

THE

# House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

THIRD SESSION OF 1966 - 71

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 2nd February, 1971.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 11.10 a.m. o'clock,

### PRESENT

His Honour Sir. J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., F.Z.S., (Speaker); Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, J.P., (Minister of Trade, Tourism, Community Development and Youth Affairs); Hon. C. E. TALMA, (Minister of Health and Social Welfare); Hon. J. C. TUDOR, C.M.G., M.A., (Leader of the House); Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P.; Hon. N. W. BOXILL, (Minister of Labour, National Insurance and Housing); Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD, J.P., (Chairman of Committee); Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; Mr. C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P.; Mr. J. B. SPRINGER; and Mr. C. L. BOLDEN.

Prayers were read.

### MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: There are various Minutes yet unconfirmed, and I will call them one by one.

The Minutes of the meeting of the 13th October, 1970, are available for confirmation and unless there is any objection, those Minutes will be confirmed.

Hearing no objection, I declare those Minutes duly confirmed.

Likewise, the Minutes of the 20th October, 1970, are now available for confirmation, and unless there is any objection, those Minutes will be confirmed.

Likewise, the Minutes of 27th October, 1970, are up for confirmation. If there is no objection, those Minutes will be confirmed and so I declare them.

The Minutes of 3rd November, 1970, are now up for confirmation. In the absence of any objection, I will declare, and I now so do, them confirmed.

The Minutes of 20th November, 1970, are now up for confirmation. In the absence of any objection, I declare those Minutes duly confirmed.

The Minutes of 8th December, 1970, are available for confirmation. In the absence of any objection, I declare those Minutes to be confirmed.

The Minutes of 16th December, 1970, are available for confirmation. In the absence of any objection, I declare those Minutes duly confirmed.

Finally, in respect of the Minutes of Tuesday, 19th January, 1971,.....

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I think there are a few corrections that may be found necessary in these Minutes, and I suggest that confirmation of them be deferred until a later date.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member undertake to point out these corrections to the Clerk?

Mr. HINDS: I have already done so.

Mr. SPEAKER: In view of the request of the hon. member and a word I have had with Mr. Clerk, I will leave the confirmation of those Minutes until the next meeting of this Chamber.

That concludes my reference to Minutes.

### MESSAGES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am asking to defer Messages and Government Notices until later in today's sitting.

### SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, before the business of the House begins, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16, 18, 19, 40 and 45 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting.

I have had a word of consultation with the present acting Leader of the Opposition and he agrees.

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

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

#### GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken.

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

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

#### COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

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

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

#### SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1970-71 No. 13

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, hon. members I think will see the necessity for this Resolution and will pass it without debate.

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

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

*Mr. St. JOHN entered the Chamber and took his seat.*

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I am in total agreement with the price charged for the State Funeral, but there is one thing that certainly does move me. I have had quite a number of reports about a price much higher than this and I was of the opinion that these high prices were somewhat thrust upon the taxpayers for the hypocrisy that was exhibited on so solemn an occasion by none other than the Prime Minister of this country, and I am glad to see that on an occasion such as this the price has been so whittled down that all hon. members can consider it none other than reasonable.

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

11.20 p.m.

#### RESOLUTION FOR \$33,036

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, the first to be supplemented under this Resolution is Head 3 -

Parliament, provision for stationery, provision for incidentals and provision for copying and air conditioning units. If there are any questions hon. members would like to ask I will be pleased to answer them. I beg to move that Head 3 stand part.

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

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

*Head 5 - JUDICIARY - was called.*

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Head 5 - Judiciary, Items 15, 18, 19 and 22. I beg to move that Head 5 stand part.

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

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Hon. Leader of the House could inform us as to what progress has been made in respect of the commitment made by the Hon. Leader in respect of the adjustment of travelling allowances.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I am not in a position to answer any further than I have answered which was to say that the matter is being examined between the parties concerned. I have not followed it up recently, but if the hon. member would like to make a special enquiry I may be able to answer him next week.

*The question that Head 5 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

*Head 39 - MINISTRY OF EDUCATION - was called.*

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Head 39 - Ministry of Education, Items 35, 20, 16, 15, 19, 27, 29 and 30. There are certain notes in explanation of these various requests for provisions, and if hon. members have any questions to ask in addition to what is given here I will be pleased to answer them. I beg to move that Head 39 stand part.

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

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

*Head 44 - MENTAL HOSPITAL - was called.*

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Item 6, Sir. I beg to move that Head 44 stand part.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, this item, according to the wording of the Addendum, must give cause for some concern. The amount of \$300 is required under this Head, and one is left to ask what period this \$300 is expected to cover. On the other hand, it is a case where we find that the officer referred to, is being employed substantively and yet receiving a pension; what must come to mind with this is, how old is the officer?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Daniel is 43 years of age and was appointed on the 1st April 1944 to the post of Sanitary Inspector. He was

appointed subsequently to the post of Senior Supervisor in the Department of Markets and was seconded to the Barbados Marketing Corporation during the period 1st June, 1963 to 31st October, 1967. During the period of secondment Mr. Daniel sustained a head injury while performing his duties at the Abattoir and he reverted to his substantive post of Senior Supervisor on 1st September, 1969 but did not in fact resume duties as he was on extended sick leave as a result of the injury he received. On the advice of his doctor, Mr. Daniel requested a transfer to another department. The doctor's request stated: "Mr. Daniel in my opinion is not fit to continue in his present post due to the fact that he gets attacks of fits whenever he returns to the same type of work. He was treated at the medical centre in the United States of America for same, and I would strongly suggest that a change of department to things of a quieter nature be given to him to see if it has any relation to these epileptic forms of seizures". The position is that Mr. Daniel occupied a higher post and to see that he does not lose anything, is the object of this Resolution. As far as pension rights are concerned, he will be protected in that respect. If there are any other questions I will be glad to answer them.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I specifically asked what period this \$300 covers; is it \$300 for one month or for one year or for the rest of the man's life? That is what we are concerned with.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Consideration has since been given to provide Mr. Daniel with alternative employment in view of the findings of the Medical Board. The salary scale attached to his present post is \$6,720 to \$8,100, z.12 - z.8, and he is presently in the grade to which he may now be considered for appointment.

11.30 a.m.

At the meeting of the 3rd December, 1969, the Public Service Commission advised the appointment of Mr. Daniel to the post of Senior Clerk, the salary scale of the post being \$4,320 - \$5,760. This post was not acceptable to him because of the low level of the maximum salary. Mr. Daniel has subsequently been afforded an appointment to the recently created post of Executive Officer, Mental Hospital. The salary attached to the post of \$6,000 x \$240 - \$7,200. He has expressed his unwillingness to accept his appointment again because of the low maximum salary which is below that of his substantive post. Mr. Daniel, it is understood, may be willing to reconsider his position provided that some suitable arrangement can be devised whereby he would not stand to lose financially and to suffer diminution of status. He has, in fact, been performing the duties of Executive Officer, Mental Hospital, since his resumption of duties on the 12th January, 1970.

In the circumstances, the Division recommends that funds be sought by Resolution of Parliament payment of a personal pensionable allowance of \$300 per annum with effect from 30th April, 1970, this being the officer's normal incremental date.

This allowance should increase each year to the extent of the increments the officer would have earned in his former post, but should cease if he is subsequently appointed to a post the salary of which equates or exceeds that of the post of Superintendent of Markets. Provision will be made in the annual Estimates for the payment of the allowance in future.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, we have the anomalous position where you find an officer in the Service at the age of 43 receiving a pension. That is what the Minister has just said; he is receiving a pension of \$300 per annum.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I think we are at cross purposes. What I did say was that the Division recommends that funds be sought by Resolution of Parliament for the payment of a personal pensionable allowance of \$300 per annum to Mr. Daniel. In other words, that is to protect his pension rights.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister now trying to say that \$300 per annum is being set aside for Mr. Daniel?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. If the hon. member will listen, he will learn. Mr. Daniel will get a personal pensionable allowance of \$300 per annum.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, was Mr. Daniel considered for workman's compensation or any appropriate compensation when he sustained injuries in the course of his duties? If not, why not? Why was the officer not considered for workman's compensation, or given the redress for which he was entitled? What was wrong with the whole scheme of things? We understand from the Minister that the Doctors who had been seeing Mr. Daniel did not favour his returning one place to work for too long a period? How long is he going to remain at the Mental Hospital? Since Mr. Daniel's complaint is a type of complaint, as we have learnt from the Minister, bordering on epilepsy, is the Mental Hospital a place to send such an officer to work at the age of 43?

Mr. Chairman, there is undoubtedly some very good reason why Mr. Daniel has been offered a post that amounted to demoting him. That is what has been done to the officer. You try to demote him, and then ask Parliament to patch up your short sightedness or wickedness. We do not think that the officer was malicious and that any act on his part was responsible for his sustaining the injuries which he suffered. Why should the Administration set about to punish the officer? The work he is doing at the Mental Hospital, I am sure, is equally as hard if not harder than he would have to do in another Department. This work must carry more mental strain than what he was doing at the Public Markets. One cannot deny that he must come in immediate contact with lunatics in the Mental Hospital. There are no known lunatics working in the Public Markets, and those are the people with whom he had been dealing in the past.

11.40 a.m.

One will find that there is some good reason why until this present moment the officer has been reluctant to accept the suggestion that has been put up to him, that is, to take the post at the Mental Hospital which is a post junior or beneath his substantive post in the Service. Now, Sir, what would be of interest is to learn from the Minister if this \$300 per annum as a pensionable allowance is acceptable to Mr. Daniel. Could the Minister tell us this? Has this been gone into with the officer, or is he just left there to take it or leave it?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I have probably given the hon. member too much information. I have already said that Mr. Daniel would be willing to re-consider his decision provided some suitable arrangement can be devised whereby he would not stand to lose financially and suffer a diminution of his status. He has in fact been performing the duties of Executive Officer, Mental Hospital, since his resumption of duties on 12th January, 1970. It is within my knowledge that every effort has been made to help Mr. Daniel. It is one of those cases where he was given long leave and sick leave for two years, he received financial assistance both here, in the United States and in other places where he went for medical attention; so this is a case in which the Government has done everything possible to assist Mr. Daniel financially, and the doctors feel that he should not do any strenuous work. We have done everything to help him, and the hon. member is attacking the Government for trying to help him. That is how it seems because this is a very unusual case, one that needs full sympathy, and the Government has gone all out to help him.

As the doctors have reported, Mr. Daniel was examined by a Medical Board to determine his fitness for further service or his retirement on medical grounds. The Report of the Medical Board as a result of an examination of 26th September, 1968, is as follows:-

"We examined this patient this morning. He is an epileptic. We can find no reason why he should not continue in the service provided that the circumstances of his employment do not constitute a danger to himself or others. In particular we feel that he should not drive a motor vehicle, work at heights, work in the vicinity of dangerous machinery, work at sea or handle dangerous or sharp instruments in the course of his work."

A further medical examination by the Medical Board on 26th September, 1969, reveals the same condition as set out in the previous paragraph."

I happen to know Mr. Daniel personally, and the present Minister of Communications and Works and many other Ministers including myself as Minister of Agriculture and in charge of the Abattoir at one time took a personal interest in this case of assist Mr. Daniel, and now we are trying to go further to protect his bread and rice to give him a personal annual allowance and a job he can do and which he has been doing since January, 1970, you still get the

Government being blamed for not trying to help Mr. Daniel or for taking advantage of him. The reverse is the case in this matter, because Mr. Daniel has friends in the Government Party and he has some of us as personal friends. I hope that satisfies the hon. member.

Mr. HINDS: What a pity that Mr. Daniel gets injured in the course of his occupation and a lot of guilty Ministers who have been responsible for the Abattoir from time to time doing nothing whatsoever. Mr. Chairman, the Minister ought to have come here today to tell this Committee that this is the scheme or plan which has been devised and has been accepted by Mr. Daniel and all is well. He has not been able to say so up to this day. I am not here to hear things as other Government Ministers hear them, because they are all part and parcel of the plot to torture this man to the extent to which he is being tortured. What we are concerning ourselves with is how long is Mr. Daniel going to remain attached to the staff of the Mental Hospital, or whether you are going to transfer him from there in another few months and then to some other Department as the Medical Officers who have been examining him from time to time suggest.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the hon. member has been around long enough, knows everything and minds everybody's business, and he should know that the Government does not make appointments. This is done by the Public Service Commission, and he cannot ask if the Minister will transfer somebody. The Minister can only transfer somebody who is working at his home.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I had really come to the end of my speech, but hearing what the hon. junior member for St. Thomas has just said, has caused me to get up again. What the Minister must know is that any Minister coming to this House on a matter such as this, ought to come well briefed from the Public Service Commission or whatever Commission it might be, to tell us whether Government has recommended that a particular officer must not remain in one job for a length of time because he gets upset and how they intend dealing with this matter in the future if they are to keep him in the service. The Minister must not come here looking short and stupid.....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, again I must rise on a point of order. When the hon. member is talking about short and stupid, I prefer to be short and stupid than tall and dishonest. How can the Public Service Commission be told by the Ministers what they are to do? The Public Service Commission is an independent body, and no Minister has a right telling the Public Service Commission what to do; so the hon. member is only talking nonsense. He wants to be an expert on everything, but the thing he should be an expert on, he is not.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I believe that you are expecting me to get up and reply to the hon. member by saying that I saw him receiving a bunch of stolen green bananas.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That has absolutely no right in this debate.

Mr. HINDS: However true it might be. What I am saying is that Mr. Daniel is an officer in the Public Service of this country.  
11.50 a.m.

We appreciate the fact that Ministers do not make appointments, but Ministers have got to come before the House and defend appointments, ask for money to pay for appointments that have been made and everything else, and what we are saying is that it is not too much in a case such as this..... (Asides.) I am sure, Mr. Chairman, you cannot hear what is coming from the hon. member.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am listening to the hon. junior member for St. Peter.

Mr. HINDS: Do not listen to him. It is not too much to expect a Minister to come properly briefed on a matter such as this, especially when it is such a peculiar case; you would not find a case like this perhaps in another 20 years in the Service, and it ought to have been gone into properly.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, what worries me about this is that every business man is expected to protect the lives and interests of his employees, and it is known that Government operates some sort of an insurance scheme - whether it covers personnel or only vehicles I am not too sure at this moment - but I say I cannot agree with the explanation given by the Minister of Health and the reason given for coming to this House today to ask for this sum, because at the moment it is \$300 annually which would have to be paid, and as he has said, provision will be made in the annual Estimates for this amount. This is an effort, in my opinion, to cover up (a) the laxities or the bad state of repair at the Abattoir, and (b) it points out that the Government's House is not in order, because if Mr. Daniel received any injury while on duty at the Abattoir, Mr. Daniel had two courses opened to him, (1) workmen's compensation and (2) a case of negligence against the Government.

If according to what has been said by the Minister, this man has had medical treatment in the United States and the doctors have said certain things about this man's health Mr. Daniel's course is to bring an action of negligence against the Government, and the method of working out Workmen's Compensation will be based on his loss of earnings in the future, and the Insurance Company would have to pay for it. It should not now have to come out of the taxpayers' pockets, and this is what is wrong here, Mr. Chairman, that this Committee is being asked to pass money for a man who received an injury in circumstances which, if it had happened anywhere else outside of Government, an Insurance Company would have to pay it. I will ask a simple question, what happened to Mr. Daniel in respect of personal injuries compensation for pain and suffering, because any man who obtains an injury not even

of this magnitude would have been paid something for his feelings. He must have been paid, and for that compensation provision should have been made for any possible loss of earnings based on his medical reports, so to come at this stage and tell us that by virtue of the medical reports you are going to shift Mr. Daniel from one department to the next and ask the Committee to make up in salary \$300 per annum, it means that something has gone wrong which is not being told today. I find that this is not true what is being presented to the Committee; something is wrong somewhere.

I am nothing to do with what is on the file, I want to know if the man has been paid any money at all for compensation in respect of injuries received. I want to know also on what basis he has been paid and whether it was on the basis of a medical report. Did the medical report say that this man would not have been able to work in his present job? These are the things which should have been done, and the Government knows this about Mr. Warren and the fire truck, where part of his claim was that every time he heard a fire engine he had an apprehension, and damages were awarded on that basis, so here we come to the Committee with the peculiar case of Mr. Daniel, and we are being asked to provide money out of Government funds to pay Mr. Daniel year after year when this could have been done out of the Insurance Company. My view is that this sum should not be like this, it should have been paid as a lump sum based on a loss of earnings calculated over the working life of the man.

*The question that Head 44 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

*The question that the Resolution for \$33,036 do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

#### RESOLUTION FOR \$310,743

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 102 stand part.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to second that.  
12.00 noon

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, we are asked to vote money to provide additional accommodation and facilities for the Ministry's Mechanical Workshop at the Ministry of Communications and Works.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I should like the hon. junior member for St. Peter to repeat what he has said, as I have not heard him.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I said that we are being asked to vote money to provide additional accommodation and facilities for the Ministry's Mechanical Workshop at the Pine, St. Michael. I want to say that, before one penny is spent further on this project, the Minister ought to carry out a

complete survey of its works and what has been going on in the Workshop when the facilities were limited and the accommodation not up to standard. I want to tell the Minister that I have tabled questions in this Honourable House in connection with this matter. My object in tabling those questions was to cause the Minister to carry out an investigation to determine whether or not one Leon Harris, a mechanic employed at the Workshop on the 14th July, 1970, did not take into the Workshop a private motor car. He was not only satisfied to take in the car, but he left his work in the Workshop, and took the taxpayers' time to drive away a man called Carlton Pinder in a vehicle marked MC 473. The Minister can find out to whom that vehicle belongs. He took the man to a garage in the City. We are saying that Leon Harris is such a boss that he can .....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am afraid that, in the Chair's opinion, this question has just been disposed of in this current Session, and I am ruling the hon. member out of order. The question of Leon Harris has recently been dealt with as a question in this House, and Order No. 26 (4) says:

"It shall be out of order to reflect on any vote of the House or attempt to reconsider any specific question upon which the House has come to a conclusion during the current session except upon a substantive motion for rescission."

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I have confidence that, as Chairman, you will read and understand what you read some day.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not entertaining, in my opinion, such insults to the Chair, and I will say quite bluntly that if the hon. member continues in this way, I will not hear him; I will ask him to take his seat, if he continues in this way.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that you have every opportunity of reading your Order Paper and seeing whether or not the questions referred to on the Order Paper have been dealt with and disposed of, or whether or not I am entitled to make reference to them or to reflect on them. The questions to which you are referring are on the Order Paper. If I have questions on the Order Paper, how can the Chairman say that I cannot refer to them and rule me out of order? I am sure you will get around to what I am saying.

Mr. Chairman, what we are saying on this side of the House is that the Mechanical Workshop at the Pine has been used for effecting repairs to the cars of Ministers of the Government as well. That is one of the things behind this matter. They are effecting repairs to the cars of Ministers of the Government, and yet when my car needs repairs I have to take it to a garage and pay for the job.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have already said that Mr. Speaker, as I have been told, has given a ruling on these questions and they are completely finished

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to run into any sort of difficulty with you. To what are you referring? If I know a man called Harris at the Pine Workshop who has repaired a car there, then cannot I say so? Even if I had asked a question and Mr. Speaker had ruled me out of order .....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has no right to reconsider any question that has reached a conclusion in this House in this current session.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, do you mean that the brains of a member must die immediately after he has asked a question? Is that your ruling? 12.10 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, if that is your ruling, I will abide by it for the moment. I will not argue with you that a member must not even consider a question he has asked. What we are saying is that the workshop at the Pine is not being used for the purpose for which it has been designed. It is not used in its fullest sense for the purpose for which the taxpayers have been called upon to contribute to its upkeep. What we are saying further is that batteries and tyres belonging to the taxpayers' trucks are being exchanged and put into motor lorries belonging to the friends of a man called Leon Harris at the Pine Workshop, and all this is being done with the knowledge of a Minister of this Government sitting on that side of the House.

We do not have, Mr. Chairman, to pat ourselves on the back to say that only he who goes to Glendairy is dishonest. I have a sorry feeling for many people whom I see go up there when I take my spectacles off and glare at some of those people who have got to sit here before me to know that their lives should have been lost away in Glendairy for all the wrongs they have done day in and day out.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That has nothing to do with this Resolution, and I am asking the hon. member to confine his remarks to the subject matter.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, if what the hon. member is saying is true why doesn't he go to the police or to the Minister in charge. To get up in the House where he knows he cannot be prosecuted for these statements and make such statements against people who do not exist is really carrying it past a joke. Why doesn't the hon. member tell the Minister or go to the police. This is what he should do, not come in here and try to hide behind the privileges of the House.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, there is a familiar Barbadian saying that whoever the cap fits, let him draw the string. All I am saying under this Resolution is that taxpayers are being asked here today to vote a sum of money to provide certain facilities. We are voting money for the the upkeep of this workshop for the repairs of Government vehicles, but we find that certain mechanics at the Workshop are sheltering under their friendship with the Minister and taking in private vehicles and prostituting the whole system. That is all I am saying; I am not going astray. One will find that it is

anticipated that the expenditure under this particular Head will be considerable. We are not against spending the money, but we want to know that when we spend it we are not doing so to provide a garage for somebody who should go into Bridgetown or somewhere else and set up his private workshop. We are trying to secure this for the maintenance of Government vehicles alone, and not for somebody to tell their friends to bring in their cars at 10 o'clock and the workmen are put to work on them out of the taxpayers' money. That is what we are trying to protect the taxpayers from. I feel that every hon. member is well within his rights to see to this. After all, we find that in the case of the Transport Board and other places doing similar work and even the same Ministry of Communications and Works have had to give out some of their work to be done elsewhere. Seeing that they have to give their work to be done elsewhere on some of their trucks, is it fair to us that you take the workmen that should be working on the Government's vehicles and put them to work on the cars of the friends of the boss foreman and take the Government's trucks and send them elsewhere? This is what we are trying to see not repeated in a case such as this.

We feel, Sir, that too much is left to the people who are foremen at this workshop. I am telling you that the tool kits have been ransacked. There is no check on inventory to determine how many spanners, pairs of pliers or shifting wrenches there are. I am telling you, Sir, that if a check was carried out at this hour, you would find that batteries that have been put into Government vehicles, which should all have their serial numbers and names, have been exchanged for old ones. Maybe in a few you will find a new battery, but if you go back to your stock list and local purchase orders, you will find that so many new batteries were ordered on this day and the other day and you issued batteries on such days, and you must wonder how it is that a battery issued on a particular day happens to be in a particular truck. The order that is being developed in this country is that you must not bring these things to light. You are a vagabond if you expose these things. That is what Barbados is coming to. The order of the day is to keep these things covered and you will be a nice boy. The Minister of Communications and Works has Parliamentary Secretaries who ought to be able to lend much more assistance to the Ministers, but what can we hope for when we look around at our Parliamentary Secretaries? What assistance can they really lend their Ministers in matters such as this? I say Mr. Chairman, that the sooner certain people are relieved of certain responsibilities to the public that have been thrust upon them, so to speak, the better it will be for all concerned.

12.20 p.m.

This Resolution, Sir, is not one to which you can merely say "yea" and "nay", it is one that could have very far-reaching consequences; it is a Resolution that should bring each and every hon. member to his feet who has the interest of the taxpayers of this country at heart. Remember, Sir,

having the interest of the taxpayers does not necessarily mean that one must put one's hand in one's pocket to give a taxpayer a dollar, but one can have a fair portion of returns by preventing taxpayers from having to meet unnecessary expenses. You will find each and every one would like to know that the Ministry of Communications and Works which must carry a large staff and which out of necessity ought to have its own competent staff of mechanics, everybody would like to know that we have competent mechanics there; but, Mr. Chairman, what we are saying here and now is that we have competent mechanics to steal, take and carry away. We are saying that every Minister must not lend himself to protecting these people when he knows that these things are true. There was such a thing as the late commencement of this work, and we read here from paragraph 3 of the notes that during the 1969-70 financial year, an amount of \$250,000 was provided by Resolution NO. 46/1969, Supplementary Estimates 1969-70 No. 7 under Head 102 - Item 25 (New) Mechanical Engineers' Section. Of this sum only \$9,099 was spent by the 31st March, 1970, as a result of the late commencement of work on the project.

We might hear, Mr. Chairman, of the late arrival of steel, the late arrival of this and the late arrival of that; that might be one side of it, but are we going to hear that when the material arrived we did not have local men to carry out their end of the work? If we were to hear such an excuse it would throw right back in the laps of the Government a very, very serious responsibility because the Government must know what work they have got to execute over a number of years and what training schemes they should have in progress to equip themselves with people for putting these schemes into operation. There is no point year after year voting money for this project and that project, the following year there is a revote, the year after there is another revote and when it all boils down you could not get men to work. We would like to hear from the Minister if anything did occur to bring about the late commencement of this work.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I did not come in here to get into this debate, but the hon. member has admonished me on more than one occasion. He used this Chamber for vilifying and almost blackmailing people.

Mr. HINDS: I object, Mr. Chairman, to those remarks.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will ask the hon. member to withdraw.....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I said "almost", I did not say he does; you cannot be guided by members of the Opposition.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am guided by my own principles and I ask the hon. member to withdraw the word.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I withdraw the word. He does this by villifying, abusing and intimidating the people in the community. His behaviour today is reminiscent to that of Purdy Fallar who used to feature in the Dick Tracy column who used to talk all the time about his constitutional rights but was the biggest criminal there ever was. The hon. member is accusing somebody at Highways and Transport of stealing; I am not here to defend them but what I would say for the record is that when the Democratic Labour Party came into power I became Parliamentary Secretary in 1964 and I was appalled when I discovered what was going on at Highways and Transport. There was then a supporter of the Barbados Labour Party who was in high office and used to insist that workmen cut his canes if they wanted to work with Highways and Transport, although they were being paid from Highways and Transport vote, but what shocked me most was when I discovered that there were absolutely no records kept of any of the tyres that went on the trucks at Highways and Transport. Immediately when I became Parliamentary Secretary, I instigated that records must be kept of the number of the tyres and the trucks they went on; furthermore I went to a leading supplier of tyres whom I discovered was supplying the Government with tyres and asked him to give me the serial numbers and he complied, and when I carried out an investigation with the directions of the Minister, we discovered a lot of things that were going on, so when the hon. member is trying to give the Chamber and the general public the feeling that we on this side know of theft and dishonesty that is taking place and we are turning a blind eye that is not true, because it is this Government that instituted this process that is going on. It is true you will get stealing because this is endemic in our society, but what happens in the firms is that people do not turn a blind eye to it as they do at Highways and Transport. If I were not so strong - physically, mentally and otherwise - I could not live in Barbados after I carried out investigations on the amount of theft that was going on in the Government after I became Parliamentary Secretary.

12.30 p.m.

When I went to Japan, a Government Watchman broke off my gate, but he did not do it deliberately. Somebody took off the gate and had it welded. I saw a mason putting on a portion of the gate. I did not know what had happened and I thought somebody had broken into the place, the Government Watchman broke off my gate and, therefore, the Government was responsible for replacing it. I gave the mason \$5 when I saw him working on the gate. Several months after that the hon. junior member for St. Peter told the House that I used my office to make a Government Watchman put on my gate.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Right now I think that the Minister's gate should not be in this debate. We have other matters to deal with at the moment.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I deny ever telling the Minister that he used his office to make a Government Watchman or any such

person put on a gate. What I told the Minister repeatedly is that he used his office to have a gate built at Government's expense. If he wants to hear it, I will give it now. (*Asides.*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. senior member for St. James addressing the Chair?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with money, and the hon. member is accusing the Government of theft. If other Ministers do not want to get up and represent themselves and the Government, I am an elected member and a Minister and I will do so. (*Asides.*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There is too much noise in this Chamber; I am going to listen to one member at a time.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, there is a workshop behind Church Village and Crumpton Street owned by a man called Prince, and I will take the hon. member in my car to that man now and let him tell him who built my gate. Would I build a house for \$30,000 and then put on a gate for \$5. I would never do that sort of thing when I know the vicious society in which we are living. They cannot point a finger at me; the most they can say is that I like a lot of the opposite sex, but I cannot say that about them. The hon. member gets up in this House and accuses a Minister of collusion with people who are stealing! Now, a Minister has reached the highest office in the land, so how could he see a man stealing tyres and do nothing about the matter? I have warned everybody that such accusations do not do anybody any good, and they do not do the society any good. You will hear people accusing others of stealing, and yet they will not go into the courts and give evidence against them.

Mr. Chairman, I am not defending the Workshop. When the Democratic Labour Party came into power ..... (*Asides.*) (Mr. CRAIG: "And will soon be going out.")

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Hon. members not addressing the Chair will please observe Rule 29 (6).

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, the members of the Opposition feel that they will get the Government, but they will have to wait a long time in order to do so. When the Democratic Labour Party came into power, we had to check the stealing that was going on in the various Departments. I am not saying that we have been able to contain it. We found certain things that were shocking going on in the Department of Highways and Transport as well as in other Government Departments. I know that a man took a carburettor from a truck, sold it, and the Department had to buy another one. It is difficult to prosecute people for these things, because you cannot get people to give evidence in court. We cannot hire and fire, so when we hear hon. members talking about dishonesty we must put the record straight. There is no Minister, that I know of, who would condone the stealing of Government property. (*Asides.*)

Mr. Chairman, I am not surprised to hear the hon. junior member for the City say that the Minister will steal himself. He knows about stealing and he would have a good knowledge of that.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if a Minister's car had a flat tyre and it was repaired at the Pine Hill Workshop, and by the time the Minister was ready to drive off he was told by the man who did the job that the tyre he took off was in bad shape and he was given a better one or one which was slightly oversized - suppose his tyre was a 450 x 15 and he was given a 470 x 15 - would the Minister be right to take it?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: If that were to happen, I would say that the Minister would be a fool to take it, and he would be acting dishonestly. Anybody who did that would be a fool.

Mr. HINDS: Some act that way.  
12.40 p.m.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: What I am saying is that I do not know of any. It did not happen during my time. I do not know if the hon. junior member for St. Michael who was Minister at that time has any understanding about it. I cannot say that it did not happen when the Barbados Labour Party was in power.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I can rise and say "fooly" in reply to the Minister. In other words, the Minister who did it would be a fool.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Nothing could be more stupid than that. If it is my present car, I challenge the hon. member to go in the yard and see that all the car tyres are the same. If it is the car I had previously, I challenge the hon. member to state who put on the tyres or go to the person who has the car M 6704 and look at the tyres and see if they have been changed.

Mr. HINDS: This information I have here contains dates about you and Leon Harris.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: The only trouble about Leon Harris is that I never heard the name before. I know more about you than about Leon Harris. I categorically deny knowing Leon Harris. I am going to challenge the hon. member to go outside this Chamber and make the same statement since he is so sure somebody put tyres on my car, and I will carry one of the Opposition members to hear the statement. Do you mean I can buy a car for \$6,180 and cannot buy a tyre?

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, the Hon. Minister likes terrazzo floors too.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: If I thought the hon. member was not going to make a point, I would not have given way. I really cannot follow the hon. member.

Mr. HINDS: I am not going to give you an opportunity to ask.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: All the hon. member is doing is making accusations, but I challenge the hon. member to go outside and make the same accusations. I categorically deny that anybody put tyres on my car. Let the hon. member deny going to prison for robbing poor people.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I deny going to prison for robbing poor people.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: That shows the character of the person we have been dealing with, because we all know about the vexation that caused the hon. member.....

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order, I would really like to what we are debating. I am interested in this Resolution, and you in the Chair should be able to call both sides of the House to order because I have not heard anything about what is mentioned in this Resolution. I cannot understand.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I am not surprised that the hon. member cannot understand.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I certainly would like all hon. members to confine themselves to Head 102.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, we are speaking on Head 102, but the hon. member has made accusations against the Government and Ministers, and now he has made an accusation against me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Before the hon. member rose, I thought it my duty to ask the hon. junior member for St. Peter to withdraw those words, but the Hon. Minister said he was speaking and did not give me any chance so to do.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: What words?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Never mind what the words are this time. I would like both hon. members to refrain from any personal abuse and confine their remarks to Head 102.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I am speaking facts. When I got up to address the Chair, I said I was not going to lose my equilibrium, but I am not going to let the hon. junior member for St. Peter or any other member for that matter make accusations against this Government as long as I am in here without defending them fully provided I have the facts. I am not going into things I do not know about; but when the hon. member makes these statements, I will say what the former Leader of the Opposition used to tell me: "come outside and make the statement".

When the Barbados Labour Party was in power, one of their officers who was in high office used to insist that the workmen come to his home and work. The moment they did not go to his home, they were laid off. It was then that I as Parliamentary Secretary after taking office, instituted this programme.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, is this building at the Pine going to have terrazzo floors like the Minister's house?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am afraid that is not a point of order.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I do not know if it will have terrazzo floors but I do not see why it should not, if this is the mentality of the hon. member.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, I heard the Minister constantly speaking about terrazzo floors. Is this something new in the Resolution?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is no point of order.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: He does not understand. It was a reply to a question asked by his colleague who knows everything. However, getting back to the Resolution I will say again before I sit that the hon. member must get his facts and endeavour to be honest in his approach to these matters on the floor of this House. He should not come in here and hide under what is known as privilege, because I feel that too often people come in here and make statements which they know they have no intention of supporting, but make them just to get a big headline in making these statements against people on this side of the House. Later on today, Mr. Chairman, I will bring out something else. I do not intend to hold up the Chamber too long with what I have been witnessing taking place among the members of the Opposition.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I could hardly sit here and allow the opportunity to pass without corroborating the remarks made by the Hon. Minister of Housing and Labour when he said that it was during his tenure of office as Parliamentary Secretary in the Ministry of Communications and Works that he instituted this programme. I refer to the period May, 1964, to October, 1965 when I happened to be Minister, and it was during that time that the hon. junior member for St. Thomas was very efficient, practical and concerned and he devised ways and means through his schemes and systems in order to keep records of these items whether they were tyres, tubes, oil, fuel, spare parts or batteries.

12.50 p.m.

He went out of his way, he really gave all the assistance he could and was very energetic along with his Permanent Secretary, and he got on as though the things were actually his property and took that interest in Government property to that extent, so to suggest that he of all people is a delinquent, in those connections is not right, he has taken a keen interest in his duties as a Parliamentary Secretary, so that his interest and his devotion to duty have been superb as Parliamentary Secretary in my tenure of office. In other words he was more a detective than a Parliamentary Secretary and he got a lot of illegal acts stopped.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I had asked a question about the late commencement of the work and I have had no reply about that. I would certainly like to hear from the appropriate Minister or somebody who could answer for him about the late commencement of the work; we have had to listen to something nearly like an obituary from the hon. junior member for Christ Church.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, we are asked to vote money in respect of this building to provide these facilities, and there is a note here saying that the work was commenced late on this project; surely the Minister must know what is responsible for the late commencement of this work.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, I am informed by the Parliamentary Secretary that the plans had to be revised and that is the reason why the work did not start as scheduled.

*The question that Head 102 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

*Head 105 - HOME AFFAIRS was called.*

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, this provision is required to supplement Item 2 of Head 105. The position is that this amount is required to pay the balance of purchase money for land at Coverley Plantation, Christ Church, to purchase land at St. Patricks for a playing field, at River Bay for a recreational facility and land in St. Michael.

In respect of the land at River Bay, the amount is two acres 3 roods, 36 perches, at St. Michael, 7 1/2 acres and at Jones Land 185,245 square feet. In respect of Coverley there is a balance of purchase money amounting to \$68,546.75, and this area is 97 acres, 1 rood and 37 perches. Negotiations with the owners were contracted and this area was compulsorily acquired. The owners agreed to accept \$3,000 an acre and the total cost therefore was \$292,443.75 of which \$223,897 has already been paid thus the balance of \$68,546.75 which is included in the sum we are now asking for. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I am quite happy to see that at long last this Resolution in relation to the acquisition of land at St. Patricks has come down, because I believe that it was I who advocated the policy that no longer should playing fields be dependent upon the state of the Rural Amenities Fund, and this is one of the reasons for the holding up of this. The position is that this playing field at St. Patricks is attempting to fulfil a long felt need, but I hope that the acquisition will take place speedily because there is no question of a title and an amount has been agreed upon. I hope that the rele-

vant Ministry will speed up the work necessary to make this into a playing field; the land is under canes at the present moment and will soon be free. When the Hon. Minister, the Sports Officer and myself went to look at it, it was then in yams, and if the money was there you could have bought it before now and there would be no cane crop on it now, but a long time ago - about four years approximately - a playing field for Gall Hill next to the big housing area was also acquired and up to now absolutely nothing has been done, so it shows that although we passed the money in this House there was an unduly long time lag. The next thing you know one man will be going up there saying that he got the playing field for Gall Hill when it was acquired ever since. As regards the purchase of the land at River Bay, I did not hear the price.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: \$25,000.

1.00 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know if this is the proper time to draw something to the attention of the Minister. With regard to the question of land acquisition, the problem of land acquisition at Oistins Town is acute and the necessity to move the Police Station up there is very acute. Government should have a look at the old Plaza Cinema, which is ideally suited for conversion into a Police Station and a Court House. I know that ..... (Asides.) It is near the District Council. Let all of the houses in Oistins Town on the seacoast be removed, because that is the only way to solve the acute congestion which arises from the fact that it is the main road to the Airport and is a fishing village.

Mr. HINDS: Which plot is the Minister going to use at Jones Land, Black Rock? Is it part of Annie Jones' estate?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, at the very outset I must say that I appreciate the assistance given by the hon. senior member for Christ Church in the selection of the site. I invited the Leader of the Opposition to assist me in selecting the site at St. Patricks for the benefit of the people up there. Along with others, we selected the best possible site for a playing field for St. Patricks. He is just as uneasy as I am in having the matter completed. The fact remains that, whenever the bargaining starts up there, the people will have to admit that the Democratic Labour Party Government did it with the Assistance and encouragement of the Leader of the Opposition.

As far as the acquisition of land is concerned, there is no difficulty; it is a question of having the money to complete the purchase and to put the playing field in order. The same thing applies to some extent to the Gall Hill playing field. I have just asked the Minister of Agriculture to find out exactly how far we have gone with the Gall Hill playing field. The fact is that the number of cane fires we have

had over the past few years has slowed down the implementation of certain projects. It is only quite recently that Cabinet released the sum of \$200,000 from the Consolidated Fund in order to go ahead with these social amenities. I understand that the delay was caused by not having money in the Rural Amenities Fund. I also understand - I have not been there recently - that the Minister of Agriculture will have to do something with a view to making the two playing fields level at very little cost to the Government. The Ministry of Agriculture has the equipment for doing this type of work. We hope that the playing fields will soon be put into good shape to be used by the people in the areas. The people responsible for them will get the credit, and the people in the areas will know who did the work.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, we must welcome any Resolution .....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I can hardly hear the hon. member as a result of the noise being made by hon. members.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, we must welcome any Resolution which seeks to provide recreational facilities for people living in any parish of this Island. I would like to know whether the Leader of the House has plans for the plot at Jones Land and the plot at River Bay. If those plans are available, then I would like to have them passed around this side of the House. I should like to draw to the attention of the Minister of Health and Social Welfare the fact that a Resolution was passed in this House for purchasing from Castle Plantation, a part of the Spring Hall group of estates, some land at Boscobelle, St. Peter, for developing a playing field and recreational facilities. It is time for the Minister to take action on this matter for the reason that the area of land envisaged is now carrying a crop of canes which will be reaped in a short time. It will be well to take action now so that the people will not cultivate another crop of canes. If the Minister acts now, he will prevent the Plantation from doing a lot of unnecessary work.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the parcel of land mentioned by the hon. member, I have made several excursions to the Manager and the Attorney of the estates. I have dealt with the matter more than once last year and more than a dozen times since I have been in Parliament and nothing has yet been done. I have also dealt with another parcel of land near Mile-and-a-Quarter. I am anxious to have this matter completed, because St. Peter is where I live and I represent the people of St. Peter. I regret very much that the Labour Welfare Fund did not contain enough money so that more facilities could have been provided, not only for the people who reside in St. Peter but for people in other parishes.

Now that the Consolidation Vote is being tapped to provide such facilities, I am hoping that it is not a precedent to provide for communal baths for the purchase of lands other than for playing fields.  
1.10 p.m.

I hope that the principle will be evoked and put into action that playing field facilities will be made available especially in those parishes where there are none, and St. Peter cannot yet boast of any and has never been able to boast of any within the long time I have been in Parliament serving under more than one Government. That is literally true. If the Order Papers were to be reviewed, you would see that year after year I have been asking for playing fields in St. Peter, not only in 1970 but in the late 1940s, and I hope that now that the Consolidated Fund has been tapped to provide certain facilities that it will be further tapped to provide playing fields and especially in parishes where there are none, and that includes first and foremost that of St. Peter. As I said, I have made excursions to the Manager of Castle Plantation, to the Attorney of that plantation and to the attorney of another plantation in another area of St. Peter in that connection, and I anxiously await results, and whatever lies within my power I am going to do to provide such facilities.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, it is always nice to hear words of wisdom from the Minister of Youth. Nonetheless, like the hon. junior member for St. Peter we on this side of the House always welcome the provision of playing fields and recreation centres for the people of this country. I would just like to ask the Government seriously to consider the possibility of providing such a recreation centre or playing field for the Dunlow Lane area. There is a portion of land at the moment that is used by the residents of that area. It is privately owned but it is used by the residents for various sports. It is my intention to bring before this House shortly a Resolution calling upon the Government to compulsorily acquire this portion of land to provide a playing field and recreational facilities for the residents of Dunlow Lane area. I would ask the Government at this stage to give serious thought even to going ahead with it.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Would the hon. member be more precise when he says recreational facilities? Would he say what type of recreational facilities he has in mind?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I grant that the portion of land is very small, and the type of recreational facility which I would suggest would be a playing field and a pavilion.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I always believe that a healthy body can create a healthy mind, and a healthy mind also create a healthy society. I am always very happy whenever there is a Resolution before this Committee for the purpose of providing recreational facilities for this country at a national level. Some time ago I drew to the attention of Government that in one of the most densely populated agricultural areas in this Island, a place known as Orange Hill in the parish of St. James, there was a piece of land, and I asked a question and was told that they were looking into the idea of providing in that area recreational facilities. This is almost two years that have passed. Since then I came back and

put up the idea to Government that there was a parcel of land in Orange Hill which a cricket team by the name of Standard now occupies, and that Government should approach the owners of it for the purpose of using this land, so that we could have in this area, which is so densely populated, some kind of recreational facilities.

If you look around all these areas in the country they have turned out so far a national long distance champion without these facilities in the person of George Payne, a young Articled Clerk at R. G. Mandeville. There is a girl in the same area by the name of Donna Payne who is supposed to be one of the champions at Alexandra School. I have tried my best to organise sports meetings. For four years straight I did this. I could not do it this year because I had the hon. senior member for St. Joseph and his son to attend to, and that was as important to me as anything else, and I could not really carry out my functions as I would have liked in 1970. However we hope to have this done at Whitsuntide. This was done for the purpose of bringing all the young boys and girls from one village for the purpose of competing against each other, and the only place we could find suitable was St. John Baptist grounds. These grounds are owned by the Church and at any time they can ask you to come off.

I also asked the Government if they did not think it was advisable having a housing area in Thorpes to put the grounds in good shape and provide these facilities in any housing area. The Government apparently has set out to do this only in the constituencies in which they have one or two members. If you take the parish of St. John, your own constituency, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the facilities at Gall Hill are as good as any you can find in any part of the world. There are hard courts which are seldom used. You do not produce a lawn tennis player there, At Thorpes there are about eleven boys who have to journey every evening to the hard courts in Bridgetown. Sometimes I have to give them bus fare, and they telephone me sometimes and ask me to drop them back home. In St. John where you are not utilising the courts, you have the finest hard courts you can think of. I do not deny you this, but on the other hand, you must understand that all the people pay taxes and their children are entitled to some of these things.

Again I am calling on the Minister and drawing to his attention the facilities which are needed in Fitts Village. I am begging them. They cannot say that I have not repeatedly asked them. They have been there on several occasions and looked at the area and they came up with some sort of half-baked decision. One Minister says that the money is in his Ministry, it is available, but there is another Ministry you have to go through which is Public Works, and when you go to the Minister of Communications and Works, that Minister tells you that you have to go to the Minister of Housing. It is a whole fancy thing. I do not know if you had this problem when you were getting the hard courts in St.

John, but I doubt it very much. Now I can say that the Government is giving a little taste in St. Lucy. When you look around St. James, the only playing field is that in which Mr. Ronald Tree was instrumental in providing for the youth of St. James. It is on Highway 1 where Maple play their cricket. 1.20 p.m.

I am calling on Government again, now that they are walking about admiring pieces of land here and there, to give St. James a look too. The only Government that would attempt to put a housing area where they want to put it in that part of St. James is this Government. I am asking you, Sir, that the same time they are providing these facilities in some of these parishes, I am asking them to look into Orange Hill where there is a densely populated agricultural area. There is not a playing field in St. James; there is one spot where the people try their best to use, but I am asking them again. I did bring a question and I was given the assurance that they would provide recreational facilities in Orange Hill; there is a piece of land there which was being used for a number of years, and if the owners are prepared to let them use it I am sure the Government could lease it.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is for 154,000 sq.ft. of land, and the plan shows that it is Jones Land, Black Rock. This is a very good area, and I am happy that the Government is acquiring it to build a Secondary School there. I would like to know a little more about this because it is not being compulsorily acquired; this seems to be an agreement between the Government and the owners of this property and I would like to know if the Will of the late owner of this property has been set aside and secondly, if this should not be the estate of Jones rather than Annie Jones *et al* to be acquired for a Secondary School and children's home. I would like the Minister to tell me the necessity for putting a children's home there when you have one nearly a stone's throw from there with five and three quarter acres of land not being used. What would be the point of putting a children's home next to a Secondary School? I hope the Minister or the Leader of the House would be able to explain this to me. This was the property of the Prime Minister, Shepherd, and Jones and you have 154,000 square feet; if this property is being bought for the purpose of building a Secondary School, I could understand taking off some of the property which adjoins the first housing area ever established in the Island, the Deacons Housing area, I do not think any should be taken off because it is not even four acres of land. When we pass this it is not difficult for the Auditor General to change it, but the Public Accounts Committee would question his right to spend money for other things. I do believe that the land should be acquired for a Secondary School, but there is no house on this land and if anybody is being fooled in Government that there is a house there, this is not true. This is no compulsory acquisition, and if this is not compulsory acquisition what has the Crown Solicitor to say about it? How have you

arrived at getting around the man's Will? I would like to hear about this. It is not compulsory acquisition, what are you paying for this?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I rise to reply to one or two points raised by the hon. senior member for St. James in respect of recreational facilities in Orange Hill. The hon. member said that he wanted to get on the band wagon but he is not honest enough to say that provision has already been made for the Orange Hill district in respect of additional recreational facilities; he is not honest enough to say that money has already been voted in this House and that .....

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order, is the hon. member accusing me of being dishonest? The hon. member ought to be the last person to use the term "dishonesty".

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is no point of order.

Mr. CRAIG: As far as you are concerned.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: As far as I am concerned it is no point of order and I am not going to be challenged by any hon. member in here.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, do not shout at me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If you have nothing more to say, sit down.

Mr. CRAIG: Do not shout at me, Sir.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Again, Mr. Chairman, I reiterate that the hon. senior member for St. James is not honest enough to say that.....

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I object to the hon. member saying that I am dishonest to say; how does the hon. member know whether I knew or not? I am asking Your Honour to rule on that Sir, the hon. member ought to be the last person to use that word.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Again, Mr. Chairman, I repeat.....

Mr. CRAIG: I am asking for a ruling, Sir.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member can understand.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for St. Andrew has said that the hon. member is not honest enough to say something which he has not said, therefore I do not deem that to be unparliamentary.  
1.30 p.m.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, am I to understand that it must go on record that I am dishonest and that I am misleading the House?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have not heard any member accuse any other member of dishonesty.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member said that the senior member for St. James.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have already ruled. Under Order 35, the decision of the Chair is final.

Mr. CRAIG: That depends.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, the senior member for St. James is not honest enough to say that when the Estimates were being discussed in this Chamber, the House was told that, in the Capital Estimates, provision in the sum of something like \$320,000 was provided in the Capital Estimates for the Housing Authority to provide, not only for the Housing area but for additional recreational facilities for residents in the Orange Hill area. It was pointed out then that provision was made in the Estimates for a Day Nursery for the area as well as an additional playing field. The hon. member was asking us to acquire a standard playing field. The area is too small; the topography is unsuitable for a playing field and so on.

Mr. Chairman, negotiations are going on between Apes Hill Plantation and the Government in respect to the acquisition of 11 acres of land. The Plantation wants the Government to acquire 14 acres, 3 acres of which contain a gully. We do not want gully land; we want land that the people can use. We are acquiring 11 acres of that land. The hon. member mentioned the matter to me, and I told him that the delay in the acquisition of the land was occasioned by the inability to get surveyors. Up to now we have not been able to get the land surveyed. There is a shortage of surveyors to survey the land in this area, and we are finding it difficult to get the work done as quickly as we would like. It is even difficult to get private surveyors to survey land. My last understanding was that the Crown Solicitor and the Solicitors for Apes Hill Plantation were trying to arrive at a reasonable price for the land.

Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member wanted to say something, he could have said that he hoped they would soon get through with the negotiations for the land at Orange Hill. They will have two playing fields: one which they are now using, and another one on about four or five acres of land which will be allocated at Apes Hill for the establishment of a playing field. Government has gone out of its way to improve the water situation in the area. We are now thinking of providing a temporary tank to accommodate 50 additional residents in the area plus what water will be used by the playing field until the reservoir at Rock Hall is completed. Even if the land had been acquired, very little could have been done until a tank was provided in the area to give Orange Hill an adequate supply of water.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is getting on as though the Government is sitting down and doing nothing in this matter. It is better to be honest and say what the facts are. They can say what they like about me, but they cannot say that I have failed to represent the people. They can attack me, but they

cannot beat me or this party in a straight fight. They have to use underhand methods; they have to hit under the belly; they cannot beat us on performance. The hon. senior member for St. Thomas has told me that they are satisfied that they cannot defeat the Democratic Labour Party on performance and, therefore, they have to accuse us of all sort of dishonesty. That is what they are getting on with. (Asides.) You will hear more about it today.

Mr. Chairman, my shoulders are broad, and I say that he is dishonest in not saying what the facts are. If the hon. senior member for St. James says that he did not know what is happening in the area, I would say that he is a stranger to the truth, and any stranger to the truth is dishonest. I am not hesitating to say it, because he knows what the facts are. He knows that he can approach any member on this side when he has a problem and he is given co-operation. However, he will get over there, for political purposes, and say all sort of things. If he knows the facts and he tries to fool the gallery and the public that Government has done nothing for the people at Orange Hill when he knows that money has been actually voted for certain things, then I say he is dishonest.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member who has just sat down is saying.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the statement that he is dishonest, and I say that it is an act of dishonesty.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has made a speech, but nothing has been said. I dismiss the hon. member who has just sat down with a simple sentence: A desperate man is a dangerous man. A desperate party is also a dangerous party. The hon. member accused me of hiding the facts, and he phrased things to suit himself. I would not pay him much attention. He also said that I approached him and asked him about providing a playing field for the people at Orange Hill.  
1.40 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, the hon. member has misrepresented me. I said he approached me in respect of these facilities because he knew and asked me what was happening and what was the delay; and what progress was being made. He did not approach me asking me to provide these things. He approached me in respect of the progress that was being made.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Point made.

Mr. CRAIG: I never approached the hon. member about what progress had been made. I am not going to say he is a liar; I could not say that in here because it would be unparliamentary. The Minister has been juggled around in so many Ministries within the past thirteen months that it would not dawn on me to ask him about any recreational facilities when the Minister was Minister of Community Development for about a month or two. There is so much

corruption that they do not know where to put the money. In all the Ministries that the Minister has been, there has been corruption.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, the only corruption I committed has been in dealing with the hon. member.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not see anything about corruption in this Resolution.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The hon member comes in here and makes sweeping statements.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like both hon. members to confine their remarks to land purchase at St. Patricks, Christ Church, and River Bay, St. Lucy for recreational facilities and at Jones Land, St. Michael for a Children's Home.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: All I am saying is that he is the arch-maker of corruption, he and all on his side.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not entertaining that type of debate in here.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I will get up and deal with him if you allow him to introduce talk about corruption.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I want both hon. members to deal with Head 105.

Mr. CRAIG: I do not know why the hon. member sweats himself so. All I have said and still maintain is that in every Ministry in which the Minister, who has just sat down, has ever been, there is suspicion of corruption.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, his birth is suspicious of corruption.

Mr. CRAIG: I did not hear the Hon. Minister. Sir, I will say this again with the hope that the Minister will get up.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have repeatedly asked the hon. senior member for St. James to confine his remarks to Head 105.

Mr. CRAIG: Am I to get up and repeat "recreational facilities" all the time? I must develop my debate as you allowed the Minister to make a speech on a point of order. I can take care of myself. I hit mostly where it can be felt. I did not approach the Minister to assist me with any kind of recreational facilities for St. James because he has been juggled around the Ministry, and in most of the Ministries that the Minister has been, there has always been suspicion of corruption, and nobody can deny this; so I could not ask him what progress was made in St. James. The hon. junior member for Christ Church can tell you that I have repeatedly called on him, telephoned him morning, evening and night and have been out in his car looking at sites and appealing to

him to assist me with recreational facilities in St. James. The Minister has never given me an assurance, but he said he would try. Should I not get up in here to put the case of Orange Hill when I asked a question almost three years ago and I think it was the Leader of the House who said it was a good idea and that he would do his best to assist not only in St. James, but in many of the areas. Some rich men are like people with cancer. They are afraid to lose their wealth especially in the way they got it. These things do not bother me; I can protect myself.

Mr. Chairman, since the Minister claims that there is money voted, I am calling on the Government to speed up the production to assist the people of Orange Hill and other parts of St. James, and for that matter the entire country, because you will remember that in my opening remarks I said that a healthy body creates a healthy mind, and a healthy mind creates a healthy country. Maybe the Minister never had a healthy body; so he could not have a healthy mind, hence his Ministries would always be accused of corruption. He got rich in thirteen months; do you think the country was stupid when only a few months before he was butting around?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That has absolutely nothing to do with Head 105.

Mr. CRAIG: You do not like how I punch. I understood he said I was corrupt from birth. Christ was accused. Who is Craig? They say Henry Forde was born in the infirmary.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like the hon. member to address the Chair on Head 105. If the hon. member has nothing more to say, I will ask him to sit.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, please do not shout at me because I can hear you. If you shout at me, I will shout back, and I hate to disrespect the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You would not dare.

Mr. CRAIG: If you shout at me, I would.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This is the third time I am asking the hon. member to debate Head 105, and not again would I ask him to do this.

Mr. CRAIG: You can move that the question be now put because only when I repeat myself, can you ask me to sit.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to read Standing Order No. 36 for the benefit of the hon. senior member for St. James. It reads:

"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."

That is what I am now doing. I am asking the hon. senior member for St. James to discontinue his speech because he persists in irrelevance.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I should like to clear one or two points which were raised by the hon. senior member for Bridgetown.  
1.50 p.m.

In so far as the acquisition of Jones Land is concerned, the hon. member would recall that the Government owns a property called Ferniehurst which was the former residence of the doctors at the Mental Hospital and that this house has been closed for a considerable time and has fallen into disrepair. The position is that it was first thought of as a workshop for the Housing Authority and then we thought of putting a children's home there, and it is mentioned in this Resolution that the land is being acquired for a children's home. I will deal with that point a little later, but that property and the additional land was intended for the erection of a Secondary School; on further investigation it was decided that the area is in need of a Secondary School so Ferniehurst and the land on which it stands will be for a Secondary School, and it is for that reason that the Hon. Leader of the House said that it was for a children's home and other purposes, so that land is being bought for the construction of a Secondary School and not for a children's home.

The hon. senior member for the City also made the point that we have another children's home in the area and that there is available land on which could be sited another building for another children's home. The hon. member knows that it is not like an institution as such, but we are breaking down and having a number of smaller children's homes established because we want to have a home atmosphere. We have to see smaller children's homes comprising of 30 to 40 children where they will get better treatment and more of the home atmosphere to enjoy. The land that is being acquired will be primarily for the erection of a new Secondary School and not a children's home.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: The question I raised was with respect to the title.

Mr. CRAIG rose.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I thought I told the hon. member that he would have to discontinue his speech because of his irrelevance; I am not hearing the hon. member on Head 105.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, you called on me to discontinue part of my speech.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I said the hon. senior member for St. James was irrelevant.

Mr. CRAIG: I bow to your wishes and I accept your ruling. I rise now, after two members spoke,

to address you, Mr. Chairman, after you called on me to discontinue that part of my speech.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have called on the hon. senior member for St. James to discontinue his speech because he was irrelevant.

Mr. CRAIG: And I bowed to your request. I sat then, and now you are setting out to deny the people of this country the right.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not denying.....

Mr. CRAIG: Therefore, I must be heard.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not hearing the hon. member on this Resolution; I have heard him and he has been very irrelevant, he will not abide by the rules which are clearly set out and every hon. member in this Chamber must abide by them.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, Sir,.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. junior member for St. Lucy has caught my eye.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, it is possible that the hon. member having heard your ruling and having agreed with it may now wish to address the Committee on a new point. In the circumstances Your Honour might wish to consider whether he might now be heard.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, shall I continue my speech after the mercies have fallen from the other side on me?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Where I am concerned, I understand that the Leader of the House.....

Mr. CRAIG: Will you please give a ruling, Sir?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What I am concerned about is that the Hon. Leader of the House is asking to report progress and I will be very willing for any member.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for St. Andrew has risen on a point of order. (*Asides.*) I am not to be argued with. All hon. members sit. The hon. senior member for St. Andrew caught my eye.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Yes, but if the hon. member has caught your eye while another hon. member is standing and you allow him to speak I will rise further on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. senior member for the City sit down, or I will ask him to go outside.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY I will go outside and come back in.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: All hon. members sit; I am speaking and I shall have that right to speak.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: It looks unfair.  
2.00 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have already read for the benefit of hon. members Rule 35:

"The Speaker in the House or the Chairman in Committee shall be responsible for the observance of the rules of order in the House and Committee respectively, and his decision upon any point of order shall not be open to appeal and shall not be reviewed by the House except upon a substantive motion. Notwithstanding anything in Standing Order No. 20 (Manner of giving Notices), such a motion shall not require more than two days' notice."

The hon. senior member for St. Andrew has risen on a point of Order, and I am going to hear him.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman.....

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: 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.*

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am on my feet, and I want to....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This House has not yet been suspended, and I expect order from all hon. members.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: I am speaking on the Motion before the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You will have the right to speak on the Motion when Mr. Speaker resumes the Chair, Mr. Marshal, will you please summon the Speaker to the Chair.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, how can you come in here when hon. members are still standing?

Mr. SPEAKER: To me Mr. CHAIRMAN has reported progress and that the Committee has asked leave to sit again.

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.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am entitled to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for Bridgetown is quite right to say that he is entitled to speak on the motion, "That the sitting be now suspended for an hour", and that is all I am now concerned with. The Motion is, "That this sitting be now suspended for an hour," and the hon. senior member for Bridgetown is entitled to speak on that.

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am also addressing the Honourable House on the Motion.

Mr. SEPAKER: The hon. senior member for Bridgetown has caught my eye. Has the hon. senior member for Bridgetown given way to a point of order?

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, it is wrong to put the Motion for the suspension of the House while hon. members are debating a matter. It is universally known that Mr. Chairman and Mr. Speaker should give greater latitude to the Opposition than to the Government in debating any matter, especially when it is known that the Government has the majority. I feel that the views of hon. members must be expressed. (*Asides.*) Do not worry with me, because I can attack any blasted body at all. Do not look at me and tell me any nonsense.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do not pay any attention to the asides.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I was saying that you have always shown that impartiality in the Chair. That is true, and anybody who says otherwise I will not agree with. A Motion has been put for the suspension of this House. The Hon. Leader of the House has got up and asked that the hon. senior member for St. James be allowed to express his last point of view. (*Asides.*) Let them talk what they like; everybody on this side will talk on the Motion for suspension. (*Asides.*) Are you hungry?

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. member given way?

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Yes.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, this Committee was divided and no vote was taken. I am asking Your Honour to make a ruling, because progress should not have been reported when a division should have been taken. A Motion was before the House; it was seconded; the Government voted "Aye", and the Opposition voted "No" and called for a division.

Mr. SPEAKER: My ruling is that whatever took place in Committee, as the Chairman of Committees was presiding, is no concern of mine other than what was reported to me.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, should the Chairman's report to the Speaker be factual and honest?

Mr. SPEAKER: There can be no doubt of that, and I assume it to be so.

Mr. HINDS: Even after hearing hon. members on this side of the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: Questions on the rulings of the Speaker, Deputy Speaker or the Chairman of Committees may only be subsequently dealt with on a motion apropos that. So far as I am concerned, a report was made to me and I accept that report.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, could the House be told what report was made to you by the Chairman?

Mr. SPEAKER: A report was made to me that the Committee had reported progress and asked for leave to sit again. That only was reported to me.

Mr. HINDS: Did I not ask you what progress? 2.10 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Chairman reported progress.

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I know you are an experience Speaker and more so an experienced parliamentarian. It has always been the custom when progress is reported to Mr. Speaker to say that six or seven Resolutions or Bills were passed in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: That has not been my experience.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, the Chairman did not report progress to you.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Chairman reported progress to me.

Mr. CRAIG: I know that you as a Knight.....

Mr. SPEAKER: That does not arise. Day or night does not arise.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, please control your voice and let us on the floor make the noise. What progress has been reported?

Mr. SPEAKER: A report was made to me, I have said what the report is and that stands. There can be no interrogation.

Mr. CRAIG: Am I not entitled to ask the Chair what has happened in Committee or in the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: My answer is that the member is not entitled to ask the Chair what happened in Committee, because the Chair is not aware of what happened in Committee.

Mr. CRAIG: Therefore I am asking what happened in the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: A report was conveyed to me.

Mr. CRAIG: I am asking what was reported.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already said what report was made to me by the Chairman, and that I accept. There can be no debate on that.

Mr. CRAIG: Is that report confidential?

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already told the House the report which was made to me. I have announced that the Chairman has reported progress and asked for leave to sit again.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: On a point of order, this is very strange and I have not been accustomed to it. You, Mr. Speaker, are there to protect the rights and privileges of members of this House, and you have always shown it more so to the minority which is the correct procedure. What I am saying is that if a report has been made to you and it is drawn to Your Honour's attention by hon. members of the Opposition side that the report is not in keeping with the facts, that is to say that a division was called for and was not taken, can it be said that you are representing the rights and privileges of hon. members of the House which we feel you do always represent? A division was called for. I have been in the Opposition with you, Mr. Speaker, for a long time, and I have seen hon. members in that Chair and they sat for six and seven hours without moving. I am drawing to your attention.....

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order, would you kindly ask either of the Clerks what was the decision on the division?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am accepting the report of the Chairman of Committees and that may be questioned in another way, but not now.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, we find ourselves running into difficulties. As a matter of fact, we are jettisoning democracy simply because we find ourselves with a Chairman whose ability does not match his authority.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid I cannot accept that. That could only arise in a substantive motion. That is no point of order.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Peter has risen on a point of order.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I am moving that the question be now put.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker.....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, there must be no more debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are two hon. members on their feet which I regard as grave disorder.

This sitting is now suspended for one hour.  
2.20 p.m.

*On resumption*

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, before we resume I would like permission to give notice of the Government Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: I indicated earlier that I would give the hon. member permission when the papers arrived.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the financial statements of the Barbados Marketing Corporation for the year ending 30th June, 1968, and on behalf of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas:

The National Insurance and Social Security (Self-employed Persons) Regulations, 1970.

The Employment Injury (Claims and Payments) Regulations, 1970.

The Employment Injury (Determination of Claims and Questions) Regulations, 1970.

The Employment Injury (Benefit) Regulations, 1970.

The National Insurance and Social Security (Collection of Contributions) (Amendment) Regulations, 1970.

#### PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Private Members' Business be now taken for one hour and a quarter.

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 Order No. 16 be taken first.

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

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

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Leader of the House is speaking and then the hon. senior member for St. Andrew.

Mr. SPEAKER: We never dispute that which is indisputable. The Hon. Leader of the House moved that further consideration be postponed, and it is now the Hon. Leader of the House to rise and speak.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: As we intimated, Mr. Speaker, we will be putting in an amendment, but I am waiving my right to speak now and allow the hon.

senior member for St. Andrew to move the amendment, but I reserve my right to speak. I said, I am giving way while reserving my right for the appropriate Minister to introduce the amendment, but I reserve my right to take part later on.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House moved that further consideration be now postponed, and he does not necessarily have to speak now. He did not speak on the motion that further consideration be postponed.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, there has been much said by hon. members on the other side in respect of the Barbados Marketing Corporation in dealing with a problem which they had to face not only in 1970 when the problem reached a head, but as far back as the 13th May, 1969 when the Barbados Marketing Corporation attempted in the interest of the Government, and thirdly not in the interest of Barbados Seafoods Limited but rather in the interest, as I said, and I cannot repeat myself too often to say that the action taken by the Barbados Marketing Corporation was taken in good faith and in the interest of the people of this country, and I am going to set about to prove here in this Chamber that any action taken by the Barbados Marketing Corporation was done in the interest of the people of this country and in good faith.

Mr. Speaker, before I set about to prove my point I should like at this stage to introduce an amendment to the Resolution moved in his own way by the hon. senior member for Christ Church, and my amendment which I will move reads as follows:

WHEREAS for many years the Barbados Seafoods Co. Ltd. were the contractors to the Barbados Marketing Corporation for the supply of shrimp;

AND WHEREAS operating out of Barbados in connection with the said contract were some 30 odd shrimp boats;

AND WHEREAS some 500 odd workers were employed in provision of services for the said shrimp industry, and a sum in excess of \$2 1/2 million was spent in Barbados;

AND WHEREAS the Barbados Marketing Corporation received an inadequate sum of money by way of fee from the processing of shrimp;

AND WHEREAS the Barbados Marketing Corporation failed to reach an agreement with the Barbados Seafoods Co. Ltd. on the terms of a new contract and awarded a contract to supply and process shrimp to the Bajan Seafoods Co. Ltd.;

AND WHEREAS the said Bajan Seafoods Co. Ltd. had only been able to supply four boats to supply shrimp to the said Barbados Marketing Corporation;

AND WHEREAS the said boats have been repossessed by their owners;

AND WHEREAS as a result of the re-possession of the said boats no shrimp has been supplied to the Barbados Marketing Corporation and the Barbados Marketing Corporation has thereby lost considerable sums of money in fees for processing shrimps;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House deplores the grave loss of employment that has occurred, the grave loss of revenue to Barbados, and calls upon the Government to take steps forthwith to restore a shrimp industry on terms much more favourable to Barbadian participation, and in an atmosphere free from racial discrimination. (*Asides.*)

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the hon. members from the other side were heckled when they were putting their case, I therefore feel and submit that just as they were listened to .....

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the mover of that Resolution would take steps to have copies of the amendment made and circulated as quickly as possible, because it is of considerable interest to us on this side of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask the Clerk to have copies made and circulated; let the hon. member proceed.  
3.30 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I move this amendment, and I am going to justify having it carried. I would like the House to accept that some 500 odd workers were employed in the provision of service in the shrimp industry.

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is he now speaking on the amendment, or on the original Resolution?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is entitled to speak on both: on the Motion and on the amendment.

Mr. CRAIG: He can speak generally but not on both, with great respect to Your Honour's ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is entitled to speak on what is before the House: the Motion and the amendment. Let the hon. member continue.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I was saying that we accept that there were some 500 odd workers who were employed in the provision of service in the shrimp industry. The Barbados Seafoods Ltd. employed about sixty per cent of that number, and the others were employed. ....

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Minister when the Barbados Seafoods Ltd. employed that 60%.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. May I remind the hon. member who rose on the alleged point of order that he has not yet spoken and he has the full right of reply.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I have absolutely no intention of answering questions raised

by the other side other than when I come to the particular points. I will cover all the points raised - fictitious and otherwise - by the Opposition in the course of my address. They need not get up and ask questions continually, because they cannot push me off my points this evening. I am going to express myself here.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may proceed.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I was saying that the others were employed by the Ice Company, foundries and other sectors in the business community of this country. The actual number directly affected as a result of the breakdown in negotiations between the Barbados Marketing Corporation and the Barbados Seafoods Limited was approximately 300. It varied from time to time between 180 to 300. The point is that it depended upon the amount of shrimps processed by the Barbados Marketing Corporation.

Now, the majority of the workers, especially those with skills, have found other gainful employment, but we are still deeply concerned about those have not yet been employed. We are pleased to announce that the situation is not nearly as bad as the attempt to make out a case here by the Opposition. We understand why this is done. We understand that this is election year and that the Opposition, being void of grist for their political mill, must find so-called areas of grievance - even if the areas are manufactured to express themselves.

Mr. Speaker, they will attack one area, and when they find it is not a successful attack they will try to find another area. That is their function, and I suppose if we were in the Opposition we would do that, too, but the only thing is that we would have been a bit more discreet about the matter. We would not have told so many lies; we would have spoken the truth, and we would not have tried to run down Barbadians who had any sort of interest in promoting the welfare of Barbadians. If Barbadians were interested in investing in industries in this country, we would not have tried to stop them at the expense of people from outside, especially when those from outside did not know how to treat black Barbadians.

Sir, it is an open secret that the workers employed by Barbados Seafoods Ltd. were not treated like human beings by a man called Schofield. It is an open secret that there has been a lot of discrimination in the operation of the Company known as Barbados Seafoods Ltd; it is an open secret that the foreign Captains were given priority over the local Captains, and in many instances they were give better wages than the local Captains. It is against this type of background that the Barbados Marketing Corporation was forced to act.

The Opposition contended that the Barbados Marketing Corporation received between \$200,000 to \$300,000 per annum by way of fees for processing shrimp. They did not say what was the net revenue. The Opposition talked about the gross revenue, but they did not say what was the net revenue. Let us go

back as far as 1965. The revenue, according to the Barbados Marketing Corporation, out of the shrimp industry was \$165,480 gross. The direct expenses, nothing to do with the indirect expenses, amounted to \$104,733; therefore for a whole year the net revenue, after taking out expenses, was \$60,747. 3.40 p.m.

For 1966-67 the gross revenue was \$197,872 and direct expenses were \$139,649, leaving a net revenue of \$58,223. In 1967-68 the gross revenue was \$215,119 and direct expenses amounted to \$134,167. In that year the Barbados Marketing Corporation had a net revenue of \$80,952. Let us watch the trend from 1967. In 1968-69 the gross revenue was \$202,176 and direct expenses amounted to \$154,352. Although the gross revenue was over \$200,000, you will notice that the direct expenses increased, therefore there was a net revenue of \$47,824. The same trend continued during 1969-70 where the gross revenue was \$185,706 and direct expenses amounted to \$136,749, and there was a net revenue of \$48,957. Taking a look at these figures, it will be noted that although the amount of shrimps processed by the Marketing Corporation for Barbados Seafoods Limited increased in volume, the Barbados Marketing Corporation was making less money than it made initially in 1965-66, because the cost of increased electricity and the devaluation of the pound led to an increase in direct expenses, and it was at this stage that the Barbados Marketing Corporation looked around to find means of increasing the revenue from the shrimp industry, because when you take into consideration the amount of capital of the Barbados Marketing Corporation, the net revenue from the shrimp industry was negligible.

It is to be noticed that the electricity bill increased from \$26,177 to \$42,087 in 1968-69, and the total electricity bill for the Barbados Marketing Corporation moved from \$57,955 to \$70,738. This is against a background where there was a shortage of flying fish and the amount of the electricity used for the cold storage section for flying fish at the Barbados Marketing Corporation reduced considerably; but on the other hand, the amount of electricity used on the shrimp side increased considerably. You will note that the charges of electricity to the shrimp side in 1965-66 were \$8,000, in 1966-67 \$5,000, in 1967-68 \$26,000, in 1968-69 \$42,000 and in 1969-70 \$40,000. That was only the electricity bill, but the Barbados Marketing Corporation paid for all the utilities connected with the shrimp industry.

I mention those figures to point out that Barbados Seafoods employed different methods of processing shrimp between 1968 and 1970. In 1965-66 most of the shrimp processed by the Barbados Marketing Corporation passed through the plant once, but from 1967-70 most of the shrimp processed by Seafoods at the Barbados Marketing Corporation passed through the plant twice. This resulted in an increase to the Barbados Marketing Corporation in the cost of utilities, but even with this increase the Barbados Seafoods Limited did not find it suitable to pay an increased rate to the Barbados Marketing Corporation.

In 1965 when the shrimp industry began, the amount of money paid to the Barbados Marketing Corporation from Barbados Seafoods was US 5 cents for every pound of shrimp processed. That amounted to between E. C. 8 cents and E. C. 9 cents. With devaluation, the American dollar had a higher value, but Barbados Seafoods then contended that they should pay what US 5 cents amounted to in 1965-66 rather than what it amounted to after devaluation. The Barbados Marketing Corporation was contending that instead of paying between E. C. 8 cents and E. C. 9 cents they should pay E. C. 10 cents. They refused. It is to be noted that the agreement between the Barbados Marketing Corporation and Barbados Seafoods Limited ended as far back as 7th July, 1969, but as far back, Mr. Speaker, as May, 1969, the Barbados Marketing Corporation had been negotiating with Barbados Seafoods on a new contract. 3.50 p.m.

I must say here that there have been several areas of disagreement between Barbados Seafoods and the B. M. C. in a new contract, but negotiations broke down on two very salient points. In negotiating for the new contract the Barbados Marketing Corporation put up two proposals to Barbados Seafoods; one, that the Barbados Seafoods should pay U. S. 7 cents per pound for all shrimp processed which would cover the cost of peeling and cleaning, and that B. M. C. should continue to pay the utilities which would be between \$40,000 and \$45,000 per annum. The alternative proposal was that Barbados Seafoods should pay the B. M. C. U. S. 6 cents per pound for all the shrimp processed and that the Barbados Seafoods Company should take care of the Utilities, that is, between \$40,000 and \$45,000 per annum. As I said, there were several areas in this agreement, and by 4th September, 1969 all the conditions of the proposed contract with Barbados Seafoods were agreed to, with the exception of two points, the amount to be paid by Barbados Seafoods was not agreed upon because the Barbados Marketing Corporation insisted on either receiving U. S. 7 cents per pound for the processing of shrimp and providing utility services, or U. S. 6 cents per pound and the Barbados Seafoods Company would pay for the utilities. The B. M. C. even went further and tried to strike a compromise by offering the Barbados Seafoods Company if they paid U. S. 6 cents per pound for processing the shrimp to pay half of the utility services and the Barbados Seafoods Company would pay the other half.

This is the extent to which they went with the negotiations, and the Barbados Seafoods Company also wanted to erase Clause 6 of the original agreement. Those were the areas of disagreement. That was on 4th September, 1969, and on 20th November, 1969, the B. M. C. reopened negotiations with Barbados Seafoods, and the Barbados Seafoods representative who was accompanied at this time by a Mr. Sorensen, when they were asked about the amount of the Corporation's request they denied categorically having promised to discuss the two

points, the price and the request of the B. M. C. dealing with the other Clause with their principals. When he was told to put the request of the B. M. C. to his principals he denied in the new negotiations on 20th November, 1969 that he was ever told or that he had ever promised to put the request of the B. M. C. to the principals of Barbados Seafoods, so he was the straw boss. Not only that, when they came to this meeting the B. M. C. again outlined the case for an increased based on an increased cost due to devaluation, and pointed out that 9 cents in the old contract amounted to 5 1/2 cents in the new contract, that is, if it were taken in 1966, compared with 5 cents U. S. which they had offered, and that the increased cost they were paying the B. M. C. was equivalent to something like 9 1/4 cents, which was almost the same 5 cents, and the B. M. C. contended that they could not operate on that basis.

Here we come to a very interesting part, Mr. Speaker, of the negotiations. The representative, Mr. Schofield, of the Barbados Seafoods Company had the gall to look at the Board of the B. M. C., a Government Statutory agency, and tell them that they were not in a position to dictate any terms to him because the B. M. C. could not survive without the contract. He was Lord Dictator to a Government agency, a man who came here to kick about Barbadians, a man who came here to discriminate against Barbadians, goes to the Board of the B. M. C. to tell the Board that they could not dictate to him what he should pay to the B. M. C. for the services provided by a Government agency in dealing with shrimp, and absolutely refused to put the case of the B. M. C. to his principals, and I understand that the principals were willing to give the B. M. C. what they wanted. The B. M. C. fought their case on the increased cost as a result of devaluation and on the fact that they had to pay an increased cost for electricity and other services and he told the B. M. C. that he nor his company was responsible for devaluation and in negotiating with the B. M. C. he was not taking devaluation into account. At this stage the man took up his paper and stamped out of the room and these were his words: "You could do what the hell you like, you can make the decision and let us know."

4.00 p.m.

In other words, he did not care what the Barbados Marketing Corporation did. He did not care about the Board because his face was half-scald and he was dealing with black people. He did not care about them, and he felt that he could treat them like boys in the yard. That is the sort of thing that the members of the Opposition want to encourage in this country. They want to encourage disrespect to Barbadians. (*Asides.*)

Mr. Speaker: Will hon. members address the Chair, and await their turn so to do.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member is saying that the Opposition is encouraging this sort of behaviour. All I am asking him is whether the Government has ever looked at

I.S.L. I have the facts and the documents locked away in a safe to tell them about who brought in I. S. L.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the hon. Minister had drawn this matter to the attention of the union.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: They are going to get up like Yo Yos the whole time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I suggest to the hon. member that when the Chair rules no point of order, he should ignore certain things.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I was saying that it is this type of behaviour that the Opposition is condoning; it is this type of treatment to their fellow-Barbadians that the Opposition is condoning. I say that if you want to come to our country to operate, you have to set aside discrimination and discriminatory practices; you cannot come here and say you are going to segregate, and you have to treat people with respect. Regardless of who you are, you cannot come here and expect that you are bigger than Barbadians.

Mr. Speaker, on the 27th November, 1969, after this man called Schofield treated the officers at the Barbados Marketing Corporation as though they were dogs - he slammed a door in their face; he treated them with the greatest contempt. If I had my own way, and were I the Minister of Home Affairs at the time and the matter was put before me, I would have asked him to leave this country immediately. The Board failed to lay an immediate report to the Cabinet on the matter. I am not going to support all the actions of the Board. This is an action of the Board that I think I should attack. The point is that they should have reported the behaviour of this alien at the time to the powers that could deal with him and get him out. I do not think anybody else will try it again.

They reported the matter on the 27th November; the Board was informed of what had taken place, and it was decided at that meeting that Schofield should go. On the 27th November the Board decided that, in the light of the treatment which was given to the Barbados Marketing Corporation's Delegation concerned with the negotiations with Schofield, if he had no respect for them they did not see why they should have respect for him.

Mr. Speaker, when you hear the hon. members on that side talking about Bajan Seafoods and saying that we broke a contract between the Barbados Marketing Corporation and Barbados Seafoods for friends of people at court, the Bajan Seafoods Ltd., I want to make the matter clear. I hope that in the same way as the Press noted the points raised by the Opposition, the Press will also note these salient points. The impression was given that the Barbados

Marketing Corporation got up one morning, turned against Schofield and his Company, and told them to leave the country because they wanted to give the contract to Bajan Seafoods. That is the impression given to people all over this country. That is due to the fact that the Opposition, in representing their case, always finds it necessary to engage in cheap politics.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I do not mind the hon. member fulminating, but he says that the Opposition finds it necessary to indulge in cheap politics. The position is quite clear; only the hon. member for St. James and I spoke on the matter, and I object to that. The hon. member cannot say that any speaker in this House made a statement and indulged in cheap politics on the floor of the House. He is not entitled to say that any speaker on this side of the House indulged in cheap politics. That is offensive and contrary to the Standing Orders.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not regard that remark as constituting an infringement of the Standing Orders.

Mr. St. JOHN: Good; I will mark that for future reference.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, every time that you hit them for six they will jump up like Yo Yos, and they have a lot of that to do. I was saying that it was not until January 20, 1970, that the Barbados Marketing Corporation was approached in respect of the establishment of an agreement between this new Company, the Bajan Seafoods Ltd., and the Barbados Marketing Corporation.  
4.10 p.m.

Since May, 1969, the Barbados Marketing Corporation had been negotiating a new agreement.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I just want to get one point straight. Did he say it was 20th January, 1970, before he was approached?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I said that it was since 13th May, 1969, that the Barbados Marketing Corporation began negotiations with Barbados Seafoods Limited for a renewal of the contract on revised terms. The negotiations broke down with Schofield insulting the members of the Board of the Barbados Marketing Corporation, a statutory body established by the Government of Barbados to run the Corporation and presided over by Barbadians. He failed to represent the points raised by the Barbados Marketing Corporation to his principals and therefore an agreement could not be reached; but it was not until 20th January, 1970, that proposals from two directors of a Company which was to be incorporated, and this company was known as Bajan Seafoods, were discussed by the Board of the Barbados Marketing Corporation.

Now the proposals of the new company were put to the Ministry of Agriculture and subsequently to the

Cabinet, and the decision was conveyed to the Barbados Marketing Corporation in respect of this company in a letter dated 19th February, 1970. At this stage negotiations had broken down; Schofield expressed contempt for the Barbados Marketing Corporation and its members and Barbados in general, because the people of Barbados elected the Government and the Government appointed the Board, and when Schofield can express contempt for that Board, he was expressing contempt for the Government and for the people that placed the Government there. So to say that Schofield was driven out for this new company or to give the people of this country the impression that the Barbados Marketing Corporation drove the Schofield and brought in a new company with Barbadian participation or that because the company had as its directors friends of the Prime Minister, is a deliberate misrepresentation of the facts.

Mr. Speaker, at any rate the Barbados Marketing Corporation could not have tolerated Schofield after he had treated them in that manner. The negotiations had broken down and as far as the Barbados Marketing Corporation was concerned, the contract had come to an end. It was then that the Barbados Marketing Corporation negotiated with Bajan Seafoods and gave a contract to operate the shrimp industry of this country.

Now, we are going to deal with that, and what I am going to say here some people are not going to like. It is a fact that these people only had four boats. It is also a fact that Bajan Seafoods had made arrangements to have eleven other boats supplied, and it is also a fact that certain pressures from members of the Opposition who had friends in one of the Banks in Bridgetown where Bajan Seafoods was raising money, put a spoke in the wheels of Bajan Seafoods and stopped the Bank of America from lending Bajan Seafoods the money they wanted.

Mr. St. JOHN: On a point of order, the hon. member is now getting down to brass tacks. I challenge the hon. member to state that either I, the hon. senior member for St. James, the hon. junior member for Bridgetown, the hon. junior member for St. Peter, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph or any member of the Opposition. ....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order, let the hon. member sit down. The hon. member cannot do that.

Mr. St. JOHN: I am on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. You either hear me or you yourself must get out too.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us get this clear. Only the electorate of St. Lucy can get me out of this House. The hon. member had arisen on a point of order. Apparently he has finished. I do not rule it not to be a point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am saying on the floor of this House and I regret, that certain members of the Opposition put a spoke in the wheel of

the negotiations between Bajan Seafoods and the bank with which they were negotiating a loan to carry on the industry, and this was to stop Barbadians from being retained in their jobs, because Bajan Seafoods agreed to employ all the people that were employed by Barbados Seafoods Limited.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, I am appealing to the Minister not to continue in this vein. He knows that what he is saying, is not all that is true.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order. Let the Hon. Minister continue.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I may perhaps be told that is not true.  
4.20 p.m.

They talked about putting Barbadians out of work; which lawyer it was that re-possessed the boats and came to the House of Assembly and bragged that he re-possessed the four boats that Bajan Seafoods got from the parent body, Outrigger Co. Ltd., to operate a shrimp industry in this country?

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, Sir, if a Minister from that side of the House contracts a debt in Bridgetown, should a lawyer from this side not prosecute him?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I am saying that neither one of the members of the Democratic Labour Party went and seized the four boats, that West Indians had an interest in, for operating the first West Indian run shrimp industry in the Caribbean; not one member of the Democratic Labour Party has done it, but I will tell you this too, that lawyers from the Democratic Labour Party refused to act for the company. Lawyers from the Democratic Labour Party refused to go against the boats that one prominent member of the Opposition acted for, re-possessed the boats, and remember, Mr. Speaker, the boats were operating in Barbados, they were finding employment for Barbadians, and a particular lawyer who is a member of the Barbados Labour Party, the Leader of the Opposition, who says that he is the obvious choice for leadership of this country, a man who pretends to be representing the poor working class people of this country, a man in order to try to embarrass the Board of the Barbados Marketing Corporation and the Government of this country, as well as embarrassing the people of this country, he is the person who stopped the 500 poor people from getting bread. The Leader of the Opposition, because it was he who re-possessed the ships operated by Bajan Seafoods Co., .....

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, Sir, is the Minister saying that the Leader of the Opposition levied on these boats for debt?

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am coming to that, Mr. Speaker, I am going to give you chapter and verse of how the person who acted for these people was acting in his own pecuniary interest and not in the interest of Barbadians. These are the facts. Outrigger Co., which was the parent body of Bajan Seafoods, had the boats from another company on a sort of lease-purchase basis; let them say it is not true. The Bajan Seafoods Co. Ltd. began to get trouble with these boats, and it was the first of these glass-bottomed boats of that size that were manufactured by this particular company; the boats had their faults, Bajan Seafoods represented to the company that something ought to be done to the boats - as a matter of fact, one actually sank. The company that manufactured and owned the boats and passed them over to Outrigger on a lease-purchase basis refused to take action to remedy the faults in the boats and Bajan Seafoods decided that until they remedied the faults of these boats they were not going to pay any more money on them; instead of this hon. member, whoever he was that represented that company that sued Bajan Seafoods and Outrigger, instead of telling them that these boats were keeping Bajans in employment and that they were keeping the shrimp industry alive in Barbados, and that these boats were keeping black Barbadians, poor Barbadians, alive, he was not at that time thinking of the 500 people employed, he was thinking of his own pocket and not the 500 Barbadians that were employed in the industry, but now he could have the brass to come in here talking about representing 500 workers that were put out of work, when he himself was the person that put them out of work.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, he did that for political reasons. You will notice in his speech that it was just another of the attempts - as I said earlier today, they cannot beat us on performance, they said that the only way they could persuade middle class people of this country to support them is that they will come forward and accuse individual members of the Government of corruption.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, we did not accuse individuals, we accused the hon. member who is speaking.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order at all.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, in this session a Resolution was introduced in this House purporting to convey the thought that the hon. member now speaking indulged in corruption; he was accused of building flats at Stanmore Lodge out of monies of the Housing Authority, he was accused of all sorts of .....

Mr. SPEAKER: I will remind the hon. member of Standing Order 26 (11) which states: "No Member is to allude to any debate of the same session upon a question or Bill not being then under discussion, except by indulgence of the House, for personal explanation."

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Private Members' Business be extended for half an hour.

Mr. CRAIG: I appreciate the half hour, but we on this side would be quite willing to entertain the Government for two more hours.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: An amendment has been moved to the original motion; the motion is for half an hour and the amendment is for two hours, I will put the amendment first.

4.30 p.m.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: What is the amendment, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Motion is for half-hour.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: I move a further amendment for an hour. I am sure the Hon. Leader of the House will accept an hour instead of two hours.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will put the amendment first. Hon. members in favour of the amendment "That Members' Business be extended for two hours" will please say "Aye." Hon. members of a contrary opinion will please say "No." (Pause) I declare the "Noes" have it.

Mr. St. JOHN: Divide.

The House divided and voted as follows:

NOES: Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Hon. N. W. BOXILL; Mr. HOPPIN; Mr. YEARWOOD; Mr. SPRINGER; Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Mr. WEEKES, and Mr. LOWE - 9.

AYES: Mr. BOLDEN; Mr. HINDS; Mr. CRAIG; Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY, Mr. St. JOHN, and Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY - 6.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am advised that, in respect of the amendment, 6 hon. members voted "Aye" and 9 hon. members voted "No."

The Motion I now put to the house is "That this debate continues for half an hour." Hon. members in favour of the Motion will please say "Aye." Hon. members against will please say "No." (Pause.) Methinks the "Ayes" have it.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Divide.

The House divided and voted as follows:

AYES: Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Hon. N. W. BOXILL.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, do we take the half hour from the time we suggest it, or from the time the Motion is carried?

Mr. SPEAKER: From the time the result of the vote is announced. Please continue taking the vote.

AYES: Mr. HOPPIN; Mr. YEARWOOD; Mr. SPRINGER; Mr. WEEKES, and Mr. LOWE. - 8.

NOES: Mr. BOLDEN; Mr. HINDS; Mr. CRAIG; Mr. St. JOHN; Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY, and Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY - 6.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am advised that 6 hon. members voted "No," whereas 8 hon. members voted "Aye;" therefore, I declare the "Ayes" have it, and this debate continues for half an hour. The hon. senior member for St. Andrew was on his feet.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I was saying that for the past six months every day I have entered this Chamber I have been attacked by members of the Opposition. Those who do not say that I indulge in corruption say that I am a thief. They say that I indulge in corruption to build houses; they say that I bought a motor car out of corruption and all sorts of things. Mr. Speaker, it is time that an end be put to it. I know what they are getting at: I am a black man; I was born poor; I am not supposed to have anything; I am not supposed to participate in the development of this country; and I am not supposed to do anything. We have to get the record straight, and I am going to put it straight now.

Mr. Speaker, I operate a few companies. I have an interest in a few companies in this country: One is known as Federal High School Ltd., and another is known as Melbourne Investments Ltd. Here am I with certificates from Barclays Bank, D.C.O., incorporation in the United Kingdom with limited liability, Hincks Street Branch, dated 1st February, 1971: I will read:

"We hereby certify that, all the close of business on December 31st, 1970, the loan account in the name of Melbourne Investments Ltd....."

That is the Company that owns all the flats at Stanmore Lodge - "..... in our books showed a debit balance.".....

That means that Melbourne Investments Ltd. owe the bank - "..... of \$80,624.81."

For Barclays Bank D.C.O.,  
R.A. P. Martins, For Manager."

Here is another one dated the same date and it says:

"We hereby certify that, at the close of business on December 31st, 1970, the current account in the name of Melbourne Investments Ltd. in our books showed a debit balance of \$63,975.26 - sixty thousand, nine hundred seventy five dollars, twenty six cents."

This was signed by the same person.  
4.40 p.m.

These are going to be documents to the House and I will pass them to you, Mr. Speaker. They want to know my business, so I am going to let them know my business. My personal account: Hon. A. DaC. Edwards:

"We hereby certify that, at the close of business on December 31st 1970, the current account in the name of Hon. A. DaC. Edwards in our books showed a debit balance of \$7,349.50 - seven thousand, three hundred forty nine dollars, fifty cents."

Mr. SPEAKER: May I just say that although this information seems to be of interest to hon. members, it does not bear any relevance to the debate.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: It bears relevance because in the debate I was accused of corruption, and it was this I was accused of.

Mr. Speaker, I continue. I bought a V.I.P. Chrysler for \$13,000. I brought it out of the garage on 5th June, 1970. I did not pay one cent for the car, but between that time and the time I paid for the car, a Resolution was brought to this House and in that Resolution it was stated that I bought the car out of the Housing Authority's money. On 29th October, a day or two before I as Minister of Trade came down on the car dealers of this country, I went to Barclays Bank and borrowed \$25,000 to pay for that car and for a piece of land which I had bought from Leroy Miller at Silver Sands, Christ Church.

Mr. St. JOHN: On a point of order, is the Hon. Minister saying he had the car and did not pay for it for four months? Did he have extended credit for four months for a car?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The facts are as I stated them. Since then some of the money has been paid, and Mr. Speaker, this is the account:

"We hereby certify that, at the close of business on December 31st, 1970, the loan account in the name of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS in our books showed a debit balance of \$23,260.80 - twenty three thousand, two hundred and sixty dollars, eighty cents."

Mr. Speaker, I also have interest in a company known as Agricultural Developments Ltd., and this Company owes Barclays Bank \$47,674.28.

Mr. St. JOHN: On a point of order, is Agricultural Developments Limited a Cayman Island Company?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: No, Mr. Speaker. It is a Company registered in Barbados. Mr. Speaker, at the close of the books on December 31st, 1970,

Agricultural Developments Limited owed Barclays Bank \$272,082.75. Federal High School Limited owed at the close of the financial year \$64,091.97 to Barclays Bank, making a grand total of \$550,931.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think the Hon. Minister should resign. He owes away \$500,000 and he has no assets. He is a bankrupt.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order whatsoever. May I again say to the hon. member that this is outside the debate on Barbados Seafoods Company Limited. Let the hon. member proceed on that.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister has given us the figures of the Melbourne Investments Limited at 31st December, 1970.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, is that a point of order? The hon. member has his opportunity to speak.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Will you let me make my point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER: I just want to hear whether it is a valid or invalid point of order.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister has said that Melbourne Investments Limited owed Barclays Bank at 31st December, 1970, \$80,624. I wonder if the Minister would be so kind as to say how much they owed at 31st December, 1969.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order whatsoever, but I remind the Hon. Minister that such alleged points have no bearing at all on the Resolution before the House, that is on Barbados Seafoods Company Limited activities for many years as contractors to the Barbados Marketing Corporation for the supply of shrimp. May I suggest to the Hon. Minister to continue his address on the Barbados Marketing Corporation?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on one further point of order I just want to find out if the documents from which the Minister read are being made documents of the House. I would like your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that has been done. I have no reason now to doubt the efficiency of the Clerks-at-the-Table.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to enquire about the copies of the amendment to this Resolution which were promised earlier.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have received the assurance that they will be circulated. I doubt very much whether this debate will conclude this afternoon.

Mr. HINDS: But we have Xerox machine.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid I do not operate it.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, may I continue? I knew they would be restless. Do you know why? From the facts which were just revealed, the people of this country can only conclude that when they talk they are dealing with sheer hypocrisy; when they talk they are dishonest in their representations just as they are dishonest in their representations in connection with the Barbados Marketing Corporation. Their attitude is to make people believe that the only thing a member of the Government can do, is to keep pimps. They are not to have friends, and the only friends they must have are friends to pull them down.

Mr. Speaker, this thing has been a matter of considerable concern to me. Because of the unfounded accusations levelled in here by members of the Opposition, I drive along the road in my car, and it is said that I stole it from the Housing Authority. 4.50 p.m.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Sir, I do not think it is right for the hon. member to say that there were unfounded accusations levelled at him.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not regard that as unparliamentary as it stands, accusations may be unfounded due to bad notice or due to bad information.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I am trying to point out that this whole exercise which we are going through now is carried out by the Opposition because the Opposition feels that people like Carlton Brathwaite, a poor country boy, has no place in industrial development in this country. They all feel that Carlton Brathwaite, who is a friend of the Prime Minister, is party to the exercise, being a shareholder in Bajan Seafoods Ltd. Even if he were a shareholder, Mr. Speaker, do you mean the only reason he could not be a shareholder is because he is a black Barbadian? I deny that he is a shareholder.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I would like to get the Minister correctly; is he denying the Carlton Brathwaite is a Director of Bajan Seafoods Ltd? Carlton Brathwaite and Bruce Procope? Let me hear him deny that now.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I categorically deny that Carlton Brathwaite is a shareholder of Bajan Seafoods Co. Ltd.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I have in my hand a cyclostyled copy of a document showing that Carlton Brathwaite has one share and Bruce Procope one share in Bajan Seafoods Co. Ltd., and you can stand up here and mislead this House?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has made his point.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I am asking that that document be made a document of this House.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I have another document in my hand, Sir.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister had not yet finished his speech.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, let us accept that what the hon. member said is true in respect of Carlton Brathwaite being a shareholder; if he were a shareholder, and my information is that he is not a shareholder. ....

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Sir, I do not think it is right for the Minister to mislead this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the point of order.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: He made an untrue statement, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: With all due respect to you, Sir, but for a member to come in here - and I am not saying the Minister is doing that - and deliberately make a statement which he knows is not true must be in breach of the rules of this Assembly, and that is what I would like the Minister to stop doing. I have a document signed by Carlton Brathwaite as Director of Bajan Seafoods Ltd., so the Minister is misleading this House, I do not want to say deliberately.

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, let me explain my position when I say that Carlton Brathwaite is not a shareholder of the company, Carlton Brathwaite is a Director of the company just like any Solicitor is a Director, if you have a Solicitor to sign papers for you in your business and you undertake to give a share to him; he does not necessarily pay for the share, and this is how Carlton Brathwaite got involved, because of one of the Directors for whom Carlton Brathwaite was asked to act. He does not have one cent in the company, but in the absence of a Director he was made a Director, and to be a Director they had to allocate one share to him, not that he bought the share but a share was allocated to him so that he could act and sign documents on behalf and for the company.

Mr. St. JOHN: On a point of order, is the Hon. Minister saying that Carlton Brathwaite did not put up one cent?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I am going to deal with the facts as they are. They are worried because ..... (Asides.) Mr. Speaker, when I am permitted to speak I will continue.

Mr. SPEAKER: There must be silence by all persons except the hon. member addressing the Chair; I mean all persons within the hearing of this microphone, have I made myself clear?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am dealing with Bajan Seafoods Co. Ltd.; it was registered in this island

around February, 1970, and the company had an equity of \$50,000 and 50% of the equity was to go to American interests and 50% to West Indian interests. The names of the Directors were needed to facilitate the Register and Mr. Bruce Procope and Mr. Carlton Brathwaite signed as Directors. I said that Carlton Brathwaite was brought into it quite innocently when he was authorised to sign on behalf of an American interest and in order for him to sign, one share was allocated to him. I might correct myself and say that Carlton Brathwaite did not buy any shares in the company, nor could he buy any shares in the company because he did not have the money to buy them. 5.00 p.m.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I do not know who is misleading the Minister, but you cannot have one share in a company and be a director. You will have to take out several shares. Mr. Brathwaite is a director, as the Minister says, and he must hold more than one share.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is now refuting his own argument, because he said that he had a document showing where Carlton Brathwaite was a director; that he was owner of one share, and that one share was allocated to him. That is the document which he made a document of this House and now he is denying it.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I will produce the other document I have signed, by Carlton Brathwaite, in his own handwriting, as a director of Seafoods Ltd. I will make it a document of the House:

"This is to certify that Bajan Seafoods Limited is in the course of being dissolved..."

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Do not make it a document of the House.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I have nothing more to say. Carlton Brathwaite has one share.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I was pointing out who were the directors of this Company, and I pointed out that Mr. Brathwaite represented an American Company but that he had no financial interest in the Company. (Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: "Who had the West Indian shares?") When the Barbados Marketing Corporation were carrying our negotiations with Bajan Seafoods Limited, knowing that \$50,000 Eastern Caribbean Currency was not enough equity, they asked for confirmation of the financial arrangements. I am giving you chapter and verse. The information is that marketing the product would have been easy as Ocean Garden Products had made joint representations with Mr. Bobb Jones to the Corporation's Board, and, on checking Ocean Gardens Products, the Bank of America in Bridgetown on the 31st January, 1970, stated that they extended, on secured credit, approximately \$5 million to that firm and that \$75,000 (US) had already been deposited to purchase the first catch. I want to mention here what I said earlier on, that the

Barbados Marketing Corporation acted in good faith.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Minister was telling us earlier that 50% of the shares were owned by West Indian nationals. Would he be so kind as to tell the House who are these West Indian Nationals that own 50% of the shares?

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, when you answer people too much, they feel that they are important. I said that \$75,000 (U. S.) was deposited to the account to purchase the first catch of shrimps, and I was trying to point out that in all of these negotiations the Barbados Marketing Corporation acted in good faith. The Barbados Marketing Corporation did what they thought was in the interest of the people of this country.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that I have to draw to the attention of the hon. member that the time for Private Members' Business has now expired, and we revert to Government Business. When Government Business was suspended the House was in Committee, and to that it now reverts.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the time be extended for another hour and a half.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already declared that the time has expired. In fact, it has expired by half of a minute. I have already declared that the time has expired and the House reverts to Government Business when the Chairman resumes the Chair.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, .....

Mr. SPEAKER: The time has expired and I am leaving the Chair.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When this Committee was suspended the hon. junior member for St. Lucy was addressing the Chair.

## GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

### ACQUISITION OF LAWS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I was rising to answer one of the queries raised by the hon. senior member for Bridgetown in respect of the ownership of the land and whether proper arrangements were made for disposing of it. All I can tell the hon. member is that the Crown Solicitor negotiated on behalf of the Government; Mr. Henry Forde on behalf of the two parties, Miss Jones and Mrs. A. M. Jackman, and in each case they acted jointly. That is to say the two sisters acted jointly in each case.

In other words, so far as Government is concerned, there has never been any question of the inability of the two parties to dispose of the land, because all communications to us have been in respect of both of them as joint owners of the property. I should also tell the House that there is an apparent discrepancy in the figures shown on the plan of 154,000 sq. ft. when in fact we are buying 185,000 sq. ft., as I said before. The Chief Land Surveyor has said that there is a small area in the north-east corner of the property, which had been excluded from the original transaction, but that this area should be the approximate difference between this small area which was first excluded and which is now included and would be the difference between the 154,000 sq. ft. and the 185,245 sq. ft.

5.10 p.m.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: How much per foot are you paying for it?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Speaking subject to correction, I think it is \$1.00 a square foot.

*The question that Head 105 - Home Affairs - stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Resolution for the sum of \$310,743 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

1970-71 No. 14

*I beg to move that Head 2 - Service Commission - stand part.*

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, in this Resolution, under Head 2 - Service Commission - we have to supplement Items 13, 14, 15 and 16. If there is any question hon. members wish to ask, I shall be pleased to answer.

*I beg to move that Head 2 - Service Commissions - stand part.*

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

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, dealing with the question of Service Commissions, the only point which comes to mind at this stage is the question of the failure of the Public Service Commission to appoint certain officers. For instance, case of the Police Service Commission, I think there are about six posts of Inspector vacant since April last year. When a situation like this is allowed to go on in the Police Force, it will only have a bad effect on the morale of the Police Force, and there-

fore I ask the Government to take steps to ensure that these appointments are made as soon as possible.

*The question that Head 2 - Service Commissions - stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

*Head 3 - Parliament - was called.*

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, under Item 27 - Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, this sum is to meet the actual and anticipated commitments of the C. P. A. to the end of the financial year.

*I beg to move that Head 3 - Parliament - stand part.*

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

Mr. HOPPIN: Mr. Chairman, under this item I would like to know how is it names have been sent in to the Secretary of the C. P. A. in connection with these prospective tours and none of the candidates whose names have been submitted have been chosen. I would like some explanation because in things of this nature we do feel that everyone should have a chance of going. I hope the Minister will be in a position to answer.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, under the Constitution of this Branch of the C. P. A., the Executive Committee has power to select delegates to represent the Branch on occasions outside the country. I do also happen to know that the Secretary of the Branch informally enquires from all members of the Branch what interest, if any, they have in certain tours abroad, and I believe that when he collects the replies from members he puts these replies before the Executive Committee and the Committee makes the selection. Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of the Selection Committee.

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

*Head 8 - Crown Solicitor - was called.*

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, under Head 8, this is a small amount to supplement the furniture and office equipment vote by \$128.

*I beg to move that Head 8 - Crown Solicitor - stand part.*

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

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

*Head 9 - Ministry of Finance - was called.*

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 9 - Ministry of Finance - stand part.

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

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

*Head 10 - Accountant General - was called.*

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 10 - Accountant General - stand part.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, note 10 tells us that as a result of irregularities which took place at the Accountant General's Department payments totalling \$5,706 have not yet been made to certain members of the public for services rendered.

Now surely the Minister ought to be in a position to give us a breakdown.  
5.20 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I will meet the hon. member halfway; I can give you the amounts but I cannot give you to whom the amounts are due. Hon. members will appreciate that this is a matter of some delicacy. I want to assist the hon. member in giving him the breakdown of the amounts so that he will know how we reached the total.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister could really call out figures without giving me an idea as to the people - for instance, I want to tell the Minister that there is a gentleman by the name of Mr. Lovell at My Lord's Hill, and I know how much is due to him. I want to test the accuracy of the information the Minister is giving this House; what I am saying is this, if the Minister comes to this House and merely expects to have this Resolution glossed over by telling this side there is a certain amount of delicacy, we are not concerned with this. At all times the taxpayers' business has got to be represented and we intend to do it from this side of the House, we are asking the Minister to tell us. Is it a case where the irregularities involved the actual paying out of money, is it a case where a clerk made a mistake in his additions or subtractions or something of the sort? Tell us exactly what has gone wrong.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, there has been a tradition in this House that I believe may even have been enshrined in the rules of this House that when matters are before the Courts in this island. ....

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, the Leader of this House ought to be fair and decent in this House that if a matter is before the Courts he ought not to take the same opportunity to bring the matter before this House to ask us to vote money in respect thereof.

We do not have to know a matter is before the Court, we are asking what happened in the office, what went wrong. The Minister might as well wait until everything gets before the Court, until the whole Treasury can be carried away and the taxpayers will then have to reimburse it, and no member of the Opposition can ask a question because the matter is before the Court. I never thought I would find the Leader of the House in such a ridiculous situation as I find the Leader today. I am asking the Minister to tell us to whom these amounts are due.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to be turned away from my point of view by the hon. member's comment, I am prepared to tell the hon. member that the sum of \$5,706.15 is made up of three amounts.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I must agree with the junior member for St. Peter, because if this is asking us to agree to a certain sum of money - and I gather that anything I say here is going to be prejudicial and I would not like to be prejudicial at this stage - but I have been given to understand that certain investigations are being carried out, and the figure which the Leader of the House mentions in itself seems to make up a portion of what I would like discussed, and if we are going to be asked at this stage to agree to pass this sum I will have no alternative whatsoever than to speak my mind openly, and I am of the opinion that this involves taxpayers' money, and I know from personal information that certain civil servants have put their hands in people's money.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like at this stage to allow members to present it in such a manner as rule 26 (3) which states: "Reference shall not be made to any matter on which a judicial decision is pending, in such a way as might in the opinion of the Chair prejudice the interests of parties thereto." As far as I have understood Head 10 seems to be awaiting a judicial decision and I would prefer to have this Head postponed.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, in the light of what the Hon. Leader of the House said, that he cannot give us a breakdown as requested by the junior member for St. Peter, it would not be fair for us to vote money in here. I beg to move that this Item be postponed for further consideration.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, the hon. members on the opposite side should know that in this Resolution which we are dealing with, which is an omnibus Resolution and this is why we are in Committee of Supply, but it is not that anybody on this side wants to hide anything or stifle debate, I would be glad to get into the debate but I heard the junior member for St. Joseph accuse civil servants of stealing money and so on; this might be true, but civil servants are from among us, and the hon. member would be one of this first people to go into the Court and ask the Prosecution a lot of hard and unnecessary questions in order to win a case.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, this is becoming ridiculous, if the hon. members feel that a lawyer is not to do his duty.  
5.30 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: At this time I do not think this is contributing to the Motion before the House. There is a Motion before the House for the postponement of Head 10.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHARIMAN: I can hardly hear; all hon. members must realise that this sitting has not yet been suspended.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I was saying that this Head came under an omnibus Resolution. Mr. Chairman, make the hon. member take his feet off the table. When white people were in here you never saw them putting their feet on the table. Hon. members do not do that at home, so why should they come in here to do it. This is February and the financial year will be closing next month, and if we do not pass it today we will have to bring it back in Committee of Supply shortly. The hon. member can talk on the matter after the case has been adjudicated. The hon. member can deal with this matter when we are discussing the Estimates. I am appealing to hon. members to let us get ahead with this item, because the money has been long outstanding. A lot of people are waiting for the money. We do not want to come back here with Items to be discussed in Committee of Supply, and that is why you will see so many on the Order Paper today. I do not have the money and nobody over here has the money. The matter is now sub judice, and we can wait until it has been adjudicated and deal with it when the Estimates come before the House.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in the first place, this is just an item to supplement a Contingency Vote pending the final investigations which are taking place in connection with the alleged irregularities. This money will not be paid out until final investigations have been completed. The second point is that these acts of irregularities were committed since May 1969. The third point I am making is that the Government does not control the schedule or the arrangement of the work in the Courts. Since May 1969 these matters have been pending and investigations have been taking place. Not one of us in this Chamber has anything to do with the arrangement of the calendar of the Courts. It is over 1 1/2 years since this matter has been pending. We are here to supplement the vote so that, if necessary, the money will be available. If we do not get the money we would not be able to pay the same people that the hon. junior member for St. Peter is trying to represent.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. When the Minister talks about representing people,

they are representing the entire taxpayers, and we on this side are here to make sure that money should not pass through here unless we are satisfied, or unless you beat us by the vote. If this matter has been pending for 18 months, then it can wait for another 3 months because the Assizes only have a few weeks to run. If the investigations into this matter have been going on for so many months and the people have not yet died, then they will not die if they have to wait a few more months. That is my view.

Mr. GRAIG: Sir, I have a Motion before the House, and I could not withdraw it on this argument. The Note here states:

"As a result of irregularities which took place at the Accountant General's Department, payments totalling \$5,706 have not yet been made to certain members of the public for services rendered."

The hon. junior member for St. Peter is asking the Leader of the House to give him a breakdown. The Leader of the House can only give him the amount of money, but to whom the money is paid, he is not prepared to say. In the circumstances, I move that the item be postponed, because it is unfair for members on this side to vote for something that we do not know anything about. The Leader of the House is not prepared to give us certain information. I am not accusing the Government of throwing away the money, but I am not going to vote for something unless I have proper information.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am entirely in agreement with the senior member for St. James (*Asides.*) I am not going to address you until the Leader of the House is prepared to listen to what I have to say. Mr. Chairman, I agree that when a matter is sub judice you should not discuss it in detail in this House. I think that everybody knows about the \$40,000 in the bank, and \$2,000 being found in a brief case. I am nothing to do with that at the moment.

I would say that the Leader of the House should have confidence in the Leader of the Opposition. If he wanted to do anything in this matter, then he should have discussed the matter with the Leader of the Opposition. The money in this country does not belong to the Government alone.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, in violence to my own personal judgement, but certainly on the suggestion of my colleagues, I am going to give the hon. member and the Committee the names of the people to whom money is owed. I, personally, think I should not, but nevertheless I am advised to do it.  
5.40 p.m.

There is a sum of \$3,270.15 to Mrs. Brown; \$1,500 to Mr. Charles Mayers, and \$935 to Mr. Lovell.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I want to know what sort of arrangement has been made to make Barclays Bank pay back some of this

money, because a crossed cheque went to Barclays Bank and at the top of the cheque was written "Don't mind this cheque is crossed, please cash it." I could only see a convulsed idiot cashing it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: While I have allowed the Leader of the House to give the names. ....

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: How do you mean you have allowed him? Could you prevent it?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not entertaining any debate on this particular item.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: I say it is collusion.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There are two hon. members on their feet.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: You cannot allow the Hon. Leader of the House to give this information and say it cannot be discussed.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, hon. members of this House are expected or are entitled to enjoy certain rights and privileges. One right is that if a money Resolution such as this is brought before this House, hon. members on this side are undoubtedly entitled to ask everything that is pertinent to that Resolution, and if Your Honour is saying that you are not allowing debate on this Resolution, in fairness to hon. members you should have the Leader of the House withdraw or postponed further consideration thereof. You cannot have it both ways. A member must enjoy his rights and privileges or no business must be done. It is only reasonable. For instance, the Leader of the House has given information about certain amounts of money due to certain people, and I would certainly like to ask certain information now in respect of one of those persons whose name has been called. What is my position, Mr. Chairman? Am I still a member of this House?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: In the opinion of the Chair this might prejudice the interests of parties hereto.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, there is still a motion before this Committee that further consideration of this matter be postponed. I would like you to put that motion before you give your ruling.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, it is for the Chairman to protect the rights of the minority group. Whose interests would be prejudiced if I were to ask if this is all the money due to Mrs. Brown?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I rule that I am not entertaining any debate on this particular item. There is a motion before the Committee that further consideration of this item be postponed, and at this stage I will entertain that motion. It is Item 27A.

*The question that further consideration of Item 27A be postponed, was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:*

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

AYES: Mr. BOLDEN; Mr. HINDS; Mr. CRAIG; Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY and Mr. St. JOHN - 5.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, you made a ruling that you are not going to entertain debate on this question. A motion was put and the Government voted that it be entertained. Now I would like to know what is the position. Would you please give a ruling on that? Can we on this side debate the motion?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I can only advise hon. members of what the Standing Orders which we go by say, and it is that debate shall go on, on a matter like this according to Standing Order No. 26 (3).

Mr. CRAIG: Now, Sir, Standing Order No. 35 says that the decision of the Chair is final. You gave a ruling just now, and I would have to get an undertaking from you again as to whether Standing Order 35 falls down or if a vote of the House must decide this. Which is right? You have to give a ruling as to whether you will entertain a debate or not. May I have Your Honour's ruling?  
5.50 p.m.

You will have now to give a ruling as to whether you will entertain debate or not, Sir. May I have Your Honour's ruling?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Any debate, in my opinion, that will prejudice any decision that is to be taken by the Courts I am not entertaining.

Mr. CRAIG: I am not asking you your opinion or what is happening in the Courts, I am concerned with the Resolution now. Your Honour gave a ruling that you are not going to entertain any debate on it, and a vote of this Committee was taken. On the Government side they are prepared to debate it, you gave a ruling that no debate could be on this, and I would like to know what is the position with this side. I would like a ruling as to whether we should debate this, whether the vote or the decision of the Chair is final. If you are prepared to stand by your decision, the decision of the Chair would then be final; if you go by the vote you are going to open yourself to a very embarrassing period.

I want to make it clear again to you. You reminded me today that the decision of the Chair is

final and I must take my seat because you were not prepared to hear me any more; now you gave a decision that you are not entertaining any debate on this item, a vote of the Committee was taken and you must give a ruling now as to whether you are going to entertain it or not, not what is your opinion, the decision of the Chair now, Sir. I ask Your Honour's ruling, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Head 10 stand part.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Opposition has the right to vote against any measure that they do not intend to vote for, but not at this time. I have decided, and I have said that in my opinion it will be prejudicial to the decision pending in the Courts, and I have said that I am not entertaining any such debate. What I can say is that the Opposition has the right to vote against any measure, but I am not entertaining any debate.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, from what I have understood from you the Leader of the House can initiate a debate, the Leader or the Minister in charge of this Item can initiate a debate, the members on this side, according to what you have said, cannot debate it, we can only vote. I want to make my case abundantly clear to you, and I sincerely hope you will go into consultation with Mr. Speaker and two Clerks of the House. I am not disrespecting your ruling, but you are not entertaining any debate, on the other hand you have just put the question that it stand part, which means that the Government can lead off the debate. (Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have said ..... ) I beg you not to heckle me, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: From the information of the Chair, I have discovered that a debate on this contravenes Standing Order 26 (3) and I have given my ruling that I will not entertain any further debate on this particular Item. That is my ruling.

Mr. CRAIG: Therefore I will try to assist you, and I know you need no assistance. Please do not put the question because I am saying this to you, with the greatest respect for this Chair and this august Assembly, if a Minister gets off those benches and initiates a debate on this Resolution I am going to talk for hours on it and say what I wish to say because you cannot allow Government to initiate debate and then on the other hand stifle the Opposition from debating it. The Government can initiate debate on this after moving that this Head stand part, you put the question but you will have no debate on it. You are now trespassing on the democratic principles of this country, you have now trespassed on the electorate of St. James. With great respect, I must apologise if I may appear to be shouting at you, but I am trying to assist you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: At this time the Chair needs absolutely no assistance. I am not entertaining any debate on this item. The question is that Head 10 stand part.

Mr. St. JOHN: With respect, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have made a ruling and my ruling stands; if the hon. member. ....

Mr. St. JOHN: I am not going to speak on the Item.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will sit down.

Mr. St. JOHN: As soon as you sit down I will stand up again.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member is challenging the authority of the Chair I will have absolutely no hesitation to use the powers open to me.

Mr. St. JOHN: This Item, Sir, calls for the expenditure of money which is only within the. ....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have said that the Opposition has the right to record its objection, and. ....

Mr. St. JOHN: It is a matter before the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: And I rule that any further debate on this Item will certainly be contravening Standing Order 26 (3); therefore I am not entertaining that. That is what I have said and the Chair is not to be argued with.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, .....

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, Sir, .....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There are two hon. members on their feet.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, Sir, please assist me.  
6.00 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, assist me, please. Is there any matter before the court in which \$5,706 forms part?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have been made to understand that there is a matter before the court in connection with this.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, we are debating \$5,706, and unless there is a specific charge before the court for this amount, .....

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, if this item had read: As a result of irregularities which took place at the Accountant General's Department, Mr. John Citizen .... We would have known that Mr. John Citizen was before the court, and I would have agreed with you. I am quite sure that the Leader of the House would not have brought the matter here for debate. The Note does not say so, and you are anticipating us. Not a single name has been mentioned in this Note.

Mr. Chairman, I am asking hon. members on the Government Benches to assist this Committee and to protect democracy. I am asking hon. mem-

bers to look at Standing Order 32 - Closure of Debate. One of the Ministers can get up and move the Closure of the Debate. That is a way of saving you, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chair does not need to be saved at this time.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Opposition.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to remind the hon. member who is now speaking that Order No. 36 says:

"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.

The Speaker or the Chairman shall order Members whose conduct is grossly disorderly to withdraw immediately from the House during the remainder of that day's sitting, and the Marshal shall act on such orders as he may receive from the Chair in pursuance of this Order. But if, on any occasion, the Speaker or the Chairman deems that his powers under the previous provisions of this Order are inadequate, he may name such Member or Members, in which event the same procedure shall be followed as is prescribed in paragraphs 3, 4, 5 and 6 of this Order.

Whenever a Member shall have been named by the Speaker or by the Chairman, immediately after the commission of the offence of disregarding the authority of the Chair, or of persistently and wilfully obstructing the business of the House by abusing the rules of the House, or otherwise, then, if the offence has been committed by such Member in the House, the Speaker shall forthwith put the question on a motion being made, no amendment, adjournment or debate being allowed, "That ..... be suspended from the service of the House"; and if the offence has been committed in Committee of the whole House, the Chairman shall forthwith suspend the proceedings of the Committee and report the circumstance to the House and the Speaker shall on a motion being made forthwith put the same question, no amendment adjournment or debate being allowed as if the offence had been committed in the House itself."

I think I have said sufficient for the benefit of Members and, therefore, I expect co-operation from all hon. members concerned.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, Rule 26(3) states:

"Reference shall not be made to any matter on which a judicial decision is pending, in

such a way as might in the opinion of the Chair prejudice the interests of parties thereto."

Now, that Rule does not say that there cannot be any debate. With all due respect to you, Sir, you cannot at the outset say that you cannot have a debate on the matter. It is only after the debate has started and you have heard what members have said that you would be in a position to say .....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have discovered that they were trespassing on what would prejudice in interest of parties thereto.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: With all due respect to you, Sir. I do not know the source of your information, and I am not really interested. That is a matter entirely for you, Sir. In order for you to say that something is *sub judice*, you would have to be aware of the nature of the indictment that is before the Court. You will have to be absolutely satisfied that the indictment before the Court is the subject matter before you. (*Asides.*)

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I sat here and I heard you make a ruling. The ruling of the Chair can only be questioned by a substantive motion. What you are entertaining here, Mr. Chairman, is a question of your authority and a question on your ruling. I submit that this can only be done by a substantive motion. Even if you are wrong in your ruling, Mr. Chairman, hon. members over here and over there cannot get up and question it. That is in accordance with the Rules of this House. If they feel that your ruling is faulty, then they will have to bring a substantive motion of no confidence in the Chair. As long as you have made a ruling the Committee will have to abide by it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have ruled that I will not entertain any debate on Item 27A.  
6.10 p.m.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: We witnessed last year the introduction to this House of the Parliamentary Privileges and Immunities Act which was an attempt by the Government to trample on the rights of the Opposition of this country.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what is the hon. member speaking?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I am speaking on Items 15, 17 and 18. Let me say this. I am commenting on what the Leader of the House said in here today. He introduced a Resolution in which he made certain comments. Am I entitled to comment on the remarks he made?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If I can get hon. members to understand, it is my opinion that discussion of this matter will be prejudicial to the parties concerned, and that is why I have ruled that no further debate

will be entertained, and if hon. members persist, I will have no other alternative than to rule them out of order.

Mr. HINDS: Just on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There are two hon. members on their feet.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, do you mean it will be prejudicial to the parties mentioned in the Resolution?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, you ruled that it will be prejudicial. Prejudicial to whom?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not here to answer all of these questions. I have already ruled.

*The question that Head 10 - Accountant General - stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: You have no manners. Go and shout at Cameron Tudor and Barrow.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. junior member for Bridgetown must leave this Chamber for the remainder of today's sitting. You must go outside.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: You must know your blasted place. You go and shout at Cameron Tudor and Barrow.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I further name Mr. Elliott Mottley. (Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Order!)

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Order what? You drunken fool! Go and shout at your friends. (*Asides.*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If the hon. senior member for Bridgetown continues in that vein, I will have no alternative than to name him too. This sitting has not been suspended.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: And what would happen?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I expect to have better behaviour from hon. members of this Chamber. I will have no debate at this time, but I must still retain order in this Chamber.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, you are being badly advised. I say that as a reflection on the Chairman.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Chairman of Committees has reported to me that he has suspended the proceedings of the Committee of the whole House, and in accordance with Standing Order 36(3) which reads: .....  
6.20 p.m.

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Speaker, during the sitting of the Committee the hon. junior member for the City has persistently and wilfully obstructed the business of the House by refusing..... (*Loud Asides.*)

Mr. SPEAKER: I must hear in silence.

Mr. YEARWOOD: I drew to the attention of the hon. member on several occasions that he was abusing the rules of the House and he refused..... (*Loud Asides.*)

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: There can be no point of privilege. The Chairman has reported to the House and has reported to the Speaker, and the rule says the Speaker on a motion being put may put the question, no amendment, adjournment or debate being allowed, so there can be no further debate or adjournment. The question is .....

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is entitled to be heard in his own defence.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I was on a point of order when the junior member for St. John was speaking and you have refused.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am bound by the Standing Orders; there can be no amendment, adjournment or debate allowed.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I do not care if you put me out, so long as I am a member of this Assembly I will demand the same right as you give any other hon. member of this House. I rose on a point of order..... (*Loud Asides.*) ..... (*Loud Asides.*) ..... You can name me, but you will hear me on a point of order before I leave this Chamber tonight. I do not care if I do not come back in here, Sir, but you are going to hear me. I rose on a point of order when the junior member for St. John was speaking, Sir. (*Loud Asides.*) ..... (*Loud Asides.*) Mr. Speaker, I rose on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that the hon. junior member for the City be suspended from the service of the House. I declare the NOES have it.

*A Division was called for.*

AYES: Hon'bles: J. C. TUDOR, C. E. TALMA, G. G. FERGUSON, A. DaC. EDWARDS and N. W. BOXILL; Messrs. J. B. YEARWOOD, R. StC. WEEKES.

Mr. BOLDEN'S name was called.

Mr. BOLDEN: What must I vote on?

Mr. HIND'S name was called.

Mr. HINDS: I do not know what I am supposed to vote on.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I rose on a point of order when the junior member for St. John was speaking and you refused to hear me and allowed the junior member for St. Lucy to speak. That is grossly unfair.  
6.30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I rose on a point of order, and you refused to hear me. You would not have treated Barrow or Cameron Tudor in that manner, but because you think I am a yard fowl you feel that you can treat me as you like. I am not going out of here; I do not care; I am sitting down, and you will have to suspend the House.

Mr. HINDS: How can His Honour conduct the business of the House with this type of disorder?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I do not care if you send me out of the House. I was sent out of this Assembly before.

Mr. St. JOHN: This meeting will be broken up tonight. There will be no more business in here tonight. You have a weak Speaker and a weak Chairman; therefore you must have trouble.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, the Clerk is calling on me. Is he talking about the \$1 million deficit between the Accountant General and Barclays Bank?

Mr. SPEAKER: The only reason why hon. members may not be able to hear is that so many hon. members are speaking. A motion has been made that the hon. junior member for Bridgetown be.....

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, you can name me or not; I do not care. John Yearwood stood up in this Chamber and deliberately lied on me.

Mr. St. JOHN: John Yearwood is a dirty, stinking liar.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, suspend the sitting until hon. members have had a chance to cool off. It is gross disorder, and we cannot continue in this vein.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot suspend during a division. A division is being taken now.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: That is dishonesty, Sir. I thought better of you until today. You are going to find yourself in the same boat as John Yearwood.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of Committees told all the lies he possibly could, and he should be kicked for the lies he has told. Any day he sits down there, I will pounce on him like a lion.

Mr. St. JOHN: He is trying to cover up for dishonest civil servants, and we must be allowed to debate the matter. We will demand our respect in here. We either have to get a Speaker and a Chairman who will use the Rules for both sides, or we will have no Speaker or Chairman.

Mr. HINDS: The Chairman is trying to cover up for dishonest civil servants. Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister cannot chase you away because you are knighted now.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am awaiting the results of the vote from the Clerks' Table.

Mr. HINDS: Cast a vote about what, Mr. Speaker? You should suspend the sitting. The Prime Minister cannot dismiss you now, but he can dismiss those over there.

Mr. St. JOHN: You are coming here to spend the taxpayers' money, and you do not want us to talk about it. Never.

Mr. SPEAKER: In view of this confusion, I will have to ask, in order that the Clerks may continue taking the votes, that all of the speakers be disconnected for the purpose. It is impossible for them to hear what is going on.

Mr. HINDS: The next thing you will hear is that I am taking my chair from behind me.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let this be clearly understood. I am giving the Clerks one final opportunity to complete taking the votes on the Motion that the junior member for the City be suspended from the service of the House.

Mr. HINDS: Name all hon. members on this side of the House.

*At this stage Mr. Speaker's microphone was disconnected.*

#### SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: I suspend this sitting for 15 minutes, after which the division will be resumed. 6.40 p.m.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the time for resumption has passed, and therefore this House may not sit.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am awaiting the record from the Official Reporter.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: When you and the other members came in, the time had already passed.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think if you were to call on the Clerks, they would tell you that the suspension took place at 6.45 p.m. and it was for fifteen minutes. It is now 7.15 p.m. and in view of that this House cannot sit because the time has expired. Before you give your ruling, I am asking you to call on the Clerk to find out what time the House was suspended.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House is sitting and the Mace is in its place, hence I heard the hon. member. I am awaiting from the Official Reporter a verbatim copy of certain words which were taken down.

This is as taken down by Mr. Whittington, Senior Reporter.

"Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: You have no manners. Go and shout at Cameron Tudor and Barrow!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. junior member for Bridgetown must leave this Chamber for the remainder of today's sitting. You must go outside.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: You must know your blasted place. You go and shout at Cameron Tudor and Barrow.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I further name Mr. Elliott Mottley."

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: That means you cannot entertain any further business here now. I will see if you will say that this is so or not.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are here now, I am in the Chair and hon. members are present.

Mr. HINDS: No, Mr. Speaker. What was the object of Your Honour having a fifteen minute suspension?

Mr. SPEAKER: In order to have a check made, the result of which has only just been handed to me and I have read it to the House.

Mr. HINDS: I quite agree. Now, Mr. Speaker, when it was found that fifteen minutes had expired, was it not your bounden duty to have returned, summoned the House and seek further leave.

Mr. SPEAKER: I regard myself as being bound by the records unless the position is disproved. In as much as the record discloses that the suspension was at 6.45 p.m. and it also discloses that the resumption of the Chair was at 7.12 p.m., I am not disposed to continue now. Of course, let this be clear. Although I am not putting any ideas into anybody's head, when the Chair adjourns this House there is always a possibility that an earlier meeting may be called if that intimation is given that it is in the public interest.

Accordingly this House now stands adjourned until Tuesday next, 9th February, 1971, at 12 noon. 7.19 p.m.