley, C.B.E., J.P., M.P., Mr. H. B. St. John, Q.C., LL.B., M.P., Mr. J. B. Yearwood, J.P., M.P., Mr. W. C. B. Hinds, M.P.

2. The Committee duly considered the "Bill to "make provision for payment of allowance to Members of the Honourable Senate and to amend and "consolidate the law relating to the remuneration of "Members of the House of Assembly, "which had been referred to them by instruction of the House of Assembly, at its meeting held on 3rd March, 1970, and duly recommend that the said Bill be amended, as follows:

(1) that Clause 3 (1) of the said Bill be deleted therefrom, and that the following be substituted therefor:

"Payment of salaries and allowances to members of the House of Assembly

3. (1) Subject to 'the provisions of subsection (2) members of the House of Assembly shall be remunerated as follows:

(a) the Speaker shall be entitled during his tenure of that office to receive salary at the rate of \$9,600 per annum a travelling allowance of \$1,800 per annum and a non -accountable entertainment allowance of \$1,200 per annum:

Provided that for the purposes of this paragraph "tenure of office" includes any period during a dissolution of Parliament;

(b) the Deputy Speaker shall be entitled during his tenure of that office to receive salary at the rate of \$5, 760 per annum and a duty allowance of \$1,800 per annum;

Provided that when the Deputy Speaker carries out the duties of the Speaker during any period when Parliament is dissolved, he shall be entitled during such period to receive salary at the rate attached to

the office of Speaker;

(c) the Chairman of Committees shall be entitled during his tenure of that office to receive salary at the rate of \$6,000 per annum, and a duty allowance of \$1,800 per annum;

(d) the Leader of the Opposition shall be entitled to receive a salary at the rate of \$6,000 per annum, a travelling allowance of \$1,800 per annum and a non-accountable entertainment allowance of \$1,200 per annum;

(e) the Leader of the House shall be entitled to receive a duty allowance of \$1,800;

(f) every member other than the Speaker, Deputy Speaker, Chairman, of Committees, Leader of the Opposition and any member while in receipt of remuneration as a Minister or Parliamentary Secretary shall be entitled to receive salary at the rate of \$4,800 per annum and a duty allowance of \$1,800 per annum." (2) The Committee are of the opinion that loans for the purchasing of motor cars should be made available to Members of the House of Assembly, to the same extent and upon the same terms and conditions as are at present applicable to members of the Public Service; and recommend that the necessary legislation thereon be drafted and presented for consideration of the House, as soon as possible."

I wish to offer a slight amendment there if I may, the Cabinet supports this in full - that the loan should be made available to members of the House, Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I doubt whether we can incorporate that in the Report.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

No, Sir. I am only intimating this.

" 3. The Committee recommend that the salary scales of the Officers of the House be revised, with

effect from 1st April, 1969, and to be as follows:-

Clerk, House of 7500:

8100; 84008760

Assembly 9120: 9480. x 480

9840: 10, 320 10,800.

Deputy Clerk, House of 5040: 6000 62406480.

Assembly 6720:6960 7200

Librarian & 5040: 6000 62406480

Secretary 6720: 6960 7200.

Secretary 4320: 4560 48005040

Marshal 3420: 3600.

Deputy Marshal 1800: 1920 2040 2160

& Library 2280:

2400 2520 x 180

Attendant - 2700: 2860.

Female Messenger/Cleaner 30.80 per week

It is further recommended that (a) the additional allowance/ granted to the Deputy Marshal and . Library Attendant in respect of late sittings of the House, be increased with effect from 1st April, 1969, from \$48 to \$240 per annum; and (b) that the person at present acting in the said post of Deputy Marshal and Library Attendant be appointed to the said post from the date of commencement of his acting appointment at the minimum point of the scale then existing, and that he be entitled to such increments as might be attached to his salary as from the date of his said appointment.

4. The Committee reserve the right to report further should occasion arise.

Dated this 7th day of March, 1970. Theodore Brancker, Chairman.

I beg to move that this Further Report be now adopted.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

APPOINTMENT OF Mr. ORVILLE BEST AS

DEPUTY MARSHAL AND LIBRARY

ATTENDANT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Mr. Orville Best be now appointed Deputy Marshal and Library Attendant of this House as from the date of commencement of his acting appointment.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill as amended by the Select Committee Report be now read a third time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

8.45 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

This is all, Mr. Speaker. As hon. members know, we have laid the Appropriation Bill and the Estimates. The Minister of Finance will introduce on Tuesday next the Bill, and after any appropriate discussion, the House will go into Committee of Supply on the Estimates and will be in Committee of Supply until the Appropriation 3U1 is finished. I am suggesting therefore that we should meet at 10 o'clock on Tuesday morning next, and I now so move that this House do now adjourn until 10 o'clock on Tuesday, 17th March.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, speaking on the motion for adjournment, as had been intimated earlier today, there is in this Island an institution known as the Barbados Marketing Corporation; in like manner there is a trading concern, an enterprise known as Barbados Sea Foods Company Limited. It is known that Barbados Sea Foods Company Limited has been a tenant, and is a tenant, of the Barbados Marketing Corporation, but the Barbados Sea Foods Company Limited employs something in the region of 300 persons, and my information is that at times they exceed 300. We have got to address our minds to those 300 persons that Barbados Sea Foods Company Limited employ because there has been a threat hanging over the heads of those workers, brought about by circumstances which we will have to investigate. We cannot get away from it for the simple reason that howsoever the Barbados Marketing -Corporation should conduct its business, however it goes about it, if it fails, the taxpayers of this country are called upon to bear the cost of its failure.

In addressing our minds to these phases of activity of the Barbados Marketing Corporation to which I will refer soon, one has got to be very, very careful to see that the Corporation be not ill-advised in its efforts to cause Barbados Sea Foods Company Limited to pull out of Barbados, to cease operations here and go elsewhere. One has got to bear in mind the stage which has been reached, which enables

Barbados Sea Foods to pay by way of income tax \$30, 749.44 to our Government, National Insurance of \$23, 963.10, for the year 1968-69 - and I would like the Minister in charge of the Corporation to take this into consideration and not allow his Corporation to be led away by big-time operators to the detriment of the taxpayers of this country when all is said and done. What the Barbados Marketing Corporation is faced with at the moment is that there is a promoter from the United States - that is what the gentleman is - who is going to come here and launch a business - a great amount of capital is involved -but after he has done the launching and the business collapses, he takes out his money and the taxpayers of this country have to bear the burden. I want to save the Barbados Marketing Corporation from undergoing this, and in doing so, to help the number of people who are Involved in this exercise.

Mr. Speaker , as I said before, this company has paid for National Insurance alone in this island the amount of \$23, 963.10 for the freezing of shrimps. The Barbados Sea Foods Co. Ltd. is provided with certain services by the Barbados Marketing Corporation, and the freezing of shrimps is one of these services. For freezing shrimps alone in the year 1969 the Barbados Sea Foods Co. Ltd. has paid the Barbados Government \$207, 903.04. But Barbados Sea Foods Co. Ltd. contributes much more than this again to the financing of this company; it pays Harbour dues, \$12,000 for the year 1969; Port charges \$4, 525.76; Waterworks \$720, and for the use of the Independence Car Park \$720, making a total of \$280, 608.30,

Mr. Speaker, we have not yet begun to touch on these figures; I am Just giving these figures to show the contribution that Barbados Sea Foods Co. Ltd. is making to the revenue of this country, and one has got to bear in mind that we now have Barbadian Captains on board these ships - the company has come over the years and it now has 10 Barbadian Captains, and the sums of money that are paid to the Captains and crew by the Barbados Sea Foods Co. Ltd. one has to stop and think about, and we should protect the interest of the workers it employs, and we have got to protect the taxpayers of this country. Barbados Sea Foods Co. Ltd. came to this country evidently not to make sport; the company has come here and for the year 1969 it has paid its managers, its office staff, and overhead maintenance. 8.55 p.m.

It has spent \$75,000 in this Island on administration alone. It has paid Ship Carpenters \$23,000; mechanics, the people who overhaul the engines, have been paid \$120,500; the people who repair the nets have been paid \$43,500; for warehousing alone the company has paid \$21,900; for maintenance it has paid \$71,500; for the processing of shrimps it has paid \$168,000 into the hands of the people.

Mr. Speaker, is this a company that has come here to make fun in Barbados? This is a company that is making money and, undoubtedly, the shareholders of the company who invest their money must get some return on their money. What we have to say is that the operations of the company are such that it cannot be disassociated, no matter how remotely, from the immediate lives of each and every member as well as the people in the community. The company came here and in a short space of time 13 Barbadian

Captains were employed on the company's ships, and there are about 33 ships. The Captains and the crew on these ships for the year 1969 have received \$717,500. Are we to sit here idly by and allow the whims and fancies of opportunists - this is a case where we have reliable information that the Barbados Marketing Corporation, I understand, has carried out a feasibility study on this gentleman who came here attempting to promote another business in competition with the Barbados Sea Foods Limited.

Mr. Speaker, here we see that the Barbados Marketing Corporation has fallen down in its planning and structure. If there is another company that is willing to come and operate in Barbados, the B.M.C. should make provision to cater for three, four or five companies. I challenge the Minister to deny this. Even when the Barbados Sea Foods Limited was being set up here it had to make loans to the B.M.C. to help it to become established. We have always learnt that ingratitude is worse than witchcraft. What are we going to find? We are going to find a company that brings money into the Island; it brings in enough money that it can help the B.M.C., a branch of the Government, to set itself up. We understand, Mr. Speaker, that there has been some difficulty between the personnel of the Barbados Marketing Corporation and the management of the Barbados Sea Foods Company. Those difficulties will come about, Mr. Speaker, in the most organised companies of the world, but there is a point at which these things can be stressed and strained, and there is a point at which they should stop.

Mr. Speaker, we want to bring this matter to the attention of the general public, because we want the straining of these points to stop at this stage. There is a Mr. Jones who is somewhere about here trying to launch one Outtrigger Incorporated. This Mr. Jones, from the feasibility study that is in the possession of the Barbados Marketing Corporation, has never been in the shrimp industry in his life; he knows nothing about shrimps; he is merely a pro-motor for a Shrimp Company.

The mischievous situation that is being created is that we are to find one Mr. Carlton Brathwaite in this Island signing a lot of cheques and confusing the staff of the Barbados Marketing Corporation as well as the Sea Foods Company, and it is high time that each and every hon. member of this House decide that something has to be done to protect the taxpayers' money. If the Barbados Marketing Corporation were to fail tonight, then the taxpayers will have to put it back on its feet. We have had to do that time and time again, and I am asking that we take some sort of consideration of the fact that 300 workers now have no security. We are calling on the Government tonight to see what can be done to put this situation in order.

Mr. Speaker, there is one thing which is confusing the whole situation at the Barbados Marketing Corporation, and it is unfair to the Corporation itself. The Barbados Marketing Corporation, as a Corporation, ought to have no interest in which airline does the shipping of shrimps. That should not be the function of the Barbados Marketing Corporation at all. As long as the rates of the different airlines appear to be competitive, that is all the Barbados Marketing Corporation ought to be concerned with.

However, you will find that it is the interest of the Chairman of the Barbados Marketing Corporation to some extent - his interest in another airline from the one the Barbados Sea Foods Company has been using all the time, and the Chairman wanting his airline to benefit from the trade with the Barbados Marketing Corporation of which he is Chairman is what is bringing about a lot of confusion and is scattering the workers.

Mr. Speaker, I find that the Barbados Sea Foods Company has done a wonderful and commendable job during its short space of time in this Island. I am warning the Barbados Marketing Corporation that in view of the fact that it does not have a credit rating in Bridgetown, and in view of the fact that for freezing shrimp it has to use ammonia and the Barbados Sea Foods Company has in the past and up to quite recently faced the counter or the importers of this ammonia - the Barbados Marketing Corporation has no credit rating and the merchants will not credit the Barbados Marketing Corporation. The Barbados Sea Foods Company had to go forward and take the credit, and then try to get the business straightened out.

The position now is that the Barbados Marketing Corporation's facilities are only producing half of what they really should produce. The Barbados Sea Foods Company has been processing something like 45,000 lbs. of shrimps daily, but it is now processing only about 15,000 to 16,000 lbs. of shrimps.

9.05 p.m.

This in turn is responsible for the members who are employed there not being able to give of their best because they are uncertain as to the functions and the future of this company, and it is only fair that something ought to be done. You will find that in 1967 an American firm by the name of Frick installed machinery for the Barbados Marketing Corporation. We have seen the accounts of the Corporation, but we have never seen that they owe this company \$US4,000 for installing the machinery and there is no hope of paying. I only pray that the Minister will not allow us to have to go further into this to expose the Barbados Marketing Corporation.

Here you have a company that is throwing an amount of \$280, 608.30 into the hands of the Barbados Marketing Corporation. Let us go further. You are trying to make the lives of these people miserable. For dry docking the Barbados Sea Foods paid \$100,000 at Barbados alone during the past year. They made a purchase of \$178,000 in goods to take on board the ships when they were going out. \$200,000 in groceries have been bought from our stores by the crew of these various fishing trawlers. For general repairs they paid \$50,000, for freight \$40,000 and there is a miscellaneous amount of \$12,000; so you will find that local purchases and general expenditure amounted to something in the region of \$748,500. There is a total of over \$3 million spent last year. The Barbados Sea Foods Limited have been employing people and trying to promote its own interest in this country.

I have carried out investigations in connection with complaints made to me by these workers, and I have learnt that a Mr. Schofield from the Barbados Sea Foods walked out of a meeting that was held with the Barbados Marketing Corporation. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that we have had occasions where hon. members even up to today walked out of this House in disgust. Are we to say that, if Mr. Schofield is negotiating on behalf of the Barbados Sea Foods he must not, if he finds conditions do not suit him to carry on, get up and walk out? That does not say that the gentleman who walked out yesterday would not be able to re-open negotiations and carry on his business after his head and the heads of the Board of the Marketing Corporation had cooled. This is not the type of business that anybody can put under his arms and move somewhere else. I made it a point on Saturday to speak to one of the members of the Barbados Marketing Corporation and he told me that the firm to which he belonged - he is not a shareholder - is now interested in going into the printing business. You will find a member of the Board has gone into it and has seen apparently what money is being paid, and he has interested his own company in buying books to go into the business. If this member of the Board is that interested, it does not necessarily mean that he should do all he possibly can to assist the Chairman to force out Barbados Sea Foods that has come in and done so much for Barbados. All these things are causing a lot of confusion; but what we have got to say is that the price for all this confusion and unpleasantness that is now wrecking the future of the Barbados Marketing Corporation must be laid at the feet of the taxpayers of this country, and our duty here tonight is to warn the Minister responsible for the operation of the Barbados Marketing Corporation that he should take action at this stage to arrest all this wickedness and undermining that is going on, and do everything possible to let the Barbados Sea Foods Company Limited carry out its operations, if it is seen and can be proven that it is doing so to the benefit of Barbados and Barbadians as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to tire this House any longer. I believe I have said enough and I only pray that we do not find ourselves being led up a track by promoters who want to make us believe that they are the owners of the largest fleet of fibre-glass trawlers, because that is what they are saying. This Company has advertised in the United States that it has purchased in Barbados a large fleet and processing facilities. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that another difference cropped up between the Barbados Marketing Corporation and the Barbados Sea Foods Company Limited over the price that is being charged for the freezing of these shrimps. It is a question of the nine cents now being paid as against fourteen cents being asked for by the Corporation. I understand that if the Corporation had been asking for fourteen cents, the promoters of Sea Foods expected to negotiate and strike a balance somewhere between nine cents and fourteen cents, but nothing like this has taken place. I understand that this has come about simply because these loud-mouthed people here are spreading it abroad that they have purchased these processing facilities in Barbados, a large fleet, and have established their own training school for the training of the vessel crews. Mr. Speaker, these things do not come up overnight. You cannot train a fishing crew to go to these banks overnight. Barbados has produced, in the short space of time that Sea Foods has been here, 13 men to be Captains of their ships, and I am to say that some of the banks in Bridgetown require identification of some of these Captains when they go with cheques for such large amounts, and many of the Captains have had to go back to Sea Foods and get somebody from there to go to the bank and let them know that these are the wages of the Captains and

crews. 9.15 p.m.

That is a fact, and I can say that nobody at Sea Foods was dissatisfied yesterday until all of this nonsense came about, and we urge upon the Minister responsible for the Barbados Marketing Corporation to take action this night to save the 300 employees and the 10 Captains and do not chase out Barbados Sea Foods Co. Ltd. Do not chase them out to bring in somebody else, only promoters who will come for two or three years. We have to find jobs for those people who are very happily employed. We have got to see that since Barbados Sea Foods Co. Ltd. has been functioning, quite a number of people were able to build small homes, some of them have taxis rented out, and we are asking the Minister to do whatever he can, what lies within his power, to have Barbados Marketing Corporation open negotiations once more with Barbados Sea Foods Co. Ltd. with the possibility of allowing Barbados Sea Foods Co. Ltd. to continue with the good work that it started in this Island. I have never before stood on my feet to defend these private companies, but I have carried out considerable investigations into the functioning of Barbados Sea Foods, and I am satisfied beyond shadow of doubt that an injustice will be done if this is allowed to happen. Mr. Speaker, I am setting aside any differences I might have in this Chamber with hon. members of the other side, and the little difference that might have cropped up between the Chairman of the Barbados Marketing Corporation and the Manager of the Barbados Sea Foods - these things can be got over; but we are asking the Minister not to let corruption plague his Corporation any longer.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The question that this House do now adjourn.....

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Speaker, I would have thought that the hon. senior member for Bridgetown would have something to say.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

I will talk when I am ready.

Mr. SPEAKER:

He cannot speak before the Minister.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

That is not true, unless you rule that way.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I so rule. The hon. member can move a subsequent motion of no-confidence in the Chair.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

I do not have to do that; this is a motion for the adjournment and any member can speak before the Minister; I am sure you do not want anybody to tell you that.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I do not want the hon. member to tell me that.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

On the motion for the adjournment.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

This is a motion for adjournment, but subject to certain qualifications the hon. acting Leader of the Opposition gave notice three days before that he proposed to raise this point; otherwise he would not have been able to raise it.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

My notice WES in three days before too.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Unfortunately, I have not been so informed, and Mr. Deputy Speaker has not so informed me.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

I would like to advise the Minister to get as quick a solution as he can on this because everybody knows that Carlton Brathwaite, the bosom friend of members of the Cabinet - and I am not mincing any matters. The Director of this business and the Chairman of the Corporation had a little difference

between them, but I certainly could not sit in here tonight and allow the hon. acting Leader of the Opposition to sing any solo because these matters were brought to me, and I investigated them as well and I know that there is some substance in which he said. What he said is quite true, and I am bound to defend them because they are primarily drawn from the fishing village of the City - and the hon. Minister of Trade knows this - so I have to stand up and defend them. There are over 300 people employed at this firm, and it is a shame to think that as long as you can become a friend of the Ministers, you can do what you like. Carlton Brathwaite is a classic example. (Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS Who is he? I do not know him.) You do not have to know him, but he is a friend of the Prime Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Hon. members not addressing the Chair, I will draw their attention to Standing Order 29.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

If they are not careful, we are going to have serious trouble here. I asked the Hon. Leader of the House, in whom we have confidence, to say that he will take this matter up at Cabinet and go into this matter carefully, I never accuse Ministers or anybody of corruption; but if this is not corruption, let the Minister tell us why he is getting rid of the people. What did they do? This is just like the Ben-Earl Company which was formed recently and only paying \$6.50 a week to people on the pretence that they are training them. Let the Minister tell us something more about it. He may ask the help of the Hon. Minister of Trade whose knowledge of fishing I respect; but we have brought this to the knowledge of the Government, and the Government must do something about it. There are no two ways about it. I feel that the Government should have an inquiry on this and publish a Report for the benefit of the general public. I have had to sign a cheque for a man, one of the Captains on these boats, when the bank refused to identify him, and now you are just telling them that you have no more use for them. I would like to hear the Minister on this because we will have a row on this tonight. Get up and be straightforward and honest in this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I just want to be very clear; has the hon. senior member for Bridgetown given way?

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

I am through, Sir.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make it quite clear. I do not believe that he who steals my purse steals trash, but I do believe that he who fobs me robs me of my good name. 9.25 p.m.

In 1963, Mr. Speaker, a firm came to this country asking particularly for me by name, Captain George Fergusson. They wanted to establish a fishing industry with shrimps in this country. I had conversations with them and introduced them to the Minister who was then the hon. junior member for Christ Church. We discussed the matter and the Prime Minister consigned me, together with the Minister of Agriculture, to look after organising the shrimp industry in this country. Eight weeks after we made the decision, we had the first five ships down here and the industry organised.

Mr. Speaker, few people in this country, including those in the Barbados Marketing Corporation, know anything about shrimps and fishing in this country and how the organisation is operated. You must have a fleet of sufficient ships to put the catches in. If anybody thinks that an individual ship should go out and fish and come home, then that is a mistake and he would be landing nothing but a load of poison in the country. If you have, say, 25 ships from A to Z, when Z is coming home, Z is bringing all of the catches from A, possibly, to M, and when another ship is coming home, it will bring the balance. That is how things are rotated. You must have at least 25 to 30 ships in order to make a feasible operation in that type of industry if you want to produce good things on the market.

Mr. Speaker, I took my spare time when the first two catches of shrimps were rejected on the United States of America market. The Food and Drugs Act in the U.S.A. is of a very high standard, and it is nothing like the standard we see knocking around Barbados. When you are dealing with that market, you have to produce quality and sanitation. With my knowledge of the industry I went down to look after the processing of the shrimps. Shrimps are graded in qualities of 10 to 15, 16 to 20, 21 and so on, and very often you cannot move something from cold to warm; you must move it from cold to colder. The shrimps should be put in a trough, and I discovered that the men would not put ice in those troughs to build up the freezing capacity and that caused the standard to drop low. If you had a series of shrimps, say, between 25 to 29 in the majority and a few at a lower grad the quantity would remain too long before they got into cold storage and would deteriorate. (Asides)

This is my business, Mr. Speaker, and I have no shame or disgrace about it. I left school and I went into fishing; I raised my children commercially on fishing; I do not have to listen to the United Nations, Sea Foods or anybody else when it comes to fishing. I have fished on the Grand Banks of Newfoundland, and there are very few fishing grounds in this world that I have not fished on; I have made an honourable living by fishing, and this is why I will contribute anything that I can to the industry.

Mr. Speaker, as Minister of Fisheries, I have met people at Party conferences and I have sat down and

allowed people from abroad to talk and take over all of the master positions on the ships. I told them that time will tell; our local men were not equipped for that type of work, and we would have to train them. Even those men who are on the United Nations ships and are the best in the Caribbean have passed through my hands and have benefited from my knowledge. This is why when I hear dirt in here, I want to exclude myself from being associated with anything that would affect the working class or the fishing class in this country. I want to make that quite clear and have it on record. My hands are clean and I can go anywhere. I can take up my instruments and go back tomorrow and do fishing with the same Sea Foods Company or anybody else in any part of the world. I am competent to do that; so I have no dread, regard, or respect for anybody when it comes to this matter. I want it recorded in here and be made quite clear.

Mr. Speaker, I have drawn to the attention of the House - (Asides) I say this here, and I do not have to apologise to anybody for what I do; what I do, I do in the interest of the people of this country. I came here as a member of the Government for what I can contribute for the upliftment of the people in Barbados, and I can walk out at any time. As long as I walk out honourably, I can go back and contribute as I have been contributing before.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Speaker, I am speaking on this matter quite dispassionately. I do not have to work myself up into any sort of a frenzy, because as the Minister of Fisheries for the time being I can only deal with what facts, figures and copies of Agreement that have come to me from official sources in my Ministry. Now, there is a lot that has been obviously worked up. I think that the Barbados Sea Foods has been ably represented here tonight, and I am not at variance with anyone who has represented that Company. (Asides) I am not going to shout; I am as calm as a cucumber, my usual self.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Barbados Sea Foods Company Limited has been referred to as a tenant of the B.M.C. but I do not think that description is strictly correct. "Tenant" was the word used by the hon. junior member for St. Peter. As far as is known to me, this Company has been using the cold storage facilities housed at the B.M.C. buildings, and it was in some sort of contract with the B.M.C. as far as buying shrimp, paying for this shrimp at an agreed rate and so on are concerned. There is an existing Agreement between the Barbados Marketing Corporation and Barbados Sea Foods Limited in this respect.

Now, the Barbados Marketing Corporation is run by a Statutory Board; that Board has its meetings, comes to its decisions. The Minister sees copies of the Minutes, but this Board runs and manages the business that goes on between the Barbados Sea Foods Limited and the Corporation. The Minister never goes to the meetings; he is never present at one; he does not have to be present at either one; he will never be present at either one unless on a special invitation. There are the Chairman, the Deputy

Chairman, the Committee - (Aaides.) That is a Statutory Board; I am nothing to do with whether it was; I do not know whether they changed it last night. Only today I conferred with the Acting Manager, not the Chairman; I have not seen the Chairman for the day and I have not spoken to him yet. (Asides.)

Mr. SPEAKER:

May I remind the hon. senior member for Bridgetown that he has already spoken!

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Speaker, I will not be interrupted like that. Now, I have heard of no straining of relationships between the Barbados Sea Foods Limited and.....(Mr. HINDS What!)

9.35 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Hon. members who spoke and are now interrupting should obey the relevant Standing Order and let us proceed with the motion for the adjournment.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Speaker, I have not heard of any estrangement in relations between the Barbados Sea Foods Limited and the 300 or more workers that it employs. I have been made to understand that when this company first operated, relationships between the management and the staff were more cordial than they are nowadays. Let me inform the House that I have been told that the workers with Barbados Sea Foods Limited are organised workers. I do not think that any knowledge of an industrial dispute has been brought before the Labour Commissioner or the Minister of Labour in this respect.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, no suggestion was ever made that there is any question of a dispute between the Barbados Sea Foods and its employees. The Minister is in dreamland.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Point made, but no point of order.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

The hon. junior member for St. Peter must remember that. I am not replying to him. I am making a speech as he made one. I have had no intimation that there is any dispute between the Barbados Sea Foods Limited and its 300 or more workers, nor have I yet been informed that any inkling of such dispute has been reported to the Labour Commissioner or to the Minister of Labour. In other words, I have heard nothing to disturb my peace of mind and to make me believe that anything like a strike is threatening, because I remember hearing the word "threat" used tonight, speaking on this very subject.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, I did say that the security of these workers is threatened.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I did not hear any reference made to anything said by the hon. Junior member for St. Peter immediately before he rose.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Speaker, I am as calm as a cucumber. There is nothing at all that has me excited. Now, Sir, the Barbados Marketing Corporation has an Agreement with the Barbados Sea Foods Limited, and like any other two contracting parties in this world, whenever an Agreement is signed, there is some clause usually inserted which allows of the possible termination of such Agreement and the possible continuation of that Agreement. -Asides)

Mr. SPEAKER:

Will the hon. senior member for Bridgetown recall that he has already addressed the Chair and there was no interruption? The hon. junior member is equally entitled to address the Chair.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

And in my own way too, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I never attempted to interrupt any speaker who has already spoken, and if any speaker is given an opportunity to speak again, I will not attempt to interrupt him either; but I can only say things as they have been put to me. I am not on the Board. I have heard certain allegations which I cannot say are true or not true. I have not had opportunity to examine these allegations. I have heard that there exists some sort of relationship between the Chairman of the Barbados Marketing Corporation and an airline. I do not know whether that is true or not. Things that I hear or overhear I never believe. (Asides)

Mr. SPEAKER:

May I ask the hon. senior member for Bridgetown who spoke uninterrupted to appreciate that other hon. members are entitled to such latitude - not to speak of longitude?

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Speaker, I am in a position of too much responsibility to just hear things and believe them, and all the furore and thundering do not move me one iota. I am too old a stager to be affected. The Barbados Marketing Corporation Board which is a Statutory body has the inherent right ordinarily as one of the contracting parties to an Agreement to terminate that Agreement or, as a clause in the Agreement says, to continue that Agreement. That is common, every-day practice. I can tell the House that I have asked certain things of the management of the Barbados Marketing Corporation and I have received certain information. Now I have heard of a company with whom the Barbados Marketing Corporation has been negotiating in respect of a new Agreement, and I have heard someone connected with that company referred to as a promoter. I have heard members of that company - let me call it the new company - referred to as gangsters; I have heard that there is a lot of corruption. I do not know how the corruption started before the company began the Agreement. I do not know the character of the individual members of what I may refer to as the new company. I am not motivated by any feeling on the part of the Barbados Sea Foods.

I know it as a name and I see reports come to my desk, and I read the Minutes of the Barbados Marketing Corporation Board and examine things in a cool manner, I do not get excited, because the moment I do that, I am going to be regarded in a peculiar way. I can say that the negotiations broke down between the Barbados Sea Foods Company Ltd. and the Barbados Marketing Corporation because the Barbados Marketing Corporation wanted an increase per pound in relation to the handling of shrimp. 9.45 p.m.

There was more than one meeting, and it reached the pitch where Barbados Sea Foods said they were not going beyond the offer of U.S. 5 per pound, and negotiations fell through. This other company was willing, and is willing, to pay more than that. The Barbados Sea Foods Co. Ltd. did not offer to pay anything more for the electricity facilities; this company has offered to pay more. As you know, there was a large out-standing bill for electricity power at night that is owed by the Barbados Marketing Corporation to the Electric Supply Corporation, and if the Board is anxious to cut down these expenses, I think they would see some virtue in accepting such an increased offer; I think so. I understand there has been a lot of propaganda; as a matter of fact, I have heard more today than I have ever heard before on this matter. I knew that the Board was seeking to terminate the Agreement, I knew the Board had consulted its lawyer, I understand what opinion the Board's lawyer had given them, and I understand a time was given when the Agreement would be legally terminated. I do not feel that there is any point in attacking the bona fides of this new company; I particularly asked the acting Manager today in the Lobby of the House, after the hon. junior member for St. Peter gave notice of his intention to speak on

the matter. Mr. Speaker, I had the acting Manager in the Lobby of the House today questioning him, and I had my Permanent Secretary down too. I do not have to try to deceive the House; when I say 'today', I mean 'today' and anybody who thinks that I discussed this before today, I would not know how to address that member in Parliament.

Let me continue. I understand that there is no threat of a displacement of anyone of those 300 or more workers who are presently in the employment of Barbados Sea Foods Co. Ltd. in the event of a new company taking over and getting an agreement with the Barbados Marketing Corporation; I have been given that information and that assurance. I have heard some mention by an hon. member who knows what he is talking about. I understand that there is to be a new method; I understand the boats used by Barbados Sea Foods were ice boats. These boats, I understand, are refrigerator boats and I understand that is a step further in scientific advancement when it comes to keeping and preserving the fish. I am not a technical man, and I do not think Barbados has a single ichthyologist; whom must I ask? There has been some talk about the workers, and I understand that they are being fed some propaganda that this new Company has only five boats; I understand that is not true.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, the company has one boat in Barbados named "Charlie",

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Speaker, I am only saying what I have been hearing, and what was put into my hand today. When the hon. junior member for St. Peter gave it as his intention to proceed with this subject, I instantly telephoned my Permanent Secretary and the acting Manager of the Barbados Marketing Corporation - you can doubt it or believe, it, that is purely your individual right. (Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY I believe it.)

Mr. SPEAKER:

May I ask the hon. senior member for Bridgetown to let the hon. member make his speech?

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Speaker, as soon as you see an hon. member on his feet and people have it in their minds to prevent him from being heard, there is something wrong; something is not too good. Why must what I have to say and read be suppressed? All hon. members had their full time, their full, large, noisy, infuriating fling without the slightest interruption from your humble servant; I do not get hot. Gulf King is a concern that actually used to work in conjunction with Barbados Sea Foods Co. Ltd.; I have been told so. This same Gulf King Co. is willing to turn over its boats to this new company - I do not know the

principal, the promoter, the Chairman or else - this is the responsibility and the business of the Barbados Marketing Corporation - a Statutory Board; understand that? The taxpayers' money is in all the Boards; this is not peculiar to the Barbados Marketing Corporation alone.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Standing Order 29. 9.55 p.m.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Speaker, hon. members must have heard that the Board intended to terminate this Agreement. The B.M.C. are of the opinion that the termination of the Agreement will benefit the Corporation and they have written to that effect. This document was given to me today. (Asides) I received this letter today in the Lobby of the House of Assembly. (Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY The Agreement must be ratified by the Cabinet.) That is not true, either. There is nothing that says that the Agreement has to go to the Cabinet to be ratified.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Hon. members not speaking will please obey Standing Order No. 29! This is going too far now and it is merely a motion for the adjournment in which permission was given to raise this matter, and hon. members on that side should not take advantage of the situation.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

All hon. members on that side want a row. When they meet a parliamentarian on this side with this temper, they cannot get a row. If there are two people - one eager for a fight, and the other one Just brushes him aside - he will become infuriated. That has been so from time immemorial. This company proposes to go in for pre-cooking and packing of sea foods and, of course, is going to pay an improved price for the shrimp and fish, and there will be no displacement of workers or any time - lapse. If the Agreement is terminated tomorrow, the new company will begin operations the same day so that the workers would not have a day at home. That is the information I have; so why suppress it? Let me give the information to Parliament, whether it is true or not. This document was sent to me by hand today. I would not go through the details as to what led up to this. (Mr. HINDS The B.M.C, wants sacking.) That may be so.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I would counsel the hon. senior member for St. Peter not even to hear asides.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

I will not go into details as to what brought to a conclusion the decision on the part of the B.M.C. Board to have the Agreement terminated, but, as far as I am concerned, I am not going to tell this House anything when it comes to any member of the Barbados Sea Foods Limited losing his temper and walking off. I am not concerned with that in the least, nor should I be interested in it. As a responsible Minister, I cannot just sit here and listen to what is said, and tell the B.M.C. Board that they must not terminate the Agreement. I will not give any assurance to Parliament that I will do that. There must be further examination, calm, cold thinking, and not infuriated humbug. I am not that type of individual; otherwise I should not be standing here. I should not even be in Parliament, if I were that type of individual. As long as I remain a Minister of the Government, I will promise the Opposition that, whenever they bring something that concerns my Ministry, I will calmly, coldly, dispassionately go into the merits of the concern; but I will not rush blindly, or be propelled into precipitate action that will take me many, many years to regret. The question that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 17th March, 1970, at 10 a.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

10.00 p.m.