

THE

# House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

THIRD SESSION OF 1966 - 71

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 3rd February, 1971

A Special Meeting of the House of Assembly was held at 4.10 p.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); Mr. J. W. CORBIN, J.P.; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES, J.P.; MR. W. R. LOWE, J.P.; Hon. N. W. BOXILL, (Minister of Labour, National Insurance and Housing); Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD, J.P., (Chairman of Committee); Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (Minister of Agriculture, Science, and Technology); Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; Mr. C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P.; Mr. J. B. SPRINGER; Mr. ELLIOTT D. MOTTLEY and Mr. C. L. BOLDEN.

Prayers were read.

Messrs. St. JOHN and CRAIG entered the House and took their seats.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, before you start Government Business, yesterday when I left this Chamber, there was a microphone before me in working order; the only microphone that was broken was the one in front of the hon. junior member for St. Peter when he was carrying on with his bad behaviour.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: To what has the hon. junior member for St. Thomas risen?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On this matter that when I left the Chamber the microphone that was here was a proper microphone, and the only microphone that

was broken in the Chamber was the one the junior member for St. Peter broke off. I will not sit here with a broken microphone or I will break off all of them now.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, I rise on a point of privilege.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker,

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. James caught my eye.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I am waiting on Your ruling as far as the microphone is concerned.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not a matter for me to rule under the Standing Orders.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Then you are looking for the House to break up now again.

Mr. SPEAKER: The matter is being drawn to the attention of the Clerk who I am sure will have it rectified with the utmost despatch.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Get a microphone in front of me.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, does the hon. member now have enough microphones? I am on a point of privilege and I would like to address Your Honour's attention to a news item which I read.....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, there are two members on the floor.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. James first caught my eye.

Mr. CRAIG: I read with some concern, Mr. Speaker, a news item in this morning's Advocate-News under the caption "House adjourns after serious disorder"; reading this, I saw it first as a Citizen and not as a member of Parliament, and secondly I saw it as a member of Parliament and it appeared to me to be rather inaccurate.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I ask the hon. member to be so good as to read the article and then I will give my ruling on it.

Mr. CRAIG: It reads: "House adjourns after serious disorder. After a lengthy sitting which began at 11.00 a.m. yesterday the House of Assembly adjourned prematurely last night after forty minutes of serious disorder. The House had passed three money Resolutions and was discussing the fourth in which there was a vote for the Accountant General's Department to make up the loss of \$5,706. The Chairman, Mr. John Yearwood, at one stage of the discussion ruled that the debate on the matter might be prejudicial to a case now going on at the Assizes. When Mr. Elliott Mottley persisted and attempted to discuss the matter, refusing to abide by the Chairman's ruling, he was called upon to leave the Chamber. The Speaker was called and bedlum followed, the session was suspended for 15 minutes and when the resumption came the Speaker, the Leader of the House and the Leader of the Opposition were in conference. Time expired and Mr. Ernest Mottley objected to the resumption of the House. The Speaker adjourned the House until next Tuesday at noon, but it is believed that an emergency meeting will be held later this week."

I view this as a citizen, and it appears to me that you, Mr. Speaker, adjourned the House because of disorder. As a member of Parliament it appears to me that it is a breach of privilege of this Hon. House and I am asking Your Honour to give a ruling at some future date, and if the ruling is that there has been no breach of privilege, I am asking you to draw to the attention of the persons concerned that this document which I now make a document of the House that they should make an apology to this august Assembly.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am grateful to the hon. member for drawing this matter to the attention of the Chamber and making it a document of the House; I will give the matter my due consideration. The hon. senior member for St. Philip caught my eye next. 4.20 p.m.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, before the Business of the House begins, I am craving your indulgence to speak a few words which I hope will go to posterity. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly perturbed after witnessing the deterioration of the Standard of the Debates in this House of Assembly and the unusual manner in which the Business of this ancient and Honourable House of Assembly was conducted yesterday.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I say to the hon. member that this is not a matter which may be dealt with at this meeting, which is a special meeting of the Chamber to deal only with certain matters. The hon. member is perfectly entitled to deal with the matter in any substantive motion. The hon. member may not now deal with it, though I appreciate his point of view, but the moment is inopportune.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking on a point of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no point of privilege, which in my opinion arises in respect of this. This is a special meeting called by virtue of certain Standing Orders.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, I am craving your indulgence.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that I cannot give you that indulgence, because I have no power under Standing Orders. Will the hon. member raise this matter at a meeting other than at a special meeting.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS rose—

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are two hon. members on their feet, and previously the hon. senior member for St. Peter had caught my eye.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order, and you are going to tell me to sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Peter has risen. Has he given way?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member started to address the Chair, and I rose on a point of order, and I think this is my democratic right and privilege. Mr. Speaker, I join with the senior member for St. Philip. You said that the matter cannot be raised here. Under what head did you allow the hon. senior member for St. James to raise a matter for which the House was not called today to discuss? If the hon. senior member for St. James was allowed to raise a matter which he has raised unjustifiably - they were the hooligans over there, and the newspaper correctly reported *verbatim* on the bad behaviour, the pattern of the wickedness of the group of them over there.

Mr. St. JOHN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. That is an offensive remark, and the hon. member cannot say that.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: There was never such bad behaviour as there was in here last night.

Mr. SPEAKER: I appeal to hon. members. This is a special meeting. No business may be done at this meeting other than the special business which has been set out by the Hon. Leader of the House. It is a fact that the Chair's attention has been drawn to something appearing in a newspaper. There can be no discussion on that; the newspaper has been handed in, and that matter will receive the attention

by the Chair at the earliest possible moment. So far as the Business of the Day is concerned, it is open only to the Hon. Leader of the House to proceed with the special business in respect of which he requested this meeting.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I am afraid that this is one time I shall have to challenge the ruling of the Chair, because any matter that affects the House must come before any business, and the matter raised by the hon. member affects the House. I am saying that it should come before any other Business of the House. How is it that the hon. senior member for St. James could come in here and read from a newspaper when Rule 29(5) says:

"Members shall not read newspapers, books, letters or other documents, except such matter therein as may be directly connected with the business under debate."

There was no business under debate when the hon. senior member for St. James read from the newspaper. Your Honour must rule consistently and not inconsistently; you cannot approbate and reprobate at the same time.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question of reference to a newspaper does not come within nor does it contravene Standing Order 26 (1):

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

This is not a question of reading extracts from books or papers other than newspapers. This is a question simply of the attention of the Chair being drawn to what may or may not be a breach of the privilege of this House. The hon. member began to speak on it; I told him that he may not speak on it, but he may hand it in and just draw it to my attention.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. There is a lot of inaccuracy going on in here these days. You have said that the hon. senior member for St. James began to speak on this matter, and he was told he could not do so. He spoke on the matter; directed that it be made a document of the House; asked you to do something about it, and you promised him to do so; yet, you are saying that he did not speak on it! I am saying that you cannot make flesh of one and fowl of the other. If you allow the hon. member for St. James to speak on it, then you will also have to allow the hon. senior member for St. Philip to speak on his matter or the meeting will be broken up. Get it straight; no business will be done in here, if you are not going to allow the hon. senior member for St. Philip to speak. You refused to name them when you had the opportunity to do so last night, showing ineptitude as a Speaker. 4.30 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must withdraw that.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I can withdraw it, but I mean it. No Speaker with any self respect would have allowed himself to come back after such conduct in here. You can send me out now and we will break it up.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must withdraw that.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I will withdraw it but I still feel that you are inept. I intend to bring in a motion of "no confidence" in you because you did not rule as a Speaker last night.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, I am again craving your indulgence to allow me to say a few words which I hope will go down to posterity. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly perturbed at the deterioration of the standard of the debate and the unusual manner in which the business of this House was conducted yesterday.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid I cannot hear any hon. member in respect of any matter other than the subject matter which is before us today by virtue of this being a Special Meeting. I will ask the Hon. Acting Leader of the House if he is so disposed to proceed with the business for which this Special Meeting was summoned. I see that the Leader of the House is once more in his place.

#### SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, in order that the House may sit for some time later than it normally would, I beg to move that Standing Orders, Nos. 5, 14, 16, 18, 40 and 45 be suspended for the remainder of the sitting.

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 resume 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 resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.*

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move the postponement for the time being of the Resolution which the Committee is now considering.

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

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, is the Leader of the House postponing the Resolution for \$990,000?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Just for the time being.

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

#### SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1970-71 No. 17

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 33 - Ministry of Agriculture, Science and Technology - stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, the sum of \$8,625 asked for under Item 94 - Labour, is to pay wages for part time and casual staff at the markets up to the end of the financial year.

Mr. Chairman, the markets, better referred to as the public markets in this Island are with very few exceptions shocking disgraces. In respect of the Cheapside Market, nothing approaching any degree of cleanliness is to be witnessed there, and the complaints coming from meat vendors and hawkers are many.

4.40 p.m.

It is a known fact that it is because of the casual approach to the problem of sanitation where our public markets are concerned that the deplorable situation in which we find ourselves at this particular moment has arisen. The stalls at the Cheapside Market are crying out for a coat of paint inside and outside, the booths provided for the hawkers are in truth and in fact A-class hotels for breeding rats, and it is known that the cleaners employed in those markets have been forced to wear their own clothes for doing the job for a very considerable time; they have had to wait for a very long time, and they made many complaints before they could get the uniforms to which they are entitled, and one has got to ask one's self how do you expect a cleaner at a market to function efficiently if he has to wear his own pair of trousers or his own pair of shoes on the job instead of rubber boots and gloves which should be provided by the Government.

These are things which speak for themselves; we have got to see, Mr. Chairman, that the upkeep of a place like a public market would be considerable as compared with many other places, for instance, some of our Bridgetown stores, because we very well know that public property is not always, and quite regrettably, accorded the measure of care that would be given as in the case of private enterprise by some people, but nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, this is a case of Government creating the situation which now obtains in these markets. The

Government has not yet set a standard, the Government has never yet provided a service as such to enhance the name of these public markets, never. Now the Eagle Hall Market. As I have said on the floor of this Hon. House already, I do not know how some people happen to live or carry on business opposite the Eagle Hall market when the obnoxious odours emanating from the market reach over the other side of the street, I just cannot understand how they do it. It is very, very offensive indeed, and what we are saying is this, it is undoubtedly a case where Government, through its own officers, must be considered as showing very little regard for public health matters, very little regard for sanitary matters when it comes to public markets. We have seen Mr. Chairman, the fish market here at Bridgetown, doors broken down and the same minute the floors are supposed to have been washed as many flies assemble as could lift the market from where it is and move it somewhere else had it not been for the fact that the flies are on top. What is it then, Mr. Chairman, that we are lacking? Is it that Government's approach to the whole problem is so unrealistic? Is it a case where Government is treating its workers as mere part time and casual? They look on the whole community as something casual and what would be interesting is if the appropriate Minister would take the opportunity to tell us for his casual staff, not so much his part time staff, how long some of these people have been employed as casual staff. Are they doing the job? Are they performing satisfactorily? When does Government intend giving all the public markets a coat of paint to tidy them up and provide better lighting facilities? Bulbs have been missing from the public market at Cheapside and some of the stalls have not been lighted for the greater part of the year 1970. This is 1971, but nevertheless the people who occupy those stalls have got to pay their rent, so why is it that the market is not kept in a sanitary and fit condition to encourage trade for these people? It is not fair to place them there and to allow conditions to remain around them in such a manner as to drive away their customers; Government should certainly see and do what can be done as quickly as possible. This is a matter of public health and I am sure that the Minister of Health ought to concern himself with things as they are, especially as I believe the Minister wants to make this his public health year in all things in which Government has to be concerned, and surely he does not want to be found with the offal from the public markets and the like just being thrown somewhere and not properly being disposed of, just forming a breeding ground for flies and other insects.

4.50 p.m.

I would certainly like to know that the Government is doing something about staffing and the general health of the people at the markets.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Sir, the hon. member's points are well taken.

*The question that Head 33 - Ministry of Agriculture, Science and Technology - stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

*Head 34 - Meteorological Office - was called.*

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 34 - Meteorological Office - stand part.

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

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

*Head 41 - Ministry of Health And Social Welfare - was called.*

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 41 - Ministry of Health and Social Welfare - stand part. In moving this Head, I think it is my duty to give additional information regarding the larger items of expenditure. I refer to Item 56, Item 125 and a few others. I will first deal with Item 56. The sum of \$1,200 was provided in the current Estimates to meet the cost of Overtime Fees for Laboratory and Unestablished Staff for work done outside of normal working hours. During the Caribbean Health Ministers' Conference most of the Drivers at the Health Centres were pressed into service for transporting personnel to and from the Airport and furniture and equipment to and from the Conference Room at the Drill Hall outside of normal working hours.

As a result of the floods in October, 1970, the transport section of the Ministry was again required to do a lot of overtime work for which no provision had been made. Consequent on these events, the balance available under this Item at the end of 1970 was \$27, and a supplementary vote of \$500 is now being sought.

Under Item 125 - Temporary Staff and Substitutes - the full explanation is that the sum of \$51,426 was provided under this Item as remuneration for staff required to act while the holders of 123 Nursing posts; 39 Ward Maids, and 30 Maids were granted leave. During the year a Training Programme for Nursing Staff had been started, and as a result 18 substitutes have had to be employed at salaries ranging from \$160 - \$225 per month. It should also be noted that, apart from the regular annual leave, several members of the Nursing Staff have been proceeding on Overseas' leave and have also been requesting extensions of such leave at half-pay. The total expenditure at November 30 amounted to \$44,210 at the rate of \$5,526 per month. It is for that reason we are asking for a supplementary sum of \$14,000 to carry us to end of the financial year.

With regard to Item 205 - Cleaning and Laundry - there was a provision of \$22,000 to meet the cost of fuel, insecticides, detergents, and the employment of cleaners at the five District Hospitals during the year 1970-71. At the end of November, 1970, the ex-

penditure under this Item amounted to \$20,371 leaving a balance of \$1,629 for the balance of the financial year. The main reason for this high rate of expenditure has been the increase in the price of fuel for the laundry at St. Michael District Hospital. There has also been a general rise in the standard of cleaning and hygiene being practised at the five institutions since the appointment of more highly trained staff and the introduction of improved, advanced methods of cleaning. We are saying that the sum of \$6,000 would be an adequate supplement for this Item.

With reference to Item 206 - Light, Power, Water and Fuel - we are asking for \$3,500 to supplement this Item. The amount expended at 30th November was \$18,785 out of a total of \$24,400. The increased rate of expenditure is due in parts to the increase in the price of fuel for which gass is used.

With regard to Item 226 - Travelling - the sum of \$4,000 was provided initially for 6 Dispensers and 3 Temporary District Nurses, and they each travel an average of 300 miles monthly. Expenditure up to October, 1970, amounted to \$3,900, and it is evident that the vote was under-estimated when the Estimates were being prepared. An additional sum of \$3,500 is required to supplement this Item. I have other explanations, but I will give them if necessary.

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I see Item 165 and Item 169. Item 165 refers to Upkeep of Laboratory, and Note No. 11 says:

"There has been an increase in activities at Enmore Health Centre and the position is likely to remain unchanged throughout the year. These increases have exaggerated the inadequacy of the provision."

I wonder if the Minister would care to explain the increase in activity, because this seems to be a rather vague term. I would like to know exactly what this increase in activity means.

Note 12, which deals with Item 169 - Control of Infectious Diseases - \$2,000, states:

"The programme for the immunization of school children has caused additional amounts of medicines and vaccines to be purchased; and it should also be noted that the floods of October, 1970 have a severe effect on the budget of the general programme."

5. p.m.

I wonder if I can have an explanation of that, particularly on Note 11.

Mr. Chairman, there does not appear to be any answer forthcoming.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, before the Minister rises, rather than getting up to reply to every member on this side, I think you would like to be able to take notes and give all his answers one time.

Note 6 says that many temporary posts have been required during the year for the efficient service of the five District Hospitals especially since the commencement of the training programme for nursing staff.

For some time, Mr. Chairman, I have been a bit concerned about these temporary posts in Government Departments on a whole, but what is of more significance is the orderlies at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I was the most shocked person when I heard that there are orderlies at the Hospital who are acting for as much as seven years and in some case probably more. What is the position with any employee of Government who is in a temporary post for these great number of years then to be appointed? If they are going to be appointed, what salary scale are you going to start them at, and what would be their pension rights? If a man goes into the service at the age of 22 and is given a temporary post for seven or ten years, he is almost giving away ten years of pension because he cannot qualify for a pension, if I am correct in saying this, until he is appointed to the post in which he has been acting for those years.

There is another matter while I am on this. There are a number of part time nurses who for several years have been performing a very necessary duty. Some of them work from 8 a.m. to 12 noon or at any rate for a four hour shift each day. Many of them work at the District Hospitals, formerly the infirmaries, and some of them are transferred to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and there is no provision made for these people. I am not saying that this is the law of the land, but I am wondering if Government could not make provision for many of these people especially the nurses, and I am asking the Minister, if he can, to tell me how many orderlies at the Hospital are acting or are in temporary posts, and for how many years they have been in this position. I can tell you that it is a very ticklish position. I have spoken to several of them and they are very concerned about it. I believe the Minister is always willing to assist, and I am quite sure he is going to give us the answers to those few questions which I have raised. I would not at this time draw his attention to a few other items which I have before me, so that he would have enough time to give us a picture of the position both for the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and myself.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, to answer the hon. senior member for St. James first, I did actually give the information, but I would like to draw to his attention that I appreciate the point he made in relation to the employees who are working on a temporary basis for all these years. I have already informed the House a few meetings ago that steps have been taken to remedy that bad situation, in that all those people who have been acting for these years have been recommended to be appointed permanently, and

their pension rights will be back dated from the time they started acting on a temporary basis. I gave the House that information some time ago.

Mr. CRAIG: If the hon. member would give way, I brought a question here in connection with it almost two years ago. I do not recall the information which the Minister gave the House. I am not saying he did not give it, and I would be very grateful if he could refresh my memory or give this information once again to the House.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, it was some time in December in dealing with a Supplementary Resolution affecting the Queen Elizabeth Hospital that I notified the House that steps had been taken to have all those employees who are acting on a temporary basis appointed permanently, and that as far as I know it has been done, and the old grievance no longer exists. The reason for that is that the Government intended setting up a Hospital Board and there was a long delay in the setting up of it and no firm decision was taken as to whether the Board should be set up. We now have a very efficient Hospital Director and everything is working smoothly and there is no necessity to set up a Hospital Board. The appointment of the Hospital Director caused some delay in the appointing acting staff for fear that they would have to be compensated. However, I can tell you that they have been recommended for permanent employment, and as far as I am aware, they are now satisfied. I do not know how long ago you made your check, but I do not believe it was recently. I was there this morning, and whenever I go there, the orderlies and so on are not slow in approaching me on this same matter, and they appeared very satisfied when I saw them today. I do not know if that satisfies the hon. member.

5.10 p.m.

I do not know if that satisfies you but that is a fact.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of explanation, if the hon. member would give way, I called in the Permanent Secretary and gave him a directive to send to the Public Service Commission, not to the Hospital Director. I am very surprised to hear the hon. member on this particular matter still because it is an old grievance which has been given redress and I would like the hon. member to check on what I am saying, because that is my understanding and as far as I know that is the position today.

Mr. CRAIG: I am satisfied to know that steps have been taken to have these Orderlies appointed. I understand from the Minister that a directive was sent down from his Ministry but due to the problem of setting up or failing to set up the Hospital Board which has been pending now for almost ten years, I am hoping that these Orderlies would not be in a very awkward position that though the Minister has sent down a directive to the Director, because there is no Hospital Board the recommendation to appoint these Orderlies remains there for any length of time. I quite appreciate what the Minister has said, he has done his part.

Mr. CRAIG: Just for the record, I wonder if the Minister would be able to tell this House how many people they have recommended for appointments. The reason why I ask this is that if there is any difficulty in these appointments not being confirmed, I would not then like to bother the Minister about this information, and I am only interested if he can possibly tell us how many people were recommended for these appointments not the amount of years they were working. As a matter of fact, how many of them were acting?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: All the Orderlies who were acting for some time or who were working on what they call a permanent temporary basis have been appointed permanently.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, are those persons who have been working in the kitchen also among those who have been appointed?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: All who were there on a temporary basis and who were acting for a year or more - if they were good enough to hold the job for a year or more, they were good enough to be appointed, and the directive applied to all, kitchen staff, Orderlies, everybody.

Mr. BOLDEN: If the Minister would remember I did ask a question earlier and I would like to get an answer.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The hon. junior member for St. Joseph asked a question on the upkeep of the laboratory, Item 165. The whole explanation is that the amount voted in the current Estimates for the upkeep of the laboratory was \$7,500 to provide mainly for the purchase and maintenance of equipment, chemicals and certain items of protective clothing as well as detergents. At the end of November, 1970 the total expenditure under this item was \$6,360 leaving a balance of \$1,140, and it can be seen therefore that the rate of expenditure is \$795 monthly. This has been caused by an increase in laboratory activities due to the immunisation of school children under the scheme the Chief Medical Officer was running to immunise children against various diseases, so the immunisation of school children has caused this increased activity and it is expected that it will continue throughout the remainder of the year. We are asking therefore for the sum of \$2,000 to supplement this provision.

The next Item the hon. junior member for St. Joseph asked a question on was Item 169 - Control of infectious diseases. The amount provided in the current Estimates was \$37,000, and expenditure at the end of November, 1970 was \$27,720 which was incurred at the monthly rate of \$3,465. The immunisation of school children has caused additional amounts of medicines and vaccines to be purchased, and the floods of October, 1970 have had a severe effect on this programme. A tremendous amount of cleaning had to be gone throughout the Island and funds were made available from this Item.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I have been hoping to hear a little bit more on what I consider the increased activities of Enmore Health Centre rather than the question of protective clothing. There is no doubt that there is a rise in the rate of communicable diseases in the world, including Barbados, and doctors at the Hospital are more than perturbed about the vast number of persons who have been coming to the Hospital, particularly out of the Hotels, with symptoms of venereal disease and they have all been referred to Enmore Health Centre. This is why I asked for an explanation on this increased activity, but it would appear that everything is now being pushed off on the little children of this country. I would say that number eleven and number twelve came too closely together, because if the Chief Medical Officer is saying that because of the floods and because of a new scheme of immunisation of school children this would increase the activity and has caused this sudden want of money, I would ask him first to make a recommendation to Government that they amend the laws of Barbados. There is still an ancient law on the law books of this country which allows a woman registering a child to take the blue paper to the police, and once she appears in Court to say she wants to swear off the vaccination of her child, the Magistrate has to stop whatever he is doing and attend to that. Two weeks after that the Government is spending money on a programme telling you to go and get your children vaccinated against this, that or the other. I have always contended that the first thing to do is to repeal this piece of legislation and then every child would have to be vaccinated and get all its immunisation as of right from the time it is born and then we would not have a catastrophe as it would appear we have that all of a sudden the Chief Medical Officer would then pass a law to immunise them when they reach school age.

5.20 p.m.

I have been reading the papers and listening to hear the Chief Medical Officer coming out and saying that there is a rise in venereal disease in Barbados, and something must be done about it. Everything is being kept under cover until one day you will get another Resolution coming here telling you that it is now out of proportion and that something drastic will have to be done. I consider this as a sort of piecemeal affair and what must be done is inadequate. I hope that the Minister of Health will take a careful look into these two things: (a) The removal of that piece of law from the Statute Book, so that mothers cannot go to a court and say they conscientiously object to having their children vaccinated or having all other types of immunization that is necessary; (b) That the Chief Medical Officer will now publicly come out and tell the people who is known and what is said in certain quarters. If it said that out of the hotels in Barbados V. D. is rampant. One Doctor has told me that he has treated every Bellboy and Waiter in a particular hotel in the course of a week. If you want to know the name, I can tell you the name of the hotel. The Doctors at the Casualty are concerned about this matter, and I thought the Chief Medical Officer would have known about it already.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL rose -

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, with regard to Item 125 - Temporary Staff and Substitutes - I have heard the attempt of the Minister to breakdown the figure relating to people in temporary posts. This is not now my main concern. I feel that the Minister's mind should be directed to the numbers on the Establishment. Firstly, it is a case where the Minister can truly say that at his 5 District Hospitals he is properly staffed with Nurses, Nursing Assistants, and so on? Is the Minister in a position to say so? If he is in a position to say so, then exactly how many are employed at these 5 Institutions at this stage? When we have got those figures, Mr. Chairman, we would then be in a position to appreciate what the Minister was telling us about how many went on leave; how many were entitled to leave; how many have not returned and so on, but merely to get up and tell us how many went away would not help us unless we knew what was the strength of the Establishment, and if there were any vacancies at any of these 5 District Hospitals for qualified staff. If there are any vacancies, let us know what steps are being taken to have them filled? Have you experienced any difficulties whatsoever in having them filled? These are some of the things to which we want to address our minds.

Now, I go right down, Mr. Chairman, to Item 163 - Upkeep of Motor Vehicles. Now, \$1,200 is required to supplement this Item. Can the Minister tell me whether there are any bills outstanding? This amount is asked for, undoubtedly, to carry us down to the financial year. The Note does not say so, but I think we can assure that this money is being asked for to carry the Ministry through to the end of the Financial year. If that is the position, then the Minister ought to be able to tell us if there are any bills outstanding. I think I should be fair to the Minister to let him know that my information is that \$1,200 cannot cover the bills which I know to be outstanding. I do not know where the Minister got his information from, but I know where I got my information. People have been waiting for this money for a long time, and this amount cannot cover the bills. I am trying to save the Minister from coming back here with another supplementary to cover bills that should have been embodied in this sum.

With regard to Item 169 - Control of Infectious Diseases - there are certain diseases which the Minister knows are notifiable diseases. In other words, if a medical practitioner were to discover at any point the presence of these diseases, it is his duty to bring it to the notice of the Chief Medical Officer. I would like to hear from the Minister of Health if all of the cases that ought to have been notified during the year 1970 have been so notified? If the Minister has not heard me, I would like to re-emphasize the point but I am sure he has heard it.  
5.30 p.m.

I am sure the Minister must have read the newspapers which sought to draw to the attention of the Chief Medical Officer that this was not being done and

the Secretary of the Medical Association in the Island did not deny that some doctors were lax in a matter as important as this is. If that is the case, what has the Minister done about a situation such as this?

Now, Sir, let us go down to Item 176. The note tells us that when the current Estimates were prepared in October, 1969, the Belleplaine Maternity Hospital had not yet been opened, and consequently the amount provided under this item was under-estimated. This, I think, is a wonderful opportunity for the Minister to tell this Committee whether or not the Belleplaine Maternity Hospital is in truth and in fact counted as a maternity hospital, and if it is, whether it is a fact that there are occasions when maternity cases turn up there and there is no midwife on the premises. Now that raises one other point. The Minister can find no excuse in saying that there is a shortage of midwives for the simple reason that there are to be found in this Island a number of Barbadians who have gone to the United Kingdom and have trained and qualified, have served in Africa on an exchange basis, have served as well in the United States of America on a similar basis, have given satisfactory service and have returned to Barbados, presented themselves at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital with applications seeking employment on the Staff there and have been refused. Some of them are still in the Island; so the Minister can find no excuse in such an avenue.

Now at Item 206 - Light, Power and Fuel - the note says that the District Hospitals were taken over by Central Government in September, 1969, and when the current Estimates were being prepared in October, 1969, this rate of expenditure was not anticipated. If one were to look at the note itself, one would see that there is an after thought I would like to argue that it was not presented to the printers when the original copy was sent to them. It says that an increase in the price of cooking gas has also been experienced during the year.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister ought to be in a position to tell us how many of these institutions are using bottled gas, how many are using natural gas, which the Minister finds to be more expensive, has the increase come about in the bottled gas or from the natural gas end, and chiefly from the natural gas exactly when did this come about.

Now we also come down to Item 220 on what I said because under this Item - Light, Power, Water and Fuel, the amount asked for is \$850. At Item 206, the amount asked for is \$3,500, but the notes to these Items bear some similarity by way of explanation, and surely the Minister would have a good reason to advance for providing this money here today.

Now, Sir, particularly with reference to the note at Item 220, it says that since the beginning of the year, these services which were formerly administered by Local Government have been steadily improved - the Minister would hardly mean 1970, because in 1970 there was no Local Government - and consequently the cost of these utility services has been constantly rising. Here is a Government telling

you that taxpayers' money must be spent in providing certain services at the District Hospitals. You do not provide these services for the healthy and strong; you provide them for the sick.

5.40 p.m.

What has the Minister got to tell us about the Government acting or what the Government is doing to cushion the shock, because the Government itself tells you here the cost of these services has been rising constantly during the last year. On the Government's own admission the cost has been constantly rising; if the Government is satisfied with it because it is the taxpayers' purse that we are drawing upon, we must tell the Government from this side of the House that we cannot and will not be satisfied with it. That is what the note says, Mr. Minister, that since the beginning of the year the cost of these utility services has been constantly rising. I would like to hear what the Government is doing or propose doing to reduce the constancy in the rise. I think, Mr. Chairman, that I should await the replies of the Minister at this stage before commenting further.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The hon. member who has just sat down asked a few searching questions, and I will attempt to answer what I can. As far as there being any vacancies at the St. Andrew's Maternity Hospital at Belleplaine for midwives, my advice is that the posts have all been filled, I do not know that there are any vacancies there. I am very surprised to hear the hon. member say that there was a case and no midwife was there to assist.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I am not saying that one case turned up; had it been one case I would not have brought it to the attention of the House at all. More than one case turned up and there was no midwife.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I will have to inquire into that; as far as I know the Belleplaine Maternity Hospital is functioning; it is true that there are certain improvements being made to the building and certain things have been done up to a few days ago, but as far as I know the Belleplaine Maternity Hospital is functioning.

Item 163 - Upkeep of Motor Vehicles. I will give the hon. member the full explanation on that. The hon. member asked the question in connection with the upkeep of motor vehicles and suggested that this amount was insufficient to pay outstanding bills. The hon. member seems to have more information than I have, I can only give what is on the files and what I have heard privately, but I do not hear as much as the hon. member does. In the current year's estimates the sum of \$14,800 had been provided for the maintenance of 13 vehicles attached to the three Health Centres under this Ministry; at the end of November, 1970 expenditure under this Item amounted to \$10,650 and was incurred at a monthly rate of \$1,330 approximately. Among the vehicles mentioned above is an International pickup which was

manufactured with a faulty gear box which has been breaking down periodically during the three years of its existence; since June, 1970 it has been committed to the workshop at the Ministry of Communications and Works and a new gearbox is now on order from the U.S.A. Owing to this mishap, on several occasions transportation has had to be hired in order to transport labourers with tools and implements from one part of the country to the other on various health projects. The cost of hired transport is usually \$110 per week and this is likely to continue until the end of the financial year, when it is hoped that a replacement for this vehicle will be approved in the 1971-72 Estimates. The amount of \$1,200 is necessary to supplement this Item.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, would the Minister tell us how long the vehicle has broken down? He said it is likely to continue until the end of the financial year. At the same time perhaps he could tell us the value of the vehicle as at the date when it broke down.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I am not a pickup expert, I would not know the value of the vehicle. If you want to know how long it broke down, I will have to get advice on that.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, the Minister is coming in here seeking to justify the expenditure of money. He is supposed to represent this money and if his Department has not given him the necessary information he cannot bound at me and tell me that. When they have the motor vehicle lying down at Highways and Transport and paying away \$110 a week for a hired vehicle, this is the taxpayers' money they are spending and they should sell the vehicle and buy another one.

5.50 p.m.

Do not tell me you are no mechanic; this is simple mathematics. No commercial entity would put down a vehicle with a bad gearbox when they could sell it, recover part of their losses, and buy a new vehicle. If the Minister is going to sit down and let the Permanent Secretary give him fictitious answers to come here and fool somebody, let him understand that people on this side know about mechanics. They are spending the taxpayers' money unjustifiably. The vehicle is occupying space that is worth money. Yesterday they voted money to extend the Workshop. That vehicle that is lying there is occupying somebody's time to watch it; it could be sold by auction in order to recover half of the cost or three-quarters of the cost; you could reimburse yourself and purchase a new one. To whom is this \$110 a week being paid? Somebody is getting rich out of somebody for doing nothing.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, the hon. junior member for St. Peter asked a question in connection with Item 125 - Temporary Staff and Substitutes. This is the information: Nursing Staff 123; Sisters 6; Ward Maids 39, and Matrons 5, making a total of 173. The hon. member also raised

a question under Item 206 - Light, Power, Water and Fuel. I thought I had given this explanation already. At the end of November, 1970, the amount expended under this Item was \$18,785, and the amount provided in the Estimates was \$24,400. The rate of expenditure was due in part to the increase price of fuel for which gas is used. It appears that this vote was under-estimated when the current Estimates were being prepared.

The hon. member also wanted to know how many Institutions had natural gas; how many had bottled gas, and so on. I can only promise that I will make a note of such questions and give the hon. member the information in due course.

*The question that Head 41 - Ministry of Health And Social Welfare - stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

*Head 42 - Welfare Department - was called.*

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 42 - Welfare Department - stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, Note 22 tells us that during the year there has been a constant rise in the rate of expenditure due mainly to an increase in the activities of the Welfare Officers. Let the Minister be frank and give us the necessary information. Is it a case where you have increased your number of Welfare Officers? If you have increased your number, undoubtedly, activity ought to be heightened. If you have not increased your number but you have increased movement, so to speak, of your old staff, is it a case where you find that your Welfare Officers are trying to do an honest day's work for an honest day's pay for the first time?

If the latter is the case, do you not find that it will be making out a case for an increase due to the fact that during the period when there was not the type of activity that the Minister would like, or we on this side would like to encourage and promote, there would be a number of cases which would be left undone? It would mean that the Minister should act as quickly as possible, increase his staff, even on a temporary basis in this case, and those cases which had been pending for a long time should be dealt with. If any such thing did come about, it would have been during the period of indecision immediately preceding the transitional period brought about by the Government itself when the Local Government Officers were to be taken over by the Central Government on an appointed day and there were postponements from one day to another creating a vacuum, so to speak. During those days, we feel that there could have been situations which could have created this increase in expenditure. We are asking the Minister to reconsider the matter and to do so as quickly as possible.

With regard to Item 31 - Old Age Pensions - you had your Old Age Pension Enquiry Officers. Exactly what has the Minister done about those Old Age Pension Enquiry Officers for whom we in the Opposition fought so valiantly? We want the Government to give them something to which they are entitled. These people have been waiting for a long time, and I would certainly like to see this matter settled. I am sure the Minister will recall that, while debating the very subject to which I have just made reference, he told the Committee at the time that there was an officer who, after he had been actually laid off, continued to work and that the work he had done was then in the hands of the Government. 6 p.m.

The work which he had carried out was then in the hands of the Government; so one would see that at least the necessity would arise that if an officer had been appointed to the post, you would have to carry out a re-examination of the work that was done by that officer who carried on working after he had been laid off or dismissed. One would not take that work and carry on from there. All these cases would have been re-examined, and in the light of this we are asking the Minister to say exactly how many sufferers there are in the Old Age Pension bracket, and how many people are now entitled and are not receiving theirs. Surely the Minister would have it at his fingertips to tell us how many people are now receiving old age pensions.

Mr. Chairman, Item 32 - Assistance in Kind - brings me to enquiring from the Minister exactly what has been done with the various sums of money that we have been told were received from various sources by the Prime Minister, by the Minister of Home Affairs and other persons for flood relief. The Minister ought to have it before him at this stage to tell us how much has been received by the Prime Minister, whether it came from royalty or otherwise and exactly what has been done with it. As a matter of fact, the note here is a dangerous one, because it tells us about the floods of October, 1970, which means we have more than one. The floods of October, 1970, have also had a severe effect on the budget attached to this programme. If the flood has caused us in any respect to draw on the \$60,000 hitherto voted for disbursement as assistance in kind, we are to say that the flood could hardly have done very much or the assistance given would have been very little if we are now merely asked to supply \$15,000, because one must bear in mind that the amount of \$60,000 had been voted to carry us through to the end of the financial year. We are not now being asked to supply money because of ordinary circumstances where there has been an increased demand for this type of assistance, but linked with it are such circumstances arising from the flood; so one has got to examine this matter most carefully. Something tells us that all is not well about this. We must admit that it is money that can be used for vote-catching; it is money that can be granted on recommendations from many people who can stand by and benefit in more ways than one from the same assistance that

is granted. It is a very ticklish piece of assistance in kind, so when we are now asked for \$15,000 and find linked up with this that because we had a flood that is now being advanced in the face of all this money we were told had been collected from every source for flood damage and to relieve flood victims, we must ask what has happened to all this flood money and the relief given to people. Are there still not people suffering? How many people are left to be relieved? How many people have been given assistance in kind up to date and how much has been given to them? What we want to know particularly are the parishes from which these people come.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I come to Item 35- Burials, and when I look over the other side and see the number of political burials that will be shortly coming about, all I am asking myself is what are those who are to be buried leaving behind. It is nothing but a very sad past as I see it. Some, Mr. Chairman, will be leaving merely words that bear no relation whatsoever to reality; but what we find is that even grave diggers have asked for an increase and we feel that they are entitled to it. The cost of 125 burials during the past year has been increased by \$20 per burial.

6.10 p.m.

Now, Sir, is it a case where this extra \$20 for each burial has come about because the cost of digging a grave in each case went up by \$20? These burials, no doubt, Mr. Chairman, were effected by contract, and I think the Minister ought to tell us this. It can be a case where the undertaker has taken the opportunity to get a little something for himself as well. I think, Mr. Chairman, that I can leave the Minister at this point.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I believe the Minister indicated that there was a contract in respect of the burials which appear in Note 25. If the Minister would be so kind as to give me the date when the contract expires, and if there is a clause in the contract which provides for increased payments during the currency of the contract I would be very grateful for this information. Perhaps the Minister could answer these questions before I continue my speech on other points.

Mr. CRAIG: Before the Minister starts his reply, there is a note here, No. 23, which has been very dear to me here, and that is where some 12,000 pensioners are each receiving \$5.00 per week. Some time ago I brought a Resolution in here asking the Government to increase old age pensions; at that time it was \$3.00 per week, and my Resolution wanted it increased to not less than \$5.00. It is sad when one takes up a Resolution and discovers that there are some 12,200 pensioners now in this country and all they are receiving now under a half-baked socialist Government is \$5.00 per week. When one examines the high cost of living in this country one can only conclude that they cannot even eke out an existence from \$5.00 a week. I am asking the Minister what plans Government has to increase the old

age pensions by a reasonable margin. I hope the Minister is listening to me carefully, because I would like a reply to this.

Secondly, I would like the Minister to tell this Committee how many Welfare Officers there are in the country. My reason for asking this question is due to the fact that in St. James I know of only one Welfare Officer. I do not know if the Welfare Officer that I know in St. James serves the entire north; if it is so, I am hoping that the Minister would make some provision to increase the number of Welfare Officers throughout the country if it is inadequate. Day after day people come to my office trying to find out where to find the Welfare Officer, and I at times have to try to get the Welfare Officer, to be told that he is at the old Town Hall and he goes to St. James once or twice per week. For how long, I do not know. You can understand, Sir, how difficult it is not only to try to eke out an existence on \$5.00 a week, but then to be running up and down trying to find the Welfare Officer to have something corrected.

I know of a case of a woman who was living in My Lords Hill and was transferred to St. James some six months before she was able to contact the Welfare Officer, and she was only able to contact the Welfare Officer by accident when I ran into her some day.

6.20 p.m.

As a matter of fact, she did not know where to go or whom she should contact in order to get her pension. There were a number of Old Age Pension Officers. I think there was a man called Gilkes who was a big boy in the Government Party some time ago in St. Peter. When they abolished the Local Government he went out like a full bus; he has not been paid anything; he cannot get a job, and so on. Here is a man that you can still use to assist poor people in getting their pensions rather than letting them travel from the North up to the Town Hall in the City in search of these Pension Officers. I wonder whether the Pension Officers decide to work at all. There is a Pension Officer in St. James, but you cannot find him. I am not saying that you cannot find him because he is not on duty, but the people who are looking for him cannot find him. I was able to contact him by accident at the Town Hall one day. As a matter of fact, there is no real office set up in St. James for the Welfare Officer. The Welfare Officer merely passes through what is supposed to be an office. That is the principle on which they operate. The Chairman says that it is not true. Mr. Chairman, are you entering this debate?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If and when I enter a debate you will hear me.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, if there is a breakdown in staff because of the number of Welfare Officers to assist the people, I am asking the Minister if he would use his office to recommend to the Cabinet that additional Welfare Officers be employed, or to create a new system whereby they would be able to

assist poor people. I do not subscribe to the policy of making a man work until he is 65 years. My personal opinion is that I should not work after attaining the age of 55, and I feel that that should be the retirement age.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I would like to draw to the attention of the hon. member that the names of all Welfare Officers were published in the newspapers on numerous occasions, and the time and place and the business hours were mentioned; consequently, it is not fair for the hon. member to state that he does not know who is who so far as Welfare Officers are concerned.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Will the hon member give way? Mr. Chairman, I am giving some of the answers at this stage. In so far as the former Old Age Pension Enquiry Officers are concerned, there was a Resolution in this House, certain recommendations were made by the Opposition which were approved, and we agreed to give them one month's pay for each completed year of service. That matter is being looked after. I have already said that steps are being taken to appoint National Assistance Officers, and we hope to employ some of the same gentlemen who had been employed, as distinct from Welfare Officers. Welfare Officers are supposed to have training at the University and so on; so in order to give people employment we are going to call them National Assistance Officers. In order to appoint people outside of the Public Service Commission it will be necessary to appoint them temporarily. The matter is being worked on, and if the hon. senior member for St. James has anybody in mind other than Mr. Gilkes, he could give me one or two names.

An hon. member wanted to know something about the staff at the Welfare Department.

Mr. CRAIG: How many Welfare Officers are now carrying out the function of looking after old age pensioners? I am not referring to the University boys. I am not talking about Gollop and so on; I am talking about the ones without passports, and those who are not going to canvass in 1971. We have to watch all of these things.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, my information is that there are 28 Welfare Officers apart from, of course, the Chief Welfare Officer; 2 Deputy Chief Welfare Officers, and 6 Senior Welfare Officers.

As far as Burials are concerned, questions were raised by the hon. junior member for St. Peter and the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. Certain contracts are entered into for the burial of paupers at the beginning of every financial year. The original figure was operative when the current Estimates were prepared, but the new rates at 1st April, 1970, have caused this supplementary to be requested.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, will the Minister tell us when the contract came into force? I want to find out when the new rates for the graves came into force.  
6.30 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I will read it again. The contract for the burial of paupers is renewed at the beginning of every financial year. In other words, 1st April, and the original figure was given when the current Estimates were prepared. The new rate at 1st April, 1970, has caused this supplementary.....

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, that does not answer the question. It is quite simple. If there is a contract which came into force on 1st April, 1970, that contract has a specific figure for burial of each case, and therefore the provision would be in that. I am not against the person who has the contract choking them on that side who cannot understand the law for more money, but what I want to say is that if there was a contract, there is a contract price per year, and you cannot come half way in the year and say you will change the contract price unless the contract makes provision for variation in the rates. If there has been an increase in grave-digging fees in between the period of the contract, the contractor has got to bear that until the new year comes. If you are making private arrangements with the contractors to pay more money because the grave diggers' money has gone up, it is unfair and illegal. If you have a contract, you either stick with it or you end the agreement and let there be a free for all.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I have not got through giving all the information. The hon. member does not seem to realise this.

Mr. BOLDEN: I am prepared to wait for the answers, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, the Minister said there were 28 Welfare Officers in the Department. He said there were 12,000 pensioners during the year, and there has been a net increase of 200 pensioners. The Minister states that they are going to set up a Board - I hope I have not misunderstood him - and use it as a National Assistance Board, but this Board would have to be vested with power.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, I may be misquoted. I did not say the National Assistance Board. I said that in order for the poor people in the various districts to receive better attention and more constant assistance we are thinking of having some National Assistance Officers who will live in the district and who will be in touch with the people to see that the assistance given is adequate.

Mr. CRAIG: Now, Sir, the Minister asked me if I would recommend one or two. The Minister can rest assured that I am going to recommend one or two, but I am not going to recommend Phil Sealey whom the Government got rid of. I asked the Government also what was Government's policy re the increase of old age pension from \$5.00 per week. Are they going to increase this? I would like to know what is Government's policy with respect to reducing the age limit from 68 to probably 65 years. These are two very important points as far as I am concerned.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The hon. senior member for St. James played a part in assisting old age pensioners

in having an increase. It is still fresh in my mind, and of course it must be constantly kept before one's eyes at this time. The matter is under review, and we are going into the question of the removal of the means test to see how much it would cost. The question of reducing the age from 68 to 65 years is being examined, and the question of increasing the amount from \$5.00 will be looked into. It is a question of cost. Under Item 31 the sum of \$3,120,000 has been provided to pay old age pensions to approximately 12,000 persons at the rate of \$5.00 per week. During the year there has been an increase of 200 pensioners, and consequent on this the expenditure at 15th December, 1970, amounted to \$2,256,811. The balance available is only \$863,189, and it can be seen that 12,200 pensioners each receiving \$5 per week for another fifteen weeks would require a sum of \$915,000.

As far as assistance in kind is concerned, the sum of \$60,000 has been voted in the current Estimates to provide clothing, household furnishings, emergency grants, house rents, spectacles and dietary supplements to needy persons. On 15th December, 1970, the expenditure under this item amounted to \$59,082 leaving a balance of \$918. This high rate of expenditure has been due to the high incident of fires with increased amounts of aid being given to such victims. The flood of October 1970 has had a severe effect on the budget attached to this programme. These are people who received assistance in kind and who had received additional assistance owing to the flood, and we are asking for \$15,000 to supplement this item.

Hon. members asked some very pertinent questions. One hon. member asked what has been done with the money received by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Home Affairs and others for assistance in kind. That is nothing to do with this item.

Mr. CRAIG: What was the contribution made by the Prince?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I am neither the Prime Minister nor the Minister of Home Affairs, nor the Minister of Finance or the Deputy Minister of Finance, and I am not in a position to answer that. I have not received any.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, this seems to be reaching the point where the Minister is coming to this Committee and asking us to concur in the passing of a vote for money to be expended, but every time a question is asked the Minister says he does not know and sits down.

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

Mr. BOLDEN: If Mr. Chairman rules that, I abide.  
6.40 p.m.

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

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for St. James caught my eye.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I gave way to the hon. senior member for St. Philip.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw to the attention of this House that the monies which were received by the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister and the Minister of Home Affairs have been handed over to the Central Fund.

Mr. CRAIG: I wonder if the hon. gentleman who just took his seat would tell us how much was handed over. Since he is aware that it was handed over to the Central Fund and the Minister is not in a position to say, he does not know how much, he is not the Minister of Finance; the hon. member is saying where the money has gone, I wonder if the hon. member would say how much money was handed over.

Mr. WEEKES: This Fund has Trustees and the books are open for inspection by any member of the public.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman,

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like hon. members to observe Standing Order 29(6);

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, it was I who asked the Minister about the contributions that had been made by the Prince of Wales. Now, Sir, the Minister is well aware that the question was put to him because the money or whatever contributions were made were made for the specific purpose of relieving or looking after the welfare of the people affected by the flood, and the Minister of Health is the Minister of Social Welfare; that is why we addressed the questions to him, he is the Minister who ought to know something about it. Here it is, Mr. Chairman, that this Minister time and again has presented the Hon. House with statements pertaining to flood damage, how is it that he does not know about the flood money? Why have they hidden the money from him?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of explanation, nothing is being hidden from me, it is just that I am not a member of the Central Emergency Relief Fund Committee. There is a committee set up to administer this Fund, the Central Emergency Relief Fund Committee, and it has trustees who are the Financial Secretary, the Chief Welfare Officer and the Senior Assistant Secretary in Home Affairs. The Fund now stands at \$28,000; there are other contributions in kind.

Mr. CRAIG: I wonder if the Minister could tell us before the Prince made this donation how much there was in the Fund; the Chief Welfare Officer is under his Ministry and I am under the impression that the Hon. Minister would be very close to the Chief Welfare Officer and his Permanent Secretary, I am only trying to find out how much money was in the Fund before the Prince made his donation. Since you have just been given a note that there is \$28,000

in the Fund, I would like to know how much was in the Fund before the Prince of Wales made his donation.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Minister if this Central Relief Committee was set up to relieve the same people that this Item 32 - Assistance in Kind for \$15,000 is being asked for. Are they the same people? Are some of them the same people?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: This is a normal supplementary which I have come for in the sum of \$15,000. The \$28,000 in the Central Emergency Relief Fund is there, I have no control over it, all the money is to help a lot of needy people who have not yet, as far as I know, been given assistance.

Mr. HINDS: Do you mean since October 2?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I have no control over the Central Emergency Relief Fund and I should not be asked any questions about the Central Emergency Relief Fund.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister aware that the Chief Welfare Officer is one of the king pins in this committee?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: He is there in his own personal capacity.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, the time has come for making a debate on the Welfare Department in Parliament. The Hon. Minister has said that there are 28 Welfare Officers, and Government is so dissatisfied with the administration that they found it necessary to appoint other officers known as National Assistance Officers. I hope that Government understands the full implication of this, because this is a real indictment on the stupidity indulged in by Government. What we have heard is that formerly both under the Vestry system and under the Local Government you had people who were assigned to each parish, and in some parishes because of their sizes you had a greater number of Welfare Officers.  
6.50 p.m.

You also had a number of part-time Old Age Pension Enquiry Officers. If something was not seriously wrong with the control of the administration in the Welfare Department, you would not have found it necessary today to think of saddling the taxpayers of this country with additional officers in the form of National Assistance Officers. When you realise that there are 24 constituencies in Barbados represented by 24 members - you have 28 Welfare Officers, and I concede that some of them will be doing special case work and other specialised work, but what necessity is there for saddling the taxpayers with National Assistance Officers? The whole trouble is that in the Welfare Department there is no proper control over what is going on. You have a National Assistance Board that has no power, and you have no control over the officers who are supposed to be working there. You are now attempting to cure this by creating posts for National Assistance Officers. What are your Welfare Officers doing - only indulging

in publicity stunts? They are indulging in publicity stunts day after day, night after night. It is surprising how much time they have that they can spend so much time facing the camera. Look in the newspaper any day and you will see what I am talking about. Are they Public Relations Officers? I would never sit here and allow the Government to waste the taxpayers money in this manner.

Mr. Chairman, ever since I have been pointing out to the Government that there has been a loss of contact between the Welfare Officers and the people for whom they are supposed to provide welfare services. I know that in my constituency it is difficult to get anybody in the almshouse, the procedure is so cumbersome and complex. Eventually, after you find the Welfare Officer you have to find this person and that person. There was a man in Dayrells Road who was sick on the pavement for days, and I had to telephone the Welfare Department and quarrel before a Welfare Officer would look into the matter. Suppose the people who were interested in that man could not have got on to a member of Parliament. Do you think that such behaviour would have been tolerated during the period of Local Government? That Welfare Officer would have to face an enquiry the very next day, but there is no one to control him now. He is responsible to nobody.

Mr. Chairman, there are some people in this country who feel that, because they have the ear of Government, they must not carry out the duties for which the taxpayers of this country are paying them a civil servant's salary. If they want to enter politics; if they want publicity, let them come out and run for a seat preferably in Christ Church. I say further that it is a startling thing for a Minister to stand on the floor of this House today and say that after the floods in October there are still some people who have not yet received their benefits. Up to today some people from Constitution Road rang me and said they were flooded out; two mattresses were given to them; the Welfare Officers promised to return, but up to now they have not done so. If you spend your time propagandising at night, then you do not have any time to work in the day.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very serious matter and the contact is not there. The answer is not by taking away Community Development and putting it somewhere else; the answer is not in the employment of National Assistance Officers. You will either have to make up in your mind that there will be a National Assistance Board with executive powers, or leave things in the Welfare Department. You cannot have your cake and eat it; you have to decide in your mind what you want to do. I am convinced that there is no proper supervision of what is going on. There are not enough detailed checks over individual work, and no master-plan has been worked out.

If you look at 28 Officers - formerly 11 to 14 officers did the work. If the work was properly allocated on the basis of population and the number of people in a particular area; if you used the old parochial boundaries or the old Local Government boundaries, you would find that things could be run

smoothly. Things are not properly run at the moment. I know that some of the big shots will be angry with me because I had the guts to speak about publicly and so on, but I know that there is grave dissatisfaction among the public in Barbados for the service they get having regard to the money that the taxpayers give them. They are not satisfied with the administration.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I had asked the hon. Minister for certain information pertaining to the contracts for the burial of the dead, but it looks as if every time I ask a question I never get an answer. I am going to pose certain other questions now. Under Item 38, there is a sum of \$3,000 for Group Work. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition has just spoken about these glorified night officers of the Government. Note 26 states:

"During preparation of the current Estimates, the amount provided under this Item was under estimated, and at the present time there are a number of other projects which have not 'got off the ground' and which were included in this year's programme."

Mr. Chairman, I would like to know what are these projects that have not yet 'got off the ground'. If they have not 'got off the ground' they will not need any money. Are these the projects which certain officers in the Social Welfare Department are engaged in at ten and eleven o'clock at night? I can name the areas where these officers are operating at night, calling Youth Groups the wings of the Democratic Labour Party. If a project is not 'off the ground' why do you want money for it? I would like to find out about the beer drinking that goes on after these so-called meetings by certain officers in the Social Welfare Department. I want to know whether Government's money is providing that. There is an ambiguous statement about Group Work and something not getting off the ground. This means nothing to anybody. What is the Group Work? To what does it refer?

Mr. Chairman, I would still like to find out about this contract for the burial of the dead, because I cannot understand how any Minister can come here and ask for money without being prepared to answer questions to justify the expenditure.

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

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

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

7 p.m.

#### SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for one hour.

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

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

*On resumption*

#### COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: When the sitting was suspended, the House was in Committee of Supply, and thereto it will now revert.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the sitting was suspended, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was addressing the Chair.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I would be grateful at this stage to the hon. member if he would outline the number of projects which represent this sum of money and what they deal with, and what projects have not got off the ground.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I may mention that as far as the staff in the Welfare Department is concerned, in giving you a breakdown, I mentioned that there are twenty-eight Welfare Officers, one Chief Welfare Officer, two Deputy Chief Welfare Officers and six senior Welfare Officers, although seven are no longer directly under the Welfare Office as such, because we have transferred community development to Trade, Tourism, Community Development and Youth Affairs, so that four Welfare Officers of the number I gave, two senior Welfare Officers and one Deputy Chief Welfare Officer are now with Community Development.

The projects which the hon. junior member for St. Joseph enquired about which have not got off the ground are competition among youth groups who used the centres and are provided with prizes for the decoration of the centres, and also the planting up of backyards, and provision is made for providing seeds, seedlings and the distribution of posters, etc. Those are two of the items which have not yet got off the ground.

Mr. St. JOHN: Now that we have it clear that there are twenty-one officers left, seven having gone over to Community Development, I want to know whether it is regarded as within the sphere of the Community Development Officers to promote youth activities or whether it is a Welfare Department function.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The Community section sees after that portion of the work.

Mr. St. JOHN: Now with 21 left, would the Minister not agree that there is not a proper division of the areas between the officers? As I understand it, in Christ Church the Welfare Officer has

to cover the whole area. I do not want to call names, but the hon. member knows who is the Welfare Officer. From the point of view of investigation in respect of old age pension, casual assistance and matters in relation to medical attention, the one Welfare Officer at the Southern District Council who has to do the day to day administration had to cover the whole of Christ Church. I am not talking about the divisional chief, because I know that at the Southern District Council there is a divisional Chief.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, this information which has been given by the Minister seems to conflict violently with the present policies of Government, because it seems as if something is in a muddle here. The Minister said that this money is to provide competition among youth groups who use centres, planting up backyards and providing seeds, seedlings and posters. Now the 4-H Club as far as I know is run under the Ministry of Agriculture; so I cannot see how the Minister is going to provide money under social welfare to do agricultural work, and still vote money under agriculture to do the same job. I am more than convinced and I am saying it openly now that since the Bye-election in St. Joseph there are Welfare Officers trying to revive clubs that had gone out of existence from 1964 when I came back to Barbados and call them youth groups. These are political arms and they are employing Social Welfare Officers to do this work at night; but this could not be correct if you are going to tell me that you are voting money now for which I am sure the 4-H Clubs and the Agricultural Department are more equipped to handle.

Mr. Chairman, there is no Social Welfare Officer I know who knows anything about agriculture to purchase any kind of seeds or seedlings. Agriculture is something of its own nature, and there is now Welfare Officer who can tell me that he knows anything about seeds. When you go to the Park you have to buy special seeds at special times; you have to know where the seedlings are coming from, because they come from stations when they are working. Who provides the seedlings? Which Social Welfare Officer is going to buy them? What are the poster about? Whose backyards are you going to plant up? Something is desperately wrong here. I would like to know where the backyards are, how many you will plant up, and if you are going to plant them at night or during the day, because the people who will use these centres are in school during the day. If you say you are putting forward a proper educational policy, and if the children are going to be in school in the day, I want to know if they are going to plant the backyards during that time or are going to come out of school on evenings and plant them. I want to know if there is overtime to be paid to the Social Welfare Officers. These are questions which arise out of the Minister's answer. I am saying that we are not being told the truth about this money, and that they are using the Social Welfare Department as a political branch.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, what the hon. member said just now is perfectly true. The hon. senior member for Christ Church said he is not going to

call names, but I will call names. The duty of a civil servant is to serve any Government in power, and I am saying here and now that the biggest political canvasser in the Civil Service today is a man called "Gollop." However you open the paper you can always find Mr. Gollop from the Social Welfare Department and Mr. Sandiford of the Ministry of Education giving a prize to an old lady at Val Rosa Club, and I have never yet seen Mr. Gollop's picture appear in anything for the people of St. James from a Welfare point of view. The whole Welfare Department needs completely revamping. You do not know where to go and for whom to ask. The hon. senior member for Christ Church spoke just now about the Ministry of Community Development. I have for several months been trying to get a pair of goal bars for St. John the Baptist Playing Field. When you go to the old Eye Ward you cannot find an officer there. They do not go to work at all.

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

Mr. CRAIG: What are you Minister of now? Microphones or what? The debate is going on well.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has risen on a point of order.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: The hon. member has made a statement to the House about Mr. Gollop and the Minister of Education appearing in pictures; so he is giving the impression to the House and to the general public that Mr. Gollop and the Minister of Education were canvassing. The points of order which I am making is that two Christmases ago there was a picture of an old lady who had reached the age of 100 and I saw Mr. Gollop and the hon. senior member for St. Thomas in it. For whom was he canvassing then? Was he canvassing for both sides? Why can't people be fair in their assumptions about these things? Apparently he was not canvassing when the hon. senior member for St. Thomas was with him, but he was canvassing when the Minister of Education was there.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is no point of order.

Mr. CRAIG: All that is wrong is that the Minister of Housing was not there. Mr. Gollop probably was canvassing for the hon. senior member for St. Thomas because he knows that that member will beat the hon. junior member for St. Thomas; so he is trying to make sure he gets on the right side.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That has nothing to do with this.

Mr. CRAIG: You should not get into the debate.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Do not tell me not to get into the debate. I am here to make sure that you are relevant, and that is irrelevance.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I always beg you not to shout. If you do not shout, we will tone down.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If you behave yourself like an hon. member, no shouting will go on.

Mr. CRAIG: Tell me how I am to behave! Like you, Sir? I take great offence to the Chair telling me that if I were to behave myself like an hon. member. ....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will respect the Rules of this Chamber.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, it is a very difficult job for any hon. member of respect the ruling of the Chair when certain persons are sitting in it. Please do not shout at me. I have warned you of this.  
8.10 p.m.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, it is a very difficult job for any hon. member to respect the ruling of the Chair when certain persons are sitting in it. Please do not shout at me, I have warned you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This is not part of the Resolution, this is not relevant and I must ask the member who is now addressing the Chair to address the Chair relevant to what is under discussion.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, what is before this Committee?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member is still addressing the Chair, I am willing to hear him.

Mr. CRAIG: I am asking you to direct me as to what is before the Committee, and I have the right to ask you as Chairman of the Committee what is before the Committee so that I may continue to address the Committee as an hon. member. Mr. Chairman, I am asking you what is before the Committee; you told me to get on with the business of the Committee and I would like to know what is before the Committee. I am quite willing, Sir, to continue but I do not know what is before the Committee.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member does not know what he has got up to address the Chair on I will advise him to sit.

Mr. CRAIG: I will sit if you so request me because I accept the ruling of the Chair, and I am also begging you to assist me with what is before the Committee. What Head are we on? That is all I am asking, and I believe, knowing that you know what is before the Committee, I am asking what is before the Committee. Please assist me, Sir. I am awaiting Your Honour's ruling; you will give a decision as to what Head is before the Committee and I will take my seat, Sir. I am still addressing this Committee, but I am awaiting Your Honour's ruling as to what is before the Committee; I am entitled to this as a member of Parliament, please assist me, Sir. You may ask the Clerk, Sir. I am appealing to you because you are in the debate, so please assist me as to what Head I am on. I need Your Honour's protection and Your Honour's sympathy, Your Honour's ruling and Your Honour's decision. If I am to discontinue my speech you will have to tell me on what Head I have been irrelevant.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member was addressing the Chair more than once on the Head which is now under discussion; if he has finished addressing the Chair I will ask him to sit.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, with the greatest respect, if you call on me to sit I shall sit, and I am also asking you to assist the Committee with what Head I was addressing the Chair. On what Head were other members addressing the Chair? Mr. Chairman, you have drawn to my attention that I was irrelevant, and you can only determine that if you know what Head we are discussing.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am again saying that you are irrelevant and I shall ask you to discontinue your speech. What you are discussing now is not relevant to the debate.

Mr. CRAIG: What is the Resolution before the Committee?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking you to sit down.

Mr. CRAIG: I am going to, I will.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member does not sit I will ask him to leave the Chamber immediately.

Mr. CRAIG: I will sit, you will not send me out.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order.

Mr. CRAIG: I have not given way, I will not give way on this occasion until the Chairman can give me a ruling.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. junior member for Christ Church has risen on a point of order and the hon. senior member for St. James will take his seat.

Mr. CRAIG: I will, Sir.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I just want to say that quite recent Your Honour will remember. ....

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The senior member for St. James has risen on a point of order.

Mr. CRAIG: I give way, the hon. member is also on a point of order, I am sorry. The hon. member for Christ Church rose on a point of order so I will sit down.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, the Community Development section has been transferred and there are seven officers to be sent there, but the question the hon. junior member for St. Joseph asked was not given the full explanation. The sum of \$3,000 was provided under Item 38 - Group Works, in the current Estimates to provide for Leadership training, holiday activities, sponsored projects and transport for voluntary workers.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On 15th December, 1970, the amount of .....

Mr. CRAIG: The Hon. Minister is giving a reply. I was speaking and you did not ask me to discontinue my speech, the Hon. Minister has now risen on a point of order and is giving a reply.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, this question was touched on by several members and I thought I would rise on a point of order to explain it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has the right to address the Chair when called by the Chair, and I will read rule 26 (13) for the benefit of the hon. senior member for St. James. (*Asides*)

I will ask the hon. senior member for St. James to leave this Chamber immediately for the remainder of today's sitting. Mr. Marshal, I am asking you to get the hon. senior member for St. James outside the precincts of this House immediately; he is obstructing the business of the House and I am asking you to get him outside.

8.20 p.m.

You did not move Mottley yesterday evening and you cannot move me now, but I will walk out.

*At this stage the hon. senior member for St. James left the Chamber.*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. junior member for Christ Church was addressing the Chair, and he may do so now.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I was trying to save an awkward situation, and that is why I attempted to give some replies at that stage by way of rising on a point of order. The position is that this Group Work is done by the section known as Community Development. It is comprised of 7 Officers who were formerly directly under the Chief Social Welfare Officer. At present the officers are under the Minister of Community Development who is also Minister of Trade, Tourism and Youth affairs. The \$3,000 which is voted is used to provide leadership training, holiday activities, sponsored projects and transport for voluntary workers. On the 15th December last year \$2,400 was spent, leaving a balance of \$600.

There are a number of other projects which the hon. junior member for St. Joseph wants clarified which have not yet "got off the ground" and which were included in the current programme. I will try to explain to the hon. member the projects which have not yet "got off the ground," and they include the provision of seeds, seedlings, distribution of posters, providing prizes for groups who compete in decorating the Community Centres, and so on. Those are the projects that have not yet "got off the ground." At the

15th December the balance in hand was \$600, and we are asking that \$500 be voted to supplement this item. I think I have given as much information as I can. Any information I have not been able to supply, I will be quite willing to obtain it from the appropriate officer and see that the member gets it.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I must say again that the Minister is being supplied with the wrong information. The Minister should remember me from 1956 when he and I used to talk about agriculture. He will know that there is nobody in the Community Development group who knows anything about seeds and seedlings. Is the Minister now saying that he is wrapping up Community Development with agriculture? Where do the 4-H Clubs stand? Who are now handling seeds and seedlings other than the Agricultural Department? Which Social Welfare Officer knows anything about agriculture. Where has he been trained? What can he teach these people? What are these posters about? Of course, I hear about seeds, seedlings and the digging up of back yards. I have just heard of leadership training, holiday activities, sponsored projects. This is conflicting, and the Minister cannot justify this raid on the taxpayers' money at this time.

You tell me that you are transferring sections from Social Welfare to Community Development; now you are mixing Agriculture with Community Development, and the next thing I will hear is that you are mixing something else with Community Development. I must confess that I cannot understand it, and the taxpayers cannot understand it either.

With regard to these leadership projects, every night these officers are out holding group meetings. Mr. Chairman, you should know that two or three nights ago they were up at St. John's School up to 11.30 p.m. I was at the door listening, and that is why I want to know the truth about this matter. This is no question of seeds or seedlings; this is ten and eleven o'clock work at night on the part of Social Welfare Officers. I am going to make it my duty to walk around wherever they appear and take notes, because the Minister is not giving us the facts of this case today.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I can well appreciate the hon. member talking about confusion existing, or what he imagines exists, between the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Community Development. The hon. member must understand that we are in Committee seeking a supplementary vote. Obviously a part of the money has been well spent. I think it would be much better if the hon. member asks for a report on what has been done with the money already spent.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I do not want to know how it was spent, because I have heard that \$600 was left. If the hon. Minister was asleep and did not hear what.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is no point of order.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, he cannot imagine I was sleeping, because I was looking at him at the time he was speaking. I do not think I am in the habit of sleeping with my eyes wide open. I think that if the hon. member would realise that this is a Supplementary Resolution and that part of this money has been already expended, he could ask for a report on how the money has been expended. If a part of that money have been expended, then it must have been expended on something on which we are now asking for more money to spend. If we are now asking for money to provide seeds and seedlings, I would assume that money has already been spent on seeds and seedlings.

Now, what about this hullabaloo about nobody in the Ministry of Community Development knows anything about seeds and seedlings. People in Barbados plant their back yards with seeds and seedlings, and they are not agricultural experts. I believe the hon. member himself may be a bit of an agriculturist, and I would not call him an expert. I was listening with some sympathy when the hon. member made a remark about the 4-H Club Movement. I can tell him that I was once the Minister of Agriculture, and I have seen the 4-H Clubs at work in various districts in the Island, but that Movement does not yet cover Barbados entirely.

8.30 p.m.

We all must have some sort of imagination. As you know and as the Minister of Health has said, there has been a division very recently. This is the month of February, the month before the end of the financial year and we are coming now for the balance of money. This is no new thing; so the hon. member need not work himself up in any extravagant mood at this stage. This is February, 1971, and the financial year is almost at an end. Why all this hue, fuss and fury? This is just a supplementary vote. Somebody has just passed me a note which I have not had time to look at yet, but it may be pertinent to what is before the Committee. This planting of seeds and seedlings in backyards is done on a competitive basis by groups, and part of this money is for prizes in the competition. There is absolutely no reason why it should engender all this heat and fuss, because there is no need for that. You do not have to be an agricultural expert to be encouraged to plant up your backyard. It does not take anybody nor is there any need for anybody in the Extensions Division of the Ministry of Agriculture to go around and be instructors in a venture of this sort. This is to encourage people to be useful and to enter into healthy competition in an exercise like this, and let the Committee bear foremost in its mind that this is February, 1971, and before the end of next month we are going to be engaged in the exercise of discussing the 1971-72 Estimates, and that is the end of it all.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Minister who has just sat down was a schoolmaster for a number of years, and I believe that the school at which he taught had lands attached to it. (Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: One of them.) I believe the hon. member

is aware that children were put out in the garden on evenings to learn gardening, and that he bought seeds and somebody showed them how to plant the seed and seedlings.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, this is not a debating point. Actually I never supervised or taught gardening. This is just to correct the hon. member, but it is not a debating point and has no worth as far as the debate is concerned.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is no point of order.

Mr. BOLDEN: It is no wonder that the Minister speaks as he does, Mr. Chairman, because it is quite clear that the Minister does not understand one iota about seeds and seedlings at all. He has now exhibited the limited knowledge which he has as Minister of Agriculture. You do not take seedlings and plant them in the ground or give them anybody and tell them to plant them in the backyards for competition. You do not take up Government money to buy seeds and seedlings and give to every Tom, Dick and Harry and tell them there is a competition coming along. You had to teach people and that is why the agricultural policies of this Government are so backward, because the people who are supposed to supervise agriculture do not know one iota about agriculture and a Minister can get up in here today and say that because it is February, 1971, you can take the taxpayers' money and buy seeds and seedlings and scatter them about as you would throw them to the wind, and the Opposition must sit here and let the money pass. No wonder money cannot be used in the way it should be, because they do not understand what is going on. This is one reason why we have got to be so careful in February, 1971 with taxes high, little to eat, people with no jobs to safeguard every cent there is that is going out of Government. We have to reduce the taxpayers' payment to Government which they take up and throw away as they like. I am satisfied that there is no answer because you are telling this Committee that you can buy seeds and throw them about to the wind because there is a competition coming along. It shows the agricultural policy and the lack of knowledge of those who are supervising this sort of thing, because if you are going to tell me that you are going to take Social Welfare Officers, people who have gone to England and have been trained to deal with the psychological aspect of the human being and tell me that you will put them to teach people how to have green fingers and how to plant in the ground, I am sad and sorry for anybody who says so.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: The heat and fury that has been engendered has gone really to no avail. This is nothing more than voting some money which means that money must have already been spent in that direction. I do not know exactly how this project has been run, but to use extravagant argument to say that you do not just push a seed in the ground and it grows does not win a debate. You do not win a debate in that form and fashion.

Mr. Chairman, it does not take an expert from the Extensions Division of the Ministry of Agriculture to be engaged in an exercise like this, and that is all I am telling the Committee. There must have been some means and ways already found to have expended some part of the money for this particular purpose. It is as simple as that and I am not hot under the collar when I am talking to the Committee. You know, Mr. Chairman, that the greater warmth you see being engendered, the least the argument is worth. That has been my long experience in Parliament. The hon. member is a young parliamentarian and is trying to get his spurs now; so he must get a little hot under the collar.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, there is no question of getting spurs. The Minister is trying to find an excuse, because he says he does not even know how the money was spent. I do not want an excuse, I want to know the facts.

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

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Oh yes, Mr. Chairman. He did evoke a smile not so very long ago and he will evoke more as he gets older. As I see it, I do not think there is any valid reason for the Committee to believe that this money has been misspent before, at least that part which has been expended, and therefore I cannot see why the Committee cannot agree to have this supplementary vote passed. There has been a change-over and my full responsibility as Minister of Community Development comes in as from next month on this particular vote and not now. Presently it is still under the Ministry of Community Development. Some measure of the information supplied to the hon. member was done by an officer in what can rightly be called part of my Ministry, and I really cannot see the fuss. Anyway the Leader of the Opposition seems to be anxious to address the Committee, and I will give him that privilege at this stage.

Mr. St. JOHN: Under this Head, Mr. Chairman, can the Minister tell us whether any of this vote was spent in providing seedlings in Silver Hill, Christ church?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph wanted to know what projects had not yet got off the ground. The projects that have not got off the ground are the providing of seedlings and things of that sort, and he is making capital of that. Nothing has been done in this respect. I went to the trouble of trying to find out what are these projects, and I have been told that the projects are providing prizes for people who compete at Community Centres for decoration of the centres and for planting backyards with flowers and seeds and seedlings and the distribution of posters and so on.

8.40 p.m.

These two projects which have not yet got off the ground. I am told that prizes are awarded to people who compete in the various flower-growing competitions, for planting seeds and seedlings in their backyards, but these are projects that have not yet got off the ground. I want to mention this, as hon. members will know, the former Ministry of Health, Housing, Local Government and Community Development no longer exists and is now the Ministry of Health and Social Welfare. The votes for Community Development work were under our Head, so that now they have been passed to the Minister of Trade, Tourism, Community Development and Youth Affairs but he does not have complete control as far as Community Development is concerned. I believe there is no room for the officers at the old hospital compound and they are still physically resident in the Welfare Department, so that it is a simple arrangement for the time being, I am not trying to conceal anything.

What I want to impress on the members of the Opposition is that these are projects not yet off the ground, but we are assisting people in various housing estates in beautifying their backyards, and we feel very proud to see how the tenants of many of these housing areas take full use of the little plots of land. We learn by doing, and so we assist them with seeds and seedlings, but you do not have to be a Minister of Agriculture or a Technical Officer to plant seeds, anybody can plant seeds, but again, that is one of the projects not yet off the ground.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, the more this debate prolongs the more it is evident that there is more than confusion on this particular issue; let me tell you why. I would like the Hon. Minister to know that in Barbados there are various soil types, there are various rainfall areas and there are various difficulties in getting seeds or seedlings to grow. In 1954-56 under the Barbados Labour Party Government the Agricultural Stations used to operate and you could get seedlings at very, very reasonable prices. The Minister has said the idea is to give these seeds and seedlings to the people on housing estates, but the position is that what the Minister is trying to tell this Committee is that they are going to take the seeds and seedlings to give to anybody to plant, and whether they grow or not they do not care about it.

If you go at any Agricultural Station in Barbados now to buy plants you will find that even a common hibiscus plant costs 75¢; I went to Graeme Hall last week and they said they raised the price because the foreigners were buying them up too fast. Some plants cost as much as \$1.25 each at Haggatts, so it shows a fall down in plans, this is an agricultural project, this is not a social welfare project. Mr. Chairman, anybody can plant seeds where they like in Barbados, but there are certain areas in St. Philip and St. Joseph that if you plant seeds they will not grow, so the Minister does not know what is going on. I know the different soils and the different rainfall areas and the various problems in planting

things like this the senior Welfare Officer will try and work on them. Have you ever had that experience yet? When they go and sit down you have to go up long stairs. You may get an old woman who can hardly walk, and she tells you that she had one dress for the year. They think they were getting at Mottley, but I am the happiest man in Barbados. I agree with the Hon. Minister that Social Welfare Officers should be put at places convenient to the people in the particular area. Here in the municipality you used to have about five or six officers, now today you have 28 for the whole Island. What is beating me is that I would like to know the amount of travelling allowance you are paing out for going around to the Community centres at night and saying that you are developing this and doing that. You know what I am talking about, Mr. Chairman. They should go and look at people and see those who are really in need, because there are those who will not come to you. There are those who do not want to go in any crowds in dealing with children. Ask Mr. Stanton Gittens who has just retired from Combermere about the number of children who asked for lunch at Combermere and were turned down, because they would say that the mother was in England; but who knows? The mother probably does not send one cent or the grandmother does not hear from her. What is better than spending the money in some of the ways we spent it?

I feel, Sir, that officers should be appointed, but I do not agree that you have to hire more people. I believe that some of these officers should be appointed in the various parishes, but you do not need eight in St. Michael. I think myself that the division between the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Health and Community Development is something which has got to be studied very much.

*The question that Head 42 - Welfare Department - stand, part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

*Head 43 - Queen Elizabeth Hospital - was called.*

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I think I should give all my detailed notes now with the hope that it would facilitate the debate.

Under Item 99 - Medical Supplies - the amount provided in the current year's Estimates is \$900,000, and at the end of November, 1970, expenditure amounted to \$890,149.23, leaving an unexpended balance of \$9,850. It can be seen therefore that expenditure has been incurred at the rate of \$111,268 per month. Efforts to restrict the order of drugs and to use substitute drugs in stock are only now beginning to have significant effect, but these efforts are limited by the continued use of certain sophisticated and expensive drugs which are considered essential for the treatment of certain types of illness. Another reason for this large sum having been disbursed in eight months is the fact that a large number of bills for orders placed in the year 1969-70 and amounting to approximately \$100,000 had to be settled from

this year's vote. That happens almost every year, I think. It is for that reason that we are asking for supplementary provision of \$150,000.

Under Item 109 - Maintenance of Motor Vehicles - the amount provided under the current year's Estimates is \$17,000 and at the end of November, 1970, expenditure amounted to \$13,868. Several factors have contributed to this level of expenditure. It should be pointed out that the number of vehicles at this institution has been increased to eight, and during the current year the price of gasoline has risen. It should also be observed that the cost of repairs has risen due mainly to the last salaries revision, and the oldest of the eight vehicles is eleven years, and the ambulance and station wagon have recorded over 100,000 miles on their speedometers. As a result of this, frequent and very costly repairs have to be effected. We will be including in our Estimates for 1971-72 provision for two new vehicles.

Under Item 117 - Laboratory - the sum of \$40,000 has been provided in this year's Estimates for the upkeep of the laboratory. At the end of November, 1970, the sum of \$37,000 had been disbursed. Requests for laboratory tests are constantly increasing as a result of the full complement of interns using the facilities of the laboratory as an integral part of their training. During the calendar year 1969 approximately 42,000 tests were carried out whereas at the end of the period January to July, 1970, there were 45,000 tests, and the sum of \$5,000 is therefore required to supplement this item.

Under Item 119 - Medical and Surgical Equipment - a vacuum tank at a cost of \$5,000 to be used in the Operating Theatre has been included in the 1971-72 Estimates. The Resident Engineer has advised that the present vacuum tanks are not considered adequate and may fail at any time as a result of overloading. Permission is being sought therefore to delete this item of equipment from 1971-72 Draft Estimates and supplement the above item in the current Estimates by the sum of \$5,000. These are the explanations and I will try to give any additional replies to questions if need be.

*I beg to move that Head 43 - Queen Elizabeth Hospital stand part.*

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, under Item 99 - Medical Supplies, it would be of considerable interest if in view of the information contained in the note hereto, the Minister would tell us when last there was an inspection carried out by the Food and Drugs Inspectors of the Public Health Department at the Hospital's Stores and Drugs Department.  
9.40 p.m.

It would be interesting to know from the Minister if the old stock of drugs to which these notes refer contains any drugs that at any time have been condemned by any previous doctors who have been employed at the Hospital during the last two years.

What is the approximate expiry date of most of these old drugs? Is it a fact the policy of Government is now that the health of this Community in terms of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is to be measured in terms of dollars and cents where drugs are concerned? There is a term "sophisticated" being used in this note with reference of drugs, and I would like to hear from the Minister if this is a technical term employed by a doctor or by the Hospital Director or merely by a Civil Servant. I am asking the Minister if he does not consider it a dangerous term. Now, Sir, I feel I should tell the Minister that even in the wards at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital Nurses and others employed thereon have made it known to patients that much of the medicine that is now being served to them comes from an old condemned stock, and that there are many patients on the wards who are advised by people serving them on the wards not to take the medicine, and much of the medicine that the Minister feels he is saving money on is now being wasted on the wards.

The Minister ought to become aware of a situation such as this, because when conditions like these are obtaining it can lead, as the Minister well knows, to a complete break down, because when a patient has justifiable reasons to lose confidence in his doctor and in the medicine prescribed by the doctor, there can be hardly any hope in recovery of that patient with that particular doctor, so one must see that the Hospital beds are just being wasted. People are losing their lives at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, people who could normally be living today and had a right to live. I am going to refer to a young lady from Rose Hill in the parish of St. Peter, Miss Sandiford, who had no less than eight days of tests carried out on her at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital; 13 tests were carried out by a group of young doctors who did not know what they were doing, and day after day, they were carrying out these tests and when the patient asked the doctors what was wrong with her, not one of them could tell her what was really wrong with her, and in the end she died. This is exactly what you are finding at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, so when you come now to tell us here that you are giving people the old drugs that you had up there ever since, and some of the druggists in the Hospital would tell you that they want Porters to sweep off the cob webs from them. If this Government feels that they cannot care for the people while they are alive that they are employing this means of getting rid of them, the Government might well resign rather than kill the people. How can the Government set about to treat people with medicine that has been condemned? When last was there a food and drug inspection at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital? Mr. Chairman, if the Minister has that particular answer ready I will sit down and hear him, because I would like to go on.

It is a perfect disgrace, our health services on the whole have been destroyed. There is one trouble we have and it is this; there are quite a number of doctors attached to our institutions - the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the Mental Hospital and other institutions - and when these doctors are acting they

are assets to the community, but the moment they get appointed they feel that they are appendages to the Government and that is where the trouble begins. They feel it is not for them to give a member of the Community of their best, and that they have got to try and effect a saving in the cost of medicine; in other words, robbing a physical human being of his blood, hoping by so doing they are helping the existence of the Government. The Government also has this belief.

*On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress and asked for leave to sit again. Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.*

9.50 p.m.

#### APPOINTMENT OF ACTING CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the hon. junior member for St. George be appointed to act as Chairman of Committees during the absence of the Chairman of Committees.

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

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

*Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supplies Mr. HOPPIN in the Chair.*

Mr. HOPPIN: When the sitting was temporarily suspended, the hon. junior member for St. Peter was addressing the Chair and he may continue. *(Asides)*

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. junior member for the City says that we now have a Chairman. Here we find the Minister of Health with the effrontery to come here with a Resolution for \$150,000 for medical supplies for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and the Note tells us that he is not concerned with the health of the people who go to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. What the Minister is concerned with is restricting the order of drugs. The Government is trying to cave money.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member has been trying to get me up for some time and he has, apparently, succeeded. The Government is not trying to restrict the order of drugs; the Government is trying to see that standard drugs are ordered and that no Doctors should come with fancy ideas to order expensive drugs when other normal, standard drugs can do. Some Doctors order sophisticated drugs. Hon. members know very well what sophisticated means. They order drugs which are high in price, whereas standard drugs can do the same job. Some Doctors will order the drugs that you do not have in an effort to show how good they are. We are not trying to prevent patients from getting the best drugs, but we are trying to standardise the drugs and cut down expenses. *(Asides)* We are not trying to kill anybody.

For that reason we have just opened an intensive Care Unit today to save lives, and that speaks for itself.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Hon. Minister would like to fool this Honourable Committee by telling us that there is such a thing as attempting to standardise the degree of illness in a community. What standardising medicine are you talking about? The Minister does not know what he is talking about. If a Doctor prescribes a particular medicine for a patient and he learns that his action is regarded as ordering sophisticated drugs, one can very well appreciate his attitude to the patient and to the Hospital in general in the future. *(Asides)*

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate when hon. members have come to the end of their tether. These things mean absolutely nothing to them; people in the Institutions can die like flies, as far as they are concerned. How can a Minister of a Socialist Government, honestly and truly, stand up and defend an action such as this. The Minister is saying that they are doing everything possible to supply the cheapest drugs to patients at the Hospital.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I never said the cheapest; I said that we were trying to standardise the drugs, so that the new Doctors would not come with high ideas or try to convince people by ordering things that we do not have at the Hospital, whereas standard drugs can do. We have a Medical Staff Committee, and we have Doctors and Druggists who advise us on these matters. I am giving you some of their advice. They say that efforts to restrict the order of drugs and to use substitute drugs in stock are only now beginning to have significant effect, but these efforts are limited by the continued use of certain sophisticated and expensive drugs which are considered essential for the treatment of certain types of illness. Nobody is saying that patients will not be getting expensive drugs. The expensive drugs are still being supplied, and it is for that reason that we have to come with this supplementary.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, who considers certain types of drugs to be essential for the treatment of certain types of illness?  
10 p.m.

Would the Minister tell us who considers them essential?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The hon. member is acting as though he is in a Court House. That is how it is getting in here. I am no doctor neither are you, and if you want a doctor to give me a special report on that particular matter, I can get a report on that, but I cannot answer that and neither can you.

Mr. HINDS: What I am saying is that the Minister cannot go and show this note to any doctor at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and expect that doctor

to give of his best in the future. In other words, you are telling me that the doctors do not know what they are doing.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: What I am giving you is from the Queen Elizabeth Hospital direct and from the Director of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital who after consultation with the doctors, the druggists and all the relevant people who are in a position to advise him, have advised us. I am quoting now from the Hospital Director personally. I presume the hon. member would say that he does not know what he is doing either.

Under Item 99 - Medical Supplies - he gives a breakdown. He says that the time lag between orders and the receipt of bills over the first four months in this financial year has made our earlier projections unrealistic. Furthermore our effect to restrict the order of drugs and use substitute drugs in stocks is only now beginning to have significant effect, but will be limited by the continued use of certain sophisticated and expensive drugs which are concerned essential for the treatment of certain types of illness. On the basis of our eight months' experience and taking into account the facts mentioned in paragraph 2, it is now projected that the sum of \$250,000 is urgently required to supplement this item. We have reduced it; we are not giving him all he has asked for.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I really thought the Minister would give me information direct from the mouth of the Hospital Director, but all the Minister did was to repeat himself by reading the information which we have in the note, and which he read before. The Minister is not fooling me with that. If this is what the Hospital Director tells you, tell him that I say he does not know what he is talking about. All that you and the Hospital Director are doing is trying to save money for the Government in one direction and throwing it away in another. In other words, you are taking people into the Hospital, you do not care whether or not they get better, the doctors who know what they are doing have been prescribing medicine for them, but you say this is too expensive.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, I have never said that.

Mr. HINDS: But the note said that.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I have said that there are certain expensive drugs which will still continue to be used in cases of certain severe illness. Nobody is trying to cut down on that. We are trying to standardize the drugs, but you cannot avoid using these expensive drugs in certain types of illness.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, in any part of the world, you can only standardize drugs when you can standardize the level of illness in the community. We might be affected by the same thing, but the degree of my illness may call for a more severe remedy than the illness of another person. The Minister does not know what he is talking about. *(Asides)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. member still discussing Item 99?

Mr. HINDS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. They are trying their best to get you in the Chair. We are maintaining that it cannot be taken as a Government acting in good faith when the health of the community is to be measured in terms of dollars and cents. We have got to look at in this light. The doctors employed at the Hospital are either capable or incapable of performing their duties. If they are capable of performing such duties, they are capable of examining a patient, diagnosing his case of illness and prescribing medicine for him to bring about some cure or measure of relief. If all these things are to be taken in their right perspective, how dare any Hospital Director or Minister or Civil Servant tell us that what the doctor has ordered is sophisticated and expensive drugs? That is what the Hospital Director, Minister and Civil Servants are doing; they are telling us that these young doctors come down here and carry out a raid on the Treasury and want to treat people with the most expensive and sophisticated drugs. They are telling us that they have some old drugs up there and the porters can take down a bottle of something, brush off the label and mix it up. The next thing the Minister will do to save money is to agree with the Hospital Director to mix up the drugs like you are mixing feed in a bucket and give everybody the same medicine. That is the standardising of medicine the Minister wants to carry out. In other words, if you employ doctors at the Hospital who do not know what they are doing, you should get rid of them. You had a lady who was killing Tom, Dick and Harry, and if you had gone in there you would have been a dead man.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I should like to know from the hon. member if he is suggesting that we should get rid of the doctors at the Hospital or the so-called pharmacists which are up there?

Mr. HINDS: The hon. member has injected new wine into this debate. The hon. junior member for St. Thomas has asked if we should get rid of the doctors or whether we should get rid of the so-called pharmacists attached to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. It is the Minister who has told us that he is acting on the advice of the Director who has had consultation with the doctors, and with the same so-called pharmacists that a member of his Cabinet is talking about and asking us to get rid of. Do you know whom we must get rid of? We must get rid of the people that are called Ministers, and the sooner the better. The Minister of Health knows absolutely nothing about the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and what is going on there. He knows nothing about what the doctors are doing. I believe he is interested.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is the best run Hospital in the British Caribbean and no one can challenge that. No matter how much shouting you do, it is the best run Hospital in the British Caribbean despite its defects. 10.10 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, if you did not have to diet people at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital under the present Dietitians, I would support the Minister 100%, but my contention is that the doctors prescribe medical supplies, and I warn you, Sir, that the doctors prescribe these medical supplies and go past the Pharmacists in the drug department. When these same doctors prescribe, the Dietitian in the Hospital at times will have to call on the Pharmacists in the drug department for certain supplies; that is, if the Dietitian knows her job, not if she is being covered up for by the Minister, but we will come to the end of that some day. What we are concerning ourselves with is this, how can we pretend to be doing all of this, having the best institution, the best Hospital in the British Caribbean, and set up ourselves at the same time that if you come into our best run institution we shall see that the cheapest drugs are sent down your swallow pipe regardless of what you are suffering from and the degree of your illness.

If a doctor prescribes for you a medicine which perhaps the Hospital Director or some other Civil Servant does not like, it is regarded as sophisticated and expensive and we do not order that drug; as a consequence we are left to feel that many people go into that institution and come out dead, and all that is required from the institution's authority is a certificate of death and they will be buried. That is all that is required, a certificate of death, but this Minister has a conscience. I am calling on the Minister to take steps to let the people of Barbados enjoy life for as long as God will have them live and not be killed by any false policy of the Government.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, when you are speaking of the continued use of expensive drugs you are speaking on a wrong premise. I cannot control you if you want to shout, but if you read and understand you will have no justification for behaving like that.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, if I read and I do not understand I want the Minister to explain to me; in other words, my policy is this, if I come inside here a fool I do not intend to go out the same fool as I came in if there is somebody here more educated than I am. I am asking the Minister to explain what this means: "Efforts to restrict the order of drugs and to use substitute drugs in stock are only now beginning to have significant effect." Now, Sir, you have drugs in stock so you are trying not to comply or to cooperate; in other words we are not letting the doctors dictate for the patients, or letting the patients get what the doctor ordered, the patients will have to get what we have in stock. Is that so? We should take these few words to mind, we do not want to order any more drugs, never mind what the doctor ordered we want to give to patients what we have in stock, so when the doctor orders this we will give a substitute hoping that the substitute will have the same effect as what the doctor ordered, and if the patient dies we will get a certificate of death and bury them in the Cemetery.

things like this the senior Welfare Officer will try and work on them. Have you ever had that experience yet? When they go and sit down you have to go up long stairs. You may get an old woman who can hardly walk, and she tells you that she had one dress for the year. They think they were getting at Mottley, but I am the happiest man in Barbados. I agree with the Hon. Minister that Social Welfare Officers should be put at places convenient to the people in the particular area. Here in the municipality you used to have about five or six officers, now today you have 28 for the whole Island. What is beating me is that I would like to know the amount of travelling allowance you are paing out for going around to the Community centres at night and saying that you are developing this and doing that. You know what I am talking about, Mr. Chairman. They should go and look at people and see those who are really in need, because there are those who will not come to you. There are those who do not want to go in any crowds in dealing with children. Ask Mr. Stanton Gittens who has just retired from Combermere about the number of children who asked for lunch at Combermere and were turned down, because they would say that the mother was in England; but who knows? The mother probably does not send one cent or the grandmother does not hear from her. What is better than spending the money in some of the ways we spent it?

I feel, Sir, that officers should be appointed, but I do not agree that you have to hire more people. I believe that some of these officers should be appointed in the various parishes, but you do not need eight in St. Michael. I think myself that the division between the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Health and Community Development is something which has got to be studied very much.

*The question that Head 42 - Welfare Department - stand, part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

*Head 43 - Queen Elizabeth Hospital - was called.*

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I think I should give all my detailed notes now with the hope that it would facilitate the debate.

Under Item 99 - Medical Supplies - the amount provided in the current year's Estimates is \$900,000, and at the end of November, 1970, expenditure amounted to \$890,149.23, leaving an unexpended balance of \$9,850. It can be seen therefore that expenditure has been incurred at the rate of \$111,268 per month. Efforts to restrict the order of drugs and to use substitute drugs in stock are only now beginning to have significant effect, but these efforts are limited by the continued use of certain sophisticated and expensive drugs which are considered essential for the treatment of certain types of illness. Another reason for this large sum having been disbursed in eight months is the fact that a large number of bills for orders placed in the year 1969-70 and amounting to approximately \$100,000 had to be settled from

this year's vote. That happens almost every year, I think. It is for that reason that we are asking for supplementary provision of \$150,000.

Under Item 109 - Maintenance of Motor Vehicles - the amount provided under the current year's Estimates is \$17,000 and at the end of November, 1970, expenditure amounted to \$13,868. Several factors have contributed to this level of expenditure. It should be pointed out that the number of vehicles at this institution has been increased to eight, and during the current year the price of gasoline has risen. It should also be observed that the cost of repairs has risen due mainly to the last salaries revision, and the oldest of the eight vehicles is eleven years, and the ambulance and station wagon have recorded over 100,000 miles on their speedometers. As a result of this, frequent and very costly repairs have to be effected. We will be including in our Estimates for 1971-72 provision for two new vehicles.

Under Item 117 - Laboratory - the sum of \$40,000 has been provided in this year's Estimates for the upkeep of the laboratory. At the end of November, 1970, the sum of \$37,000 had been disbursed. Requests for laboratory tests are constantly increasing as a result of the full complement of interns using the facilities of the laboratory as an integral part of their training. During the calendar year 1969 approximately 42,000 tests were carried out whereas at the end of the period January to July, 1970, there were 45,000 tests, and the sum of \$5,000 is therefore required to supplement this item.

Under Item 119 - Medical and Surgical Equipment - a vacuum tank at a cost of \$5,000 to be used in the Operating Theatre has been included in the 1971-72 Estimates. The Resident Engineer has advised that the present vacuum tanks are not considered adequate and may fail at any time as a result of overloading. Permission is being sought therefore to delete this item of equipment from 1971-72 Draft Estimates and supplement the above item in the current Estimates by the sum of \$5,000. These are the explanations and I will try to give any additional replies to questions if need be.

*I beg to move that Head 43 - Queen Elizabeth Hospital stand part.*

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, under Item 99 - Medical Supplies, it would be of considerable interest if in view of the information contained in the note hereto, the Minister would tell us when last there was an inspection carried out by the Food and Drugs Inspectors of the Public Health Department at the Hospital's Stores and Drugs Department.  
9.40 p.m.

It would be interesting to know from the Minister if the old stock of drugs to which these notes refer contains any drugs that at any time have been condemned by any previous doctors who have been employed at the Hospital during the last two years.

What is the approximate expiry date of most of these old drugs? Is it a fact the policy of Government is now that the health of this Community in terms of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is to be measured in terms of dollars and cents where drugs are concerned? There is a term "sophisticated" being used in this note with reference of drugs, and I would like to hear from the Minister if this is a technical term employed by a doctor or by the Hospital Director or merely by a Civil Servant. I am asking the Minister if he does not consider it a dangerous term. Now, Sir, I feel I should tell the Minister that even in the wards at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital Nurses and others employed thereon have made it known to patients that much of the medicine that is now being served to them comes from an old condemned stock, and that there are many patients on the wards who are advised by people serving them on the wards not to take the medicine, and much of the medicine that the Minister feels he is saving money on is now being wasted on the wards.

The Minister ought to become aware of a situation such as this, because when conditions like these are obtaining it can lead, as the Minister well knows, to a complete break down, because when a patient has justifiable reasons to lose confidence in his doctor and in the medicine prescribed by the doctor, there can be hardly any hope in recovery of that patient with that particular doctor, so one must see that the Hospital beds are just being wasted. People are losing their lives at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, people who could normally be living today and had a right to live. I am going to refer to a young lady from Rose Hill in the parish of St. Peter, Miss Sandiford, who had no less than eight days of tests carried out on her at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital; 13 tests were carried out by a group of young doctors who did not know what they were doing, and day after day, they were carrying out these tests and when the patient asked the doctors what was wrong with her, not one of them could tell her what was really wrong with her, and in the end she died. This is exactly what you are finding at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, so when you come now to tell us here that you are giving people the old drugs that you had up there ever since, and some of the druggists in the Hospital would tell you that they want Porters to sweep off the cob webs from them. If this Government feels that they cannot care for the people while they are alive that they are employing this means of getting rid of them, the Government might well resign rather than kill the people. How can the Government set about to treat people with medicine that has been condemned? When last was there a food and drug inspection at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital? Mr. Chairman, if the Minister has that particular answer ready I will sit down and hear him, because I would like to go on.

It is a perfect disgrace, our health services on the whole have been destroyed. There is one trouble we have and it is this; there are quite a number of doctors attached to our institutions - the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the Mental Hospital and other institutions - and when these doctors are acting they

are assets to the community, but the moment they get appointed they feel that they are appendages to the Government and that is where the trouble begins. They feel it is not for them to give a member of the Community of their best, and that they have got to try and effect a saving in the cost of medicine; in other words, robbing a physical human being of his blood, hoping by so doing they are helping the existence of the Government. The Government also has this belief.

*On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress and asked for leave to sit again. Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.*

9.50 p.m.

#### APPOINTMENT OF ACTING CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the hon. junior member for St. George be appointed to act as Chairman of Committees during the absence of the Chairman of Committees.

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

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

*Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supplies Mr. HOPPIN in the Chair.*

Mr. HOPPIN: When the sitting was temporarily suspended, the hon. junior member for St. Peter was addressing the Chair and he may continue. *(Asides)*

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. junior member for the City says that we now have a Chairman. Here we find the Minister of Health with the effrontery to come here with a Resolution for \$150,000 for medical supplies for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and the Note tells us that he is not concerned with the health of the people who go to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. What the Minister is concerned with is restricting the order of drugs. The Government is trying to cave money.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member has been trying to get me up for some time and he has, apparently, succeeded. The Government is not trying to restrict the order of drugs; the Government is trying to see that standard drugs are ordered and that no Doctors should come with fancy ideas to order expensive drugs when other normal, standard drugs can do. Some Doctors order sophisticated drugs. Hon. members know very well what sophisticated means. They order drugs which are high in price, whereas standard drugs can do the same job. Some Doctors will order the drugs that you do not have in an effort to show how good they are. We are not trying to prevent patients from getting the best drugs, but we are trying to standardise the drugs and cut down expenses. *(Asides)* We are not trying to kill anybody.

For that reason we have just opened an intensive Care Unit today to save lives, and that speaks for itself.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Hon. Minister would like to fool this Honourable Committee by telling us that there is such a thing as attempting to standardise the degree of illness in a community. What standardising medicine are you talking about? The Minister does not know what he is talking about. If a Doctor prescribes a particular medicine for a patient and he learns that his action is regarded as ordering sophisticated drugs, one can very well appreciate his attitude to the patient and to the Hospital in general in the future. *(Asides)*

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate when hon. members have come to the end of their tether. These things mean absolutely nothing to them; people in the Institutions can die like flies, as far as they are concerned. How can a Minister of a Socialist Government, honestly and truly, stand up and defend an action such as this. The Minister is saying that they are doing everything possible to supply the cheapest drugs to patients at the Hospital.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I never said the cheapest; I said that we were trying to standardise the drugs, so that the new Doctors would not come with high ideas or try to convince people by ordering things that we do not have at the Hospital, whereas standard drugs can do. We have a Medical Staff Committee, and we have Doctors and Druggists who advise us on these matters. I am giving you some of their advice. They say that efforts to restrict the order of drugs and to use substitute drugs in stock are only now beginning to have significant effect, but these efforts are limited by the continued use of certain sophisticated and expensive drugs which are considered essential for the treatment of certain types of illness. Nobody is saying that patients will not be getting expensive drugs. The expensive drugs are still being supplied, and it is for that reason that we have to come with this supplementary.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, who considers certain types of drugs to be essential for the treatment of certain types of illness?

10 p.m.

Would the Minister tell us who considers them essential?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The hon. member is acting as though he is in a Court House. That is how it is getting in here. I am no doctor neither are you, and if you want a doctor to give me a special report on that particular matter, I can get a report on that, but I cannot answer that and neither can you.

Mr. HINDS: What I am saying is that the Minister cannot go and show this note to any doctor at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and expect that doctor

to give of his best in the future. In other words, you are telling me that the doctors do not know what they are doing.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: What I am giving you is from the Queen Elizabeth Hospital direct and from the Director of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital who after consultation with the doctors, the druggists and all the relevant people who are in a position to advise him, have advised us. I am quoting now from the Hospital Director personally. I presume the hon. member would say that he does not know what he is doing either.

Under Item 99 - Medical Supplies - he gives a breakdown. He says that the time lag between orders and the receipt of bills over the first four months in this financial year has made our earlier projections unrealistic. Furthermore our effect to restrict the order of drugs and use substitute drugs in stocks is only now beginning to have significant effect, but will be limited by the continued use of certain sophisticated and expensive drugs which are concerned essential for the treatment of certain types of illness. On the basis of our eight months' experience and taking into account the facts mentioned in paragraph 2, it is now projected that the sum of \$250,000 is urgently required to supplement this item. We have reduced it; we are not giving him all he has asked for.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I really thought the Minister would give me information direct from the mouth of the Hospital Director, but all the Minister did was to repeat himself by reading the information which we have in the note, and which he read before. The Minister is not fooling me with that. If this is what the Hospital Director tells you, tell him that I say he does not know what he is talking about. All that you and the Hospital Director are doing is trying to save money for the Government in one direction and throwing it away in another. In other words, you are taking people into the Hospital, you do not care whether or not they get better, the doctors who know what they are doing have been prescribing medicine for them, but you say this is too expensive.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, I have never said that.

Mr. HINDS: But the note said that.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I have said that there are certain expensive drugs which will still continue to be used in cases of certain severe illness. Nobody is trying to cut down on that. We are trying to standardize the drugs, but you cannot avoid using these expensive drugs in certain types of illness.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, in any part of the world, you can only standardize drugs when you can standardize the level of illness in the community. We might be affected by the same thing, but the degree of my illness may call for a more severe remedy than the illness of another person. The Minister does not know what he is talking about. *(Asides)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. member still discussing Item 99?

Mr. HINDS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. They are trying their best to get you in the Chair. We are maintaining that it cannot be taken as a Government acting in good faith when the health of the community is to be measured in terms of dollars and cents. We have got to look at in this light. The doctors employed at the Hospital are either capable or incapable of performing their duties. If they are capable of performing such duties, they are capable of examining a patient, diagnosing his case of illness and prescribing medicine for him to bring about some cure or measure of relief. If all these things are to be taken in their right perspective, how dare any Hospital Director or Minister or Civil Servant tell us that what the doctor has ordered is sophisticated and expensive drugs? That is what the Hospital Director, Minister and Civil Servants are doing; they are telling us that these young doctors come down here and carry out a raid on the Treasury and want to treat people with the most expensive and sophisticated drugs. They are telling us that they have some old drugs up there and the porters can take down a bottle of something, brush off the label and mix it up. The next thing the Minister will do to save money is to agree with the Hospital Director to mix up the drugs like you are mixing feed in a bucket and give everybody the same medicine. That is the standardising of medicine the Minister wants to carry out. In other words, if you employ doctors at the Hospital who do not know what they are doing, you should get rid of them. You had a lady who was killing Tom, Dick and Harry, and if you had gone in there you would have been a dead man.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I should like to know from the hon. member if he is suggesting that we should get rid of the doctors at the Hospital or the so-called pharmacists which are up there?

Mr. HINDS: The hon. member has injected new wine into this debate. The hon. junior member for St. Thomas has asked if we should get rid of the doctors or whether we should get rid of the so-called pharmacists attached to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. It is the Minister who has told us that he is acting on the advice of the Director who has had consultation with the doctors, and with the same so-called pharmacists that a member of his Cabinet is talking about and asking us to get rid of. Do you know whom we must get rid of? We must get rid of the people that are called Ministers, and the sooner the better. The Minister of Health knows absolutely nothing about the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and what is going on there. He knows nothing about what the doctors are doing. I believe he is interested.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is the best run Hospital in the British Caribbean and no one can challenge that. No matter how much shouting you do, it is the best run Hospital in the British Caribbean despite its defects. 10.10 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, if you did not have to diet people at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital under the present Dietitians, I would support the Minister 100%, but my contention is that the doctors prescribe medical supplies, and I warn you, Sir, that the doctors prescribe these medical supplies and go past the Pharmacists in the drug department. When these same doctors prescribe, the Dietitian in the Hospital at times will have to call on the Pharmacists in the drug department for certain supplies; that is, if the Dietitian knows her job, not if she is being covered up for by the Minister, but we will come to the end of that some day. What we are concerning ourselves with is this, how can we pretend to be doing all of this, having the best institution, the best Hospital in the British Caribbean, and set up ourselves at the same time that if you come into our best run institution we shall see that the cheapest drugs are sent down your swallow pipe regardless of what you are suffering from and the degree of your illness.

If a doctor prescribes for you a medicine which perhaps the Hospital Director or some other Civil Servant does not like, it is regarded as sophisticated and expensive and we do not order that drug; as a consequence we are left to feel that many people go into that institution and come out dead, and all that is required from the institution's authority is a certificate of death and they will be buried. That is all that is required, a certificate of death, but this Minister has a conscience. I am calling on the Minister to take steps to let the people of Barbados enjoy life for as long as God will have them live and not be killed by any false policy of the Government.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, when you are speaking of the continued use of expensive drugs you are speaking on a wrong premise. I cannot control you if you want to shout, but if you read and understand you will have no justification for behaving like that.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, if I read and I do not understand I want the Minister to explain to me; in other words, my policy is this, if I come inside here a fool I do not intend to go out the same fool as I came in if there is somebody here more educated than I am. I am asking the Minister to explain what this means: "Efforts to restrict the order of drugs and to use substitute drugs in stock are only now beginning to have significant effect." Now, Sir, you have drugs in stock so you are trying not to comply or to cooperate; in other words we are not letting the doctors dictate for the patients, or letting the patients get what the doctor ordered, the patients will have to get what we have in stock. Is that so? We should take these few words to mind, we do not want to order any more drugs, never mind what the doctor ordered we want to give to patients what we have in stock, so when the doctor orders this we will give a substitute hoping that the substitute will have the same effect as what the doctor ordered, and if the patient dies we will get a certificate of death and bury them in the Cemetery.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, in order to give the hon. member a chance to breeze off, I will give him this information. In the year 1968-69 we voted \$885,000, in the year 1970-71 we voted \$900,000, so we are voting more money each year. We committed and spent in 1968-69 \$72,436.18, in 1969-70 \$884,983.07, and in 1970-71 to 30th November we spent \$819,149.23, so we are spending more money and it is not that we are cutting back. In one breath you are accusing us of wasting, now we are trying to see that the money is spent and better utilised and that standard drugs wherever possible are used; there is nothing wrong with that, expensive drugs are still being ordered.

Mr. HINDS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I understand the Minister to point out that we are spending more money each year at the Hospital. We are treating more people each year at the Hospital, devaluation has caused a rising of the cost of the commodities throughout the Caribbean, the costs of supplies have gone up. Even the Minister comes here without being properly briefed; it has just been brought to my attention that in Estimates 1970-71 Item 99 includes provisions for supply of drugs to other departments. Reimbursement of \$8,000 for drugs supplied to other departments paid to revenue. Increase due to higher cost of dressings, medicines and surgical instruments. Also more drugs required with the extension of radio-therapy department. All of these things are under the Minister's institution and he does not remember them.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, this is not a question of remembering, this is a supplementary; do you want me to go back into all that again?

Mr. HINDS: It is not a case of the Minister not remembering, he had forgotten.  
10.20 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, I ought to continue to read this Note, because the Minister is not going to explain it to me. It says:

"Efforts to restrict the order of drugs and to use substitute drugs in stock....."

Do you hear where the substitute drugs come from? The Minister has not yet told us when last they called in a Public Health Inspector to inspect the Drugs Department and say what drugs should be condemned. He has not told us about the expiry date on some of the labels on bottles of medicine up there. The cobweb, the dust, the age of the labels on the bottles - the cockroaches up there have destroyed some of the old labels and it is impossible for the Druggists to determine the expiry date on some of those drugs. The Minister must come to a conclusion that it is beyond dangerous to allow sick people in that Institution to continue to take medicine from that Drugs Department from bottles and tins when they do not know the age of medicine.

In other words, the Minister is just behaving, to my mind, like some poor people who know that a

a child is suffering from gas; they cannot buy salts, so they tap the child's belly and rub his back in the hope that the air will come out. That is what the Minister is doing. In other words, so long as the air comes out, they do not care how it comes out. That is the Minister's attitude to this matter. This is a question of life and death. When it comes to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the Minister must understand that he has a proper Institution which the Barbados Labour Party built. When people pass they have to ask, what lovely building is this? Such a lovely Institution was built that the Minister was able to come to this House and justify charging people more money for staying there. In other words, he is saying: you have to pay more money and you have to take my old drugs. When you put the old iodine on a cut it does not burn you. There is turpentine in that Dispensary, and when you smell it you do not know whether it is turpentine or wine; you do not know whether it has in 2 spirits, 10 spirits or no spirits. If you were a man working obeh, you certainly could not go to that Institution and ask for turpentine with spirits in it.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister must go around and know what is happening in the Institution. I understand him to say that he was at the Institution this morning, and if anything was wrong the Porters or the Orderlies would have told him. I want to tell the Minister that No Porter or Orderly will tell him anything. (Asides.) Bruce Prince is not going to do it. When most of the Ministers have their parties, they employ Bruce Prince to cater for the parties, and when he misbehaves himself in the Hospital kitchen nobody can discipline him.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us deal with Medical Supplies, please.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I know that you will give me neither latitude nor longitude. We are dealing with Medical Supplies and the Note thereto. What the Minister is trying to shelter under is this: the first part of the Note tells you how they are trying to cut back on the money. They are not ordering new drugs, but they are using the supply of old drugs. The Note goes on to say that success is very limited because Doctors are still placing orders for certain sophisticated and expensive drugs.

I am maintaining that that is destroying the good relationship between patient and Doctor and between Institution and Doctor, when the term "sophisticated" is being applied here. It is wicked and ought not to have been inserted here under any condition whatsoever. The Note continues to state that these sophisticated and expensive drugs are considered essential for the treatment of certain types of illness. What are they saying? Honestly, if I were a Minister no civil servant could get me to come in here with this Note; it would have to be revised. I would come here with something that I could stand up and defend. The Minister cannot defend it, because he cannot explain it.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Sir, If you want to harangue and get on like that, I cannot do anything to stop you. I have already explained the matter, and if you have not followed it that is your business. I have explained that efforts are being made to standardise certain drugs. Take for instance, you have Aspirin and Phensic, and either one serves the same purpose, as far as I know. There are certain standardised drugs for certain ailments. Some of these new Doctors come and, just to show off their ability, they take particular pains in ordering drugs which are not in stock and by so doing they feel they can convince people that they are better Doctors than the ones who are there, whereas standard drugs can do. That is a fact. In a case where special drugs are needed for a special type of ailment, the money will continue to be spent in seeing that the expensive drugs are obtained for the special cases which need attention. Those are facts, and if you do not know that you do not know anything.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister knows very well that Canadians have brought a type of venerael diseased into this Island. Are you standardising the penicillin or whatever type of drug is being used to cure it?

10.30 p.m.

What are you doing about it? Are you standardising that type of penicillin? (*Asides.*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Members not addressing the Chair, please observe the Standing Orders.

Mr. HINDS: If you are standardising medicine, what I am saying.....

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: On a point of order, the Minister has made a rather serious allegation about doctors at the hospital that they try to show off their knowledge and order fancy drugs.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I did not say that. I said that certain young doctors tend to show off their knowledge. I did not refer to any specific doctor. I know that a lot of young doctors try to do more than anybody else and they want you to make room for them. That is the attitude today and it applies to doctors just as it applies to anybody else.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Is the Minister saying that this is so at the Hospital or it is not so? Is the Minister saying that there are doctors at the Hospital who want to show off their knowledge and order fancy drugs? Why does he refer to it then in relation to the Hospital? This is what I would like the Minister to state. (Hon. C. E. TALMA: I did not say that.) Exactly what did the Minister say?

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, this is the second time during my time in this House that I have had to enter a debate of this sort. I am going to draw to the Hon. Minister's attention that I led the debate when the Barbados Labour Party was in power when this attempt was being made, and I challenge him to deny it. You do not measure people's

health in dollars and cents and I hope that is clearly understood. Before I came here on that occasion I was well briefed by medical persons on this matter. You have the British, the American, the European and the Canadian pharmacopoeia and so on, but everything depends on the potency of the particular drugs and the lasting time they have. If a doctor who operates on a person say for some intestinal trouble finds that a person with pressure responded better to a Canadian drug, would you say that he should use a cheap English drug because it is cheaper? Would you like it to be used on you? Every doctor, especially surgeons who operate, knows the type of drug he prefers to use on a person whose blood clots. When this matter was first brought to the House a book was actually sent around to medical men at the hospital at the time saying that they must order drugs only as prescribed here and they were not to go in for any of the fancy drugs. The hon. member who introduced this now and the Leader of the House were in the Opposition, and we raised so much hell in here about it that it had to be taken back; and this is the first time it has made its reappearance in this Assembly.

Mr. Chairman, this note says that there are efforts to restrict the ordering of drugs and to use substitutes. There is no such thing as a substitute for a particular drug to give to a human being. It is all well and good to say that people have little children and cannot afford to use the drugs which you are going to prescribe, and therefore you get some gully root and boil it and give them. That is a substitute; but what is a substitute for a drug? You are going to use substitute drugs in stock. How long did you have them in stock? In other words, have you got an old stock? Medicine for hypertension is not good after a certain time, nor is medicine for diabetes good after a certain time. I know the drugs may be expensive, but you do not measure somebody's health in dollars and cents. There is the type of drug that you import from Johns in Europe, or from the hard currency area or from the United States and Britian, and it all depends on the potency. You have just passed a Bill to make it legal for the Medical Registrar at the Hospital to practise. If he has been trained to practice for six or seven years and finds that there is a particular drug which is good for people whose pressure after operation is so much and he is accustomed to using that, are you going to suggest to him that he should use some of the drugs you have in stock although they may be five years old? Cortisone may be only good for two years. You are not talking to a novice on this thing. Are you suggesting they will have to use the drugs you must have had in stock for over two years? Never would I give a vote in favour of this. I would rather you come for \$100,000 more and tell us that the drugs are old and get rid of them; but you must not say the doctors must use substitute drugs which you have in stock. If you have substitute drugs in stock, were you overstocked? Or were the doctors not using these drugs because they did not believe in them?

Mr. Chairman, I say again that this matter found itself in this Chamber when the Barbados Labour Party was in power and I led the attack against it and it was stopped. The Minister was then in the Opposition. Let the Leader of the House deny that. Doctors were circulated and told they must only use those drugs and must not prescribe certain drugs. Now you are asking me to agree with your efforts to restrict the order of drugs. Somebody must know what he is doing up there.

10.40 p.m.

There are certain specialists up there who have patients on whom they have to use drugs. It is my opinion that although you want to say people in the pay wards should pay for the drugs, I would not fight this, but I say that the people in the poor wards should have the same proper drugs as the ones in the pay wards. Why must you now say not to order these drugs? I think you should carry this back. When you have a note such as the one you have here in the Addendum it makes it difficult for people to vote for it; I have been in here so long and I have said already that this could be done, so tell me why you have drugs in stock. Were you over stocked? Do you now have too much drugs?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, it is becoming increasingly obvious what has happened in this particular instance and the reason why Government has had to restrict the ordering of drugs and to use substitute drugs in stock. The Labour Party at some time was criticising the failure of the Government to appoint a Hospital Board, and also we have been critical of the Hospital administration. As I said, Sir, it is obvious what has happened, through the lack of proper administration in the Hospital over a period of years - I do not know if there is an existing Drug Committee at the Hospital, but a few years ago there was no Drug Committee existing at the Hospital - so that if a Head of Department wanted to order drugs what he did was to order the drugs on his own accord and without any regard to the other Heads of Departments so that any effort could have been made at that stage to standardise any drugs. What has happened is that you had doctors ordering drugs without any consultation with the other Heads of Departments at the Hospital, and this has obviously led to the overstocking by the Hospital of certain drugs, and as a result of this the Government now finds itself in the position of having to use those drugs before they can order more.

To come here now and say that efforts to restrict the order of drugs and to use substitute drugs in stock are only now beginning to have significant effect is a lot of nonsense, and what I would like to find out from the Minister is at what stage and when were these efforts started to restrict the ordering of drugs and by whose authority. Was it Government's policy or was it on a recommendation from the Hospital? Is this a cut back on the spending of money on drugs at the Hospital? Did this effort come about as a result of a recommendation from the Hospital or was this recommendation due to the fact that the

Medical Department was over stocked? Was it due as a result of the Government economising at the Hospital? If the Minister is prepared to answer at this stage I will give way.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The whole question of the drug department was investigated by an officer who is no longer there, and he investigated the whole drug system and made certain recommendations which we are now following up, so it is through that recommendation mainly.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: As I understand it, this effort to restrict the ordering of drugs has come about through the investigation of one doctor. I do not know who he is but.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA: It was a Committee headed by one doctor who investigated the drug section and instigated new systems.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Was it a departmental Commission of Enquiry or a Government Commission of Enquiry or what?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: It was a Committee set up under the Ministry, but one doctor in particular who was the chief man conducted this and made the recommendation.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: When was this recommendation made?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Two months ago.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Who is he?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Dr. Hall, a very good doctor.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: So that it is only within the last few months that the Government discovered that there was an over stock of drugs at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: That is what you want me to say, but I am not saying that.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: When the Minister said that as a result of enquiries recently carried out these recommendations were made, it is obvious to assume that one of the findings of that Committee was that the Hospital drug department was over-stocked; if it was not over-stocked you would never use the words "efforts to restrict the ordering of drugs"

10.50 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: It was not only then we were aware that the Drugs Department was overstocked. It was not since this Doctor came along and we had the Committee of Inquiry to investigate and devise systems to improve things. The hon. member must realise that since the Hospital Director has taken over, he is trying to improve all different sections and Departments with the assistance of Pan American

Health Experts, and we are looking into various Departments and sections as we go along.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Is there a Drugs Committee at the Hospital? Is there a Committee to order drugs at the Hospital? I would like the Minister to tell me who is on that Committee and when that Committee was formed. I am prepared to give way and let the Minister give the information.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, the Committee to which I have just referred is the Committee looking into the whole drugs section.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I am talking about a Standing Committee to order drugs for the Hospital. Is there such a Committee? Who will look after the ordering of drugs in August this year? Are you going to bring back Dr. Hall to do it? Who will be responsible for ordering drugs next year? Certainly not the Director of the Hospital! Who will be responsible for the ordering of drugs?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The Hospital Director is responsible to the Ministry, and he has people under him in the various Departments.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the Minister knows that the Director of the Hospital is not a Doctor. How are you going to get the drugs standardised between the Surgical Department, the Medical Department, the Paediatrics Departments, and so on?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member knows that we have a Medical Staff Committee. Is he forgetting that? The Medical Staff Committee sees after the detailing of Doctors, technical matters, drugs, Druggists, etc., and the Committee advises the Hospital Director on what is needed.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister saying that the Staff Committee at the Hospital is responsible for the ordering of drugs?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: There a Drugs Committee.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I do not want to know about that. You came in here with a Note stating.

"Efforts to restrict the order of drugs and to use substitute drugs in stock are only now beginning to have significant effect....."

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. As far as I know, there is a Drugs Committee, but I cannot call the names of the people who comprise it.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: You said that you did not know whether there was a Drugs Committee, and now you are saying that there is a Drugs Committee. Are you pulling that out of a hat?

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, there must be a Drugs Committee. There is an officer from the Hospital sitting in the Gallery. It is difficult to understand if you are going to dump drugs what you will have to do. The Superintendent of the Hospital cannot order drugs. There must be a Drugs Committee and it must be comprised of highly trained medical men such as Specialists, the Chief Pharmacist, and so on, to order drugs. It is necessary to have Specialists to know what drugs to order. A paper is now being sent to the Minister, and he will be able to answer us.

Mr. BOLDEN rose - -

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the junior member for St. Joseph still desirous of addressing the Chair?

Mr. BOLDEN: Very much so, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I cannot complete my speech until the Minister gives me a satisfactory answer. If the Minister has information which he can give us, I will be prepared to take my seat. The Minister does not know what is going on.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, one of the officers from my Ministry is here, and unfortunately only now chooses to give me some information. I am no expert at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I could not give the information before I received it from the officer. (*Asides.*) I can be as rough as anybody else. The hon. junior member for the City knows that there is a Drugs Committee, but he starts off by saying that there is no Committee.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I did not start off by saying that there was no Drugs Committee. I asked the Minister whether there was a Drugs Committee and when it came into existence.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I said that there was one.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: You said that you did not know if there was one.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The hon. member said that no Drugs Committee existed at the Hospital for the past two years. That is the first statement the hon. member made.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I said originally that there was no Drugs Committee, and I did not know whether there was one today. I wanted you to tell the Committee whether there was one when it came into existence. You said you did not know, and later you pulled an answer out of the air and said that there was one.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Dr. Graham is the Chairman of the Drugs Committee, and the Supplies Officer orders the drugs. The term "sophisticated drugs" was used by the Hospital Director, because I was reading

from his memorandum, when the junior member for St. Peter tried to point out that I was reading the same thing all over again. He brought in this high-sounding expression of "sophisticated drugs" which has caused all of this confusion in here tonight. He should have been in here to hear how "sophisticated" was accepted. I did not invent this word which has caused all of this confusion in here tonight. This is sophisticated confusion.

In connection with the standardisation of drugs, it is customary to have formularies in the Hospital such as the British National formulary. The Pharmacist is preparing such a formulary.  
11 p.m.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, what does that mean?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. junior member for St. Peter is breaking the Rules of the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am sorry; I meant the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, let us look at the wording of the note. It says that efforts to restrict the order of drugs and to use substitute drugs in stock are only now beginning to have significant effect. How can anybody reading this get any other impression than that the Government does not want to order drugs? This cannot be right. We have been saying for a long time that the notes to these Addenda are not proper. When you read this, nobody could believe that the Government intends to order drugs again at the hospital, but will use substitute drugs in stock. Would the Minister tell this Committee what is the meaning of the words "substitute drugs"? Are you using something other than drugs? Is this what the Hospital is coming to? I know the Government is lacking in ideas, but I did not think they were so stupid as to come down here with an Addendum saying that efforts to restrict the order of drugs and to use substitute drugs in stock are only now beginning to have significant effect.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The hon. member wants to know the meaning of the word "substitute". I do not think he needs me to explain that to him. It means a drug of similar potency; it is another drug which will serve the same purpose. Formularies are certain approved drugs which are determined by the Drugs Committee. They are compiled in book form and supplied to the Medical Staff Department and you would have to get permission from the Medical Staff Committee. This gives an idea of what standard drugs are.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I am a layman, but I might be of little assistance at this time to the Committee. When I was a young man a little booklet fell into my hand by pure accident. It came from a doctor's office. It was the sort of booklet that had certain medical preparations listed, and against them the disease or sickness for which it might be prescribed. For instance, let us take

influenza. There would be a prescription marked, two or three things would form the prescription for influenza, then a space was left out, another three or four would be just as good, another four or five in certain proportions would be just as good and so on; and that was complied by a British Drug House by the name of Boots. So the word "substitute" is a very unfortunate word. I think the hon. junior member for Bridgetown got the right word which is "generic." This is a very unfortunate wording of a note in my humble opinion, and that has caused a lot of trouble. You see, when a note says "substitute drugs", one gets the idea at once that this is something inferior, and the idea has been mooted that the Government was now trying to restrict its orders, cutting back on its expenses in order to offer substitute drugs.

Now even laymen know that today you get a lot of pills and tablets with different trade names. One will contain a little more bicarbonate of soda than the other, the other will contain a little more of one element than the other, but they are all for the same type of malady, and so you would not say that one is just a substitute for the other. As a matter of fact, one composition may work miracles with me and to another patient might be quite allergic to it. I can only speak as a layman. I have been a patient more than once, and my body will react to certain drugs in quite a different manner from another man's body; but the position is that it may have been discovered at the hospital that doctors need not always prescribe certain compositions. I cannot use the technical language, but as I say, this wording has been so unfortunate that when the words "restrict" and "substitute" appear, I can appreciate the reaction of all members of the Opposition. To use the word "sophisticated" in talking about medicine is grossly unfortunate. I did not know what "formulary" meant, but all that meant was the compiling by well-famed drug houses such as Boots, Parke-Davis and the rest all over the world, and those are supplied to doctors. As a young man one of these books fell into my hands, and name any sickness you like, you would see it there with five or six prescriptive drugs beside it. Naturally one doctor will prescribe this one for me and the other one for you, Mr. Chairman, and so on. So it is not that this Government is so mean.

11.10 p.m.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, the youthful Minister is entirely wrong, he is wrong from beginning to end. If he would read what he got up to talk about he would see where he is wrong, because it says "to use substitute drugs in stock". At the Hospital they have got drugs there which they want to use up, so let us talk about the used up drugs and I will show you why the Hon. Minister does not understand what he has just said.

There are certain people who react differently to certain drugs. Penicillin is one of the known drugs that will work miracles with patient "A" and patient "B" will be allergic to it, and if you give him an injection and you cannot catch him quickly

he will die. The next thing about it is this, the same penicillin can only be use up to a certain time, and you will always see "use before a particular date" marked on it, so this is not a question of general drugs, this is a question of using old stock, because penicillin is created from bacteria and if you leave it too long it recreates itself into bacteria, so the substitute drugs in stock means exactly what it says here in this note.

I want the Hon. Minister to know this, about a year and a half ago I was called to the Hospital to make a will for a man who was supposed to go for an operation; the man told me to come back that afternoon because they were taking him to the surgery. When I got back he told me they were not taking him up then because they neither had the equipment nor the medicine, and the man went home and died. His name was Greenidge and he came from St. Philip; he had a lung complaint, and this whole thing cuts across the very principle you are trying out at the Hospital. Every year you are bringing down specialist doctors, and you just had an eye specialist here from the United Kingdom; if you are bringing this man or woman who is a specialist and he orders drugs, are you going to tell him that he should only use the drugs in stock? You are wasting time. Are you going to present the man with a list at the Hospital door which states that these are what you have in stock and that he should use these and nothing else? That is what it means it says to use substitute drugs in stock, or will you tell him to use croton oil or lignum vitae? You cannot tell him to use croton oil or lignum vitae? You cannot tell this Committee that when you say substitute drugs you mean general drugs, because if you are going to restrict the doctors to use what is in stock, and nobody goes in there who is allergic to what is in stock, what is the position with that person?

I would not wish it to happen to the Minister, but I know if he had any relatives in there who could not use penicillin and they said they were still using penicillin he would get worried, like the certain Government official that went into the Hospital and when he heard Miss Underhill was going to operate on him he took up his clothes and left. It is condemning anybody who should ever enter the doors of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital to a potential death if they did that only with the standard run of persons who are using the drugs in stock up there. I have personal experience, because I have had a daughter who had to have treatment for her eyes and they told me to wait till the specialist came. I sent my daughter elsewhere, but if the specialist had ordered something for my daughter eyes, would you have told me to use what you had in stock? To put in whose eyes? I would not want it for my daughter, and I would not want it for anybody else outside in the street, and I am going to vote against the Resolution irrespective of what anybody says, because if you are taking people in a hospital, bringing down specialists to look after them and new doctors to be trained, every time a new doctor comes out he comes with new knowledge of the latest drugs which

have been developed to treat the maladies he is dealing with, and you cannot talk about young doctors being sophisticated at all. I say point blank the Minister of Health who said so is against youth, and that is why they appointed a man of your age as a Minister for youth, because the Minister is saying that no young man who comes out here with qualifications should be allowed to use his knowledge; that is what he means.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, the hon. member will not be getting way with that at all, I said no such thing. I said that certain young doctors were coming out here feeling like certain young lawyers for that matter, very, very, bombastic. They feel they know more than anybody else and they come and order, drugs, some of which might be quite good but in some cases there are other drugs existing in the Hospital that can do, but they want to display their knowledge and order drugs they know very well are very expensive.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: If the Minister would give way, what I would like to find out is if this still happened at the Hospital.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I would really like to reply .....

Mr. BOLDEN: I am not finished yet, if you want to reply let me finish first. I sat down on a point of order, and I was saying that the Minister of Health said earlier that certain young doctors want to come and show off their knowledge. They are very inconsistent; they are talking about sending young doctors to be trained, and they came in here last week and passed a new medical bill to bring the young doctors out of the university back to the Hospital. If these young doctors are being taught out of up-to-date medical books, they know up-to-date medicine, they are acquainted with up-to-date methods. A couple of weeks ago they came down here and they said they wanted money to buy new equipment for the laboratory because the personnel in the laboratory were being trained on equipment at the University of the West Indies which they were familiar with. If you have a young doctor who is now familiar with new medicine, are you going to say he is bombastic like young lawyer, and that he is only showing off the knowledge you sent him to gain? Do you want him to learn from modern books and use old medicine? This is inconsistent, this is like putting an old man to be Minister of Health. I cannot see how you can tell him to use the drugs in stock, the drugs might have been in stock for the last two years, they are old drugs; the books which recommended them four years ago have been condemned to be relics as ancient works. Use the new works now, new medicine, new works, this is why the Pharmaceutical Societies and laboratories have technicians constantly experimenting. Quite recently it has been said that they have found a drug which is likely to cure cancer.

11.20 p.m.

This is foolish talk. You will either treat patients as they deserve to be treated, or you will have to tell the public that you are looking after dollars and cents. When it comes to the next sentence, I will show how inconsistent they are. They do not care about the lives of people. When we are dealing with laboratory Technicians, I will talk on that matter, too. The people who have to test the blood to find out what blood should be given to the patients have been begging Government ever since for increased salaries and they have not been given anything.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member who has just sat down is very clever. He said that when I was addressing the Committee and I said that "substitute" was a very unfortunate word and that the word should have been "generic", I saw an expression on the hon. member's face and it appeared as if he were feeling that I was on the right track. When the hon. member resumed his speech, he said that I should not have been right at all, and that I was wrong from the very beginning because the words "in stock" came after the word "substitute". He said that I could not have been right because they were talking about "substitute in stock." It did not suit the hon. member to say that since I had put "generic" in place of "substitute" it could not have been drugs generic in stock. This would give a different meaning altogether. He said that the Minister and the Government were creating a situation where Doctors at the Hospital had to use not the sophisticated drugs, but drugs that are substitutes for standard drugs.

Mr. Chairman, I have already said that sophisticated" was a very unfortunate word .....

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: There is no point of order. There can only be a point of order if you can quote the Standing Order. You are a lawyer, but you do not know the procedure. Sit down! (*Asides.*) Quote a Standing Order. It is not a point of order, but a point of interruption.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for St. Peter is still addressing the Chair.

Mr. BOLDEN: All right, Mr. Chairman, I bow to your ruling.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: He will learn. Let us go to the second part. These efforts are however, limited by the continued use of certain - note the word "continued" - use of certain "sophisticated" - a foolish word - and expensive drugs which are considered essential - and will continue to be used, because types of disease have to be treated. We are not going to discontinue the use of the so-called "sophisticated" drugs. I hate to use the word "sophisticated". It is a question of whenever the occasion or the need arises that the modern and up-to-date drugs - the drugs which came about by modern or ultra modern research. These drugs will continue to be used for

certain specific cases. If the hon. member's relative, the hon member, my relative or myself happens to be a patient at the Hospital and a Doctor considers that his relative or my relative and so on should be treated by the so-called more modern, potent and up-to-date drugs - you will notice that I did not use the word "sophisticated" because I hate it and condemn it equally as much as the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. He and I are in the same boat and in the same frame of mind when it comes to condemning this word. "sophisticated".

Mr. Chairman, why do members on that side leave out the second part of the Note and dwell on the first part? The second part is the saviour of the whole thing, but every member on that side seems to want to forget that and eliminate that. The hon. member, who is a trained lawyer, knows how to employ different shades of meaning here and there, and how to forget certain words when it suits him. He is a professional man. I am saying that if he would stick to the representation I first made to the Committee and use the words "generic drugs in stock", then he would have no quarrel with me. He want to say that they could not possibly have meant generic. (Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: "It means old drugs in stock.") Substitute need not mean old drugs in stock; it could also mean generic drugs in stock. It is my contention that that was the idea in the mind of the gentleman who framed the Note. We have been told in the Committee that the word "Sophisticated" was an invention by the Director and not a medical man, which made it so difficult for all of us. If we would reason that way, we would see some light in the matter.

Mr. Chairman, this Note begins in a negative tone by using the word "restrict". It is badly written, and it almost unfortunate. It was badly written, but I know that if the hon. junior member for St. Joseph would accept "generic drugs in stock", he would not be in the dilemma in which he appears to be in.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, this matter has been going on for too long, but I rise to answer the junior member for St. Joseph. He was quite irrational and almost irresponsible in some of the statements he made. (*Asides.*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Rule 29(6) is still in operation. While a member is speaking, all other Members shall be silent or shall confer only in undertones.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member worked up some steam and talked about young Doctors and so on. I am going to ask the hon. member, who trained the young Doctors? Older Doctors trained the young Doctors. Is he trying to tell the Committee that because a new Doctor is young and there is a new drug on the market that the old Doctors would not know about it? I have read about new drugs and I am not a medical student. (*Asides.*)

Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member who is trying to heckle me had any manners or any respect for himself, when he came into this Chamber this afternoon the first thing he should have got up and done was to apologise to the Speaker for his bad behaviour yesterday.  
11.30 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let the hon. member confine his remarks to Head 43.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: On a point of order, is the hon. member of all people telling somebody that he should apologise for misbehaviour?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I have never since I have been in this Chamber abused the Chair as your son did yesterday. (Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: You got put out though.) These things will happen. But being put out did not worry me; it worried you. You got put out for bad behaviour and impoliteness to the Chair. I got put out because the Chair made a mistake, but I had to obey the Chair's ruling; so do not worry with that nonsense.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Anyhow, let us get back to Head 43.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I will speak on Head 43, but I want you to tell the Opposition and especially the hon. junior member for Bridgetown that when I get up to address this Chamber, he should keep his mouth closed.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I want the Minister to know that he cannot threaten me in here.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will both hon. members please take their seats? I am still the Chairman and I have to rule. If an hon. member feels he can disobey the orders of the Chair, he will feel the penalty from me. I have no friends when I am in the Chair. Let us continue the debate.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I would like to see some behaviour obtaining in here from members on the opposite side, because the behaviour in here yesterday was atrocious.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: I object to that. I have seen worse behaviour over there than I have seen in my life. What are you talking about?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: You were blind yesterday and that is why you saw worse behaviour.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There are three hon. members on their feet. Let us continue the debate amicably on Head 43. Do not disrespect the Chair.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, the way the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was carrying on, one would have thought that

when a new drug comes on the market it is something done secretly so that the old doctors cannot see it. If a doctor is so old that he cannot see and understand medicine, there are refresher courses, and I cannot understand the irrationality of the hon. member's debate, because when the hon. senior member for St. Peter said that the word that should have been used was "generic", the hon. member got up in his regular way trying to lambast the Minister and trying to make out a case that the Minister did not know what he was talking about. Apparently nobody on this side seems to know what he is talking about. All the experts are on that side. God help us if the world were left to you to do anything other than to misbehave in and break it up.

What I was pointing out to the hon. member is that the young doctors were taught medicine by the old doctors; and the doctor who performed the first heart transplant, Mr. Chairman, is an old doctor. (Asides) Do you feel that only when somebody reaches your age he is old? You will die from old age at the age of seven.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are we still on Head 43?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, and we are talking about old age I know the hon. member is going to die from old age at the age of seven; he cannot mature. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph must understand that the world cannot be left up to all young people. That is why you have old people in certain things for age and experience. I will say to him that there is no doctor who has just finished his internship whom the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was going to risk putting his life in his hands to perform a heart transplant or even a kidney transplant; so all these young doctors you heard him talking about with these fancy medicines...

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, for the benefit of the Hon. Minister, I have not got a bad heart. I was once told so which proved not to be true; so I have not got to put myself under a doctor for a heart transplant.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, accept that the hon. member does not have a bad heart. Maybe he has no heart at all. (A VOICE: But he has brains.) I am not saying he has not got brains, but the only trouble is that he has his brain where his guts should be; so you know what it is filled with.

To get back to the debate, the point I was trying to make is that whenever we come here to deal with something for the hospital, hon. members on the opposite side want to approbate and reprobate. In a former discussion today I heard the hon. junior member for St. Joseph say - and I hope he does not think I am picking on him - that he had to watch the taxpayers' money which we were squandering. Now the hon. member comes back in this debate and says that we are trying to save money, and in order to save money we were throwing away lives. He mentioned the case of some gentleman who went to the hospital and because they did not have some special

medicine the gentleman died. I say that most likely the gentleman would have died anyhow. The problem is that when a man dies under the doctor's hand, nobody says anything; it is just misfortune or the person was unfortunate and died. But how do you know that the man would not have died anyhow? Maybe the complaint did not need an operation; it may have been so far gone that it was not necessary to operate. So do not attribute it to the fact that because they did not have a particular medicine the man died, because people die even when you have the best medicine in the world. The best medicines come from places like Germany, the United States of America, Canada and Great Britain, and more people die in these countries in one year than in all the World Wars we have had. So let us be rational in our approach to these things. Do not come here and make out a case that because somebody did not get a particular medicine he died. (Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: sit down.)

Mr. Chairman, you must keep order in here. Do not be afraid of anybody in here including me. Ask them to leave if they cannot behave themselves. I do not consider what the hon. junior member for Bridgetown said to be irrational or erratic; it was irascible, because he did not make any point; he was merely haranguing the Minister. He did not say anything that anybody could get something from. He was trying to put words in the Minister's mouth, and despite the Minister's repetition that he did not say something, the hon. member persisted, and here is where I thought the Chair fell down a bit, because the Chair should have called him to order or made him sit down, because he kept repeating himself. (Asides.) The hon. member is talking about somebody talking nonsense. He ought to be ashamed of himself because he has not made one pertinent point for the whole evening. He was jumping up like some yo-yo without making any points at all on the matter.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I am accustomed to the fact that when the Hon. Minister has nothing to say, he indulges in personal abuse.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not consider that a point of order.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I am asking you to ask the hon. member to withdraw that because I did not indulge in any personal abuse. I want it struck off the Hansard. He is accusing me of something I did not do.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member said "personal abuse", but not of any specific one. I do not consider that a point to be withdrawn.  
11.40 p.m.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I am asking the hon. member to withdraw that because I have not abused any person; he is accusing me of something I did not do.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: He said personal abuse but he did not mention any specific person, so I do not consider that to be unparliamentary.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I bow to your ruling. Unlike the members on the opposite side, I will not argue with you.

*On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress and asked for leave to sit sit again, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.*

#### SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be suspended for 15 minutes.

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

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

11.45 p.m.

*On resumption*

Mr. SPEAKER: When the sitting was suspended the House was in Committee of Supply and thereto it shall now revert.

*Mr. Speaker left the Chair and Mr. HOPPIN resumed the Chair.*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the sitting was suspended, the junior member for St. Thomas was addressing the Chair.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I was finished, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, on hearing the Minister a few points came to my mind. I wonder if the Minister is in a position to tell us when last stock was taken in the drug department at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Perhaps the Minister would know that drugs for the Hospital are imported through the firm of A. S. Bryden in Bridgetown and through DaCosta and Musson. They are two of the firms, and what I would like to hear from the Minister is this, if the Hospital Director or the hospital authorities have received any communication from A. S. Bryden that some of the drugs which are presently in the hospital stock are no longer being manufactured in Germany, and if that is so, is it a case where the hospital is trying to get rid of those old drugs that are no longer being manufactured. The hospital stocks drugs, I believe, that are manufactured in British houses, America houses and German houses amongst some others; surely the Minister ought to be in a position to tell us if amongst the British, America and German drugs it has not been discovered that the British drugs have been put into use or drawn on at a slower rate than the America and German manufactures.  
12.05 a.m.

In other words, if you were to take stock of the Hospital supplies and look back over the past three to five years, it would be found that percentage wise drugs manufactured in Germany and in the United States, or by German manufacturers and United States Manufacturers, have been much more in demand than drugs manufactured by British concerns. I am of the opinion that this is one of the problems that is facing the Hospital at the present moment. It is faced with a position where it has to try to bring itself up to date.

Mr. Chairman, we are willing to offer what suggestions we can. The Hospital ought to be provided with a catalogue of supplies, and as drugs are put on the market the catalogue should be brought up to date, and as they go out of manufacture they should be struck off the list. In cases where Doctors have shown a consistent preference for a particular brand of drugs, surely, if that had been used as a guide, I do not think the Hospital would have found itself with the present stock. The Minister has not yet admitted that the Hospital has this large stock, but we know that there is an old stock of drugs that the Hospital wants to get rid of.

Mr. Chairman, there is one thing that we on this side of the House would like the Minister, if he possibly can, to do for us, and it is to free our minds from having to believe that there are two, speaking moneywise, types of drugs ordered and kept at the Hospital: one type for the rich and another type for the poor. In other words, there is a drug that is imported and kept for the high-paying patients in the Pay Wards, but the patients in the General Wards can be given anything from any shelf from anywhere.

Now, to get back to the Note for a few brief moments. I am sure that the hon. senior member for St. Peter who has been at pains to read and interpret Note 28 under reference, must agree with me that these words "drugs which are considered essential"—the words "considered essential" are critical of the Doctors who are ordering the drugs. We are not concerning ourselves now, Sir, with the fact that expensive drugs are also involved in any Institution. In our view no drug is expensive if, as this Note tells us, it is for the treatment of certain types of illness. It is not expensive if it is for a certain type of illness.

Mr. Chairman, when the two words "considered essential" are taken into consideration, one must come to the conclusion that whilst it is in the Note, it is not everybody who is considering that these drugs that are expensive are necessary for the treatment of certain types of illness. Any reasonable creature in being and under the Queen's peace..... (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: "Come in.") When hon. members are addressing the Chair, you do not tell them to come in.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us continue.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, we do not want to keep the Minister at bay any longer. We would all like to see this Item passed, but we would certainly like to hear what the Minister has to say on the few points

that have been raised. When he has given us the information, we might be able to pass the Item.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to allay the fears of the hon. junior member for St. Peter. I am a socialist, and I believe in socialised medicine, but in Barbados we have not yet come to that. As a young man I jumped for joy when New Zealand went socialist as regards the medical profession, and later on the United Kingdom also went socialist in that respect. The hon. member knows my interpretation of the Note in question. I do not believe in having one set of Health Rules and conveniences for the rich and another for the poor. I am a poor man, and I represent poor people like the hon. junior member for St. Peter. There can be no distinctive line drawn between our ideas when it comes to socialised medicine. I am probably miles ahead of him in this respect. There is no argument between us on this score, and that is all I want to say. 12.15 a.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The hon. junior member for St. Peter asked certain pertinent questions. He wanted to know when was an inspection carried out by the Public Health Officers on Food and Drugs at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. The inspection was not carried out by the Public Health Officers. That is done periodically, of course; but we had Mr. Garner of W. H. O. who is a consultant, and he took a complete stock and carried out an inspection around September 1970.

The hon. member also asked whether any of these drugs have been condemned. No condemned drugs would be kept in stock, and I hope he will appreciate that. He also asked whether it is a fact that the policy of the Government is that the health of the community is measured in dollars and cents. It cannot be measured in dollars and cents when we are coming here for \$150,000 which you all would not pass. Apparently you all measure it in dollars and cents because you would not allow the Resolution to pass.

The hon. member made mention about a catalogue. What he calls a catalogue is what I call a formulary as referred to by the doctors, and that is where the standard drugs come in that are in stock, are of good quality and are used by doctors of experience, but which so many young doctors would not use in certain cases and prescribe American or Canadian drugs. They insist on having certain expensive drugs which are of Canadian or American origin for which we have substitutes from other sources whether British or German. That is what substitute means. The identical drug but from another country. You are saying that every prescription which calls for expensive drugs should be adopted whereas the same prescription can be met at the hospital by drugs from a British or German firm or even Canadian in some cases.

Mr. Chairman, there are lots of travelling agents who go around and try to sell all different types of medicine and drugs. If we followed everything that goes around we would be buying all different types

of drugs all the time and there would be a lot of wastage. So when I say "standardise," I do not mean something that is inferior or has been condemned; I mean drugs of the same proper and high calibre which would be just as effective as other drugs which certain young doctors may order, but which are there in stock. Hon. members understand that, but just for the sake of debate they talk for five or six hours on the same thing, choosing to misinterpret what was intended and actually said. If you want to go on until morning, I cannot do anything about it.

Mr. HINDS: I asked the Minister if any of the drugs had been condemned.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: And I said no.

Mr. HINDS: Is the Minister telling us.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA: None of the drugs which will be in use have been condemned.

Mr. HINDS: I believe that you are not using condemned drugs, but in going through your stock, is it not true that it was found necessary to condemn some of the drugs that you had in stock?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I am not aware that any drugs have been condemned.

Mr. HINDS: Would the Minister investigate the matter? Not only that. Let the Minister try and find out if after some of the drugs were condemned the remain on the premises for more than a week and that some of the pharmacists were trying to get the Director to call in the police after some of the condemned drugs had been stolen or mysteriously disappeared off the Hospital's premises. In other words, they were condemned as not being good for the Hospital but evidently they found themselves on the market somewhere about. (*Asides*) I am not saying the Minister is responsible for somebody stealing them. If all the people in the hospital died, the Minister is not responsible either because he did not poison anybody; but he is answerable for it. Nobody is suggesting that the Minister must be there to watch the condemned goods; but what I am asking the Minister to do is to try and find out if it is not true that some of the drugs had to be condemned chiefly because the age of the drugs could not be determined, the labels on the cartons and the labels on some of the bottles could not be read clearly enough, and it was thought best to condemn them. It was a very good thing for them to be condemned, but some bright fellow, knowing they were there, to my mind, for much longer than they should have been, saw to it that they could find themselves elsewhere and perhaps a sale was made somewhere else. This is a dangerous thing and it ought not to have happened.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: If the hon. member would give way, my advice is that portion of the medical supplies which were condemned are still in stock, stored and have not yet been disposed of.

Mr. HINDS: Two minutes ago the Minister said they did not have any condemned.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I said what we use have not been condemned.

Mr. HINDS: The Minister said that the drugs in use had not been condemned, and I asked him if he was saying that none of the drugs had been condemned at all, and after the Minister said that, I asked the Minister to investigate this because I went on to point out to the Minister what had taken place since the condemnation of those goods.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, I made it clear that no supplies that are being used are condemned stuff. I never said that none at all were condemned.

Mr. HINDS: On what date were they condemned?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: If the hon. member wants all that information, he has to ask a substantive question and he will get all the information.  
12.25 a.m.

Mr. HINDS: If the Minister is now telling us the drugs were condemned, is it too much to ask what date were condemned?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: September, 1970.

Mr. HINDS: Do I still have to ask a substantive question?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I would like to find out from the Minister, Sir, we read here in note 28: "Efforts to restrict the order of drugs and to use substitute drugs in stock are only now beginning to have significant effect, etc....." I would like to find out from the Minister if this effort to restrict the order of drugs is to economise on the purchase by the hospital. I would like an answer from the Minister.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: If as a young prominent lawyer you will read and understand what is written you will see the answer for yourself.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I have been trying to find out from the Minister if this effort to restrict the order of drugs is partly due to an attempt by the Government to economise on the spending of money on drugs at the Hospital.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, it is no attempt to economise as such, we are trying to regulate things and put things on a better footing and to use the drugs we have in hand but drugs will continue to be ordered.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: When the Minister says that the attempt is to standardise that must mean that you are attempting to save money by standardising drugs; is that correct, Mr. Minister?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Your colleagues have asked all those questions already and if you were listening you would have got the answers.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I did not hear the answers, Mr. Minister. I am quite serious in this matter, I did not hear the answers and it would be very simple for the Minister to say the answer is so and so.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, it would be for anybody who has the slightest modicum of common sense to understand that it would be to get the best possible amount of drugs for the amount of money you have to spend, and not necessary to economise.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, if I may go on to Item 117 and note 30 which reads:

Requests for laboratory tests are constantly increasing as a result of the full complement of Interns using the facilities of the Laboratory as an integral part of their training. During the calendar year 1969, approximately 42,000 tests were carried out, whereas during the period January to July, 1970 there were 45,000 tests.

Mr. Chairman, this Item deals with laboratory technicians, and I heard the Hon. Minister for Labour and Housing say some time earlier tonight that I was speaking about saving the taxpayers money and at the same time I was asking to spend more money at the hospital. I believe the hon. member did not get hold of my full argument on these points. I was looking at spending the taxpayers' money in a manner which was unjustifiable but I do not believe in pinching money and not saving human lives, because human lives can never be measured in dollars and cents.

I am dealing now with the question of spending more money at the Hospital. It is known that the work of the laboratory technicians has increased considerably as a result of the present number of interns at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital; I have been given to understand that the laboratory technicians have made certain recommendations to the Government in respect of pay for the increased work which they are doing. A point I would wish to bring to the notice of this Committee is that laboratory technicians are called out at night; first of all, Government did not assist in the payment for their telephones and I think it is wrong to ask a laboratory attendant to put in a telephone withing making some contribution towards the cost. I remember we had a Magistrate in Barbados and when he applied for a telephone and Government would not pay for it he refused to put it in his name, but he put it in his wife's name and when they wanted him to come out they had to send a police van to tell him they wanted him. After this, the Government was forced to spend a colossal sum of money to put a telephone in his house.

There is a very small standby pay paid to these technicians, I think it is something like \$2.00 a night, and we have had this argument in the House already about standby payment for personnel who have to be on duty. There is also the question of the increased number of tests and the working hours which these technicians have to undergo as a result of the num-

ber of interns at the Hospital. I know certain proposals have been put up to the Civil Service Association, and I do not see how you are going to constantly request an increase of the equipment and facilities in the laboratory and ask the technicians to do increased work for longer hours without having some consideration for the personnel. I have known of one particular man who was called out an afternoon and worked right through till 8 o'clock the next morning doing blood tests for somebody who was in surgery, and I know this was a big bone of contention. 12.35 a.m.

Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister to understand that if those technicians are not treated properly - they used to get a certain form of refreshment in the Laboratory and it has been discontinued. I understand that they are given one tin of orange juice and 5lb. of sugar nowadays to serve about ten or fifteen people in the Laboratory. You have reduced them now to cane-cutters in the field where they must mix sugar and water to drink. These things are inequitable. You cannot expect Laboratory Technicians to use sophisticated equipment, and carry out delicate tests to determine what blood and what drug to give a patient, and then fail to treat the personnel right. If the personnel are dissatisfied; if they make incorrect tests, then it is known that the Doctors cannot work without getting results from the Laboratory. There are cases where Laboratory Technicians have to diagnose a certain type of illness before the Doctor can prescribe medicine for the patient. I hope the Minister of Health will look into this matter urgently.

*The question that Head 43 - Queen Elizabeth Hospital - stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

*Head 44 - Mental Hospital - was called.*

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 44 - Mental Hospital - stand part.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, with regard to Item 46 - Provisions - the sum of \$380,000 was originally provided, and there is now a need for \$19,000. During the past month a considerable saving has been effected by specialised dieting that is now being carried on at the Mental Hospital, but where the Mental Hospital like the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and other Institutions must run unto difficulties is that these Institutions have been given directives whereby they must purchase items from the Barbados Marketing Corporation. They have to buy from the Barbados Marketing Corporation regardless of the price at which the items are sold. In every case the Mental Hospital and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital could be supplied with these commodities much cheaper and much quicker, but because the Corporation must be patronised that is where the difficulty arises.

Mr. Chairman, we have to consider, at this particular stage, whether or not it is reasonable and just to take the taxpayers money and give it to the Barbados Marketing Corporation to be thrown away and driven about in expensive motor cars and the like. We have to do something to save Institutions such as the Mental Hospital, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the District Hospitals from having to request these supplementaries. The Institutions should be given a free hand; Let them buy wherever they can get these commodities, and do not force them to purchase from the Corporation for the sake of supporting the Barbados Marketing Corporation. The Institutions are not getting any better quality provisions from the Corporation than can be obtained elsewhere. Very often when they order items from the Barbados Marketing Corporation the things are supplied in a condition in which no outside competitor would have supplied them. Such items are not sent back to the Corporation, because it is felt that it is one Government Institution supplying another Government Institution. This system is not working in the best interest of the taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, you will find that, so long as the Barbados Marketing Corporation continue to owe everybody in Town - (*Asides.*) They owe C. F. Harrison & Co. \$74,000. I have a list of the names and the amounts they owe to people. Nobody would credit the Barbados Marketing Corporation. When they credit the commodities from the small farmers and others, the Corporation are then tagging on a price to make a profit for themselves for doing absolutely nothing. If the Corporation were running their affairs in such a manner as not to loss money and the Institutions were spending more money than they should, then one would be inclined to give the Corporation some support. However, the Institutions are now being given a bad name. In other words, they appear as if they are not now running or managing their affairs as well as they did in the past. (*Asides.*)

Mr. Chairman, the Institutions would be glad to manage their affairs properly; they would be glad to buy these commodities wherever they could get them. There is no guaranteed supply to the Mental Hospital through the Barbados Marketing Corporation, because the Barbados Marketing Corporation have no credit facilities in Bridgetown or in the country.

12.45 a.m.

The Barbados Marketing Corporation could not get \$1/2 million in credit anywhere at all in Barbados, so it is merely sucking the blood of these various institutions. It is not fair. We feel that something has got to be done, and I believe that the Minister of Health would be doing his institutions human service if he were to discuss this matter with the Minister of Finance.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, this is a Cabinet directive and I am afraid that I alone cannot change it. It has gone through to all insitutions.

Mr. HINDS: So if the Cabinet takes a decision to sell the whole of Barbados, do you mean the Cabinet

cannot go back on its word if it is seen that it is selling Barbados and the people in it? Let the Cabinet know that things are not working well as a result of the decision it took some time ago. Let the Cabinet know that your various institutions and Departments are those mostly affected, and it is not fair to those institutions.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I really heard about this Cabinet directive and this thing about purchasing from the Barbados Marketing Corporation. I am sure that most people understand the motivation of the decision, but what people are really concerned about is that there should be periodical checks made by the relevant Ministry to see that the Marketing Corporation is not exploiting this monopoly which is given to it by virtue of the directive, otherwise you would be giving the Barbados Marketing Corporation an indirect subsidy, and these institutions should be allowed to make complaints about these prices. That is the only point I want to make.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I want to tell the Leader of the Opposition that the Ministry of Health and Social Welfare has actually done that exercise and we know exactly what percentage more we are paying.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I agree with what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has said. I do not want to prolong this any longer, but it is very pertinent coming from the Leader of the Opposition that a review should be made of the Barbados Marketing Corporation. I believe that the members of this Committee are aware that the Barbados Marketing Corporation has been advertising extensively in the Advocate's "For Sale" column, beef at certain prices, and it is known that the Barbados Marketing Corporation has lost the contract for school meals, and as a result when tons of beef were brought to the Harbour, they did not have money to clear it, and after they had to work a little something with the Bank they managed to get it out and are stuck with it on their hands. This is in the form of a subsidy to the Barbados Marketing Corporation. If the officers at the Barbados Marketing Corporation are bad administrators, you have to get rid of them, because what we are doing time after time in here is using the institutions to subsidise the Barbados Marketing Corporation for its bad administration by its Ministers. Here it is you have beef being advertised at 77 cents a pound for leg chops when the commercial beef in Bridgetown is sold at 90 cents and \$1.10 per pound. Something must be wrong that you can afford to let officers at the Barbados Marketing Corporation order tons of beef and cannot pay for it, lose the school meals contract and now spend money to get rid of it.

I feel, Mr. Chairman, that this sort of directive is a sort of propping up of the Barbados Marketing Corporation and its officers. They are so sure that they can get away with this sort of bad administration, that they do these things, and unless the Cabinet reviews its directive, you will never get the Barbados Marketing Corporation functioning correctly, because I understand that there is more beef on the way

coming, another 8,000 pounds odd, and I want to know what they are going to do when it comes. I do not think the Bank will lend them any more money if they cannot pay back what they had a credit note on. This is a serious situation in which we are voting money to keep the Barbados Marketing Corporation in operation, it is creating liabilities and other institutions are paying for it. I think that Board and the officers responsible need changing, and the quicker the Government get around to doing this, the better, otherwise we are subsidising the Barbados Marketing Corporation.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, just a few remarks I would like to make on this, because the point the hon. member has raised is a very good one. I would like to tell the Committee that in respect of that particular transaction, it was a genuine mistake made in anticipation of getting the school meals contract. I cannot remember all the details, but I think that the tender went out for fresh meat and they anticipated they would have got the frozen meat contract, ordered in anticipation to supplying for the next term and they did not get the contract. It was a genuine anticipation in expectation of getting a contract. But the hon. member's point is well taken. What we personally feel is that although the mistake may have been a genuine one, they had no business to make it without perhaps prior approval from the Board, because what actually happened in this case was that an officer of the Barbados Marketing Corporation went ahead on his own steam and thought he was doing the Barbados Marketing Corporation a service and did this thing without even telling anybody he was going to do it, with the consequence that they are stuck with it.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I believe the Hon. Minister is also aware that there had been the same problem earlier in the year in respect of a certain amount of eggs. The officers down there are not taking directions from the Board and that is why I say they are running the Barbados Marketing Corporation into liabilities, because they know that their mistakes will be covered up by some other Department. This has got to stop. What I am worried about is what is going to happen when the other meat on order comes. They will have to sell it at a very cheap price; but at the same time the taxpayers are subsidising the inefficiency there.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the Hon. Leader of the House is aware that there was a big mix-up with eggs. There is something serious going on, and therefore I consider that this sirective should be changed even if it is set aside temporarily in order to bring the officers to realize that they cannot act on their own without approval of the Board, or to go ahead and order beef contemplating a contract. It is not hardware that you can store in some bond. If it is frozen meat; you have to take it from a ship's frozen goods department and put it in storage, and I know that cold storage is four cents a pound for the first month and three cents a pound thereafter. So however you look at it, we are spending money uselessly.

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

*On motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. J. C. TUDOR, the Resolution for the sum of \$338,314 was passed.*

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of four Resolutions and the postponement of one, and that the Committee asks for leave to sit again.

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

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

12.55 p.m.

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

#### SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until Friday, 5th February, 1971 at 4.00 p.m.

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

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

1.00 a.m.

*On resumption*

Mr. SPEAKER: When the sitting was suspended, the House was in Committee, and thereto it automatically now reverts.

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

#### SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1970-71 No. 16

*A Resolution for \$140,203 was called.*

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I think the Committee is aware that it is Government's policy to pass on to the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation what Government itself receives from the customs duties collected on the importation of Television Receivers and component parts. For obvious reasons it is never possible, when we are doing the Estimates, to put in the full amount that they should receive, because it is only given to them on the basis that the Government has itself received it. It is a direct subsidy, and the amount can only be what Government has itself received.

If hon. members look at the current Estimates they will see that in this financial year we have put in \$150,000. In actual fact, if I give hon. members

now a breakdown they will see that up to to December, 1970, what was actually due to them was rather more than what we had provided, and in addition to that, of course, at the beginning of the financial year when the amount appropriated had already gone into the Estimates there are invariably some amounts due covering the last month or two of the previous financial year.

For instance, in March, 1970, the amount collected on Television Receivers and component parts was \$9,970.98; in April \$24,332.75; in May \$27,058.09; in June \$15,596.97; in July \$6,140.05; in August \$4,721.88; in September \$47,681.61; in October \$36,523.11; in November \$15,898.75; and in December \$7,664.66. This gives a grand total of \$195,588.85, which is about \$40,000 even in excess of the amount appropriated in the Estimates.

Now, for February, 1970, the amount collected was \$21,045.38, and this in addition to what I just gave would give a final total of \$216,634.23. The refunds to them provided in the Estimates are \$150,000., and this gives a balance due to the Corporation of \$66,634.23, hence the supplementary appropriation required.

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

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

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I have no specific quarrel with money being handed over to the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation, but I am somewhat amazed to think that C.B.C., the Corporation which are supposed to operate for educational purposes and for the benefit of the people in the community should, at this stage, be lodging complaints in the civil court to collect licence fees.

I notice from reports in the newspapers that they are now going in for colour television. This means that the Corporation will require more funds, but at the same time I think it is inappropriate for the Corporation to attempt to go in for colour television which, in a larger country like Great Britain, is something new. They have had several years operating black and white television. I do not think there is any person who can tell you that the television section of C.B.C. is operating efficiently.

They have just introduced within, I believe, the last three or four years the video-tape. Although I watch television for a limited amount of time, there is general complaint that video-tape is not even 50% correct. There is always a hum; there is always a shake; you see half of the picture at times, and I believe that C.B.C. should first give us perfect operation on black and white television before trespassing into further unknown areas by the use of colour television. Now, colour television is going to cost partially twice the sum required for a black and white set, and that is why I mentioned at the beginning of my speech the question of collecting licence fees through the court.

I believe that this should be a free service. I am still questioning how much the Corporation are going to get out of the sums collected through the court, because they, obviously, have to pay the Solicitors involved. It is going to impose a greater burden upon persons when costs should go against them in the collection of these licence fees. At the same time, if the media is there for educational purposes, then I feel that it defeats the very idea we are trying to foster. I believe that the Government should take a careful and serious look into the financing of the Corporation. I would have no quarrel if the Corporation could be financed to the extent that there would be no licence fees payable in respect of radio or television.

I can give an example where I believe some people are paying and others are not paying any licence fees. One sees along the streets today practically every man, woman and child with a portable radio set. I am sure that these people are not paying licences for such radios, but if you take the same set; put in a cabinet and put it in a house, you are required to put a licence fee.

4.10 p.m.

Now it is the same set receiving from the same station for the same educational purpose, and therefore I believe that something should be done in this respect.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I did not want to interrupt the hon. member but I think he has made a slight error. If I understood him correctly, he said that if you have a transistor set - I presume he means a transistor radio set - and you put it in your house, you have to pay for it. Nobody pays a radio licence fee now. We abolished that. You pay for a T.V. licence.

Mr. BOLDEN: I do not believe the Hon. Minister fully understood my argument. My argument is that they are both for educational purposes. You have educational T.V. which is now directed to the schools, but they are also repeated in the afternoon, and there are programmes which are put out on Saturday and Sunday mornings for the benefit of children. Well it means that if a child is in school, it is receiving the same television programmes, but at the home you are required to pay a licence fee, and my argument is that you should not have to pay a licence fee because it is supposed to be educational. (*Asides.*) I might have left out a word which the Hon. Minister would like to tell me about, but my honest view is that the corporation should be financed to the extent that there should be no licence fees payable, because the money which is going to be expended to venture into colour television can be used for that purpose. Nobody can say that we have got a perfect working system in respect of black and white television, and therefore I believe you should perfect that system first before you get into colour, and the money which is going to be expended to put in colour television should be used to offset licence fees.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, some of the things the hon. member said have some merit, but I

think he got mixed up in what he wanted to say. He is saying that people should not pay licence fees for T.V. sets. I cannot agree with that. A T.V. is more important in a home than a gun, and you may have a gun lying down at home for a whole year, you do not fire a shot and yet you have to pay a licence fee, but I put on my T.V. every night. You keep a gun for your protection but you have a T.V. for entertainment and not only education; so people would have to pay for these things. You should not expect the Corporation to pay for these things. Why do people want to pay for certain things that I do not consider necessities while other things that are more necessary the hon. member says they should not be paid for? I cannot agree with that and I hope he accepts the theory I have put forward.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, I will explain to the hon. member that we live in a progressive world. The hon. member last Wednesday afternoon was talking about youth. When he talks about youth, he is up my line because I am much younger than he is. There is a point the hon. member seems to be overlooking, and it is that the world is advancing, and I will say to him that the reason why we are not going towards black and white anymore is that within the next five years black and white T.V. is going to be a thing of the past like the dodo; so the Board of C.B.C. rightly decided that since they have to change the equipment it would be better to introduce this new system. The hon. member knows that if he wanted to buy a car today he was not going to buy a three-pedalled Ford which was the first motor car made; he would look for the most modern car because he knows that if he bought a three-pedalled Ford, he would have to resuscitate Henry Ford to get parts made. In order to keep in line with the trend, he would buy the most recent car, maybe a Toyota, Datsun or one of the new cars. The same thing goes with T.V. All machinery is the same. Manufacturers always try to be better; so they have discovered now that colour T.V., despite the fact that it will cost more in the initial stage, will be much cheaper in the long run and much better. The beauty about colour television is that black and white can be shown on a colour T.V. set, but colour films cannot be shown on a black and white set. Even the men who have gone on the moon are using colour T.V. because the experts have discovered that in the long run it will be a lot cheaper and better for the whole community.

I hope the hon. member does not think that the people at C. B. C. are a bunch of nitwits. If he looks at the members of the Board at C.B.C. he will see that there are some fairly intelligent people there, and it has been put to them that it would be better now that they have to restructure the place to introduce colour T.V. The equipment at C.B.C. is becoming antiquated and this may be one of the reasons why when you are watching a picture and things get interesting, you see a sign on the screen "Do Not Adjust Your Set". This is what happens, and to avoid this they have decided that it would be better if you are going to spend money to spend it one time by putting down colour T.V. equipment, and in the long run they would not have to come back and do it, because

if they restructure with black and white equipment, it would mean that within the next three to five years this would be antiquated and there would be nobody who could operate this thing. When a pilot is trained to fly a jet, it is difficult to find somebody to fly the DC3s because they are outdated. It is not a matter of somebody trying to be so sophisticated, or somebody working for mauby money and trying to buy champagne; but there is nobody in this community who can truthfully say and expect anybody to believe him that the T.V. medium in Barbados has not served a useful purpose, because on Wednesdays, I do not like to miss Alfred Hitchcock, and I am sure people like to watch these things. (Mr. BOLDEN: That is why it should be free.) According to what the hon. member is saying, he expects to have a free society and you should not pay for anything at all. We have to support this thing and this is the reason why people have to pay a licence fee. Why is it that people do not like to pay a licence for anything? I brought the analogy just now that I have a gun and if a thief comes to my place, I would have to try and see if it is working, but I have to pay for it every year. 4.20 p.m.

If anybody comes at my house at the wrong time it might go off, but my television works every night. The hon. member is saying that it is educational; I am not arguing that it is not educational but it is entertaining too. You have to buy your books when you got to a University, and that is educational, so we must realistic.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I hate to interrupt the hon. member.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what has the hon. member risen?

Mr. BOLDEN: I will speak afterwards.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member must understand that we live in a small society and he should not try to play politics with everything that comes before the Chamber. The hon. member is hoping, like any proper Opposition, that the Opposition will be the next Government, but we know this is far-fetched and will never be realised, but you must not try to play these cheap politics. Where are we going to get the money from to run our society? Barbados has been inhabited for over 300 years now and for that time under the capitalist Government who ran this country before we took over, but this Government has never had one cent in grant-in-aid from anybody, we have always been able to keep our heads above water.

If we create a society of parasites where everybody expects to get something for nothing, what do you think will happen in this country? Remember this, the hon. member is around my age, and despite that he does not have my political acumen, he is hoping to remain in politics for at least the next session. I am not hoping, I know, but when the time comes every man will be for himself and

God for us all, and then we will see who are the giants. I went through two and won them both, so I have 100% and my name will go down for posterity. Mr. Chairman, what I want to tell the hon. member is that I appreciate the hon. member for his gump-tion, maybe because he is as short as I am, but I honestly admire the hon. member, I like him and I would like to say to him as a friend, do not expect to use the political platform on everything that is brought to the Chamber because you might find yourself in what is known as a four-hole and you will not be able to get out.

The hon. member has got to be realistic, and I am personally making the statement that I feel too many things are going in Barbados for free. We have too much of a free society here; people get everything free around here and they still want more freedom. After all, you must contribute something to the society in which you live, and I will say this before I sit down, that a great Statesman by the name of John Kennedy used those remarks in one of his speeches and I always like to quote them: "It is not what your country can do for you that really matters but it is what you are prepared to do for your country that really matters". This is our country and you will find yourself in the position of not knowing which side of the fence you are on. We are all Barbadians and we all have to live here, so do not tear the society down because you will tear yourself down, and whatever we are going to get up in this Chamber to debate a matter, I hope the debate will always be kept at a high level. We must always think of the repercussions, so do not try to give the impression that the Opposition is representing the poor people, because the poor people put the Government in power.

These are facts, and I want the hon. member when he gets up to make a speech in this Chamber to make one that when I get up to reply to him I can say some of the words which I said earlier in my address, that I agree with some of the things he has said. I want to agree with some of the things you have said but do not get up for the sake of politics and think that by playing to the Gallery it is going to help you, because one day you might find yourself in the unfavourable position of trying to run your own country, not in the next ten or twenty years, but as I said we are both young and we are looking forward to better days. One day you might come over on this side, because of things on that side; over here is a refuge home for you all. (*Asides.*) I heard the hon. member saying something about Doc. Husbands, but do not worry about him because Nigel Barrow was the Prime Minister's Personal Aide before he went over to your Party. I am saying to the hon. member do not rock the boat because you might find yourself in it, and then you will find out that running a country is not as easy as people on the other side think. Before I sit down, I would like to tell the hon. member this, that the hon. junior member for St. Peter who is his colleague and who is sitting next to him now was on this side at one time, unofficially of course. He has been associated with this Party.

(*Asides.*) You do not have to be a member of the Mafia to be associated with it.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I hope the hon. member has taken the few words I have said in the light in which I have said them, without any animosity or anything. Do not say that people should not pay T.V. licences; I have a gun, and you should get one too, but I have not used my gun from the time I had it and I still have to pay for it every year; the T.V. is a different thing altogether. Whilst being educational, T.V. is also something for entertainment; as a result of T.V. I do not worry to go to the theatre now, this is something for the upkeep of the country. We are subsidising C.B.C. right now and if we are asked to abolish the licence fee it would have to subsidise it further, and it would also mean that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph would have to go deeper in his pocket, it will mean that I will have to go deeper in my pocket and everybody else in this country. Why can we not pay for something which we are getting?  
4.30 p.m.

Whilst agreeing with some of the points which he has made earlier, I cannot accept the notion that people should not pay T.V. licences and that payment of such licence fees should be abolished. As long as we are on this side of the House, I do not see any reason why we should abolish them. I am sure that if the hon. member had the slightest inkling of how Governments are being run, he would never have suggested this.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, first of all, I would like the hon. member to understand that any time I get up in this Chamber to speak, I am not playing politics; I am merely expressing my views - views which I have held for a long time. I would not worry to comment on the question of paying a licence fee for a gun and not using it.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. If the hon. member is offended by my using the words "cheap politics", I meant no offence, and I beg to withdraw that.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I compare the question of television licences with the University. It is common knowledge that from the time a branch of the University was established in Barbados, Barbadians have been able to attend classes at the University without payment of fees. (Hon. N. W. BOXILL: "They bought books.") The hon. member is talking about buying books. Let us put it in the same boiling pot. At the University Barbadians are entitled to free tuition, but they have to buy their books. You have a Television Station; you buy your television sets, so you should have free viewing. If the hon. member accepts that, at this period of our society we are trying to uplift and educate the community, then it would be on the same status as the University. If you are going to give educational programme in the evening on Saturdays, Sundays and during the week to school children, it is a form of education. What are you talking about subsidising things? I see no difference between the two and I equate them the same way.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I do not really think that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph can afford to reiterate the point about education. I said *sotto voce* that he was going all right but he had made a single omission and it was the word "only". The T.V. service is not simply an educational service; it is a service of information and a service of entertainment, and I do not see why people should not pay for their entertainment. Once on the floor of this House, I unfortunately let slip that Barbadians, generally speaking, did not like to pay for their entertainment, and I was subjected to bitter criticism. I was not speaking about C.B.C./TV at the time; I was speaking about an outdoor game.

I reiterate now that the sort of films that we see on T.V. at our homes are about ninety percent entertainment; five percent informative; and another five percent educational, and that is a factual assessment. I have heard members on the other side - I think I am looking at one now - who stood in this Chamber and criticised CBC/TV., and said that far from educational it was debasing the youths of this country. The same hon. members were present and are even present now. How can you say that CBC/TV is educational only? The hon. junior member for St. Joseph knows that is not the whole truth; it is part of the truth and by no means the major part of the truth. Of course, I think he was in error, too, when he compared the time which the U.K. took to go from black and white to colour television. There is no reason why we should follow the U.K. in such practice, because as science advances what the undeveloped countries of the New World could have access to today it took decades for the great Metropolitan prosperous countries to attain owing to the advancement of science.

Now, there was a time when an agricultural worker, who had a splinter filing in his eye working in a sugar factory, had to be sent to Trinidad because there was no magnet in Barbados to extract the piece of iron filing in his eye. That is not so today. Today that is being done at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital; science has advanced, and we have to advance with the times. I was appalled to hear the hon. member reiterating that point. It is not for the sake of gaining a debating point or reiterating a debating point, he could honourably - I use the word "honourably" without any reflection - resist from doing that, because he knows that more than ninety percent of it is entertainment.

Mr. Chairman, it is true that certain programmes are sponsored; the sponsors pay for their advertisements, and through that means we have access to those pictures. Somebody has to pay for them. Nevertheless, I do not think that paying \$10 a year for a T.V. licence is too much. I do not think there is any real complaint on that score, especially since the radio licence has been abolished. You can use your radio free. That was a minor slip on the part of the hon. member. Maybe, speaking as fast as he did, he had forgotten that and it is pardonable.

After all, it took a lot of money to install a T.V. Station; to maintain the staff and its operations, and

now that we are going to introduce colour T.V. - when you talk about colour T.V., I have seen it myself in Florida. You can get three different tints: bright, extra bright, and not so bright. I suppose on some sets there are four tints, and people use whichever is easier on the eyes. As the hon. junior member for St. Thomas has said, within the next 5 years there will be no such thing seen as black and white T.V. I do not think there is any grounds for trying to impress the Committee that the \$10 licence should be abolished. I never thought this debate would have taken so long.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, it is, perhaps, somewhat tragic to find us having to debate any Resolution whatsoever to subsidise or otherwise reimburse, whatever one may call it, the funds of C.B.C. 4.40 p.m.

From its inception C. B. C. was launched on the wrong footing, but the opportunity is still available to us today that we can have better viewing than we now have. Our educational programme can be stepped up much more swiftly, and all this is within the knowledge of Government that it can all be done at little or no cost to the taxpayers of this country. The Government cannot deny that for the greater part of its existence C.B.C. has been supporting in very great measure the Thomson Organisation. The Thomson Organisation happens to be a sort of millstone around the neck of C.B.C. In other words, whatever C.B.C. earns, whether at the end of the year there was a deficit as there has always been, Thomson's share was the first one. Is Government in a position to tell us now if it has completely shaken off the Thomson shackle? Having shaken off Thomson, has Government allowed itself to be tied to any other organisation, and if not, with C.B.C. having on these commercials that one can see, why is it not paying its way?

Mr. Chairman, it is about time that we stopped patting ourselves on the back and at the same time digging deeply into the taxpayers pockets to provide services which the taxpayer need not pay for at all. C.B.C. has been in existence for a long enough time, and I feel that this Committee ought to have been presented with a survey report as to its achievement to date, and let us assess in some measure what in our view has been for the good of the community and what we should support and what not. It is all right to have us, as it might appear to some, quibbling over the licence fee for T.V. sets. For some it may be a quibble. I am one of those who support the view that there ought to be no need whatsoever to pay a licence fee for T.V. sets whether the programmes are 5 per cent, 2 per cent or .02% educational or otherwise. What we have got to concern ourselves with is whether we are satisfied at this stage that the finances of C.B.C. are being managed in a manner which becomes a body such as C.B.C.

I can give Government an instance which though small can still serve as a pointer. Not so long ago the owner of a T.V. set sent a check for \$12 to C.B.C. by post at the end of the month. Two or three days later in the following month when the cheques were returned from the bank to the person who had issued

the cheque to C.B.C., the cheque had been cashed, but having posted the cheque the person had not yet received a receipt from C.B.C. for the money which they had received. The person promptly got on the telephone, a young lady answered, and after some fidgeting and tumbling around, the young lady on the telephone told the gentleman that the cheque was on the desk before her. The gentleman particularly asked whether she meant the cheque or the receipt. She said "no, the cheque." The gentleman asked her to wait, and this is where I think he made the mistake. He returned to the telephone with his cheque book and read the number of the stub to the lady instead of asking her to read the number. He wanted to be so helpful to this poor soul that he read out to her the number of the cheque he had sent and which had been cashed. Evidently as he called out the numbers she copied them down and it ended up with her insisting that she had the cheque before her.

Now, Sir, it is a small matter. It is only \$12, but what I am asking Government to do is this: we are not going to vote against this money, but we are asking Government to see that the finances of C.B.C. are managed in a manner which cannot cause suspicion to be cast upon anybody associated with C.B.C. These are things small indeed but nevertheless they can be noticed. Now, Sir, no one would deny that perhaps in the best run T.V. Station and in a community as people would perhaps like to say as sophisticated as ours, you will still find criticism coming from some quarter as to the type of films or shows that are put on. I must state that I do not spend much time watching television. That time really is not available to me, but there are still too many ganster films and the use of guns being shown. If it is humanly possible for us to turn ourselves adrift from this cheap type of film, we might do the community some good in the long run. The Leader of the House has been at pains to give us figures of the various amounts collected by C.B.C. from February, 1970.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Not collected by C.B.C., Mr. Chairman, collected by the customs.  
4.50 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: And not received by C.B.C.?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Due to C.B.C.

Mr. HINDS: So then, Mr. Chairman, if Customs have received this amount of money, has there been any delay occasioned in the handing over of what is due to C.B.C.?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If the hon. member would give way, I will explain to him that we appropriate a certain amount of money every year and this money is never the full equivalent of what it should be, because Government collects the Customs revenue and then from that the money passes over to C.B.C., so that in any year in which the Customs revenue is \$216,000 and we have paid them \$150,000 we have to give the amount that is due.

Mr. HINDS: So then, Mr. Chairman, this brings us to the point where the licence fee that is due to C.B.C. becomes so important.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The licence fee they collect themselves. I believe the hon. member knows what it is all about, but you could not have a system in which the Customs authorities hand over money directly to C.B.C., money collected by the Customs as the hon. member knows must go the Treasury.

Mr. HINDS: But, Mr. Chairman, we have still got to concern ourselves about the licence fees that are due and owing to C.B.C.; that amount of money forms a very important part of their revenue. Apart from Solicitors taking people into Court, what has been done, or what is being done to see that C.B.C. is not in the red where these licence fees are concerned? This is important.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If the hon. member would give way, it will always be in the red where the licence fees are concerned if it does not collect them all. If the hon. member would bear with me I can give him some figures of the revenue from licence fees over the last six years. For instance, December, 1964 to December 1965, they collected \$33,390, January to December, 1966 \$41,090, January to December, 1967 \$38,220, January to December, 1968 \$64,440, January to December, 1969 \$85,149 and January to December, 1970, this is an unaudited figure of \$111,100. Of course, in each of these years the amount collected for licence fees would represent what is due and owing in that particular year as well as such arrears as they could manage to collect.

Mr. HINDS: Now, Mr. Chairman, these figures amount to \$373,365 and this must be considered as an amount worthy of note; in other words, this amount can make some sort of impact upon the activities of C.B.C.'s finances, and if over a period of 6 years this is what they have actually got, I wonder if the Minister is in a position to tell us over the same period how much money is due and owing to them. This amount represents what they have received; what then is due and owing to them over the same 6-year period? The Minister is asking for money for C.B.C.; and you cannot only look on the credit side of C.B.C. to come and ask for money.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If the hon. member would give way, I do not know if the hon. member recalls this, but I am sure that the last audited financial statement of the Corporation which the House had before it was that for 1969. It is my impression that in these statements every year there is always information about the cash position of the Corporation, its assets and its liabilities. I think that they will tell you what the uncollected arrears of licence fees will be, but it would not be reasonable for me to have this here because we are not really dealing with this, we are dealing with what the House is asked to provide by way of Customs duties.

Mr. HINDS: I can see the Minister's point, but I am sure the Minister could not consider that we are in any way unreasonable if the Minister is provided with information as to the credit side of C.B.C. in that although C.B.C.'s financial year ends December, 1970,

the Minister has been provided with information to show - although he says it is not what we may call a rounded off figure - the Minister can still say they expect to receive \$111,100. It is in the same breath then, Mr. Chairman, that we are asking the Minister to tell us if you expect to receive this amount, how much do you expect to be outstanding and not to receive up to and including the same December, 1970. This is only reasonable, so that it would give us an idea to see exactly how C.B.C. is managing its affairs. We are not voting against the money, we will vote for it, but we want an idea of how C.B.C. is managing its affairs.

5.00 p.m.

When we are satisfied as to these small things, I am sure we can move on to greater things with confidence.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to hold up this Head any longer, but it is about time that C.B.C.'s finances should be looked into. The Minister must bear in mind that it is not only to be said that a balance sheet is provided annually, because the auditors themselves tell you that this balance sheet is drawn up in keeping with information sought and in accordance with the replies given to the questions asked by them. I have already given this Committee and the House the benefit of my own experience with these auditors. There are some auditors in the City of Bridgetown who from one set of books can prepare a balance sheet to show the Bank that a business is making money, and from the same set of books make out a return to the Revenue Department to show that the business has lost money.

However, Mr. Chairman, we will no doubt lend our support to this Resolution. We are asking the Minister to see that all of these things to which we have addressed our minds this afternoon be rectified, so that in future we may have a better understanding of the affairs of C.B.C.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a few comments on the revenue aspect of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation. From a conversation with various members of the Board, with people who work there and from my own observations on the television, one notices that after about 9.30 p.m. there are no advertisements on television. When I tried to find out from certain members of the Board the reason for this, I was told that the advertising agents had decided that people do not watch television after 9.30 p.m. I think that is a big mistake in this country. I do not think that the advertising agents have done any sort of investigation into this matter. Certainly some sort of survey should be carried out, if not by the advertising agents by C.B.C. themselves, to see what is the viewing like after 9.30 p.m. and so on. This is very important.

Secondly, the C.B.C. Board should make arrangement to encourage or promote sales time later at night. Advertising at peak hours should be made far more expensive, and they could try to spread out the advertising later in the night. To give an example, the programme of wrestling which comes over on

Friday night - now and then you may see a Banks advertisement or one from the Sport Shop, but as a rule there are very few advertisements in it. From a poll done in the *Advocate* newspaper, however genuine it may be I think one must pay some regard to it, the programme of wrestling came either first or second in that poll. That in itself would give an indication of the popularity of that programme. This may be so in quite a number of other programmes, but I believe that the basic trouble with the advertising agents in this country is that they are not Barbadians. A lot of the advertising agencies in this country are not Barbadians, and they are not *au fait* with the habits of Barbadians. To suggest that nobody in Barbados watches television after 9.30 p.m., as has been suggested to me as recently as last month by a member of C.B.C. Board is ridiculous.

I know for a fact that one of the high-ranking members of the Board has said that people do not watch television after 9.30 p.m. and it is a waste of time. When I recently enquired for the reason for the cut back in C.B.C. programmes, I was told that people do not watch television after 9.30 p.m. It is a question of revenue for C.B.C., and I would seriously ask the Government to take up the matter with C.B.C. If the advertising agents do not want to carry out a survey, then C.B.C. should carry out their own survey to ascertain what the viewing is like after 9.30 p.m. I do not know if this is in existence at the moment but if you can spread the advertisements over a period after 9.30 p.m., you will encourage more people to advertise. In order to do this the rates for advertising at peak hours may be increased and the rates later in the night may be reduced, and this would then encourage people to spread out their advertisements.

Mr. Chairman, even though the Radio has been in existence for some time, there are no advertisements over C.B.C. after 9 p.m. This is bad. The last programme that comes over the Radio at 11.10 p.m. comes on without an Announcer, and there is no advertisement whatsoever. I feel that if this programme is run properly by a particular man built up into a personality show, then people would listen to the Radio and you could sell advertisements. I would seriously ask the Minister concerned to ask the Board to consider this.

There is one other point on which I would like to hear the Leader of the House. Some time ago, I think it was the senior member for St. Joseph who raised the question of broadcasting the debates of the House. I think it was in January last year that a Resolution was passed to this effect, and I believe the Leader of the House had promised to give us a statement about it at least by the end of May, but nothing has been done so far.

5.10 p.m.

I wonder if the Leader of the House could make some statement on this aspect of it.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I would like to deal perhaps with the last one first. I believe that the management

of the Corporation and the Debates Committee of Parliament are discussing this matter. I do not know at what stage it is. It was on the Agenda for the recent meeting of the Debates Committee. I believe there will be a meeting with the present Debates Committee to discuss with the Corporation terms and conditions under which this service can be on, but I cannot tell you anything more because I have not myself gone much further than when I spoke about it during the last Estimates.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister would give way, I think I can assist him just briefly on that point. On the Agenda is an item where C.B.C. has offered to give a ten minute broadcast of a meeting of the House and ten minutes of a meeting of the Other Place. That is all.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Of course that could not be accepted. The hon. member would take 9 1/2 minutes of that time and there would be nothing left for me. Apparently, if I understand the hon. member correctly, there is a proposal which is to be studied which on the face of it appears to be totally unacceptable. Anyhow, those members of this Chamber who are members of the Debates Committee will take note of this next week.

The hon. junior member for St. Peter asked about our connection with Thomson. C.B.C. wrote Thomson terminating the arrangement for service by Thomson with effect from March, 1968. The hon. member will remember that very lengthy and very interesting debate in this House in 1967, I believe on the re-financing of the Corporation. There was nothing we could do then. We took note of the House's view in that debate, but there was nothing we could do in that financial year; but in the next financial year, 1968, we wrote terminating the arrangements with them, and we also directed that C.B.C. should pay for any service rendered after that date, and we would pay for this on what is a *quantum meruit* basis. I would say that being free from 1968 of those obligations, if the hon. member looks again at the 1969 financial statement of C.B.C., the finances of the Corporation were in the black for the first time in 1969, and if we could use the term of audited accounts, we would find that they would be even blacker in 1970, but of course the 1970 accounts are not yet available.

May I just add one comment on the colour television issue. It would appear from enquiries which we made and the correspondence which the Corporation has with the producers and manufacturers of television sets and television parts, that the black and white medium is being phased out in most if not all of the countries of the world, and consequently the manufacturers, it would appear, are not continuing to produce equipment in black and white; so when you have black and white equipment and you have to replace it, you get increasing difficulty in replacing black and white equipment; but rather more facility in getting colour equipment. So that all the technical advice we have at our disposal seems to tell us or warn us that colour television will itself become more and more economical as

time goes on. There is that aspect of it that would not so much be the concern of the Corporation, but would be the concern of individual persons. Colour T.V. receiving sets are extraordinarily expensive, and I do not know that many people will be able to buy them. They cost \$1,000 and \$1,200, and I have seen a quotation price as much as \$1,600; and incidentally if they are put out for rental, the results on them will be quite expensive as well because people will feel that they would have to capitalise on or amortise their investments; so it will be a very expensive business from the point of view of people who enjoy it. I just would like however to say that even at the moment, although we do not have colour transmission, over 50 percent of the film used is in colour. Of course it appears as black and white as it can only appear in black and white in the absence of the equipment which would put it out in colour.

The hon. junior member for Bridgetown made another point in respect of whether a survey could be carried out to ascertain if commercials could be accepted and put over the station after 9.30 p.m. It is my understanding that some time last year a survey was carried out. I am not at the moment sure whether the Corporation itself did this or whether the advertising agencies did it; but it seems to me to be a very silly idea for the Corporation, if this how they look at it, arbitrarily to decide that nobody watches T.V. after 9.30 p.m., because the incentive to watch after 9.30 p.m. would depend on what is offered, and if the programmes are interesting and the viewer response is increasing, I would think that the advertisers would want to take note of that. But, as I said, I cannot now remember by whom the survey was taken.

The set count in the Island, I believe is about 17,000 at the moment. The signal is taken, and I myself have seen it, in St. Lucia. I do not know if we can count the 3,000 or 4,000 sets in St. Lucia as an additional sets count to our own; probably not, because we do get any revenue from their operation, but we can say that there are perhaps about 22,000 television sets here and in St. Lucia, and probably another 2,000 in St. Vincent and certain parts of Grenada watch programmes from Barbados with varying degrees of comfort and ease. I will certainly call the Corporation's attention to the point made about trying to get more after 9.30 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister is aware that C.B.C. is losing a considerable amount of revenue by merely selling viewing time to the advertising agencies. In other words, C.B.C. has a fixed price for the sale of its time, but the advertising agencies are allowed to use C.B.C. to make a fortune for themselves without C.B.C. detting any benefits whatsoever.  
5.20 p.m.

There are opportunities for C.B.C. to cash in on this because C.B.C. ought to carry out these services as often as possible in its own interest, and apart from the sale of time for advertising a parti-

cular commodity or something, according to the response, C.B.C., if they know how to run their affairs, would then be entitled to make a commission on this.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If the hon. member would give way, I thought the hon. member meant that the Corporation was losing revenue merely by charging for advertising and not perhaps for the time it takes to prepare the matter.

Mr. HINDS: The agency does that.

*The question that Head 17 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

*Head 21 CIVIL AVIATION - was called.*

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Under this Head, Mr. Chairman, there are several Items, Furniture and Fixtures, Toilet Requisites, Stationery Travelling, Air Traffic Services and Fixtures, Fittings and Equipment.

Previously the Department's maintenance was carried out at irregular intervals and when faults occurred, but a new system of preventative maintenance, embracing systematic and regular maintenance, has been introduced for greater efficiency. The maintenance is being carried out by Space Research Corporation. In addition, maintenance fees for two tape recorders which International Aeradio (Caribbean) Limited formerly maintained free of cost is being charged for this year at the rate of \$100 per month. International Aeradio (Caribbean) Limited ceased to carry out the maintenance in July and Space Research Corporation has since been taking charge of it.

Total additional expenditure under this item is expected to be in the region of \$7,176 made up as follows:-

|                                                                                                        |                   |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Payment for checking tape recorders and replacing tapes for period 1/4170 - 31/3/71 @ \$100 per month  | \$1,200.00        |
| Maintenance of air/ground and other electronic equipment for period 1/8170 - 31/3/71 @ \$500 per month | 4,000.00          |
| Rental of telex for Met messages from 1/9/70 - 31/3/71                                                 | 420.00            |
| Installation of telex machine                                                                          | 56.00             |
| Purchasing of spares and replacements to equipment to 31st March, 1971                                 | 1,500.00          |
|                                                                                                        | <u>\$7,176.00</u> |

There is however an uncommitted sum of \$1,535 in hand out of the original sum of \$13,500, expenditure being \$10,405 and commitments \$1,560. This reduces the amount now required to \$5,641 and accordingly supplementary provision in the said sum of \$5,641 under this item is being asked for.

If there are any questions hon. members wish to ask I will be pleased to answer them. I beg to move that Head 21 stand part.

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

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

*Head 23 - PUBLIC RELATIONS - was called.*

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 23 stand part.

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

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

*Head 25 - MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS - was called.*

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 25 stand part.

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

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, this is additional money being voted for the Ministry of External Affairs, but there are certain things which has caused us some disquiet for sometime. Some time ago the House voted, I think it was £35,000, to purchase a house in London, and I understand that since that house has been purchased the High Commissioner has never taken up residence there. I understand the Leader of the House on his visit to London stood at the house for a while and I understand that the High Commissioner has said that the house which has been purchased is far too cold to be used in winter. I believe I am right in saying that this house was purchased from a gentleman who had property in the Bahamas or Bermuda, and this house was used during the summer months by its former owner. During the winter months this gentleman came to the West Indies either the Bahamas or Bermuda; nonetheless, he sold this house to the Barbados Government, and having bought it the High Commissioner found, as I understand, that it was far too cold to live in during the winter months.

The house, I believe, is right on the Thames, a place called Thames-Ditton, and I would like to find out from the Government what is being done with the house. I know for a fact that the High Commissioner has a flat in London proper, and I would like to find out from the Government who is paying for this flat. I would like to find out whether the High Commissioner is paying for this himself or whether money is being spent by the Government to pay for this flat for the High Commissioner. This is a very serious problem, because to take £35,000 and spend to buy a house, then the High Commission-

er decides he is not living in it, and then money is being spent to rent a flat for the High Commissioner in London, I do not think this is the way Government should treat the taxpayers of this country. 5.30 p.m.

Sir, with reference to Item 68 - Communications - some time ago, the Government complained about a Postman carrying the *Beacon* to St. Thomas in a Post Office van, and yet this Government has now resorted to sending the *Democrat* to New York in the Diplomatic Mail.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I do not suppose that there is anything that cannot now be said of this Government by hon. members opposite. No, not this one! I think the hon. member wants to say something, but he does not quite know how to say it (*Asides.*)

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I am grateful to the hon. member for St. Peter, Sir. The Minister has risen, but he has not denied it.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, how can you deny something which simply is not.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Is not what? Up to now the Minister has not said it is not true.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member will favour me by making the allegation in a form in which it can be denied, I will deny it.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am saying that the *Democrat* is being sent to New York to somebody who is working in the United Nations Office to be circulated in New York, and it is being sent in the Diplomatic Bag of this country.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I deny that; that is not true.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would expect the Hon. Minister to deny it, but he should confess that, before he can deny it, he should check the facts with the Minister of Home Affairs or with the civil servants to find out whether it is true. After all, he is not the Minister of Home Affairs. He should not get up and deny it merely for the sake of denying it. It is scandalous. Before I came into this House as a member, I remember sitting in the Public Gallery and I heard, I think it was the junior member for St. Thomas say that a Postman was taking the *Beacon* to St. Thomas on Saturdays in a Post Office van. I believe the Postman was fired as a result of that. We now find this Government using the Diplomatic Mail for their own purpose. This cannot be right.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, when the hon. member says the Diplomatic Mail, what exactly is he saying?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: The Diplomatic Mail Bag.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The bag can only contain communications from this Government to its representatives abroad. There is nothing wrong with a copy of the *Democrat*, a copy of the *Truth*, a copy of the *Advocate - News*, a copy of the *Bajan*, if it appears in time, or a copy of any publication in Barbados being sent to the reading rooms of the Embassies and High Commissions. There is nothing wrong with that.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, is the Leader of the House now agreeing with me that the *Democrat* goes to the United Nations via the Diplomatic Bag?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I am not saying that, and you are not in court. I am saying that there is nothing wrong with copies of the publications in Barbados being sent by the Ministry of External Affairs to the representatives abroad, if it is for the benefit of Nationals or other interested persons to look at, but that is not what the hon. member said.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: That is not what I mean either. I said that the *Democrat* is being sent to a gentleman who works in the United Nations Office to be distributed in New York City to subscribers of the *Democrat*. It is not being sent to the High Commissioner or the Permanent Representative of any Nation. A number of copies are being sent every week in the Diplomatic Mail Bag to be distributed in New York for the simple reason that the *Democrat* does not want to pay for posting them by airmail. This is disgraceful and shameful.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I must absolutely deny this. I even said just now that to me it was conceivable that single copies of publications could be sent that way. I would not see anything wrong in that, provided there was no discrimination against any newspaper or any publication. I was thinking about a single copy for the reading rooms of the Mission abroad. I am advised that the hon. member's charge is really not so, and not even the *Advocate - News* is sent by the Diplomatic Bag.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, is the Leader of the House so naïve as to believe that I would expect him to get up and say it is so? I would not expect him to say so even if it were so. It would have been a serious admission on the part of the Government.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: You should expect me to say so if it were so, and I knew it was so.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I know that you do not know whether it is so or not, but you are still saying it is not so.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I know as much about it as the hon. member.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I know much more about it, Sir. My charges are true.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I notice that the Leader of the House has not replied to the points raised by the hon. member in respect of the residence in the United Kingdom.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I have the reply on that.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I understand it is a fact that there is grave difficulty in auditing the accounts of the Overseas Missions. I would be glad for an up-to-date statement with respect to the auditing of the accounts of the Overseas Missions, particularly the ones in New York.

I should also like to find out from the Hon. Minister whether it is not a fact that there have been some difficulties with personnel relations in London with respect to the High Commissioner and some members of his staff, involving action being taken by the High Commissioner and action being taken by the Public Service Commission which was, to say the least, a complete reversal of the stand taken by the High Commissioner. In view of this, I wonder whether the time has not arrived when the Government should review the method of appointment of people who have to work in the household of the High Commissioner or under the dominion of the household of the Commissioner. It is dependent on these answers whether we will continue the debate on his Head.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the house at Thames Ditton, hon. members know that when we bought this house we said, and I still think, it was a good bargain. A house in that part of Surrey in England in these days for £35,000, or whatever it was, is a good bargain. I think that while countries like our own should not aim at owning too much property abroad, when we have opportunities to purchase properties which are good bargains, I think we would be justified in having them.

Now, this residence was not occupied in the early stages when we bought it, because until Sir Lionel Luckhoo's tenure of office came to an end there was no High Commissioner for Barbados alone until July, 1970, when Mr. Ramsay was appointed. 5.40 p.m.

The flat in London was purchased along with and as part of the office accommodation at No. 6 Upper Belgrave Street. I think I am right in saying that we gave an explanation of this in March last year when we were doing the Estimates. With respect to the residence which we purchased, it is true that in that part of England any property which lies near a river will tend to be colder and damper in winter than it would be on other occasions, and more so, if the house has not been lived in for some considerable time. I do not wish to step on anybody's corns, and I certainly do not wish to be over critical in a matter like this, but I think that different people find different ways of addressing themselves to cer-

tain situations and whereas for instance speaking now for myself I would live in that house and make it comfortable because I would find ways of making it comfortable, other people may not wish to take that trouble, so that objectively it may not be the house, it may be the length of time or the persistence which some people would need to make a house comfortable which everybody does not have. There is no question of our getting rid of it. I myself think that if it were lived in for a long time, it is possible to be comfortable inside the house. I would not like to speak for outside of it, because if you live near a river in that part of England, you cannot enjoy the outside of any house for about four or five months of any one year, but I think for the other seven it is purely tolerable. There would be five months that it would not be, but I would think that inside it is perfectly possible to heat it up and do certain things with it that would make it convenient to live in. Now I am awaiting some information.....

Mr. St. JOHN: If the hon. member would give way, Sir, this is a very serious matter. If you have a house which costs the taxpayers of Barbados £35,000, around \$190,000 which would be nearer to £40,000 - perhaps the purchase price was £35,000 and the other charges for closing brought up the difference - and it is not being lived in, it means that the house is bound to be deteriorating. It is a fact that whether the house is in London or anywhere else, if it is closed up, it is bound to deteriorate and the consequential maintenance cost is bound to go up. If a man is High Commissioner and that is the residence for him, either he lives in it or he goes; so the suggestion that you are making that some people will not make themselves comfortable while others would is all right, but the point is that either you accept the job on these terms or you are quitting. This is the residence for the High Commissioner in London, and he must comply with the terms, because he is costing us money, and another officer can occupy the flat at the office of the High Commissioner. This must be the reason why he was removed, and that is a serious thing. (*Asides.*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Hon. members must observe Standing Order No. 29 (6).

Mr. St. JOHN: I also noticed that we have passed money under Item 22 for a certain amount of staff, and surely that staff was fixed in relation to the size of the house; so if you do not use it, what is happening with that? Are you drawing the money and saving on that? This is a very serious matter.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: In a case like that the money would not be used. What would be the basis of taking money to pay them?

Mr. St. JOHN: My understanding is that you allocate X dollars based upon a non-established staff of four, which means that a global sum is paid to you and you hire the staff. It is not a question of Public Service Commission appointments or anything like that, and the Leader of the House would have to check this very carefully, because that money

should be allocated and if it is allocated it would be drawn whether or not they employ the staff, because as I understand it, the difference in the size of the flat where they live right now and the house are two completely different entities. One is a house by itself and one is a flat. Surely when you purchased the accommodation with the flat, you did not envisage that as the High Commissioner's residence; so why should a High Commissioner be allowed to depart from the general basis of understanding? We passed money in here to provide a residence, and if he does not live in it, he should be fired. You cannot do that because you are using the taxpayers' money on a basis of false pretence. This is part of the terms and conditions, but you are too soft over there. People must either conform or quit, because the taxpayers are being saddled with extra maintenance costs because of the fact that nobody is living in that house. Is there any maintenance staff there? If there is maintenance staff, who is paying them? I should like to know whether that house is heated in winter, what happens to the furniture inside, how often it is opened and whether you are hiring some real estate agency in the area to look after it. What about the grounds and all those things? I remember the Prime Minister saying that it had two or four double garages and there was an old car. The old car should have been driven into the river because it was no use at all. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: It was not as bad as that.) If nobody is using the motor car, what is happening with the maintenance of that?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If the hon. member would give way, a lot of the attitudes which he expresses on this business of what our servants abroad should do and what they conform to would find agreement with me. We are not as silly and flabby as he thinks we are. The High Commissioner occupies the house from time to time during the week. What I am trying to tell hon. members is that there is no question of the High Commissioner abandoning the house for it to deteriorate. What happens is that occasionally when his commitments in London are not pressing or as frequent as they might be, he is in residence at Iverta, but obviously there is much that cannot be done from that residence and can be better done from the flat in London. It is a question that if you have frequent appointments day after day, for instance if your heaviest days are Tuesday and Wednesday in any one week, there is no point driving up two or three times a day from there.

5.50 p.m.

There is nothing wrong with that; in most countries where it is not possible always for diplomatic representatives to live within a stone's throw of the offices, they sometimes have some place near the centre of things for entertaining and the like or for living, so I want to make it quite clear that all the people who represent this country abroad are servants of the people of Barbados and they are not permitted to make decisions on their own, but if they make up a case for a certain facility we like to accommodate them because the diplomatic life, though it might appear to be an easy life, is the most exacting and perhaps the most unrewarding life there is.

May I just say something while I am on my feet about the new premises. Since we spoke about it in last year's Estimates I do not think the House has had an opportunity to hear much more about it, but new offices were purchased for the staff of the Mission in September, 1970 and the office space in the new premises is greater and consequently has better facilities.

Mr. St. JOHN: It is obvious that when the Government bought this they were buying it as a country retreat for the High Commissioner, because the Leader of the House is going to give us the impression that they feel it is perfectly proper for the High Commissioner to periodically go there, whereas the impression given when the money was being passed was that you were providing an everyday house for the High Commissioner. It is clearly obvious now why you have to transfer the present High Commissioner from London; I do not believe the Government should go into the real estate business in foreign countries, and if you buy a house it should be the residence of the High Commissioner, and when you bought it you made a mistake, because the High Commissioner is now saying that it is inconvenient to live in. I am still asking what happens with the maintenance, whether there is a permanent staff there at the house.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am in the happy position to know that when the Government came for the money to buy this residence, not only did I vote against it but I spoke against it and I am in the happy position to know that when they came for money to buy some of the property in Washington that I got put out of the House on that occasion, and I think it is worth it because this is a classic example of the Government squandering the taxpayers' money. How can the Leader of the House tell us that we are providing two residences for one man in London? This cannot be right for the taxpayers in this country, this Government has gone mad with this sort of attitude. We have people in this country suffering, all down Chapman Lane people cannot get proper houses, nor can they get proper facilities, and two weeks ago the Minister of Community Development said that because of the cane fires, the Rural Amenities Fund has no money in it, therefore you cannot have any money, but it is what we call bad planning.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If the hon. member would give way, I see the point the hon. member is developing, and it is purely a political point, but for the sake of the record, what the Minister was trying to tell the House was that rural amenities, not only with us but with your side when you were in power, money for them came out of the Labour Welfare Fund; if in any one year the resources of the Fund are depleted you take it out of the Treasury. He was in fact saying that there was no money but he was coming to the Treasury and not to the Fund.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I am saying the the Government is guilty of bad planning, because how can a Government really spend £35,000, over

\$180,000, to buy a house for a High Commissioner to live in and then the Leader of the House has the gall and the gumption to get up in here and say that from time to time the High Commissioner goes there and he lives in another flat? How can an island 21 x 14 with a one-crop economy provide a man with two houses to live in? We do not even provide the Prime Minister with two houses. I am glad to see the senior member for St. Philip walking into the Chamber, because it was the senior member for St. Philip not so long ago who had to beg the Minister of Communications to go there and put in some roads for the people of St. Philip. I wonder how the backbenchers of the Democratic Labour Party feel when they go to St. Philip, St. George and other constituencies? How do you really look at somebody and tell the taxpayers of this country, a man who is working in the cane fields that you bought two houses for a man to live in in London? You bought one house and you are allowing him to live in another one. The leader of the House has said that the High Commissioner lives at the flat and he goes from time to time at the house on Thames-Ditton. The Leader of the House has said that the High Commissioner lives in the flat and that he visits the house Thames-Ditton from time to time; how could this Government call themselves a Socialist Government?

6.00 p.m.

Who lives in the house during the time the High Commissioner is not there? (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: "Staff.") I do not understand the Leader of the House continuing to say that there is staff there. A few minutes ago when the Leader of the Opposition asked him about staff maintenance, he was not in a position to give him an answer, but he is now saying that there is a staff there. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: "I have the information now.") Sir, is the Leader of the House pulling these things out of the air? He realises what the position is, and he must say there is a staff living there.

Mr. Chairman, after listening to the first remarks made by the Leader of the House, one could never get the impression that the High Commission used to go there and live. The Minister said that the house was not lived in for a very long time, and as soon as somebody started to live in the house it would get warmer. Is this true even today of Thames Ditton? (Asides.) How can somebody get the impression that the High Commissioner was living in the house when you said that as soon as somebody started living in the house it would get warmer?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I thank the hon. member for giving way. When I said that as soon as somebody lives in a house it becomes more convenient, I was not answering your point. I was meeting the objections of your Leader, and I answered him much more differently from how I answered you. I will answer you on your specific point when I rise again.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, my point is simple. Does the High Commissioner live at Thames Ditton?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Has he set up a household there? Does he live in the flat in London, too?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes, when he has late business.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: He is either using the flat in London, or he does not live there.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether I could simplify this matter for the hon. member. The official residence of the Barbados High Commissioner is at a place called "Iverta" at Thames Ditton, Surrey. This house he occupies. There is, however, a flat which is part of the new office premises which the High Commission has moved into. The staff have moved from Kensington, or wherever it was, to Belgravia, and in the premises where they now are, there is a flat which he uses whenever his commitments in London will not permit him to return to Thames Ditton, which is his residence, at night. Meanwhile, of course, at his residence he has his staff: his housekeeper, cook, his gardener and his cleaner. These are the facts.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the Leader of the House will tell us how far from the flat in Belgrave Street is this house at Thames Ditton.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: About twenty-three miles.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, the last answer is completely inconsistent with the first one. In the first answer he laid the emphasis on the flat, and then he said that he would visit Thames Ditton periodically. He would occupy the flat in London and then go to Thames Ditton as a sort of country retreat. The Minister has now reversed it. The true position is that the High Commissioner wants too much accommodation. He is taking up accommodation which another officer could use. Government could get revenue out of this flat because the other officers, as I understand it, do not get the same privileges as the High Commissioner. You provide a residence for the High Commissioner and, therefore, this is a waste of the taxpayers' money. It is very unfair particularly *vis-a-vis* the Missions in other parts of the world. There is no other High Commissioner or Ambassador who has two places of residence that he can use!

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member speaks of two places of residence. Of course, there are two places of residence in so far as the official residence and the use of the flat which is part of the office. It is as if, God forbid, Mr. Chairman, you were residing here in a flat on these premises when the House is sitting late as it has been now three nights this week, but retained your residence at Gall Hill. The flat which would be here would be a part of the office complex.

Now, we had thought that this flat would have been occupied in time by an officer of the Mission who would be there on the premises night and day, but to date no officer has shown any interest in occupying the flat, probably, because of not particularly wishing to undertake caretaking duties.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, Barbados is a most remarkable country. Barbados has the most remarkable staff at the Mission. In London where there is expensive accommodation, if this flat is fit to accommodate the High Commissioner, then I am surprised that no officer will be willing to use it! The hon. Leader of the House should be frank with us. We know you have had difficulties with this house. I will tell you the information we have at the moment. We were told that the former Joint High Commissioner made this deal for his friend who was living in Bermuda; he wanted to get rid of the house and he could not do so, and it is a White Elephant.

Everybody knew - every one of the Barbadians in London knew that it was a bad deal. It is 23 miles away from London and during the winter it is not the best place to live. The former owner had a house in Bermuda; he spent the Winter in Bermuda, and returned to Thames Ditton as his summer home. It is obvious that the Government, having bought it, must allow the High Commissioner to use the residence upstairs the office as his winter home, so to speak, and Thames Ditton will be his summer home, except when the Hon. Leader of the House travels up there. I understand that the Hon. Leader of the House finds it very tolerable. (*Asides.*) Then you must insist that the High Commissioner should go there and occupy it.

Mr. Chairman, this is a most unsatisfactory situation, because the Hon. Leader of the House can never convince us that the fact that the flat is occupied and the house at Thames Ditton is occupied will not result in additional cost to Barbados. The staff, which has been allocated to the High Commissioner, is being used at the flat where the Commissioner sleeps more regularly. I do not know whether he has ever slept at Thames Ditton at all.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the House has said that Thames Ditton is the official residence of the Barbados High Commissioner, because it has been purchased by the Government as the official residence. He goes on to say: "The Commissioner has moved into a flat at Belgravia." He said earlier: "From time to time during the week the High Commissioner visits Thames Ditton." As a rule the Leader of the House does not make mistakes in English. When a person is visiting Thames Ditton from time to time that would signify and indicate that he is not really living at Thames Ditton, but that he is living at Belgravia.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, there are 7 nights in a week. It is true that you can argue that if you sleep over here for 4 nights and over there for 3 you are living here but visiting there.  
6.10 p.m.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: On your same analysis, tell us where the High Commissioner lives and where he sleeps.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Do you wish me to speak under privilege? (Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Yes.) I do not know.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: This is a case where as I said earlier the Leader of the House was only pulling things out of the sky and telling us. What is the floor space of the flat at Belgravia? Belgravia as anybody knows is a posh area; so it cannot be an ordinary flat. Anybody who lived in London would have some sort of idea of what Belgravia is. At any rate the High Commissioner considered it a fit enough place for himself and his family to live, and therefore that would signify that the flat is of some value, and the Leader of the House goes on to say that from time to time the High Commissioner would visit Thames-Ditton, and to quote his own words, it was no question of the High Commissioner abandoning the use of the house. The question of abandoning the house would only arise if the High Commissioner does not sleep there. It boils down to this: We provide an official residence for the Prime Minister of this country. If he did not live there and lived at some other place for which we would have to pay rent, we on this side would object to it. If he was prepared to pay the money, it would be all right. In the same way if the High Commissioner in this instance was prepared to go and rent his own flat in Belgravia, that would be fair enough, but the Government would still be wasting money. The Government cannot provide a house for the High Commissioner which he does not live in and then provide a flat for him to live in where there are so many people in this country who need houses. Where does the Deputy High Commissioner live?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I believe that we rent a house somewhere in North London.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: You are not certain. There is one other point I would like to get at. Now I understand that the entire allowance including personal emoluments paid to the High Commissioner in London is \$44,000. Is this correct?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I can check this, but as the hon. member knows, High Commissioners are paid as Permanent Secretaries basically and then they have the various allowances attaching to their posts, but the amount and quantum I could not now say.

Mr. St. JOHN: The note to Item 23 on page 49 reads as follows:-

"Provision included for the following allowances - Foreign Service; Entertainment; Outfit and Housing Accommodation (Resolution No. 53/1969). See Appendix M."

My Estimates do not have that Appendix M; so we really cannot check this. The note to Item 22 says:-

"Provision also included for domestic staff of four for High Commissioner's residence."

In view of the number of residences that the High Commissioner has in England, where are these four? At Thames-Ditton or at the flat? (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: At Thames-Ditton.)

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I would like to find out the total sum paid to the High Commissioner for a year, because it is very important. I understand we are paying the High Commissioner \$44,000, and this is a fantastic sum to be paying him. When we debated the other point in the House, the Leader of the House said that the house at Thames-Ditton was too far from London. I remember well the hon. senior member for St. Thomas pointing this out to the Government, and he specifically told the Government at the time that before purchasing the house to consider that it would be too far from London proper and that no High Commissioner would want to travel out there and have to return to London in the evening, but naturally somebody from the Opposition said it and the Government did not accept it.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: But the same hon. member said it was not a bad bargain for its situation and price.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: But on the other hand, you are not in the real estate business, and if you are buying some place for a particular person to live in, you do not say it is not a bad bargain.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The hon. member did not say any of this then.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Recalling the name of High Commissioner, I see the reason why he is given all this preference, because you are trying to get him to come back to run the general elections. It is wrong to show him all these favours to get him to come back.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I remember some years ago when Sir Learie Constantine was serving his last days in London as High Commissioner for Trinidad, it was said of him that he left the dignified post of High Commissioner and went down to Bristol and got involved in a bus strike, because he was representing the interest of coloured people in Britain at the time, one of whom I understood was not a Barbadian.  
6.20 p.m.

Everybody attached a certain amount of dignity to the office of High Commissioner; if the Barbados Government is going to have a High Commissioner in London who thinks it better to occupy a flat when there is an official residence, certainly he lowers the dignity not only of himself but of Barbados as a whole. One must not, because of a man's idea of not living in a house, place all the blame on the gentleman, because as I understand it he took one look at the house and said he is not living there, the place is

cold and he could not tolerate the residence. As the Leader of the Opposition said, to spend \$190,000 to provide a residence for some gentleman who prefers to live in a flat in Belgravia, I am sure four servants cannot operate in the flat in Belgravia, but in means that \$190,000 is lying down non-interest bearing and at the same time there are Barbadians suffering who could at least benefit from some of this money. Who have got roads all over the country - and the hon. member for St. Philip smiles when I say so because he knows why he smiles, that in this Chamber last week the hon. member said he wanted the Government to go to St. Philip and try to do something with the roads there. I have asked the Government to do something with the roads in St. Joseph which have been broken away for some eight years now, and nothing has been done; at the same time, the house in Thames - Ditton stands practically unoccupied. It is only the very, very rich, like some we have on the west coast that buy a house, leave the maids in it for four or five months of the year and they fly out to some country and then come back, but here it is, the High Commissioner has an official residence, staff - according to the Leader of the Opposition - and he is living in a flat in Belgravia. If this sort of thing exists with the High Commissioner there must be some fault, and any Government which can afford this type of accommodation can afford to remedy some of the difficulties pointed out to it by its own members. I heard the hon. member for St. George speak about more street lighting.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am afraid that this part of the Resolution does not deal with that, we are now dealing with Head 25, External Affairs.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I abide by your ruling, and Head 25, with all due respect to you, deals with the Ministry of External Affairs, Overtime, Communications, Travelling expenses, and therefore I was seeking to show that if we look at Notes 9 and 10, they refer to the High Commission's offices, and I believe that the term "High Commission" means overseas High Commission, so I was of the opinion that in dealing with External Affairs where there is expenditure of money involving External Affairs we would be able to comment on it.

If you look at what I was saying a little bit outside the latitude of High Commission, according to the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, you will see, but I will confine my speech to external Affairs. I want to talk about the overtime expenditure involving the chauffeurs. I would like to know what are the duties involved which necessitated an extra vote for overtime.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Notes 9, 10 and 11.

9. The full expenses on overtime for the post of chauffeur now fall to be met by Barbados. The sum of \$1,100 is required to supplement this item.

10. Barbados no longer shares the cost of telephone service with Guyana. In addition the High Commission has recently moved to larger premises necessitating additional and improved telephone facilities. An amount of \$4,526 is required to supplement this item.

11. There has been an increase in the incidence of providing transport for visiting delegations. The sum of \$2,016 is accordingly required to supplement this item.

This seems to be quite honest; apparently you heard that the Opposition heard that Dr. Waldo Ramsay was no longer living in the House, and I am not saying that it is only for this reason you made your position quite clear; tell us, therefore, why it is necessary to to live in a larger house.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: They moved to larger offices, not residence.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Tell us this, if the High Commissioner is living in a house or in a flat.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: He lives in both. This is the position; there is a 23 mile distance to cover and sometimes the High Commissioner has engagements in London and he finds it convenient on two or three occasions per week to remain and occupy the flat for the rest of the time rather than to go down to Thames-Ditton where the place is; this is part of the office complex.  
6.30 p.m.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Premises can cover a multitude of things. Premises can mean the home he lives in and the office. I do not see anything about offices here.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: From what are you quoting?

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: I am reading from Note 10: "In addition the High Commissioner has recently moved to larger premises....."

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: That is the High Commission; the unit itself. The people who work there have moved to larger premises.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, to err is human. You bought a place thinking it was the best; you told us it was reasonably cheap. If the High Commissioner does not want to live there and he wants to live in a flat, which is more convenient anyhow, and you are keeping Thames-Ditton for entertainment and so on, you should tell us straight and plain.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, it is not quite like that. It is not as if the High Commissioner has arbitrarily disliked the house, or has point-blank refused to live in it or anything like that. He occupies it. First of all, in the new office premises, there is a flat. We would like this flat to be occupied by an officer of the Mission, not the High Commissioner but by a subordinate officer, who would be in residence there and could perform - if you can call it perform - the duties of caretaker of the entire building. No junior officer has volunteered to take up the premises, so we allowed the High Commissioner to use it. I think I can safely say that if a junior officer offers to live in the premises, then the Ministry will tell the High Commissioner that he has to live per-

manently or altogether in his residence and commute to London. The only reason he is allowed to use the flat at the moment is that no junior officer has offered to use it. Those are the facts.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Has any junior officer or any other person been given an opportunity to use the flat?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes, we have asked.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Who have been asked? Give me the names of those who have been asked.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I do not know; I do not live there.

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

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I know a lot of people working there, and they have not been asked.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I have been told so.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Do not make the Committee believe that nobody else wants to occupy the flat, and that is why the High Commissioner has to live in it.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I was not making the Committee believe that. I was saying that it was the Government's intention that whenever.....

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. With reference to the offer made to a junior officer in the Commission, will the Leader of the House tell us on what basis the rent of the flat now used by the High Commissioner will be worked out?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I would take it that any junior officer would occupy it on the basis that if he is in the grade where free quarters are to be provided for him, he would occupy it on that basis. If he is at the grade at which he has to pay some portion of his salary towards rent, then some portion of his salary would be deducted.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the House said that an offer had been made to a junior officer. Am I correct in saying that an offer had been made?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Perhaps I put it badly, Mr. Chairman. I should have said it is intended.....  
(Asides.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am sure the Reporter is finding it difficult to report correctly.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I should have said to the Committee that it is intended that the flat will be occupied by an officer of the Mission who will undertake the functions of caretaking over the whole building, but to date no one has shown any interest in occupying this flat. I added that, possibly, they did not want the responsibility of looking after the building.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, when that happy event occurs, and a junior officer decides to live in the flat and look after it, what is going to happen to the High Commissioner?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: We would instruct him to move.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: To move and go where?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: To spend the time at "Iverta" which he from time to time spends in the flat.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Two hon. members are on their feet.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, according to the leader of the House, when a junior officer moves into the flat, the High Commissioner will be instructed to go to Thames-Ditton. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: "Not to go; he is already there.") When the High Commissioner vacates this flat, it is the intention of the Government to rent a flat in London for him?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Obviously not. He is only there because there happens to be a flat there. Having provided him with an official residence, we have no obligation to find a second one for him.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: In that case the High Commissioner will be left to live at Thames-Ditton.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, then what is all of this argument that the Leader of the House puts forward about the house being 23 miles from London, and if the High Commissioner has to stay late in London he has to stay at the flat? What will happen to the High Commissioner on those occasions?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: In such a contingency, Thames-Ditton will still be 23 miles from the centre of London. Instead, perhaps, of using the flat, we may have to provide more overtime for the Chauffeur and more of one or two other things, but he would be living there.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: In short, the High Commissioner would then be forced to live at Thames-Ditton. Then there is absolutely no reason now why the Government cannot tell the High Commissioner: "You cannot use the flat; go and live at Thames-Ditton at the house we paid £35,000 for."

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: But the Government ought not to act by malice.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: That is not malice.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I think that hon. members on the opposite side feel they are on to a good point. I think they could get some, apparently, good arguments to support them. These are the facts.

There is an official residence and there is an office 23 miles away. The High Commissioner discovers that his engagements are such that on three of four nights a week it is more convenient to stay here than to go there, but his wife and children will be commuted. Sometimes they will be here and at other times they will be there, but there is an official residence.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I quite understand the explanation which the Leader of the House is trying to give. The Leader of the House made two statements. He said: "It is intended that an offer will be made to a junior officer..." but previously he said that no officer had shown a willingness to occupy the flat. I would like the Leader of the House to say when the Government is going to make an offer to a junior officer.

6.40 p.m.

What I can say now is that the Government is accommodating the High Commissioner by not making an offer in respect of this flat so that the High Commissioner has the facility of living at Thames-Ditton or living at the flat when he feels like. I would like to know when Government will make the offer to the junior officer and under what terms they are going to make the offer, and that will tell us how soon the High Commissioner will be asked to get out.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I could not truthfully answer this. What I could say about it is that the staff in the High Commission knows of the existence of the flat. They know that the High Commissioner is in it. The High Commissioner knows that it is not a High Commissioner's flat. It is not as if he is wilfully occupying it against orders or against his better judgment. (Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: How long has he been occupying it?) Probably three or four months. It is the Government's intention that that flat, since it is an office flat, should be occupied by a junior officer who, in addition to his other duties, by being on the premises at night, will be the man that in an emergency you will ring and say that something has happened to a Barbadian national, and how do we play it from here. My information is that to date no junior officer has shown any interest in it. (*Asides.*) For whatever the reason, it is still a fact that to date nobody has shown an interest.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Now that the High Commissioner is on vacation or otherwise on other business in New York, who is living in the flat? (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I would have to enquire about that.) Who is living in the house? The minute you say that the wife and children live in it, you have put it that the flat is the official residence. When you bought this house, you told us that it was a bargain. I understand from good authority that it was the summer home belonging to a man from Bermuda. I have a great liking for Dr. Ramsay because I know him as a youngster and I appreciate the dignity with which he moves around. I would like to accommodate him, but it must be at one house or the other. Dr. Ramsay does not want to live in that summer home, and he told you he was not going to live in it. Where is this flat? What district in London is it in? (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: It is at 6 Belgrave

Street.) I believe one of the junior clerks lived in Mayfair. This is a swell district, and if the High Commissioner wants to live there in the flat, then you should sell the house and admit that you make a mistake. You should be frank about it and say that you have a white elephant and you have to get rid of it. I would like to see Dr. Ramsay in the Mayfair flat. I lived in a cold country too, and this young man does not want to live in that monstrosity you have on the Thames. I wonder if Luckhoo got a commission for selling it. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I do not know.) I do not believe you know. You would not know the transaction, but it seems to me that from the praise that was given in this House when you were buying it, we had to agree that it was something good. This place is cold and Dr. Ramsay is not living in it and he told you so.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I have very strong views on this. People have various ideas about what comfort is, and no two people can agree objectively on what it would take them to feel comfortable in a house. I personally know that I could live in that house in winter and not complain about it, because I should know what to do with it.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Let me tell you one thing. I have been in the Opposition with you and you know that we used to do this. If you came for \$1,000 to pay chauffeurs overtime, you would have to tell us the rate of overtime. Nobody could get through in this house so. Suppose I asked you what rate you are paying him. When you are coming here for money, your Civil Servants should be armed with every iota because you must anticipate that the Opposition would ask you these questions. You are lucky that I am nearing the evening of my days. Years ago you know you would have to tell me how you are paying him. I believe the hon. senior member for St. James will ask you that. You made a mistake with the house. I know that they young man prefers the flat and I would prefer to let him have it. Do not tell us that a junior officer wants to have the flat. Let the Commissioner have the flat because it is much better and more convenient.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I would only like to say one final thing. The Leader of the House says that no junior officer shows his willingness to occupy the flat although he knows it is there; but it is quite simple. If the High Commissioner is now occupying the flat, there is no Civil Servant who is going to write the Government and say he wants to live in the House to the exclusion of the High Commissioner, because when the end of the year comes and his confidential report has got to be made up, it is the High Commissioner who is going to put on the last note at the bottom. So the Leader of the House knows full well that unless the Government tells the High Commissioner to use his official residence and put a notice in the office that the flat is available, nobody will show a willingness to occupy it, because no officer is going to try to offend the High Commissioner. That is as true as night follows day, and as long as the High Commissioner bounces out of it - because this is all he is doing according to the Leader of the House - as long as he puts his little bits and pieces in there,

every officer is going to keep quiet outwardly, but inwardly and in the little corners they are going to be saying that there is a flat that one of them could be using, but the High Commissioner uses it when he feels like and goes to Thames-Ditton when he feels like. It is reported that the High Commissioner took one look at the place and said he was not living in there, it was too cold.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the House has given us to understand that the High Commissioner has an official residence which he is not occupying. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I did not give you that understanding.) He visits it from time to time, but he is living at the flat. Is the High Commissioner charged rent for the flat he is occupying in view of the fact that he has an official residence?

Is he charged rent for the flat? If not, why not? The Leader of the House cannot deny this, they have their security men and since 14th December the High Commissioner and whosoever live in this Thames-Ditton house have been trying to evade the newspaper men because it has been announced by a member of the High Commissioner's household that the place is haunted, and the Government knows this.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I do not know it, I have slept in that house undisturbed and with a clear conscience.

Mr. HINDS: One of the reasons why the High Commissioner would not occupy this house is because the house is supposed to be haunted. Newspaper men have been trying their best to get a picture of the High Commissioner and his lady emerging from this haunted house.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: This is nonsense, nobody believes that kind of nonsense nowadays. The hon. member does not believe in haunted houses, I cannot believe that.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, what I believe is that the High Commissioner and others who are expected to live in the house believe that the house is haunted. Mr. Chairman, at Culloden Farm, our official residence for the Prime Minister, the police have been summoned already because it was reported to them that the Prime Minister had seen people going through the keyhole; it is in the police diary, so if the High Commissioner in Britain - I am not saying it is the High Commissioner himself who is saying this house is haunted, but it is his wife more so who says she will not live there, it is a fact. What we want to address our minds to is this one fact, that here is a case where Government is content to take £35,000 - I have heard the Leader of the House lay considerable emphasis on what is comfort and what it takes to provide comfort for this as against the other. Mr. Chairman, all the poor people in St. Peter, St. Andrew, St. Lucy - his own constituency - are crying out for housing schemes, for roads and other necessary services, and what we are saying is this, that £35,000 being spent to provide so much comfort for one man and the man cares nothing about it, and you provide an office now that this man can live there.

In other words, if we hear from Government that the High Commissioner is not being charged a rent for his occupation of the flat, it means that the Government is providing two official residences for the High Commissioner in the United Kingdom, and all of this in the face of the hardship, suffering and the wants of the poor people that we have got to come in contact with daily. It is not a very easy thing, Mr. Chairman, for us in Opposition to adopt an attitude in a matter such as this like that of the Government; one must remember when it was put to us that there were so many advantages to be gained, I remember the Prime Minister coming into the House himself and telling us of the advantages to be gained from buying this house and we all, although with some reluctance I must say, tried to accommodate him by believing him, but, Sir, in so short a space of time we have been able to see that if the advantages and the good things which we were told then were there, it is about time we ask who has stolen somebody's jar, because from what one can gather the Leader of the House says he could go there and would live there throughout the year. We have been told that the former owner of the house kept a home in Bermuda or elsewhere.

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

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

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

7.00 p.m.

#### SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for an hour.

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

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

*On resumption*

Mr. SPEAKER: When the sitting was suspended the House was in Committee, and to that it will now revert.

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

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

#### SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1970-71 No. 16

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, there is something about this Resolution which must make hon. members pause and think. With reference to Overtime - \$1,110 - the Note to this item says:

"The full expenses on overtime for the post of chauffeur now fall to be met by Barbados."

We would like to hear from the Leader of the House if the question of overtime has not really arisen through the High Commissioner and his family living at this flat, which is supposed to be 23 miles away, according to the Leader of the House, from the official residence. In other words, the chauffeur we feel, and from what the Leader of the House has said, must be at the official residence. Nothing has been said up to now that there is any accommodation at the flat for the chauffeur.

The Leader of the House must know that the High Commissioner was on the verge of dismissing the chauffeur because the chauffeur could not find it possible to be at the High Commissioner's call after having to travel that distance. I am asking the Leader of the House if this is not responsible for bringing up the question of overtime. The question of the High Commissioner's children being taken to school has been discussed, and the Government ought to know about it. The chauffeur could not find it possible to be on duty at certain hours when the High Commissioner requested him to be on duty after the High Commissioner took up residence at this flat, and that is exactly what has raised the question of overtime that is now being asked for the chauffeur. 8.05 p.m.

It would be better under the circumstances for the Leader of the House to say he does not know, if he does not know, but he should not say it is not so. Now, Sir, we come to this further point. Is the Leader of the House telling us that the new offices and the flat are in one and the same building? (*Asides.*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. member still addressing the Chair?

Mr. HINDS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Apparently the Leader of the House is trying to be briefed on the point.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I can assist the Hon. Leader of the House on this because the flat in which the Hon. High Commissioner is living is not attached to and has nothing to do with the High Commission. The High Commissioner lives in a flat for which he is paying £32 a week, and I would like to know who is paying that money. It is a mews flat in Belgravia.

Mr. HINDS: The Leader of the House is now faced with an entirely different situation. It is a picture entirely different from what he trotted out to us earlier. What is the rental of the offices which the High Commissioner is occupying? Is it £32 a week which we have just heard from the hon. junior member for Bridgetown? The Leader of the House caused this Committee to believe that the flat which the High Commissioner is now occupying is part and parcel of the new offices that the Commission has moved into, and that a junior officer would be expected to occupy the flat when the High Commissioner is not living there, and so take care of the offices as if

one was above and one below. Our information is that the one is not attached to the other at all, and that the High Commissioner is now renting somewhere at £32 per week. I particularly asked the Leader of the House if the High Commissioner was charged rental for the flat he is occupying and if the taxpayers of Barbados were being asked to pay for this in view of the fact that the High Commissioner is provided with an official residence. I think in fairness to us, the Leader of the House ought to be in a position at this stage to give us a reply to these questions before we go any further. I want to urge upon the Leader of the House that if these replies are not forthcoming he should not expect us on this side to vote for this Resolution.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I cannot control how the hon. member will vote nor do I wish to. The point is that there seems to be public business which is in some respects a secret from some members of this House but to be known to others. I have no interest in hiding anything from the hon. member. If you ask me a question on the basis of information I received, I answer it. I have no status in trying to deceive the House or the Committee.

Mr. HINDS: We accept it that the Leader of the House has no reason for trying to deceive the House. Let the Leader of the House come out now and answer the questions we have asked with respect to the rent that the High Commissioner is paying, and in respect to the position that the flat occupies to the new offices. These are very pertinent points which we would like to hear the Leader of the House on at this stage.

Mr. Chairman, the note on this overtime is misleading. It is not really and truly because Barbados was not paying its full share previously or because Guyana has set up new offices. I am putting it to the Leader of the House that it is exactly as I have stated. One can only say that the High Commissioner is proving himself to be an item too costly for the poor taxpayers of this country. We have got to look around ourselves, Mr. Chairman, and see where we are lacking before we launch out on providing this type of double comfort for a High Commissioner at the expense of the poor taxpayers. There are no two ways about it. The Leader of the House has told us that he was at this house some time in June and believes he would stay there all the year round. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the services provided for the Leader of the House at that time were not the same type of services that are now available to the High Commissioner, and that might be one of the reasons why he has had to run from this House. I may just come to the point where Mr. Sidney Alleyne was very much around and about the official residence officiating in the month of June when the Leader of the House was there.

8.15 p.m.

The Leader of the House tells us that this gentleman, Mr. Sydney Alleyne, was around the official residence on two occasions; those are the two occasions that he met the Leader of the House, there

might be other occasions that he did not meet the Leader, but nevertheless he has been making his services available to the High Commissioner and we are to wonder if he is being paid for his services to the High Commissioner. He supervised some of the meals that were served during the month of June. I would like to hear an explanation from the Leader of the House on Note No. 9. "the full expenses on overtime for the post of chauffeur now fall to be met by Barbados. The sum of \$1,100 is required to supplement this item." I would like to hear from the Leader of the House exactly what this means.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: My information is that the new flat is the flat purchased on a parcel of the new premises, situated on the same block but the entrance is on a different street. I myself am not familiar with this building so I cannot tell the hon. member any more. I am told now that it is situated on the same block but the entrance is on a different street; there is no question of rental, but this is part and parcel of the property now owned by the Government of Barbados.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: The flat in which the High Commissioner lives is the new flat which has been purchased; will the Minister admit that from his knowledge of flats in London new flats are very expensive? I do not quite understand this Item 25 and, like the junior member for St. Peter, I have some difficulty in understanding it, because this is not the personal emolument paid to the Chauffeur, but this money is being paid as overtime. What I would like to find out from the Leader of the House is whether the overtime voted was paid for overtime for the Chauffeur, this \$2,000, and I would like to find out, bearing in mind the figure that is being paid, \$2,000 plus \$1,100, what is the actual salary of the Chauffeur permanently and what is the rate of overtime, because as I understand that, if the entire amount of overtime is paid to him, then it means he receives \$250 or £50 a month in overtime alone. This would seem to me to be money paid surely for overtime, and I would like to find out the rate at which this overtime is being paid.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: As at the 31st December, 1970 the amount of \$583.44 had been expended under this Item and \$1,683.24 was already committed.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: On a point of order, would the Minister please explain to me what he means by committed?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Any vote of let us say \$100,000 for doing certain things, according as the expenditure has gone under that, what is already spent and what is needed for items already ordered but not yet received and therefore not yet paid for but due.

8.25 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, is the Minister saying that, although the money has been voted, they are withholding money from the chauffeur for overtime?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I did not say that; the hon. member did not allow me to finish, and he interrupted me at a point. Mr. Chairman, the performance of the duties of the High Commissioner on a full-time basis has at the same time meant an increase in the working hours of the chauffeur and expenditure on overtime wages. Such expenditure now averages approximately \$480 per month. That is 160 hours overtime per month, and it has created the need for supplementary expenditure of \$1,100 to cover the period 1st January to 31st March.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I did not hear the first part.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I was saying that the performance of the duties of the High Commissioner on a full-time basis - I am talking about our own High Commissioner since the change over from Sir Lionel Luckhoo - has at the same time meant an increase in the working hours of the chauffeur and expenditure on overtime wages. Such expenditure now averages approximately \$480 per month. That is 160 hours overtime per month, and it has created the need for supplementary expenditure of \$1,100 to cover the period 1st January to 31st March. Of course, it would not only be the chauffeur, but it would include the clerical staff who stay after working hours: the people in the Passport Division, and so on.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, that information is misleading, because Note 9 says:

"The full expenses on overtime for the post of chauffeur now fall to be met by Barbados."

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: There are two chauffeurs.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Does the Leader of the House know that there has been some trade union difficulty encountered with this chauffeur on the question of wages?

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

Mr. HINDS: Who was the chauffeur responsible for the trade union intervention and the question of overtime?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: There are two of them, and I do not know which one you are talking about.

Mr. HINDS: I am speaking about the one who brought in the trade union to act on his behalf. The Note speaks of only one chauffeur.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: There is one who works with the Mission, and another one who works with the High Commissioner.

Mr. HINDS: The Note does not say chauffeurs.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: There is nothing wrong with that.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, are we to understand that this amount is asked for to pay two chauffeurs overtime? If that is the case, then how much will be paid to each of them?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman the Overtime Vote can be paid to any member of the Mission who performs lawful functions after working hours, including chauffeurs. I would have thought that would be obvious.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, if these documents means anything and are supposed to convey truthful evidence to this Chamber, I would believe that the Explanatory Note is a factual record of what we are supposed to deal with. If the Note says:

"The full expenses on overtime for the post of chauffeur now fall to be met by Barbados."

Then I cannot see how the Hon. Minister can tell us that this overtime can be paid to anybody else. I have asked a question nearly two hours ago about overtime for the chauffeur, and it has not yet been answered. I have certain information concerning this chauffeur and how this overtime came about. I am now being told that the Note does not mean chauffeur but everybody. It seems that if one of the members on the other side go up there and work after working hours he could be paid out of this overtime. The Note says chauffeur, and I want to know what is correct.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, we are supplementing Head 25 in the Estimates. There is for overtime \$2,000. Now, it was drawn to my attention and I am sorry I did not notice it even when we were doing the Estimates, that there is no Explanatory Note for this item and the Committee ought certainly to have had one. There is no reason why you should not have had one. But if you see an item Overtime inserted under a Head, this is money which can be paid to any officer in the Department lawfully discharging duties after working hours.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, am I to believe, as the most recent member of this Chamber, that we must disregard a Note when it appears next to any item in these documents? Throughout this sitting we have been working on the Notes which were attached to a particular item. Are we now to disregard the Notes attached to these items? If you are saying that under the Note anybody performing lawful duties after normal working hours must be paid, then it means that Note 9 is erroneous. I have often heard that a document which tells lies on itself is a fraudulent document. If your statement is correct, then something is wrong. Either the Note, the document, or somebody is wrong. I would certainly like to know what to believe. I am sure there are very many Resolutions here with Notes attached to them, and I want to know what I can believe.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member is entitled to believe that it is the general Overtime Vote that is being supplemented, but

that in recent months or weeks the chauffeur of the High Commissioner has worked more hours than he would be normally called upon now that we have our own High Commissioner and, therefore, the reason for supplementing the vote is due to the fact that a large amount of overtime money is due to him.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I should like to know from the Minister how much of this money is due to the chauffeur, and how much is due to the other lawful employees in the Mission.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I cannot tell you that. I can tell you that up to the point at which we still shared expenses with Guyana our budgeting was based on the shared expense. As I see it, what we did not take into account when we were making up these Estimates was the fact that we would, sometime during this financial year, have had our own High Commissioner using his own chauffeur and paying the full expense for it, therefore, the provision put here would not have accommodated overtime for him and for the staff of the High Commissioner.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister would just look back at his own figures, he would see that this statement cannot be true. He said that \$583.44 was paid to the chauffeur; there was \$1,628.24 committed, which means owed to the chauffeur or chauffeurs, and the original vote was \$2,000. That is \$221.68 over the original vote.  
8.35 p.m.

The Minister is now saying that part of this money will be paid to chauffeurs, and the other part to other employees for overtime work. Obviously \$221 have gone already to the chauffeurs. I want to know how much more of the vote according to the note is due and owing or will be paid to the chauffeurs and to whom will be paid the remainder.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I believe I did say to one hon. member that the overtime provision covers not only the overtime work of the chauffeurs, but would cover the overtime work of the clerical staff and the people who do welfare work if they work after hours, it would cover the overtime work of the people, for instance, in the months of October and November who work extraordinarily long hours getting passports ready for Barbadians who may wish to come home or travel out of the country and things like that. The overtime vote can be paid to anybody who is lawfully engaged after normal working hours.

Mr. BOLDEN: Would the Minister admit that the note is incorrect or misleading? The note does not tell us about people who work on passports for people to come home in December. It does not tell us about Social Welfare Officers because I am sure that if I began to talk about Social Welfare Officers and how they are doing their work at the High Commission, you would tell me I am outside what we are dealing with. I am dealing with overtime for chauffeurs; so if I am being told that this mean Clerks, Social Welfare Officers, and Passport Division Officers, then

I am entitled to talk on each, and I have been told that I cannot talk on each. The note is therefore misleading.

Mr. HINDS: What may be said, Mr. Chairman, is that if the Minister thinks he knows that Clerks and Welfare Officers and the like are involved in this overtime, he should have at his fingertips their rates of overtime pay so that we can determine how it is that you are asking for so little money. You voted \$2,000 and you are asking for \$1,100 more and this money is to pay to chauffeurs, Clerks, Welfare Officers and all those people who do overtime work from some time in June until the end of the financial year. How could it be possible that \$3,100 could pay all this overtime when the Minister tells us that \$1,638.24 are already committed?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The hon. member may wish to try to confuse me, but he would not succeed. I said that of the \$2,000 the sum of \$500 odd was spend and \$1,600 committed. This would give you \$2,168.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, committed to doing what?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: To pay overtime.

Mr. HINDS: To whom?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: To all the persons who are entitled to have it.

Mr. HINDS: We admit you are paying overtime to the chauffeurs. How many clerks are you paying? How many Welfare Officers are you paying? Or how many other officers are you paying overtime? (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: It can be anybody who works.) Mr. Chairman, what are the chauffeurs paid per week or per month? What is his basic pay, and is it not true that there is some Trade Union intervention that has caused all this overtime money to be looked for now? Why doesn't the Minister come straight to the point?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Sir, under Item 69 - Travelling Expenses - note 11 says that there has been an increase in the incidence of providing transport of visiting delegations. The sum of \$2,016 is accordingly required to supplement this Item. Could the Minister elaborate on this and explain exactly what is used for?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I think the hon. member knows that quite frequently delegations from Barbados either go to London or pass through the United Kingdom in transit to conferences and other places. In case the hon. member gets it in his head that this means Ministers, I say "yes" but more frequently public officers and other persons. All these people have to be met, they have to be taken care of by the Mission, they have to be taken from one airport and put on trains or taken to seaports or whatever it is for their onward journeys, and this has caused an in-

crease in the number of trips which officers from the Mission have to make to the airport or seaport as the case may be, to extend the necessary courtesies and the necessary assistance. In addition to this there has been increased activity in welfare work among Barbadians nationals.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: On a point of order, is the Minister really admitting that this note does not say anything about that?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: We have long become accustomed on both sides of the House to be quarrelling about explanatory notes. Explanatory notes are done by public officers. It is true that on one occasions when we ourselves look at them, we know as politicians and Parliamentarians that it would not satisfy the House, but sometimes they escape us and consequently when we come into the House and you complain about the note because it is at variance with the explanations, we give you, you think we are trying to fool you. What we say is not contrary to the note, but in extension of it.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: The Minister has not done more than tell me what is in the note. I want to know how the sum.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what has the hon. member risen?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I would like the Minister to give me a breakdown of \$2,016.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The hon. member would have to continue talking while I get that information for him.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I do not quite understand this. You come in here, you have bad notes which bear no relationship whatsoever to the item to be discussed, they mean nothing when you read them, and whenever you ask the Minister for an explanation, he has to go and ask somebody.  
8.45 p.m.

This is really wasting time, because obviously all that has happened here is that the Prime Minister who is responsible for the Ministry of External Affairs should be in here doing his work instead of gallivanting all over the place wasting taxpayers' money. I would really like to know who paid for his trip to Tokyo.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I should be grateful if the hon. member would stick to the subject matter under discussion.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could give us at this stage the wage of this Chauffeur we have been asking for.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I am informed, Mr. Chairman, that the wages are £22 per week.

Mr. HINDS: There are two chauffeurs, are they paid £22 per week each?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is no point of order.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is insisting that there are two Chauffeurs and he tells us one is paid £22 per week.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The same way I am waiting the answer in respect of one I am awaiting the answer in respect of the other. I now have it, he is paid the same £22 per week. The High Commissioner in his submission with respect to the overtime for his personal Chauffeur says: "My personal Chauffeur earns overtime at approximately the rate of 35 extra hours per week because of numerous engagements which I have to undertake. It therefore means that for the five remaining months of the financial year, November 1970 to March 1971 inclusive, he can conceivably earn £400 in overtime. The Clerical Officers of the Passport Section will also be required to work overtime with the issue of passports in connection with chartered flights, and £100 is estimated for this purpose".

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister or whoever is in charge has seriously looked at this note, because for the High Commissioner to say his personal chauffeur will do approximately 35 hours a week doing overtime it means that that man cannot do a day's work. In England you cannot work more than 42 hours a week; how will he do 35 hours of work overtime plus 42? This cannot be correct. I say now the High Commissioner has been bamboozling the Barbados Government and somebody is drawing money they are not entitled to, because I cannot see how that man week after week can do 77 hours per week.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If the hon. member would give way, I am not contesting his argument on that particular point, but would not 24 hours at time and a half be equal to 36?

Mr. BOLDEN: 24 hours even at time and a half makes that man do more work than he possibly can. There are certain regulations attaching to Chauffeurs or anybody driving in London, the Ministry has regulated how many hours any man can work in any one week. If the Minister wants to find out I can leave now and go to my office and bring back the law books now.

Mr. SPRINGER: Sir, on a point of order, I would agree with the hon. member on a point of law, but if a man works on a Sunday automatically it is double time, and if he works whole day on a Saturday one half is done on overtime and that is time and a half.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I am not a Government backbencher, but they ought not to be making fun of the Minister like this. Would anybody expect us to be such novices not to know what the hon. member is saying?

Mr. SPRINGER: On a point of order, I am not talking about working during normal working hours, any time a worker works on a Sunday, under T.U.C. regulations it is double time.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, it is a pity that the High Commissioner does not know all that has been said in this House, because the High Commissioner himself has said that this man is going to work 35 hours per week, and he means 35 working hours. Whenever the High Commissioner talks about 35 hours must you cut it in half? The High Commissioner is a lawyer. It is evident now, Mr. Chairman, that the High Commissioner should be called upon to offer some better explanation to the Government about this overtime money, it is the money of the taxpayers of this country which we can ill afford. We have seen enough here to tell us, even from what the High Commissioner himself is saying, that somebody is being deprived of a job because enough money is certainly knocking about there as would pay another person £22 a week.  
8.55 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, what is the date of the Note from the High Commissioner?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: November 16, 1970.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, if we take that answer to be correct, and we look at the vote for \$1,000, which I calculate to be in the vicinity of £200, and the High Commissioner's Note says that his personal chauffeur will work for £100 a month in overtime, it can be calculated quite easily that you have not covered the amount of money to the end of the financial year. In January, February and March for his personal chauffeur's overtime alone you will be £71 short, and if you go back to November and December you will be £200 added to that short. The truth is not mentioned here. Let them tell you what has happened with the chauffeur and the trade union. We are not getting the true facts, because if you work out the amount at £100 a month from November to March you will not be able to cover it by the \$1,100 you are asking for today.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister state when was the last time the accountants in London were audited? With regard to the External Affairs Accounts, my information is that the Auditors are having great difficulty in having them audited. I appreciate your difficulty.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The hon. member will be vouchsafed a reply on that before the debate on the Head is closed. May I just answer the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. If this debate has done any good, it has shown one inescapable fact that in Barbados you cannot get money out of the Treasury unless you come here for it. No matter who they are or where they are, they have to run this particular gauntlet. Now, I happen to know from a cursory glance from time to time at the External Affairs appropriation that each Embassy or High

Commission has savings under other Heads, but they have no authority to take the savings under one item and spend it on another; therefore, whenever a particular item has to be supplemented they have to make submissions, and we have to come here to have the money voted.

Now, it happens in this case that the Explanatory Note - and I must take some blame for this because I approved the Draft Addendum to the Resolution, but I have so many things to do that I cannot always put the fine tooth comb through everything, and I approved it in the form in which it came here. Since the debate has gone on, I see that it is woefully inadequate. I have to admit this, because I myself, if I were on the other side, or if I had to fall back on my parliamentary experience in the Opposition, would probably have been worse in attacking the Government. At sometimes when hon. members on the other side think they are giving us trouble here, I smile at them, because I know what I was capable of in my day on the other side. I do not blame hon. members for this, because they have a right to ask questions.

I should like the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to remember that although he may think that the explanations based on the Notes are unsatisfactory, in truth and in fact when we tell you the facts we are asking you to believe us. You may not think that some of our explanations are satisfactory to you and you have a right to probe, but there is nothing underhand or wrong in any of this. I myself think that in some cases the people in our Overseas Offices do not make their submissions for money as clear or as promptly as they should and, consequently, when they make a submission for money in November you have to deal with it in January. The hon. junior member for St. Peter asked when was this request made, so you are bound to calculate that in two months' time the situation is bound to be worse than when the submission was made. All I can say to that is if they have miscalculated and they then discover that they want more money under this Head, they will have to ask for it again, and I or some other Minister will have the trouble of explaining to you why it has been so and why they did not present a proper case when we first came before you.  
(Asides.)

Mr. Chairman, all I can tell the hon. member is that the Auditor General pays periodic visits to Overseas Missions to have a look at them; to examine their procedures and see whether they are doing what they should. I believe that he will go soon again during this financial year or, perhaps, during the next one.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: When last has he visited the U.N.?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I think the Auditor General visited the United Nations and the Mission in Washington last year.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Has he ever been to London?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes, on his way from Tokyo. They all travel that way. On his way from Tokyo he stopped in to visit the London Mission. This should be a yearly exercise, and that is all I can say.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, Item 11 states:

"There has been an increase in the incidence of providing transport for visiting delegations."

Is that to or from Barbados?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: From Barbados to London, from Barbados through London to other places, and from other places through London coming back to Barbados.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister in a position to say whether the Delegation that went from Singapore to Japan will be involved in this? I know that the Prime Minister was personally invited, and I am not questioning him.  
9.05 p.m.

I know the Prime Minister was personally invited to these places. What about these other people who went to Japan? We were told about the Singapore business.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: None of the expenses for these visits are chargeable to this. Let me explain. All expenditure for the Commonwealth Prime Ministers Conference or visits paid by the Prime Minister to foreign countries would come under the External Affairs vote which is for Special Missions. I cannot remember what item it is. The expenses for the visit to Malaysia, Singapore and Japan would be met out of the External Affairs vote. I think the Item may be 61 - Special Missions.

Mr. St. JOHN: The Item is 61 - Overseas Representation - and the note reads: "Provision includes cost of passages and other expenses of officers and families, resettlement of officers transferred to and from Barbados, Conferences, Special Missions, Protocol, and other expenses in connection with the external relations of Barbados".

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The hon. member is quite right. It is form that vote that expenses for that kind of journey would be paid. Would that answer the hon. member's specific question?

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: The term "visiting delegations" is not clear to me.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: For instance, let us say there is a seminar on Adult Education in Denmark. The Chief Education Officer or some competent authority in the Ministry of Education goes to it. He passes through London. He might not be moving on

immediately; so they have to drive to get him, take him to London and bring him back and do the same thing for him when he is coming back. It may be a Minister. (Mr. St. JOHN: Not a member of the Opposition though.) I hope it should be. I do not know if I have answered the hon. member.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: You have answered in a way.

*The question that Head 25 - Ministry of External Affairs - stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

*On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Resolution for the sum of \$104,203 was passed.*

*Head 36 - Waterworks - was called.*

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move the Head 36 - Waterworks - stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.  
9.15 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Head 36 stand part.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, as far as I know when the Committee met last time Head 10 was being considered, and as far as I understand it was not passed. I would like a ruling from the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will give that ruling later, but in the meantime we will continue on any other Head.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Can we go on to discuss another Head without postponing discussion on this Head? As I understand it, the only way you can go on to another Head is if you postpone further consideration on this Head.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to move that Head 10 be temporarily postponed.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would prefer to have this verified by the Reporter's notes because I am sure the question was put and Head 10 was passed.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: I would just like to say this, if there is any record of it the Clerk-at-the-table should know, but the Government has just moved that further consideration be postponed, and my recollection is that it has not been passed.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, the Government moved a Resolution and is now moving that further consideration be postponed; if that is the Government's attitude, what is the delay?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If the hon. member would give way, this is only because the Chairman recol-

lects that the Head was passed; this can only be subject to verification and we would have to find the records to do this. I myself am in some doubt; I had moved the postponement of the whole Resolution at one stage, but it was while we were discussing Head 10 that the troubles arose. What I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that the incident occurred at a point when the hon. member over there felt aggrieved because he thought Your Honour had put the question while he was on his feet, therefore we just have to verify whether in fact Your Honour had put the question or not, so that it would seem to me that a temporary postponement would be in order.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in view of the difficulty we are moving that further consideration of this be temporarily postponed.

*The question that Head 10 be temporarily postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

Head 35 - MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS AND WORKS was called.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 35 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.  
9.25 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I am sure, in view of the fact that there has been skipping and jumping here and there, that hon. members should be permitted to catch up with their notes. Now, the repairs to bridges which were damaged during the October floods have been causing some concern in St. Andrew of all places; in St. Joseph and in St. Michael. Let us direct our attention to the St. Andrew situation. I understand that there has been a suspension of the Rocklyn bus service to the extent that the buses have to leave St. Andrew at a much earlier hour than they used to formerly and return at a later hour. The midday service has been suspended so as to permit work to be carried out on these bridges, but the aggravating situation comes about when the number of persons employed on these bridges does not exceed more than 8 persons and half of those persons can be seen doing actual work. It is a situation which to my mind, calls for not the kind of casual approach which has so far been given to a project such as this. The Government ought to have applied all of the resources at its command to bring, particularly, the St. Andrew bridges back into operation.

Now, the damage to Dr. Smith's Bridge, that is the Bridge near the St. Andrew's Church, has caused vehicular traffic to make a detour. One has to appreciate the position with the Rocklyn buses, because the journey is undoubtedly made longer now; it is more hazardous, but the fare remains the same. Nobody would like to know that whilst the Bridge is being repaired the bus fare is raised. There is a time when everybody has to make some sort of sacrifice. We are saying that Government has to make some sort of strenuous effort to tackle this problem. The Government has not tackled the problem as one would have expected it to have done, and

the few workmen who have been assigned to the re-construction programme are not measuring up to expectations in every respect. We would like to see something done to expedite matters and bring things back to normal.

Mr. Chairman, the crop season has already started, and it creates a further problem in the re-building of these bridges. It also creates a problem for the vehicular traffic and the peasants, who must try as early as possible to have their canes transported to factories now much further away than in the past. It is something that has to be considered. One must realise that the Note to Item 34 is telling us today, and I am wondering if the Minister will still tell us about drawings being prepared for Dr. Smith's Bridge in St. Andrew. The workmen have gone there and, instead of having stones and mortar, they have carried more plans and have stretched them out on the roadway blocking traffic. That is nonsense, and we want to see some work done. It is our view that enough people have not been employed to get the Bridges back into operation as quickly as they ought to.

Mr. Chairman, since the 2nd October the damage to these Bridges occurred, and three months have gone by. We must appreciate the fact that this is not the type of occurrence for which we can have people to standby. It came on us unexpectedly but, nevertheless, when we look at the overall picture and see the human suffering that it has occasioned, we have to call upon the Government to wake up. It is not a matter where money was not available to the Government; it is not a matter where, to our knowledge, expertise was not available in the field of reconstruction. There was no shortage of material and, if so, we are certain that efforts could have been made to acquire any material that may have been in short supply at the time and put us back on our feet at a time such as this. As I have said, with the harvesting of the canes a greater difficulty must present itself to persons who might attempt to use the roads and the workmen actually engaged on these sites.

9.35 p.m.

I would certainly like to hear from the Minister exactly what progress has been made on these various bridges. At St. Michael there is the bridge at Cane-wood. We are just fortunate that since the flood we have not had any real heavy rains to cause a wash, and we could have put in some steady work in our re-construction programme. There has been a delay somewhere and the Minister undoubtedly ought to be in a position to tell us what could have occasioned all this.

Mr. St. JOHN: I notice that this is only for casual labour for flood damage on the bridges. We have a little bridge at Christ Church just above the fish market by Exnor which was terribly damaged in the flood, in that the drain that comes down from Oistin Hill tore away all the sand that was between the road and the sea, and there is a deep depression

left there which is full of stagnant water. It naturally used to drain into the sea, but what happened is that when this sand moved away, it formed a sort of pond and it cannot flow into the sea anymore. Perhaps it could be pumped out and some sand be placed in it because there is a large amount of sand below. Every morning you take a lot of sand out of the drains below and it is thrown back into the sea. Even if you pump out the water and replace the sand above, it would prevent the water from smelling.

Secondly the drain itself needs cleaning, and the whole situation has been interfered with because of the fact that they have now built a fuel terminal and some of the building material from the terminal in the back of Esso in Oistin is blocking that drain. It needs clearing again otherwise the next time it will move away the whole road. So I wish that some of this work can be done in that area because this is an area which was badly damaged in the flood, and I invite the Hon. Minister to pass through there at any time and have a look. It is just above the Police Station and the Salvation Army, and he cannot miss it.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I have spoken before about the condition of the bridges in St. Joseph. I would like to draw special attention to the bridge at Melvin's Hill. I know the Minister will agree with me when I say that this is about the only road which will accommodate vehicular traffic when sugar canes are being removed from Parks, Lower Parks and the surrounding areas. Part of the road has been broken away, and up to two weeks ago there were still a number of stands bolcking off part of the road. I would be happy if this road could at least be temporarily bridged, because as soon as the crop begins, it would present difficulties for lorries loaded with canes to get up that hill and to the factories on the other side of the hill. If there is any traffic coming down, I am sure there is going to be traffic congestion along that road. I hope that the Minister could at least send some casual labourers to fix that particular road.

There is also another instance which I would like to draw to the Minister's attention. In St. Elizabeth's Village I understand that they re-surfaced the road some time ago and have changed the position of a particular ridge on the road and as a result the river which passed under the road came out in a different position. After the flood it went right across some open land and now flows directly in front of a house in which there is an old lady and a child living. The house in my opinion is too old to be removed, and the back of it has been damaged by flood waters. I would be grateful if the Minister could send his team of experts or whatever he has at the Ministry of Communications and Works and see if it is possible to re-route the river into its original course rather than where it has been since the flood waters, because I am sure that if it continues to run there, the House may tumble down because it is right on the front door of the House and passes under the lady's house. If the Minister cares,

I could accompany him and show him where it used to run and where it is now running.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, I should like to answer the hon. junior member for St. Joseph first. He mentioned a river somewhere in St. Joseph which has changed its course and is at present running in front of some old lady's house. I would like some time with the hon. member and with the technical people from my department to visit and examine the damage mentioned and see what can be done.

With regard to the question raised by the hon. senior member for Christ Church, I would like to remind him that just two days ago in this Chamber he mentioned to me an area in Christ Church and I immediately sent on instructions to the department to have the water immediately pumped out of it and at least try and clear some of the sand. If it were possible for sea water to go into that area it would stop the water from becoming stagnant.

I would like to tell the hon. junior member for St. Peter that the Government cannot be guilty of any negligence with regard to the flood. Immediately after the flood action was taken, but the damage to some of these bridges required re-construction and new designing altogether. With some of the bridges it was not just a matter of water overflowing the sides of the bridges, but the bridges themselves were damaged and the design would have to be changed completely. I will start first with Canewood Bridge. That had to be re-designed. I would like to assure the hon. member that I paid a few visits there since work was commenced, and Government has been paying great attention especially to some of those bridges on which we depend for the cane crop. Now that Warrens is no longer operating and canes from that area would have to go to Lower Estate, Canewood Bridge is very essential in moving canes to Lower Estate, and this Bridge will be opened to traffic during the last week of this month in time to take the canes out when Lower Estate is working.  
9.45 p.m.

This bridge will be opened to traffic during the last week of this month in time to take the canes out when Lower Estate is working, because not only are we reconstructing the bridge but we have to give it a reasonable amount of time after it is reconstructed to be cured before traffic can go on it, and I would like to assure you that Canewood Bridge will be opened in time. It has been redesigned completely, a new bridge being built altogether, and this will be opened to traffic in time for the crop.

Dr. Smith's Bridge. This is one of the bridges that will also have to be redesigned, but the damage was not on the sides of the bridge but the actual bridge itself was damaged. Some of the concrete piling that supports the bridge was damaged, and therefore this requires a completely new reconstruction altogether, and this is being looked after. This

bridge out of order will cause traffic to deviate about one to one and a half miles off the track; that is about the maximum, but it is not that they are not performing any repairs on this, temporary repairs are essential but it will have to be reconstructed.

Mr. St. JOHN: Is Dr. Smith's Bridge the one in St. Andrew? (Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Yes.) Is that the real name?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: This is the only name I have heard it called by.

Mr. St. JOHN: That bridge was there before Dr. Smith was there.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, the traffic that once used Dr. Smith's bridge would now have to deviate across Babylon Road, and as I have mentioned this would be about one to one and a half miles off the normal journey. They are considering the construction of a simple span bridge similar to the Duncan O'Neal Bridge to replace the Dr. Smith Bridge.

Dr. Thompson's Bridge. This bridge will be opened to vehicular traffic by the end of this week.

Coggins Bridge. Work is in progress on Coggins Bridge, and gabions and abutments are being constructed. It is expected that the road will be ready for use by the 15th March. With reference to Dark Hole, it is expected that the bridge will be opened within three weeks from now. There are other bridges at Conset Bay, Coach Hill and Glenburnie, St. John which have been recently completed and are now open to vehicular traffic.

With reference to the Salt Pond, the Ministry is giving consideration to the best means for draining the Salt Pond. A number of schemes have been discussed and it is expected that a decision on this matter will be taken by the end of March, 1971. As I mentioned in here, Mr. Chairman, just a few weeks ago since the flood, the entire drainage system in the Island is being watched and we expect soon to have it examined. We have asked for technical aid to examine the whole Island, all along the north and west coasts and the entire coast of the Island as far as the drainage system is concerned, as it is not a small matter. In a lot of instances the waterways to these bridges have been blocked up, and as the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has said, the rivers have changed their tracks completely and the more curves water takes the stronger they will run. Water on its normal straight course will run at a far slower speed than if it deviates and take curves, and we are considering an examination of the entire drainage problem all over the Island.

Mr. Chairman, as I have mentioned already, an application has been submitted to the United Kingdom Government for a term of drainage experts, first to carry out a comprehensive survey of the Island's drainage system, and priorities are to review the urban drainage system of Bridgetown and

to submit recommendations in relation to the main storm water drainage from the south western area which forms tributaries into the Constitution River and which is the main outlet into the sea. Deviation of this storm water drainage into the outlets other than the Constitution River should also be investigated. Secondly, the large outfall drain on the edge of the Harbour Industrial area connected to the pump house on Princess Alice Highway which receives storm water from the Emerton and other tributary drains. Thirdly, to investigate and make recommendations for the canalisation of all outfall drains from Speightstown in the west and along the south west and south coasts up to Oistins; also to design the sea heads to prevent or alleviate the blocking of these outfall drains with sand from the sea when rough, and with the tide during floods, the spring tide. Fourthly, to investigate the beach erosion around the coast of Barbados and to formulate proposals for the siting and design of groynes or sea walls to counteract this erosion; also to submit alternative proposals if it is considered that the above stated problem may be solved in different ways. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I think hon. members will see that the Government is not sitting down, this is a serious matter and we are giving it consideration in an overall plan.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I think I understand the Minister to say that Dr. Smith's Bridge in St. Andrew requires a span somewhat similar to the Charles Duncan O'Neal Bridge, but the Minister did not tell us when he expects that the Dr. Smith's Bridge will be opened.  
9.55 p.m.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, we are considering plans for the complete change of Dr. Smith's Bridge, and we hope to put down a span similar to the Dr. Duncan O'Neal's Bridge. As a matter of fact, that is one of the Bridges where you can use a roundabout road. We have been paying more attention to Cane Wood Bridge, because the Draughtsman is designing other Bridges. I cannot give a date when Dr. Smith's Bridge will be opened. That matter is left in the hands of the Designers to decide what type of Bridge should be put there.

*The question that Head 35 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

*Head 36 - Waterworks - was called.*

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 36 - Waterworks - stand part.

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

Mr. HOPPIN: Mr. Chairman, with reference to Overtime, Note 35 states: "..... it was necessary for the clerical staff of the Waterworks Department to work overtime in order to ensure that payment of arrears were made without delay...." I have heard many complaints about the Waterworks Department sending out bills to people who have paid their bills already, and that is causing some concern. I hope that they will get this matter straightened out quickly, because people have produced some of these bills to

me showing me where they have paid the amount and they still keep sending them the same bills. If money is being paid for overtime, then I hope that the clerks who are working overtime will do a better job than what I have had occasion to witness.

With reference to Head 36, Item 35 - Plumbing - \$89,542 - there are reports from most people that they are unable to get the water service. People in Sweet Vale, St. George, and many other places have bought lengths of pipe long ago and are still unable to get the water service. They have complained to me about this. When you go to the Waterworks Department and ask about these things, you are told that it is a question of not having Plumbers. Are we so short of Plumbers that people cannot get their pipes connected? I hope that Plumbers will be made available to help these people, because everybody is trying to get water in his home. The people are trying to get away from going to the standpipe. Some people have paid their money three or four months ago and still cannot get the water service. I hope that there will be some improvement in this matter, and that an effort will be made to assist these people.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to see that the clerical staff is working overtime at the Waterworks Department. What I am worried about is the whole financial arrangement operating in that Department. It is known that bills have not been sent out of the Department for some 2 1/2 years, and now the bills are going out there are instances where people are asked to pay as much as \$860. I know of a gentleman who went to the Department and said: "First of all, I dispute the amount, because I have average amounts which I can use. How do you expect me to pay \$860 in 21 days?" Notes have been sent out on bills from the Waterworks Department requesting payment within 21 days or the service will be cut off. (*Asides.*) An hon. member refers to the Telephone Company, but they send out bills every month. I refer to bills which are sent out two years late.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that there is some directive that only the Minister responsible can make arrangements for periodical payments. If the Waterworks Department fell down in not sending out its bills for two years, I would hope that whoever is responsible will look into the matter now and make provision for these bills to be paid over a period of time and not within the 21 days mentioned.

Now, during November, 1970 - I think all members know what happened in November, 1970. (*Asides.*) I refer to the by-election in St. Joseph -- the Waterworks Department laid watermains in Blackmans and told the people to run their lines three inches off the main and they would be connected the first week in December, but up to now no connections have been made. I have asked questions about the matter, and I have been told that connections cannot be made until the estimates have gone out and the money paid. No estimates have

been sent out, and when I asked why the estimates have not been sent out, I am told that they cannot get Plumbers to do the job. The people will now have to wait. I do not believe in these political gimmicks.

The hon. junior member for St. George says that he knows another place where the people have watermains. If they knew that they were not going to connect the pipes, why did they go in Blackmans and fool the people that they would have given them water by December?

Mr. Chairman, I have already asked the Leader of the House if I am to believe the Notes which accompany these Items. Note 36 says:

"The provision of \$500,000 under this Item has proved inadequate to meet expenditure to the end of the financial year, due to the increase in the number of mains laid for private developments, new services and repairs."

Now, everybody knows to whom the new developments belong. The hon. Minister of Labour is always talking about when the white people were running the country. I would like the people at the Waterworks Department to know that they should leave off some of the new developments and make connections in places like Blackman's Tenantry and the place the hon. junior member for St. George spoke about.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is going wrong, and I have to put him right. The making of a service connection is something completely different from laying mains in new developments.  
10.05 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, I said to the hon. member that making a survey connection is a completely different thing from making a development connection. When you are laying pipes for private developers, you lay anything from a 3-inch to a 6-inch pipe, but when you are making a service connection, it is a matter of half an inch pipe. I am not speaking for the Minister, but I want to correct the hon. member. Whenever there is a strike in these big countries, it affects us down here. The problem is that there was a storage of both lead and the material for making the connection, and as the Waterworks Act stands, they are not supposed to take money from a client unless they are sure they can connect that person's water within three months unlike when the Barbados Labour Party was in power and you had to go and beg Gladstone Hope to make a connection. We did not have the law books then because I would have prosecuted him or the Waterworks. Maybe the hon. junior member for St. Joseph did not have to go to the pipe like I did as a boy, and when we were trying to get in a pipe, you had to go and beg to get it installed. Years would pass with the pipe laying in the ground before you could get a connection; so the hon. member should not accuse the Waterworks, the Minister or anybody, because this was no political stunt anybody was playing. There was a

strike in England and the Waterworks ran short of lead although the request for lead was submitted six months before.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister said he always likes to defend his side, but I can carry him and show him one particular development which has been marked off in eight and nine thousand square feet areas, and at every junction, they have tapped off the main and put in stop cocks waiting for the houses to go up.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order, I am not denying that. The hon. member is missing the point. A stop cock goes in with a ferrel, but to make a connection you must have lead to make the ball joint. That has nothing to do with the stop cock. You tap the pipe and thread it at the same time and you put the stop cock end until you are ready to make the connection. In making a house connection, you have to use lead. This is a bit technical, but if the hon. member is willing to learn and he comes over here, I will teach him.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, this is not so technical, but I would like the Minister to go down to Sunset Crest and see if these houses are going up and people are living in them without water. If he wants to answer that, let him tell me if they are not making connection at Sunset Crest every day. That is a new development, but because Blackmans is not like Sunset Crest, you are telling me that you cannot make connections in Blackmans. There is a new house going up in Sunset Crest every day, water is put in and people are living in them; so do not tell me that you have run out of lead to make connections. I would like to see connections made in Blackmans, and if the Minister says that the Waterworks cannot take people's money unless they are sure that they can make connections in three months, why did they tell the people that they would get connections in December? It was a false promise.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order, I really do not want to get into any argument with the hon. member, but he must not make these irresponsible statements about false promises. When he talks about false promises, does he forget what Grantley Adams as Leader of the Barbados Labour Party told people about the molasses? He said that molasses would be shipped in bulk over his dead body, and immediately after the people were digging the pipe drains. I am not speaking on the Minister's behalf, but I cannot allow the hon. member to get away with this kind of murder he is trying to get away with. I am telling the hon. member in all justification that I have investigated this matter because I have friends who cannot get water too. He should not think that he is the only person with friends. The people thought they were doing a good and put down a pipe. What is the use of putting down a big 6-inch main and then you do not get back any money out of it. The 6-inch main put down in Blackmans cost the Waterworks at least \$10,000; so you will put down a pipe costing \$10,000 and get back nothing for doing so. Do you think anybody

could be that much spiteful? I will tell the hon. member that when it comes down to spite, he must look and see who is working at these places. Do not let us become personal and start attacking people. All you are doing is giving yourself a cuff in the face. Nothing dishonest went on at the Waterworks. The Chief Engineer and the powers that be decided they were not going to take people's money until they were sure they could make these connections, and in the case of Blackmans the order had been made for over six months. The hon. member knows that there was a big strike in England the other day; and whenever there is a strike in England or in the United States, the small people have to pay for it. It was not that anybody was trying to be spiteful; so the hon. member must not say this. Should we be spiteful because they voted for you? How did we know whom they were going to vote for? This is a mistake and everybody makes a mistake in life.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to assure the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that the last thing I would do would be to make any political issue out of the services to people in a country. I always make it clear that I represent the people who voted for me, the ones in St. Michael in St. Andrew and in every parish. I am Minister of Communications and Works for the Island and not of any area. The money is the taxpayers' money, and if I wanted to carry out spite on people, I would do that with something belonging to me, not something belonging to the general public.

With regard to the waterworks, I would not say that what has been said is not true because I have heard about it and have myself received bills under the same conditions. I will go further and say that there are people who have not received bills for a very long time, and I would like to quote an extract from my file.

"Immediate attention must be given to removing the defect in the collecting and accounting system at the Waterworks Department. Strenuous efforts will have to be made to collect and bring to account revenue which is due to Government."

The reply to that is as follows:-

"The Chief Engineer of the Department has pointed out the arduous and adverse conditions under which the staff are presently required to work and has mentioned specifically (a) limitation of office accommodation; (b) inadequacy of staff; (c) obsolescence of accounting and billing methods."

Mr. Chairman, the average number of services connected annually is in the vicinity of 4,000. If you take the number of services that the Waterworks Department has put in from 1962 until now and they are still operating in the same small office without any further accommodation, you can see where the problem is. The financial position of people and their upliftment have grown to such an extent that the man who once worried about a standpost now

worries about a service in his own place. This is what the Government has been asking for, not building up a set of standposts all over the place. It is pathetic when you go around the end of the month and see the amount of people in a long line not to draw money, but to pay money. I would get discouraged sometimes if I went to draw money and met a line of people like that waiting their turn, furthermore having to go and pay it.  
10.15 p.m.

I am perfectly sure, Mr. Chairman, in the new offices now being built in the Pine with a collection service in town that we will be able to remedy these things. I sympathise with them, but I do agree with the hon. junior member for St. Peter and other members that what is going on is wrong, and I am aware of it and I know that the Government is aware of it. These things are happening, and I know they are happening because it has happened to me, and I would be the last person in any instance that I hear about to allow them to compel the man to pay the amount all at once when it was through their own negligence that it occurred. I would like to assure hon. members that the Government is taking active steps to have this remedied with better accounting machines and things like that, and we have got experts down for the complete reorganisation of the Waterworks Department.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Hon. Minister would make it possible to pass a directive to have this money collected in instalments, two or three payments rather than the one payment which I understand has got to be done.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Does the hon. member actually mean payment for putting in services?

Mr. BOLDEN: Take for instance a man who has to pay \$860 and they are asking for it in 21 days. I understand that the Personnel in the Waterworks Department have no authority but to collect it in one payment, and I am wondering if the Minister would do all that is possible to have it divided up into three or four payments rather than one payment and pass a directive to the Waterworks Department that they will know.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, I will look into it, but I would think it would be rather silly of anybody or any department if I owe them \$100 and when I carry \$25 or \$50 they tell me they cannot take it and I will have to pay all at once. This is surprising to me and I do not think I could really past up with this if it is really true.

Mr. BOLDEN: If the Minister wants factual evidence I can give him the bill, the man's name and I can tell him the date on which he tendered one quarter of the money and they told him they cannot take it, he must pay all at once, or the service will be cut off in 21 days. I am asking that the Minister look into this and give a proper directive.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Certainly, Mr. Chairman, I am surprised to hear this. This is something beyond my knowledge, but I cannot see how anybody could refuse part of a payment due to them especially when it was due to their negligence in not servicing the bills in a proper time.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I really did not want to enter this Waterworks debate at this stage because I have a resolution on the Order Paper and I think that is enough time for me to direct my attention to all there is that is going on in this Department. Mr. Chairman, there are one or two things occurring at the Waterworks Department at the present moment; they have got to be looked into most readily, and one is that there is a complete breakdown of discipline in the department. You cannot deny that at all. Apart from that, there is the practice of discrimination, and members of the staff are made to look like fools when they act in accordance with what is the custom of the department coupled with their own conscience, and then to find that the treatment that is meted out to one type of customer who goes to the Waterworks Department is not the same type of treatment that is meted out to the other type. I have more complaints, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I would like the specific department in which this discrimination is going on.

Mr. HINDS: I have evidence, Mr. Chairman, in my possession of more complaints coming from within the Waterworks Department than I have from the customers outside. The situation is as serious as this, and when we get the monthly publication of the number of connections that have been made, I am saying here and now that it is farcical when compared with the number of persons who turned up at the Waterworks Department from as far as St. Lucy, St. Peter, St. Andrew, St. Philip, and some of them turned up more than once, twice or three times to make applications for water services and were turned back, but they are turned back and another section of the community is turned back by certain members of staff, but this other section will go a little higher up, and directives are passed down on a scrap pad that they must receive money from those persons, and at the same time they have during the course of the day turned back maybe 20 or 25 persons who had paid bus fare from all part of the country.

The Waterworks Department, I am saying, is in a scandalous situation beginning from top to bottom, plus the fact that it is riddled with mad men from top to bottom. The Waterworks Department, we must admit, has something like 43,000 subscribers and we agree that in large establishments, like as has been said, other public utility companies, you have accountants who are trained and qualified people. I know that in the Waterworks Department applications have been made time and time again for qualified staff, but it would appear as if those whom

the other departments do not want, are passed off in the hope that they will be washed down the gutter at the Waterworks Department.

10.25 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to make strictures against the Waterworks Department tonight. There is a lot that I have to say when I am debating my Resolution. I understand that there is considerable uneasiness since I tabled the Resolution. I am not going to oppose this money tonight, but what we want to know is what is responsible for certain things. For instance, two years after the Waterworks Department has fitted a ball tap for a person for \$3.60, a bill comes to him, it is paid, and in another three days another bill is presented to him for the same \$3.60 that he has already paid. A lot of things have been happening over there that cause me to remember some very bright boys who were functioning at that Department a few years ago. It is time that we investigate the Waterworks Department and do not take for granted that all is well.

Mr. Chairman, there is the question of materials. We find here that customers for whom connections are made are called upon to pay - I am not an expert and I do not pretend to be an expert in this field or that field. I am not a Plumber, but I am saying that what the Waterworks Department charges some customers is far in excess of what ought to have been charged considering:

(a) That it is a Government Department; and

(b) It is not a money-making concern, so to speak.

You will find that there is no proper supervision of the materials that are issued. I know what I am saying. There are some Plumbers in this Department who do not want to see a young man who has any specialist training around there. They do not want such a young man, because he is not skilled in the art of disposing of his employer's materials. He knows his job as a Plumber, but he is not skilled in the art of sleight-of-hand.

We have a situation at the Waterworks Department which has to be dealt with quickly. We have to do all we can to arrest the situation at this stage if it is not to worsen. I have a list of the names of people who made application for water; they paid in their money, and one person waited one year and one month before the connection was made. Two other persons had waiting periods of more than 7 months, although they had paid their money into the Waterworks Department.

Mr. Chairman, one must get the impression that the books at the Waterworks Department, apparently, are not kept the same place and by the same members of the staff, because when an enquiry is directed to the person who is supposed to be the Receiving

Teller there is a considerable period of silence before one can get an answer, although one has already given the date of the person's receipt, the number, and the name of the person. Something is definitely wrong with the Waterworks Department.

With regard to the shortage of Plumbers, Government stands indicted tonight on this score. The Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic ought to have been turning out Plumbers. That is where we find that instead of Government strengthening the hand of the Technical Institute it has done otherwise. The Technical Institute could be used for this type of work and Plumbers could be trained there. We have Sanitary Engineering Works; we have Experts in that Department, and there are other Firms and Institutions that could give on-the-job instructions and assist Government with a crash programme in order to turn out Plumbers who would be able to carry out these connections.

Mr. Chairman, I am saying that quite a number of people go to considerable expense in order to obtain material; they waste a lot of time going backward and forward making applications; they have to visit the Waterworks Department regularly to make enquiries about the applications, and yet at the end of the month we are told that so many connections have been made. Unfortunately we are never told how many applications have been made and how many have been refused. That is what we will have to concern ourselves with in the future.

I believe that other hon. members might want to say something on this Item and I will conclude here. I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that things are far from being well at the Waterworks Department. The Plumbers themselves are dissatisfied with what is going on there. We have too many bosses in the Waterworks Department. Everybody up there is a boss, and it would appear as if the Chief Engineer is not making it known that he alone is boss. It is not my fault; it is his.

I want to draw attention to this very considerable sum that we are asked to vote here. It is \$89,542 in respect of plumbing after having voted \$500,000.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. This money is recoverable. This is money put in due to the extra services, the building and the reconstruction going on in the Island. This money is not then paid to the Waterworks Department, but it is paid into revenue.  
10.35 p.m.

This is not included in plumbing for normal services; this is put in as plumbing for development, development of private enterprise and that sort of thing and it is recoverable.

Mr. HINDS: I take it that the Minister means that part of it is recoverable, and I know that the Minister knows that I know that a part would be

recoverable. But the reason why the amount is so considerable is because a very fair portion of it cannot be accounted for under any circumstances. When last was a stock-taking carried out at the Waterworks Department, and how true is their stock-taking? I believe, Mr. Chairman, that stock is taken every Friday.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: On a point of order, I would like to assure the hon. member that I agree with him that it is practically impossible to take stock with the amount of congestion. I have been in there just a couple of weeks ago and there is hardly space in the storeroom for the people who work in there to turn around, furthermore to attempt to take stock. As I have said, there are new premises close to the Ministry in the Pine which the Waterworks Department will soon be utilising, and they will be able then to completely re-organise the system. As I have mentioned already, it has outgrown its usefulness over the last ten years, and nobody can deny that working in this congested place creates disharmony among people who have nowhere to turn around, and it creates sharpness in each other's feelings. With more elbow room, better offices and better equipment I am sure we will be able to remedy the situation. I am not denying the fact that it is in a bad condition.

Mr. HINDS: Now, Sir, there is under consideration by the Waterworks Department the question of instituting a re-connection fee when people's services have been cut off. I do not know if the Minister knows this. *(Asides.)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Members not addressing the Chair must observe Standing Order No. 29(6).

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, on this re-connection fee, I know that Barbados Light and Power carries it, but to my mind the Waterworks Department has very outstanding arrears. You would be surprised to know that there are services for which bills have not been sent out for more than three years.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order, I would like to ask the hon. member if his water was turned off and whether he had to pay a fee to get it re-connected.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.

Mr. HINDS: Sir, I pay my water rates. If I had terrazzo floors in my house, I would pay for them. The hon. member does not pay for his and the lawyer has to sue him.

Mr. Chairman, there is just one burden of complaint that comes out of the office of the Waterworks Department itself, and it is that there is an officer whose name I have who sends out to disconnect the water of certain people, but he never disconnects the water of other people who appear before him and who have arrears over a long period. That is the

type of thing we do not want concealed. If you are disconnecting water, let us do it like the telephone company, where if you have not paid by the morning of the 21st of the month, it is disconnected. It should not be done on the basis that because I belong to a party difference from yours or for some other reason you send and disconnect mine while the person who lives next door and owes ten times as much does not have his service disconnected. There are on the books of the Waterworks Department names that have been drawn to the attention of the officers in the Department whose responsibility it is, they have had water service for over three years and no bills have been sent out to ask them to pay. These are things we want to see done so that we may have a better run Department. I am still going to rinse out the Waterworks Department and slush it down the drain when I come with my Resolution.

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

*Head 38 - Electrical Inspection - was called.*

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, under Head 38 I would like to insert a note to item 8 that has been circulated. It reads as follows:

"Six temporary staff members have been added to the establishment of the Electrical Inspection Department to cope with the growing work load of the Department. A sum of \$10,000 has been provided in the Current Estimates of Expenditure under Head 38 - Electrical Inspection, Item 8 - Temporary Staff. The unexpended balance under this item is \$379.00 and a supplement of \$1,984 is required to meet staff salaries to the end of the financial year."

*I beg to move that Head 38 - Electrical Inspection - as amended stand part.*

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

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

10.45 p.m.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment to be inserted in connection with Head 39 and it reads as follows:

By Resolution No. 80/1970, a supplementary vote of \$1,541 was granted, as a revote, to meet the cost of certain furniture and equipment which had been ordered on proper authority during the previous financial year but which had not been delivered by the end of that year. A National Commission for UNESCO is to be established in the Ministry of Education and it was hoped to use some of the furniture and equipment referred to for the Commission's purposes. However, the sum of \$1,541 provided by Resolution No. 80/1970 is short by \$2,385 to meet the cost of the furniture and equipment required for the Commission.

Accordingly, the sum of \$2,385 is now being sought for the purpose.

This amendment is in connection with Item 39 and I beg to move that Head 39 as amended stand part.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, this is the year 1971 and we had been promised a new Education Act, I think I am right in saying, by the present Leader of the House since something like 1962. It would appear then that if the Leader of the House is to be taken seriously, he is still living in the decreed 1962 days. This Item - Allowances to Heads of Departments, is in our view another attempt at showing how the present Government is thinking in the matter of education where the people of this nation are concerned. We must ask ourselves why not a comprehensive scheme? Where is Government's White Paper on Education? What have we got before us now? That a sum of \$13,440 is being asked for to pay pensionable allowances from 1st September, 1970 to 31st March, 1971 at the rate of \$480 per annum to 48 teachers to be designated Heads of Comprehensive Schools. Mr. Chairman, as I remember, we have seven Comprehensive Schools in this Island; each Comprehensive School has a Head-teacher and at each of these schools there was created what has been known as a post of special responsibility. At some schools there are called Deputy Heads and at other schools they are called Senior Assistants.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If the hon. member would give way, where he reads "48 teachers to be designated Heads of Comprehensive Schools" it ought to be "designated Heads of Departments."

Mr. HINDS: In our present system, as I was saying, we have had them in the Grammar Schools, in our Primary Schools and in the Comprehensive Schools. But in the Grammar Schools, such persons are called Deputy Heads; at the Primary Schools persons performing such duties are called Senior Assistants. (*Asides.*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: While a member is speaking all other members shall be silent, and I will ask the hon. junior member for St. Peter to direct his attention to the Chair.

Mr. HINDS: At the Comprehensive Schools they have been called Deputy Heads, and we are now going to have 48.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If the hon. member would give way, I think that he is probably including the Technical Institute, but the post of Deputy Head or Senior Assistant Teacher in a Primary School is more an administrative post, and these are teaching posts. The people who are Heads of Departments are supposed to do exactly what is set out here, drawing up syllabuses, advising the Heads on the choice of text books and other matters relating to this, but

these are organisational posts and not necessarily administrative posts because they have to do with the actual work of teaching the subject in the school. 10.55 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, regardless of what the Leader of the House may say, there are people who will be given special responsibilities in these Schools. Now, according to the Notes:

"It is proposed to establish departments in the schools on the basis of the following subjects groups -

- (i) English
- (ii) Foreign Languages
- (iii) Mathematics
- (iv) Science
- (v) Home Economics
- (vi) Vocational Studies
- (vii) General Studies (including all subjects which do not fall in Categories (i) to (vi).

Mr. Chairman, however one may look at it there is one answer to all of this. These posts have been created not to help your child or my child, not to increase or improve the knowledge that is to be imparted to the children who attend these Schools, these posts are being created to give a few more dollars to a few more people.

With regard to the classification, I speak as a layman. I agree, in the first place, with the subject English, but there are two very important subjects or activities that have been omitted. I refer to Health Education and Physical Training, but there should also be a Department of Humanities which should be responsible for English, Geography, History, and History would include Bible History as well. We should have, in our view, a grouping classified as follows:

- (i) English
- (ii) Foreign Languages
- (iii) Mathematics
- (iv) Science, (and this will include Domestic and Social Science.)
- (v) Technical to include Arts and Crafts.

Now, Vocational Studies can be academic, technical and modern. There are some Specialist Teachers, as the Community College, who have nothing to do; they do not have students to teach; they do not have enough students to keep them occupied for a day. (*Asides.*) It is time to stop fooling people about this Community College. Now, (vi) could be Health Education And Physical Training. The object of this re-classification should be that the whole exercise should be meaningful.

Mr. Chairman, in the Note to (vii) it says: "General Studies (including all subjects which do not fall in Categories (i) to (vi))." We are appointing Specialists or creating Specialist posts in these various Schools. We are setting up Department Heads for Specialist subjects. How then can we

have General Studies? What we are saying is that having a teacher doing General Studies - the term is too vague in a set up such as this.

In other words, to suggest that you have General Studies in a Department of Specifics is a contradiction in terms, because you are setting out a straight line, so to speak, but here you are going to make deviations. You are no longer specific as long as you are general. We do not need these 38 Heads, or whatever one might call them, to prepare or help prepare syllabuses, because this was the type of work which was performed in the past by teachers with the spirit of altruism. We agree and appreciate the fact that commercialism has taken hold of what was done voluntarily or freely in the past, and that might somewhat be responsible for much of what you have to pay for in these days.

11.05 p.m.

It does not mean, Mr. Chairman, that that in itself is a sufficient justification for Government coming before us today with this short-sighted policy in dealing with the comprehensive schools in isolation. That is what it amounts to, because in the senior department schools there is dissatisfaction. What is Government doing about those schools? Now in the Ministry's own report for the years 1960-1963 it is stated that senior elementary schools or senior department schools now called all-age schools have equal status; but, Sir from what we know these senior department schools have been very much neglected, and more so during the past six, seven or eight years. It shows quite clearly that this Resolution has not enjoyed the careful and meticulous study of either the technical officers of the Ministry or of the Minister himself, because as soon as the comprehensive schools have been dealt with, next in line must be the senior department schools. The Minister must soon come back and ask this House to consider something for the senior assistants in these schools.

Education is not a thing to be approached in a piecemeal fashion as Government is presently trying to do. It requires a comprehensive plan and the taxpayers are the burden bearers all along. The results that we are getting in every possible examination during the past seven to nine years certainly do not justify the expenditure that is authorised by Parliament annually. We are not all satisfied with it. Something is wrong somewhere, and what we must tell ourselves is that the whole scheme of things is not being dealt with in a manner befitting any Government that is really serious about education and its problems.

We have, Sir, Home Economics. The Leader of the House will recall that what is now known as Home Economics was Domestic Science to us until he and Miss Enid Maxwell went to Puerto Rico and returned. All that has been done is that we have given it a new name, but Sir, have we brought anything to bear further on the teaching of the subject? Have we turned out any students who are excelling in any Department in any way superior to those of earlier

years? There is still much to be desired, Mr. Chairman, from the performances of those who now act in such capacities, but nevertheless it has its new name, and all we are finding is that Government year in and year out, week in week out is approaching all these problems in this manner, and we are saying that our Home Economics teaching should be grouped under the teaching of science at Head (iv).

Now, Sir, at a time such as this when so much consideration is being given to the teaching of sex education in schools, one does not find the prominence given to this subject that one should expect. We have special training colleges for health education, and we do need a department set up whereby a matter such as this can be examined in the light of our limited experience, where we can be guided by people from further afield, but without at any time losing our own poise, that is, by being very careful to adopt and to apply only such as may come from abroad, as is good and is found workable in a community such as ours. We feel, Sir, that Government coming here with this scheme to pay these forty-eight Heads is not the answer to any of our educational problems at all.

11.15 p.m.

We do not find anything about teaching better manners in schools, it is known that discipline in schools is a very serious question and it has fallen in many schools, with very few exceptions. We have seen nothing to show us that Government intends doing anything to bring the discipline of these schools up to standard, and even teaching our children better road manners. There is nothing in this Resolution about this, and at a time such as this when the harvesting of the crop is getting into progress the children should be taught road manners. There is an increased number of vehicles on the road, and there is a greater temptation to children to attempt to help themselves with the canes carried by motor lorries, and this is something we would like to know that schools take the opportunity to lecture to children on this subject so that they will avoid becoming involved in this exercise.

Mr. Chairman, we feel that Religious education in schools must be given better curricular status than at present; it should not be an optional subject in an institution such as Erdiston Training College, and we feel that Government should not lend its support to any school in this community which does not teach its children Religious Knowledge, and what we are saying is that we would like to know that every school that is receiving any sort of support from the taxpayers of this country is doing something to encourage our young people to realise that there is still something called the "Presence of God." It is very important, and I do not think that anyone should be against it.

Mr. Chairman, we were concerning ourselves with the drawing up of schemes and syllabuses. It is my view that the responsibility for this should rest ultimately with the Headteacher of any school. What

we have got to guard against is this, a Headteacher ought to be relied upon to know to whom to delegate this type of responsibility, and in the past there were such groups as special panellist or department Heads as they are now called, and this is exactly what we are now being asked to pay for, but we feel that we are now being asked to pay for this merely to accommodate a few University graduates, and that is not right. What we are saying is that it is not always a University Graduate who is best able or best suited for performing such tasks. The arranging and drawing up of schemes and syllabuses must be seen as internal organisation, the Headmaster's responsibility, and it can be done in any school voluntarily if the relationship between the Headteacher and staff is what it ought to be, but we know what a lot of this is about. At the Grammar Schools we will hear the Games Masters are paid, and that might be one of the reasons why every other person is to make a demand for everything that is done, and why it is something extra. All of this, Mr. Chairman, has apparently deprived us of the spirit which we have witnessed throughout the years in helping to nurture our Cadet Corps and help to bring Scouting to what it has been at one time or another.

11.25 p.m.

The voluntary spirit that prevailed in those days seems to be non-existent today. There is grave dissatisfaction over the method of appointments and juniors are now being pitchforked. I might be told that it has happened in previous years and that it will happen again, but because a person has gone to a University it does not necessarily mean that he is best able or most capable to impart knowledge. The University graduate has to learn how to teach; he has to come and gain experience. I am not against paying the graduate for his achievements, his degrees, and so on. I feel that this sum is a burden inflicted upon the taxpayers by the present Government. It is an unnecessary burden. It would have been better if the Government had left these things just where they were within the bosom of the Head Teachers of these respective Schools, and leave it to them to summon assistance from among their staff when it was found necessary.

One must hear that the duties of these teachers will be the drawing up of syllabuses and the development of curriculum in respect of each subject falling within his or her Department. I am saying that some of the Head Teachers are going to find some of these Departmental Heads an unmanageable lot. Some of them are going to spend more time working for this \$480 per annum than they would spend working for their whole year's salary. Every man is now a boss. You will find that Headmasters and Headmistresses at these Comprehensive Schools are now going to be flooded with suggestions about textbooks, and all of these suggestions will come from publishers who happen to be the friends of some people who will be getting a commission on the amount they can get in circulation among the people. They will not have any particular desire for the benefit to be derived from

anything that anybody might learn from one of the books that is put in the hands of these children.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that Government may very well be seen in the light of making a last ditch to win the friendship of 48 people in these Secondary Schools to make them their chief canvassers at these Schools. All of this is in the game. If you give them \$40 a month they will be the Government's chief canvassers at these schools. What are Headmasters and Headmistresses left to do now, with all these Department Heads, every subject a Head? One must get the impression now that there are 48 Schools plus 7 Heads, so you must be having all Heads, but no feet on which to stand. I consider that it is a waste of the taxpayers' money, and I would advise that the Government should set about to study education not merely for the sake of coming down with some scheme that appears new or some catchy scheme every now and again, but to give it the careful and painstaking study it requires because it encompasses the whole community. Each and every person in this community plays some part in our educational programme.

Mr. Chairman, one has to be realistic. Education is costing money. Let us try and begin relating results to the expenditure. Let us see if we can get more or better outstanding results than we are getting at the present moment and strive after that. Let us direct all of our energies towards that. To be using the taxpayers' money merely to be winning friends in these Comprehensive Schools is not, in my view, a good enough venture at a stage such as this.

11.35 p.m.

I will therefore ask the Leader of the House to take back word to the Cabinet. It is time that the Education Act promised since 1962 be laid on the Table of this House. We understand that comments have been invited from various organisations, teacher organisations and educational bodies, and surely if Government has been working in the interest of the community on a matter such as this, we believe that something concrete ought to be in the Government's hands to lay before the Legislature at a time such as this rather than coming here with this half-baked, half-washed improperly named scheme which is merely a vote-catching stunt.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, undoubtedly the Minister must have some sort of explanation to give to some of the points that have been raised. I appreciate that the Minister is tired, but I too am tired. We certainly are not here for fun.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The whole of the hon. member's discussion has been comments of his own on the educational system. The one question he asked was about the Education Act, and all I can tell him is that we hope to bring it to the House shortly. The hon. member knows as much about this as I do. He knows that the draft was sent to the various institutions for their comments, their comments have gone back into

the Ministry and for action to the drafting people in the Crown Law Office for the Draft Bill to be prepared. That is as much as I can say on that.

Mr. HINDS: But the Minister did not say what Government intends doing about the senior department schools. You have come now for the comprehensives; what are you going to do about the senior departments?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: When we come with this, would we not say it then?

*The question that Head 39 - Ministry of Education - stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

*Head 26 - Ministry of Home Affairs - was called.*

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 26 stand part.

If there are any questions, they will be answered.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I do not believe you will like the question I am going to ask the Minister now. The note says that there has been an increase in the number of overseas calls and this amount is required to meet anticipated expenditure to the end of the financial year. Now the Prime Minister has just been in Singapore, and I wonder if the Minister knows whether or not the Prime Minister has been making telephone calls from Singapore to other than Government Departments.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I could have no means of knowing that.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I have means of knowing it, and I am making a statement that the Prime Minister has been telephoning each day he has been in Singapore to a woman who lives in Brittons Hill. I do not want to say whose concubine she is. I pray to God that it is not out of the expenses of the taxpayers of this country. It is a definite fact and you can investigate it. If it does not suit you to have means of knowing it, I am telling the Minister that we on this side have means of doing these things. You are there to refute it. If you do not know, you do not know, but all we are concerning ourselves with is that the taxpayers of this country are crying out from every quarter, and if these telephone calls are not made for official business for the country, if they are just a question of courtship or to know who slept there the last night during his absence and what not - because that is one of the questions that was asked one day - then they should not be charged to Government. Mr. Chairman, you would not know all, but I am telling you that some of the things this Government has carried on are a definite scandal, and we are to hope that an end will be put to this shortly. We feel, Sir, that there might have been genuine cases where one might have had to make telephone calls, but we feel that these calls would have to be directed from the Prime Minister to whatever person, but from Government to Government and not to the home of private individuals.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Look, Mr. Chairman, I wish to tell the hon. member this. However much you may dislike a person, you still would have to give him credit for some kind of commonsense. A man may be in your own view the wickedest and most evil kind of person, but he need not be a fool for all that. Now what would make the hon. member think, even supposing what he has just said is true, that if the Prime Minister or anybody telephones somebody from Singapore or wherever he was, not on Government business, not on a Government phone, that that would be chargeable to the Government of Barbados?

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, that is exactly what I said. I said I hope it is not to be charged to the taxpayers of this country.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: What right has it on the floor of this House even if it is so? Do you mean that all kinds of rubbish are going to come in here now?

Mr. HINDS: Is that rubbish? (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If it does not concern the Government.) Lots of things come before this House and members never have an opportunity to enquire into this. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: But is that before the House?) Telephone calls are before the House and money for telephone calls. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: For Government.) Is the Prime Minister not part of Government?  
11.45 p.m.

We say that we hope that all Government expenditure is lawfully and rightfully spent, that is all.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If in my opinion the hon. member is giving an opinion that the Prime Minister is making private calls and including them in Government expenditure I will say he is breaking Rule 26(7), because no member shall impute improper motives to another member, and in my view that would be an improper motive the hon. member is imputing to another member. I hope he will desist from this type of debate.

Mr. HINDS: Desist from what, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Confine your observations only to the subject matter under discussion, and the subject matter is telephone calls from abroad.

Mr. HINDS: Singapore is not Barbados, I am saying that I hope the telephone calls the Prime Minister made from Singapore to a woman at Brittons Hill will not be charged to Government.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I want to make one or two observations on the Item - Bye-Elections. I hold no brief for anyone in this Chamber, so let me make my position absolutely clear. I believe there is such a thing as equality in law, and that all people appear equal before the law. If as a result of the passing of the Public Order Act the Police in this country saw fit to bring a charge against a man called Bobby Clarke for certain utterances made on the political platform, I understand that in this same bye-election a candidate of the Democratic

Labour Party stood on the political platform in the presence of Police Officers and made extremely damaging statements about Bobby Clarke and a member of this political party to the effect that we were responsible for burning down Cave Shepherd, and yet the Police of this country did not see fit to bring a charge against that candidate of the Democratic Labour Party. When this sort of thing happens, how can anybody have any respect for law in this country when it shows quite clearly that if Bobby Clarke says something about the Government he is going to be prosecuted, but if somebody says something about Bobby Clarke which is obviously detrimental to him that person will not suffer by the law. This is not fair, and the other statement made was made about my brother, and I think it is disgraceful for any candidate, whether he is Dudley Smith or anybody else, and I have evidence that Dudley Smith said that Elton Mottley was responsible, along with Bobby Clarke, for burning down Cave Shepherd, and yet the Police of this country who were supposed to have been at the meeting taking notes did absolutely nothing about it. This is a fine example of the Police playing politics and taking sides; these things must stop, and I will issue a warning to the Police and the Government to let everybody be equal before the law, and do not bring certain people before the Courts and just because other people are members of the Democratic Labour Party, the police do not prosecute them. If you do this, every time you prosecute anybody, you will never get any convictions before the Court.

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

*Head 27 - LANDS AND SURVEYS - was called.*

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 27 stand part.

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

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

*Mr. YEARWOOD left the Chair and Mr. HOPPIN took the Chair.*

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

*Head 28 - Police - was called.*

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 28 - Police - stand part.

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

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I notice under Head 28, Item 66 - Writ Servers. Note 24 says that there has been an increase in the rates of travelling for Writ Servers and this amount is required to meet commitments to the end of the financial year. The question of Writ Servers in the courts of Barbados has been a burning question to everybody dealing with the affairs of the courts. For a long time it has been

known that certain Writ Servers have not been carrying out the duties which have been assigned to them. I am amazed to think that they are asking for more money for travelling when, in my opinion, half of them could be got rid of. I am saying bluntly that the Writ Servers are quasi Gods unto themselves with nobody to tell them anything. If you complain to the Commissioner of Police very little is done, and the Magistrates have no control over them.

It has been proved that certain Writ Servers have been carrying out documents and not serving them. They return to the office and mark "cannot be found". This is causing no end of concern in the courts. In fact, it has been discovered that when the Writ Servers have to serve Police documents a different attitude is adopted. Now, Writ Servers are Policemen, and it is said that the dregs of the Police Force are sent to the Writ Servers' Department. They will serve Police summonses. It is seldom that you go into a Traffic Court or a Criminal Court and see a complaint issued by the Commissioner of Police coming back in with the words "Not found", but when it is a civil document you can get all sorts of fancy affidavits sworn to on the back of these documents: "Not found; I have been told he has removed 10 yards down the road." The Magistrates have no control over them.

Mr. Chairman, I know of a particular case where a Magistrate sent to call a Writ Server, and the Writ Server sent back a message: "He has no control over me; he cannot send for me; all he can do is to report me to the Commissioner of Police." I would like the Minister responsible to do something about this matter quickly. The Bar Association has suggested long ago that Writ Servers should be put under the control of the Magistrates. You should put them in the same position as the Marshals are in relation to the Supreme Court. Long ago the Bar Association has been asking for this and nothing has been done, and until there is some authority other than the Commissioner of Police who can deal with 90% of the Writ Servers, the position is going to be worse.

Mr. Chairman, I know of a particular instance, but I do not want to call names on the floor of this Chamber. I know of a particular instance in which a prominent member of this society was sued; the Writ Server went into the Library and told him: "I have this for you; go and pay the money, and after you have paid it I will give it to you." The money was paid; the document was then served, and the man said that he was not paying costs because the money was paid before the document was served on him. This is a typical example of what is happening today. I would like the Minister responsible to call an investigation to determine how best to deal with these Writ Servers. I am not saying that 100% of them are bad. There are some Writ Servers who do their job, but I know that the majority of them do not. I would like to see that something be done about this matter speedily. I would hope that they could be transferred and put under the jurisdiction of the Magistrate.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I rise to endorse the remarks made by the junior member

for St. Joseph. I am doing so at this stage because I know we will be debating the Estimates some time next month. I do not expect the Minister to answer queries or make any comments on any statement that we make here today. I sincerely hope when we come back here to deal with the Estimates next month the Minister will have investigated the allegations made and will be in a position to tell this Committee what is the exact position.

Mr. Chairman, the present system works hardship on the litigant. I have known in the past where a Police Officer was found to be the putative father of a child. He lived opposite Boarded Hall Police Station and was stationed at District C. The mother of the child had left Barbados and the grand mother, eventually, got herself appointed guardian so that she would be in a position to draw and to execute the affiliation order. There was some \$300 owing, and it took about three months before the then Writ Server at District B Police Station could find the Police Officer who lived almost opposite the Boarded Hall Police Station and was stationed at District C. The only time that writ was served was after I phoned the Commissioner of Police and told him that, if he did not do something about it, I would write the newspaper and take it up with the Attorney General and the appropriate Minister. The day after that writ was served. Nobody can tell me that that was not a deliberate attempt by the Writ Server to withhold a writ.

12.05 a.m.

The basic trouble with the writ servers is simply that as the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has said, the people who are at the moment in the Writ Serving Department are people who are more or less frustrated officers who because they failed the examination were not promoted, and therefore they have no real interest in performing the work they are doing. Another thing is this: if cricket is being played in Barbados, for instance, when the Indians come here and there is an island match and a test match at Kensington, these writ servers are taken by the Commissioner of Police and put to work at Kensington. I do not blame the writ servers for this, because they tell you that if they worked at cricket from 11 o'clock until 6 o'clock, they have no intention of going out at night and serving any writs. I support the writ servers on this because I think it is nonsense to take the writ servers from doing their job and put them to work at Kensington for the duration of the cricket matches. No writs or summonses are served except the ones that the police want to be served when they would sent any police officer to serve them. That situation creates hardship on a litigant, and it would give any litigant the wrong impression of the administration of justice in this country.

As the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has said, we of the Bar Association have been waiting on Government for a very long time to remove the writ servers completely from the Police Department. By all means give them some sort of power to arrest people for assault in the execution of their duty, as you have with the Marshals of the Supreme Court. If

a Marshal goes to serve a Supreme Court writ and is assaulted in the execution of his duty, that person can be charged specially. By all means, make him a special constable, but the fact remains that he must be removed from under the direct control of the police officer and brought under the direct control of the magistrates, and in order to do this, it would necessitate the appointment of a Chief Magistrate which is something that the Government has been shying away from, for a very long time.

Mr. Chairman, the time has come when the Magistrates' Courts in this country must be properly administered and run, and the only way you are going to do it is to have somebody responsible for the administration of the Magistrates' Courts, not merely giving decisions, but looking after the Civil Service side of it, and the only person who can do this would be a Chief Magistrate having an executive officer directly responsible to him on the one side and on the other side you would have your chief writ server directly responsible to the Chief Magistrate. If a judge sends for a Marshal of the Supreme Court, no marshal would dare send back and tell the judge that he has no control over him and he is not coming; but today if summonses are not served in the Magistrates' Court and the magistrate sends for the writ server, he can send back and say that he has no control over him and he is not coming. This is a situation which the Government must investigate and give urgent treatment, and I hope that in a few weeks' time when we come back here to do the Estimates that the Minister responsible for this would be in a position to tell this Chamber that the Government has done something about it.

Again, Sir, I give the Government another opportunity. In the Estimates last year, I enquired what was being done about the dress of policemen in this country. I was told then that it was being considered, but almost a year has passed and absolutely nothing has been done about it. I do not expect the Minister responsible to answer tonight, but I will raise this point again in the Estimates, and I expect at that time the Minister to be in a position to tell this House what is being done, because the present uniform is outmoded and bears no relationship to the functions of police officers. Even as regards bus drivers and conductors, the Government accepted that their uniform could be changed when I stood in here and asked that this be done. Although the fireman's uniform is all black, it is a much lighter uniform. It is a terylene and wool and the uniform of the police is really ridiculous when compared with that. It is unfair to ask police officers to stand out in the hot sun all day, long dressed in that uniform. The senior officers of the Force from Inspector up wear a garbedine type of uniform which is very light, and even though because of the colour, it may look hot, at any rate, it is suited to the tropics. The uniform that the ordinary policeman from Station Sergeant back down wears is not suitable. Look at the police officers dressed in that black uniform in here tonight! It is really outmoded, and I think that in fairness to the police you should do something about it.

In the debate on Tuesday I mentioned that the morale of the Police Force was being affected because of the failure of either the Commissioner of Police to make recommendations or the Police Service Commission to make appointments to the six vacant posts of Inspector. This is unsatisfactory. For over one year there has been six vacant posts of Inspector; this cannot be fair to those who should be promoted or considered for promotion. Once you do not promote the Inspectors, it means that you are hampering the other people in their promotion right down the line because you are not going to be able to appoint your Station Sergeants, Sergeants or Corporals. Again, Sir, I would like when we come back here in the Estimates to have some firm statement from the Minister responsible as to the reason why these vacant posts have not been filled.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I want to carry on from exactly the last point which the hon. member who has just sat down has raised, that is, the six Inspectors not having been appointed. Mr. Chairman, there is perhaps a very good reason why there has been a delay. I feel, Sir, that the Police Service Commission ought to have re-examined the forecast requirements of the Force and determine whether or not there is not a necessity for increasing the rank of Corporals. While we would like to see promotion give to deserving ranks, in the Force at the moment there is amongst the Inspectorate an overlapping of services to the extent that it would appear now that we have just have to many of them, or deploying them leaves much to be desired.

12.15 a.m.

There is among the Inspectorate an overlapping of services to the extent that it would appear now that we just have too many of them, or that deploying them leaves much to be desired. For instance, who would believe that if a Police Constable with 12, 13 or 14 years' service reports sick tomorrow you can find an Inspector or a Superintendent to carry that Constable to a doctor? A Constable who would have been in the service for over 12 years, he is so sick that he has got to be lifted and taken to a doctor, and all that has got to be carried along with him is a diary of the Constable's medical record if he has one, but what some of these Police Officers are used for in such cases is this; there is a feeling in the Force that when a Policeman reports sick he is a piece of wood and as such he cannot be sick, so what one will find is this, that these Officers are sent out to carry these Constables to the doctor and they go to the Medical Officer, leaving the Constable outside, so that they can have their first say with the Medical Officer. In other words, as if to suggest to the Medical Officer what is wrong or how the Medical Officer should determine and treat the man's illness as the case may be. What I am saying is this, it is stupid on the one hand and extremely wicked on the other, and no Medical Officer who is worth his salt should allow a Police Inspector, even if he is the Police Commissioner, to have anything to say to him in connection with any man who has reported sick. I feel even in cases where a Policeman is charged departmentally, that it is highly improper if he reports sick that the Policeman's charge sheet should be sent on to the doctor with the Policeman.

This, Mr. Chairman, must make for bad feeling amongst members of the Force; all of this makes for the insecurity that one must feel in the service, and when you have a service of men who are an unhappy and uncomfortable lot, what must the general public feel in return? We believe the time has come when every man must be taken as a man, and Police Medical Officers ought not to allow their profession to be prostituted by requests made to them by senior Police Officers, or Inspectors particularly, when junior ranks are involved. We feel that if the Commissioner of Police was faced with a difficult situation tomorrow he would find a way out of it perhaps without anybody knowing, and it is unfair to any Policeman, whether he has served one year or twelve years, who has reported sick to find a Sergeant running inside and telling the doctor the man is only playing the fool. The doctor ought to chase the Officer out of his office and report him to the Commissioner of Police. This kind of nastiness has got to stop and wherever I know it exists in the Force I intend to use my influence to expose it.

Quite recently there was one Police Inspector who was called upon to accompany a Constable to the doctor, and I am pleased to say that the Inspector felt that it was an insult to his high office, and he made it known; somebody else was then called upon to accompany the Constable to the doctor. Mr. Chairman, the Commissioner of Police must be told that if a Policeman has been in the force for a number of years and is sick and cannot be trusted to go to the doctor and return to the Station with the doctor's findings entered on the record, the Commissioner would be a fool to try to do anything to have that man remain in the Force. If he cannot be trusted to go to a doctor, do not have him around at all, but undoubtedly the Police Force is a place that must make the lives of even Policemen hard.

12.25 a.m.

That is what it seems, Sir, so it will mean that something has got to be done to let the Commissioner of Police know what is going on, because I have been informed that much of the unpleasantness that is meted out to serving members of the Force is really not known to the Commissioner of Police. He, apparently, is now too far removed from his mean and that is where you must get difficulty. There are others who believe that the Force is theirs, and they set about to do nothing else but to torture the lives of those who happen to be under them.

We have here an amount of money to pay fees to the Government Bacteriologist and other experts in scientific investigation. I wonder if the Minister would be in a position to tell us how far has the Government got with the setting up of the Forensic Laboratory for the Police Department. It is time, no doubt, that we ought to be well equipped to carry out investigations into many of the crimes that have been baffling the Force in the past. We have to appreciate the fact that our approach to the use of our Laboratory when it is functioning has to be very much different from what is to be witnessed in many other Departments in the Force. It is known that much credit that should go to

the Police Force is lost from the Force by the Force itself. The reason for that is that the Force is divided against itself.

Mr. Chairman, you will find that there are men and women serving in the Force today who cannot give of their best because, like some in the Civil Service, they do not know whether they are doing right from wrong, and although they have been taught to do what is right, they still do not know when they have done something right whether it is right. As a result of that you are finding that much of the glory the Force should have to its credit is lost. These are things that need a very considerable amount of investigation. Who is going to carry out the investigation that is so necessary? Can you trust the Police themselves to be factual?

Sir, we are living in an extremely dangerous era, and this has come about mainly because there are some people, as in the Police Force, who have to hide from themselves when they are going to get married. This is a positive fact. It is not easy even for an ordinary recruit who enters the Force intending to make policing a career to gollow along regular procedural lines and to reach anywhere near the top. That man's road is being strewn with thorns all the way, just because there are people in the Force who feel that they did not reach their present position without encountering some sort of difficulty and without being subjected to this and that. They feel that every policeman must be tarred with the same brush, so to speak, before he graduates into the type of policeman that others would like to see.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Minister will have a reply to give us as to the position regarding the Laboratory. With regard to Item 34 - Special Constable, I wonder how many Special Constables are being appointed now that we have the crop season, and ripe canes? Are you employing, Special Constables as firewatchers to see that we reduce the incidence of cane fires, or should we just toy with the idea? 12.35 p.m.

I see here that a special constable is employed for watching the residences of Ministers and senior Government officials who go overseas on Government business. I wonder if the home of either Government Minister or senior Government official has been robbed since the decision has been taken to appoint watchmen. Mr. Chairman, the Minister is beckoning that he does not know. What purpose does the Minister serve? Is it merely to come and ask for money? I am asking the Minister to resign and give us an opportunity of showing him how Ministries should be run.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I think the whole House knows that the hon. member has access to information which the other twenty-three do not. I really could not tell you I know some of the things that the hon. member knows or hears. I have no doubt that he hears them, but I do not know them.

Mr. HINDS: If you do not know, all you must do is to ask for the money. Mr. Chairman, what we want the Minister to do is to find out if any responsi-

bility is attached to a special constable who is employed as a watchman watching the residence of a Government official when he goes overseas. In other words, you employ a special constable but the officer's house is still robbed. If you employ a constable to watch the officer's house and it is still robbed, is any responsibility attached to the watchman? (Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: When a watchman is at my place, it is my business.)

Mr. Chairman, on this item of transportation for policemen when travelling to and from duty, I have already asked about transporting police horses after they have put on these musical rides, say, at Alexandra. After police horses put on these musical rides at various places throughout the Island, what I am saying is that there should be horse boxes for transporting them back to their station, and there should also be vehicles for transporting the riders. In other words, it is not kind to have a police horse end its parade in Speightstown or wherever it is at 10 o'clock and then have the policemen riding for almost another hour before he reaches his station wherever it may be. What we are saying is that immediately the officer finishes his ride at the point of display, he should be transported back to his station and his horse should be put in a horse box attached to some trailer system and towed back to the station. It makes for much quicker and safer dispatch. I think I have asked all the questions under this Head.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, under Item 44 - Incidentals - the note says that this amount is required to settle outstanding claims and to meet commitments to the end of the financial year. I wonder if the Minister responsible can tell us what these outstanding claims are. While we are waiting for that information, I should also like to refer to the fees paid to bacteriologists and other experts. I am sorry that the Minister of Housing and Labour is in the land of Nod at this stage. He always comments on lawyers who go in the Courts and fight for acquittals for their clients, but I would like to draw to the attention of the Minister what I consider a very dangerous practice which exists in the Police Force. When officers are investigating certain crimes, they write across the file the notation "N.F.A." which means "no further action" if the investigating officer feels that there is no justification to proceed. It has been known that senior officers have changed that notation and have put cases up with the remarks "see what the magistrate will do". Many of these cases come before the Court and the obvious result always turns out. What I am concerned about is the suffering which the poor accused has got to go through during the period he is charged with offences of a certain nature. If you look back at Note 26 on the question of sexual offences, I have known of cases where alleged victims have been taken to a doctor who finds no evidence of sexual offence, the pathologist at the Hospital finds no evidence of the offence thereby substantiating the medical officer's opinion, and yet the police have allowed charges against the persons whose names have been called.

12.45 a.m.

There are habits which I hope the Minister will look into and rid the Force of this practice of Senior Officers sort of overriding the opinion of the investigation officers. I wonder if the Minister is in a position now to give us an answer to Note 21 with respect to outstanding claims.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: In respect of Incidentals, the amount of \$4,036 is provided under this Item in the current Estimates. At the 31st August, 1970 the sum of \$3,000.87 was spent leaving a balance of \$1,035.13 which is considered inadequate. The near exhaustion of funds under this Item is due mainly to the purchase of an increase number of rubber stamps for the Immigration Officers at Seawell and Bridgetown. There was also an increase in the cost of labour for cleaning the compounds of the various stations.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to the Hon. Minister, as I said earlier in this Chamber, these notes seem to bear very little relation to what we are asking to sit down here and pass money under the various Heads for, because my view of outstanding claims is that outstanding claims cannot come under rubber stamps at all. It is fantastic if outstanding claims come under rubber stamps, unless the officers are being sued for the cost of a rubber stamp; that is the only thing I can accept, but to tell me that this is to provide rubber stamps and for the cleaning of barracks is far, in my opinion. I may be ignorant, but honestly I cannot for the life of me put these two things together. Mr. Chairman, the Minister took blame earlier tonight under certain circumstances, but I would like the Minister to know that it is not satisfactory to come here and when we question these statements we get these fancy answers, because they bear no relation at all to the notes which we are supposed to work by.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I agree with all that. I will take note and have it drawn to the Minister's attention. All the points you have made in respect of Writ Servers, sick Policemen, and I believe the point made by the junior member for Bridgetown about promotions, and also the hon. member for St. Peter's point. In respect of the forensic laboratory, I think we have put into this year's Estimates a token vote of \$1,00 to enable us to get ahead with this, but plans have been made to incorporate the forensic laboratory into the proposed medical complex which is to adjoin the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. These plans were submitted to the Central Planning Unit of Government some time ago and they were required to make adjustments which I believe are now being done. It appears that in the new development at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital it is proposed to put the forensic laboratory there as part of that new development.

In respect of the other point about special Constables and putting them to help in the prevention of cane fires, my understanding is that the Sugar Producers' Association have been talking about controlled burning of canes this year and to this extent will probably organise their own people to supervise this. Of course the hon. member's question in respect of people acting as Wardens to detect fires and

perhaps to prevent them from spreading, this can be looked into but I know of no plans at the moment to employ special Constables in this respect. The second point he raised in respect of watching at the houses of senior Government officials and Ministers and whether in one case there was a robbery or a breaking in, my information is that there were no reports to this effect made known to the Ministry of Home Affairs since the system has been instituted.

Mr. HINDS: If there were reports made to the Police would that not be the same thing as reports made to the Ministry of Home Affairs?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Not exactly. I think the hon. member understands something about the way Government works, and the Ministry would be quite honest in saying that nothing has been reported to it, but this would probably not mean that nothing had happened. I myself do not know of any incident at my home.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, before you close the debate, if I may go back to the question of Writ Servers and beg leave to expand a little bit on this question of promotion and the double duties, I would like the Hon. Minister in making his notes for the person responsible for the Police Force to include the Court Orderlies, especially those who are employed in the Courts of Bridgetown, in this promotion or duty business, because there are several instances in which the Courts in Bridgetown have sat after mid-day, as late as 3 o'clock in the afternoon, and these Orderlies are then required to go on duty at places like the Y.M.C.A. to basketball and Kensington when there is anything going on there at night. I suppose they will now have to go to the Stadium, and after working till whatever time their function is through, they then have to come back and be on duty I think at 7 or 8 o'clock in the morning again to serve as Orderlies in the Courts next day. I find this is punishing, and for the rate which I understand they are paid - I understand it was 75 cents and now it has gone up to \$2.00 - I believe this is unfair and I would hope that these Orderlies along with the Writ Servers who have got to do a full day's work are not then called upon to do extra work at night until approximately 2 o'clock in the morning then to be called upon next day.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I sincerely hope that when we come to deal with the Estimates, the Minister would be in a position to tell us if the Government has sent anybody yet to train for the forensic laboratory. I know they have not sent anybody yet, and I sincerely hope you can give me an answer then.

The other point is this, I think the time has come when representation should be made to the Commissioner of Police to stop having this Police Officer standing Outside Government House with a gun in his hand. I think it is a lot of nonsense to have a Policeman standing up with a gun that has no bullets just for ceremonial occasions.  
12.55 a.m.

They have stopped it at Central Police Station, and I do not see why you should have a policeman standing up at Government House with a gun in his hand. I would urge upon the Minister to make representations to the Commissioner of Police. If anything, let him be armed with a Service Revolver at his side, but do not put him there to stand up with a gun. The officer on duty at Government House could be given a small hut where he could sit down and stop cars going out and coming in. I think it is a lot of nonsense in this day and age to have a policeman standing up in a white cork hat, a white tunic with long sleeves, a black serge pants, and a gun in his hand stretched out all day long.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I will make representations.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I hope by the time you come back here to deal with the Estimates you will be able to tell me something about it.

*The question that Head 28 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply, and that the Committee ask for leave to sit again.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution be now read a first time.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution be now read a second time.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution be now agreed to.

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

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

#### PAPERS LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, before I move the adjournment, I should like to have Your Honour's permission to lay two documents which I should have laid before.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has my permission to do so.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I am commanded to lay on behalf of the Minister of Finance the Mortgage Insurance (Amendment) Regulations, 1971, and on behalf of the Prime Minister the Public Officers Loan and Travelling Allowances (Amendment) Regulations, 1971.

*Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House be now adjourned.....*

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that we cannot adjourn, we may only suspend. If we do not suspend until Monday, or some other time, there is an adjournment until Tuesday next week.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I would like the House to meet at ten o'clock on Tuesday morning.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, if you suspend the sitting now, you can only do the special business on the Order Paper.  
1.05 a.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I understand that if we suspend this sitting until Tuesday, we can only carry on with what this meeting was summoned to do. We will have to suspend this sitting therefore until Monday at 10 o'clock. We have been accommodating you all this week.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Before the hon. member moves the motion, I just want to appeal to the Minister. The Leader of the House must appreciate that there are other people with business commitments already and that 10 o'clock is not suitable. If you suspend until 10 o'clock, you have to be here at 10 a.m. sharp.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until Monday, 8th February, 1971, at 10.30 a.m.

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

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

1.11 a.m.

*On resumption*

#### COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: When the sitting was suspended the House was in Committee of Supply. Thereto it now reverts.

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

*Head 29 - Fire Service - was called.*

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 29 - Fire Service - stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS: Now, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister is in a position to tell us whether or not the engine block damaged during the flood has been replaced as yet. The note says that this amount is required to settle outstanding claims from local supplies and the Crown Agents for materials used in the building of a new water tender and is a revote of lapsing funds. Who built the water tender? Undoubtedly if our local firemen built it, it should be seen as a credit to these men, and we feel they would have effected a saving as a result of so doing. While it may be admitted that they are men who are permanently attached to the service, for doing such outstanding work which I understand this water tender has proven to be, we are to wonder if there cannot be a scheme devised where the men who actually worked in turning out this appliance could not be given some sort of compensation, since it might act as a sort of incentive to encourage others. It is also noted here that there will be an anticipated increase in the amount of travelling during the harvesting season of the sugar crop.

Now I wonder if the Minister is in a position to tell us if all the units of the Fire Service are in A-one condition to meet any emergencies or whether the men are not presently engaged in trying to reshape and recast units, and if such is the case, it is not necessary or thought advisable to lend the fire services whatever expertise there is available on the Island at the present moment so as to have their units ship shape? It cannot be denied that every hour that can be afforded the firemen to rest at this moment should be made available to them because of the heavy demand that is going to be made upon them during the crop season. (*Asides.*) That is what your notes tell me.

Hon. A. D. C. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, we on this side do not anticipate that there will be a heavy demand on the firemen this season because we have introduced controlled burning and we think this will minimize the incidence of cane fires during this crop season.

Mr. HINDS: That is a very good reply from the Minister, but it all depends on who has an interest in the burning of canes, but believe me I do not want to go into that. In any case whether burning is to be controlled or else, all the appliances of the Fire Service ought to be ready to go off at a click, and there can be no excuse if any unit is now found not to be in such a condition. I do not think there is anything further that I want to raise under this Head.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has raised several points. When the hon. member spoke about rest hours for firemen, he did not ask a question in respect of this, he merely said he hoped rest hours could be made available to them because of the heavy demands on their time during the crop season. I take it that the authorities will see to this.

In respect of the engine block, what happened was that while pumping operations were being carried

out during the flood, one of the appliances broke down and as a result of high water around the engine while at high operating temperatures, the sudden cooling caused distortion and fracture of the block. The vote here is to replace this block. I do not know if the hon. member is satisfied with that.

Mr. HINDS: I asked whether the block has been replaced as yet. I have my reason for asking the question.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I will get an answer for the hon. member in a minute or two. The hon. member also asked a question about the compensation for the personnel who did the body work on the appliance. Yes, compensation has been decided on for them and the amounts are now being worked out.

I would like to take this opportunity of putting on the record the Government's appreciation of the personnel of the Fire Service whose skill made it possible for much of this work to be done here, and in consequence there was an overall saving on the project to Government of about \$12,000.  
10.40 a.m.

If we had bought the entire appliance overseas we would have paid something like \$36,422.40, including the cost of freight and insurance charges. The cost of the appliance constructed locally was something like \$24,000 and we made an overall saving of \$12,000. We think it only proper that some of this saving should be passed on to the persons who made it possible, and this will be done. Will the hon. member develop his point about the units being in A-1 condition?

Mr. HINDS: I wonder whether all the units of the Fire Service are presently in A-1 condition, in view of the fact that the harvesting of the cane crop is upon us.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I would not like to say that as of now, a quarter to eleven, all are in A-1 condition, but I have to assume that the staff of the Department know what is required and are making all the efforts to put them in good condition. I have no information to the contrary, and if the hon. member has, he might let the Committee know.

Mr. HINDS: Has the engine block that was damaged in October been replaced?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I have been informed that the engine block has been replaced.

*The question that Head 29 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

*Head 30 – TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING – was called.*

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 30 stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

Mr. St. JOHN: I am just rising to ask the Hon. Minister if any progress has been made in connection with suggestions we made in respect of this Department, namely that the publication of the minimum standards be made. I would really like to see the standards in respect of building and parking and matters of that kind published, because I find it remarkable, and I really do not understand the decision, to allow the Chase Manhattan Bank to build a three-storey building on that site without a proper pavement, because when one looks at the building next door one sees that Hanschell and Larsen had to cut back in for a pavement of about 7' in depth, and this building has not had to cut back at all. That seems to be a major development, and it has no pavement; it looks very odd, so I want to know what the requirements are area by area. The new K. R. Hunte building is another example, no parking is provided there and I want to know whether there are different standards for different areas in the City, because I happen to know of other applications for other parts of the City, and the requirement is for one park for every 50 square feet of office space.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, just one point on parking. I had suggested on a previous occasion to the House that we have got to consider seriously in the case of all new buildings in the City of Bridgetown that they must provide roof deck or underground parking. We have got to face it squarely, and in the matter of the K. R. Hunte building, before the corner stone had been laid the suggestion was made and that could have been provided. We have got to start it with some building or other in the City of Bridgetown, and it is not fair to the taxpayers of this country that all these places are carrying on business, members of their staff have to have transportation and that taxpayers must provide parking when the institutions in themselves are not called upon by Government to lend a helping hand. They can provide roof deck parking, and this also brings me to the point that we have got to provide on our highways proper street crossings for pedestrians. We have got to go underground sooner or later.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, if I may say a few words on this, I agree with the hon. member on one point. I agree with the senior member for Christ Church, but the problem here in Bridgetown is very different from the problem in most other Cities, because the other Cities are somewhat elevated. If you look in the tunnel under the Public Buildings yard you will see that water is right there; I agree with overhead parking, but I do not think you can get any underground parking done. I agree also that the firms in town should do this, but we live in a society where politicians try to make the people believe that they must get everything free and that is where you are getting the trouble. We have to be blamed because we make them believe that everything is free, but when they go overseas, they have to pay for everything. The hon. member is now seeing the difficulty, but we as leaders should be able to guide the people because you lead from the front and not from the back. You do not drive your car from behind because there is no steering wheel

at the back the only thing you drive from behind is a donkey cart, and therefore if we are supposed to be leaders we have to lead from in front, and it is time that politicians in particular stop trying to see everything as politics and get down to real business. This is our country, this is my country and I want to see this country holding its own with any other country.

10.50 a.m.

I say, again, that we are getting all of this trouble because we, politicians, are a bunch of parasites who are afraid to tell the people the truth. Sometimes people come and abuse things, and if somebody feels that he can get a vote or two from him he will not say anything about it. I agree that the time has come when we will have to look into this matter seriously. The hon. member has just pointed out that a three-storeyed building is going up in the centre of the road. A portion of K. R. Hunte's building is also in the road, and I am waiting to see what is going to happen. Of course, if it came under my Ministry I know what I would have done. These people are really taking advantage of the situation.

Mr. Chairman, I know that our Town and Country Planning Department has its job to do, but I want everybody to know that I am a Barbadian first, and anything else afterwards. I do not care who you are, if you come here and you do not want to abide with our Rules and Regulations, as far as I am concerned, you can leave the country. We have been getting through before a lot of these people came here. I do not want anybody to get the misguided idea that I want to run people out of this country, but I do not see why we should change our features to please somebody and after he comes here and makes a lot of money, he goes away. This is our country, and I am appealing to the opposition to examine things carefully when the Government brings them here for discussion. It is your duty as the Opposition to criticise things, but do not criticise for the sake of criticising; do not try to be extra critical in things when you know that we cannot help anybody; do not try to make people believe that you have more political acumen than anybody on this side, because it is a waste of time. It is the duty of the Opposition to come together with the Government on these matters wherever possible. I am not saying that we can see eye to eye on every point, but I want the Opposition to understand that there is no Government run by the Opposition. The hon. senior member for Christ Church generally makes some very valid points. He is a Barbadian like myself, and I do not want to see our country desecrated because we want to please any and everybody.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that the Hanschell building was a complete building, but that the Bank building was an alteration with no major structural change, so that set back did not seem reasonable in this case. It appears that in the case of the Bank building most of the changes were internal changes: two storeys converted to three and so on, and that in cases like this they do not require setting back. On the question of car parking in the

central areas of Bridgetown, this is currently receiving attention.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I asked about the new K. R. Hunte building, because I do not see any parking provided there. I happen to know that when other buildings were being built in Broad Street - Canadian Imperial Bank for instance - car parking was required there. I want to know whether you are going to let the new Cave Shepherd building go up without car parking space being required there. It seems to me that you are going to be in grave difficulty, having allowed a development of the K. R. Hunte type and not requiring any parking. What are you going to do with the building replacing the old Cave Shepherd building?

This is a very difficult problem, because it seems to me that you will either have a standard which will apply to the whole street or you do not have a standard at all. I know about applications for Pinfold Street and you demanded that parking space be provided, but in Broad Street you do not provide parking. The Canadian Imperial Bank had to provide parking, but I do not see any provided at the K. R. Hunte building.

This is the problem I do not understand with the Town and Country Planning Department. You should either have general forms and only in special circumstances you depart from them, or you do not have them. It seems to me that you do not have any. When a man puts in his application for planning permission, he should know not only what is the setback but what is required otherwise you will get a lot of bad feeling. That is the problem we have; I want to know about it, and it is very serious. We had a golden opportunity to specify when they knocked down that building that we have some kind of parking. I agree with the hon. member for St. Thomas that in some areas you might not be able to provide parking, but in some areas you can do so. There is an area at the back of the St. Michael's Cathedral, and I understand that the Government has acquired it for a central parking area for Roebuck Street and so on. I know for a fact that the Scavenging Department has been asked to move out. I would hope that it would be a whole re-development around there connecting with Roebuck Street near Carlton Browne's Drug Store. There is a whole area in there that could relieve this situation. We know that because of no planning in the past we have had to provide parking areas, but let us not saddle ourselves in the future by not, at this stage, insisting on some parking requirements.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, what the hon. member said about the acquisition of the site where Redman and Taylor's Garage was, is true. What we have planned for that site is a multi-storeyed parking lot. As the hon. member has said, the Scavenging Department has to be removed. The burnt out area and the houses on the left will be cleared and made into one area. There will be a one-way street, so that the traffic coming from Constitution Road through Church Village and from the parking area will go towards Roebuck Street.

There may be a two-lane or a three-lane road leading to Roebuck Street. That is what the Government has in mind.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, my advice is that modern traffic principles do not favour parking on expensive land in the central area, and that indiscriminate parking on individual sites all over Town would intensify congestion. The Town and Country Planning Department is at the moment considering the fairest ways of distributing the cost of providing parking on carefully selected and properly controlled sites.

Mr. St. JOHN: In the light of that, when we have planning applications in future and they ask for parking space, we will fight it to the hilt.

*The question that Head 30 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

*Head 32 - Printing Office - was called.*

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 32 - Printing Office - stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I am sure the Minister very well knows that I would like to have a breakdown for this expenditure of \$12,000.  
11.00 a.m.

The note tells us that this amount is required to pay staff at the Government Printing Office for work done during extra hours in order to have the Estimates, work for the Rate and Taxes Division as well as other work done in time and to maintain the normal production of the Department. Unfortunately for Parliament, that is now being asked for this money for overtime, we just happen to fall amongst those Departments which do not have their work done on time, because even now there can be no denial that we have a backlog, and exactly when we are going to get rid of it, God in Heaven alone knows. However, Sir, perhaps it would be more pertinent if the notes had been a little more explanatory and perhaps a little more informative, that is, if we had been informed as to the difficulties with equipment at the Government Printery. As we look in the Minutes that are presented to the House when we get them time and again, there is an abundance of evidence that the equipment there is not all that can be desired. In correcting the Minutes, I do not for instance pay much attention although I should do, to what are called wrong font letters, but when we bear in mind that these Minutes are going on record not for you and me only to see but for many who will come generations after us to read and we might find in these generations people with a more analytical eye than ours, a mind more particularly concerned with what we might call the finer points of the Arts, these are things to which we should address our minds. The notes do not at any point give us any of that information that the very

work as turned out by the Government Department tells in itself. That is one of the reasons why I would like to have some sort of breakdown on the overtime because what can occasion a considerable amount of overtime is working faulty equipment and machinery. All this can add to your overtime.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, let me start by putting certain facts before the Committee. I think the hon. member will remember that an amount of some \$12,000 is provided under this Item in the current Estimates to pay for overtime work. At 31st October, 1970, the sum of \$11,725 was already expended leaving a balance of \$275 which of course on that basis would be inadequate to meet any commitments to the end of the financial year. The exhaustion of the vote is as a result of the increased workload at the Printing Office. The hon. member will already have seen from the explanatory note that there has been a considerable amount of work from the Ministry of Finance in respect of the Rates and Taxes Division, but apart from that, let me refresh the Committee's memory of the situation in the last financial year. In the last financial year we had a supplementary of about \$6,000 for overtime, and even this proved inadequate because when this financial year began we had to make payments out of this current vote for commitments for overtime left from the last financial year. Besides the annual increase in printing for departments, the Printing Office this year, as I understand, produced four publications for the Ministry of Education in connection with the Ministry's contribution to International Education Year. I understand that three of these publications have been handbooks for teachers on the teaching of science, and one on the teaching of English; so it would appear that there is justification for this increased provision which is based (a) on the increased workload generally and (b) on the increased workload generally and (b) on the special work they have had to do, and of course the fact that they had to spend some \$2,000 of this year's vote to pay the unpaid overtime of \$2,568.40 towards the end of the last financial year, and in that financial year they had only had a supplementary of \$6,000.

Mr. HINDS: Now I wonder if the Minister would look back to see if the last financial year he did not then account for the high expenditure of overtime as having to prepare the Development Plan which came very late indeed. Is it that you have now had to do another Economic Survey and another Development Plan? In the case of the books for International Education Year, what was wrong that it could not have been done during normal working hours? If the Printery was equipped for doing that type of work machinery-wise, would it not have been better to have recruited additional staff if you found you were going to spend an amount of \$6,000 in overtime? One has got to remember that overtime is not paid at normal working rates. I do not want to deny any worker earning overtime money, but what one has got to bear in mind is that these workers who receive overtime money are the workers who are supposed to have put in a particularly strenuous eight-hour day already, and you are then paying them

time and a half or whatever it might be for producing work with tired bodies. That is what one has got to look at.

One has got to be very careful, Mr. Chairman, with the money of the taxpayers. It is true that in printing as in many other phases of Government activity, you find hon. members who are not familiar with this or that aspect of it, but we have got to be ultra-cautious, because there is an attitude adopted by many workers today that their presence on the job is sufficient to earn them their week's pay.  
11.10 a.m.

There is nothing to prevent many people at the Government Printery, I have gone there myself to see them idling through no fault of their own, because there was no machine or equipment to do the work, and if there is an absence of equipment with which these people must work, it must necessitate longer hours of work. What is your structure? How do you stay equipment-wise? That is what I want to hear the Minister tell us something about, we understand about the money but let us hear what made it absolutely necessary for you to have to spend this amount of money on overtime. What is the position with your machinery and equipment? As I have said already, Sir, the Minutes tell the story, plus other work that comes down from the Government Printery. What the Minister might like to tell us in the case of the books published for International Educational Year is how many copies of each issue were turned out and exactly what distribution took place.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: A thousand copies each. I have not seen the publication myself so I cannot tell the hon. member for the number of the pages. The need for this overtime, in addition to what I have already said, has been occasioned by unscheduled rush work coming into the department in addition to the normal work. We have not, so far as I am aware, increased the staff of the Printery, the same complement of staff is doing more routine work and a greater proportion of unscheduled work. In addition to the things I have just mentioned like the special work for the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Education, I would think and I hope the hon. member would accept this argument that if all of this kind of work, both the increased routine work and the extraordinary work, had been done during normal working hours by the present staff, I would imagine that that would be an indication that the staff had been overworked.

Mr. HINDS: Would it be over working the staff or the machines?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Both.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, you cannot over work a machine, a machine only needs oil and grease. The Minister has spoken about unscheduled work, and I wonder if the Minister is taking into consideration such work as has gone to the Government Printery from, let us say, the former three Councils where we have Boards now in place of Councils. We

have the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board, the Child Care Board and the Parks and the Playing Fields Board. The work from those Boards has been handed over to the Government Printery; what is the position with handing over all that work to the Government Printery? Is it being done at the Printery as normal or routine work? Has the taking over of that work caused Government to pay overtime? If the taking over of that work is causing the Government to pay overtime, would it not be more reasonable to let the Government Printery do only such as it can accommodate and let the Boards or Councils give out this other work so as not to pressure these people? What would be of some interest to us would be to let us find out how many extra hours each man is supposed to have put in at the Government Printery because we would then be able to determine if a person is supposed to work 42 or 44 hours a week exactly how many hours the Government is pressing on this man to work, and we would then know whether the man is working under pressure or whether something is not operating as to create disgust in the man's mind. There are many people who would prefer to be doing something for themselves at home after having faced the camera or whatever it might be for the greater part of eight hours during the course of a day. The truth is this, Mr. Chairman, I find that the Minister does not really have an answer for the problem that faces the Government Printery, because up to now he has not said anything about the equipment. If the Minister is right, that the taking in of this work from these other Boards has created a situation where we have to pay overtime, why pay for it at time and a half rates when other business places can do the work for you?

11.20 a.m.

It is unfair. How can it cost more? All you need do is to get an honest estimate from the Government Printery as to what they will do the work for and then get an estimate from any other printery for the job. If it is higher than the Government Printery's estimate, then it will not be entertained. You should use the Government Printery as a guide line. We are saying that it is not fair to the taxpayer to take in work to be done by the Government Printery at time and a half, perhaps, at double time. I wonder if some of this work is paid for, Mr. Chairman, at double time.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes, if he works on Sundays.

Mr. HINDS: Why take in work to be paid for at double time, when other printeries could do the work in normal working hours and cost the taxpayers less money? We are seriously asking the Government to reconsider the position where the Government Printery is concerned and do not put undue pressure on them. It is known that the Government Printery do not have enough equipment and that there are people at the Government Printery still idling through no fault of their own. They would be glad to work, but they do not have the machinery to operate. I would like to hear the Hon. Minister deny that part of it.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member contends that, if the Government Printery cannot handle all of the work which the Government has to do as a result of the abolition of the District Councils and Local Government and the establishment of Statutory Boards, it would be more economical to ask other printeries to do the work than to pay overtime to the workers at the Government Printery. If the hon. member is contending that there is a question of overworking the officers at the Government Printery and that they suffer from frustration as a result of having to do overtime, if this is factual, I can sympathise with his views. Our information is that far from the people in the Printery shying away from overtime they welcome it. I do not think he has a point of frustration there.

Let us go a little further. I know the hon. member will get up and say that they welcome overtime; therefore, they do not work during the day and they will want overtime after normal working hours. If the hon. member will look at the workload at the Printery, see what it turns out today and what it turned out yesterday, he will see that it is enough work. He and most of us agree that the workload from the Local Government bodies has increased the workload of the Printery, yet the Printery is doing all of it. I do not think it would be logical to say that the people at the Government Printery are underworked during normal working hours and they agree to do overtime work, or that they underwork themselves in order to get overtime rates.

The point I rise to make is that if you give the work to other printeries to do, it does not necessarily mean that you are going to get it done at a more reasonable rate than it can be done at the Government Printery even on overtime rates. It would seem reasonable to me that if a printery cost \$X to administer - let us say the Advocate or any printery you are dealing with - it is not only the staff that you will have to take into consideration when arriving at the cost of work. It is a question of the depreciation of the machinery; a question of the cost of the overall administration, and it is a question of the proportionate interest rates which would have to be taken into consideration in the contract, and so on.

All we are asking here is to pass a supplementary provision to pay overtime in the sum of \$10,000 for work done. The hon. member must look at what it cost the Local Government Bodies to pay for printing prior to the abolition of Local Government. Did it cost these bodies more than \$10,000 a year? If it cost these bodies more than \$10,000 a year, then we are justified in giving the Government Printery a supplementary provision of \$10,000 a year. I am sure that it cost the Local Government more than \$10,000 a year. I do not think the hon. member can contend, with any degree of accuracy, that it would be more economical to give out this work on a private contract. All we have to do is to provide overtime to do the same work. At any rate, the Government Printery can absorb some of the work of the Local Government Councils, but, to

complete all of the work and the unscheduled work they have to do, it will be necessary for us to pay the workers overtime.

We have not yet heard where the employees at the Government Printery have been crying out because they have to do overtime to get through the work. If they are crying out, then we will come here and suggest that the work be done by private enterprise because the workers are crying out. Most of us working in a job would like the money received from working overtime. Far from crying out, they welcome overtime so that they can take home something extra for their families. It, perhaps, may not be the best thing for us to get here and criticise the fact that overtime is paid at the Government Printery, because the people up there may be interested in the overtime work in the same way as the workers at Highways and Transport are interested in it to augment the small salary which they are getting.

Mr. Chairman, I am advised that consideration is being given, even at the present moment, to extend the building so that we can increase the staff and the equipment at the Government Printery to be able to do all of the work during normal working hours. It is a question of the staff and machinery not being enough to do all the work we have to do. Even if we want to recruit more staff, the present building does not have the capacity to accommodate the staff and machinery that would be necessary to cope with the demands of the Government.

The hon. member raised the question of double time. There is no double time paid at the Government Printery. Overtime is paid at a rate and a half in accordance with the fixed rates of Government.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The Minister told us last week that the High Commissioner's chauffeur was getting double time.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, if a person works on Sunday, he is entitled to overtime. 11.30 a.m.

We have not said in this debate that these people work on Sundays and bank holidays.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: What the hon. member has just said is that the Government's policy, as I understand it, is to pay overtime at rate and a half and not double time.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: If it is a normal working day, the statutory rate island-wide is time and a half; if it is a bank holiday or Sunday, one has got to pay double time; but the point we are making here is that this work is not done on Sundays because we are not paying double time to anybody. It is just that if a man works two or three hours overtime he is paid time and a half for it. I hope the hon. member sees the point.

In going out to private enterprise, we have to weigh the pros and cons. We have to see what would be the additional cost of going out to private printers and weigh that against the rates which we are paying as wages to the employees there. When you go to a printer outside, you have to pay more than the wages. If I sent some work to the hon. junior member for St. Peter, he is not going to tell me just to pay him for the labour cost of doing it. It is a question of material, depreciation on his machinery and bank interests and so on which he has to meet; so the hon. member must look on these things in a broader light rather than the amount of money which is paid out in wages as overtime. What we are doing here is providing money to pay overtime wages. We are not paying overtime machinery, overtime interests or for overtime administration, because nobody working in an administrative position normally gets overtime. It is the skilled worker that is given overtime.

Mr. Chairman, it would be difficult to decide on what it would cost or decide there and now that it would be more economical to go out on private contract rather than to pay the little extra overtime, because it may not be necessary to give all the local Government work to private contract. The printer may be in a position to handle some, and it is this extra together with the unscheduled work which has resulted in having to pay overtime rates.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to talk about overtime interests, at any rate not in the same breath as the hon. senior member for St. Andrew who has made it absolutely clear to us recently that he is a financial wizard. What I do want to say is that it does not seem clear to me whether the overtime at the Printery was caused by inadequacy of the machinery to do the work, or shortage of manpower. I think this is very important because this would be an increase of 100% on what was spent last year on overtime, and therefore I think it would be in the interest of Government....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, I hate to interrupt the hon. member, but he would have heard the Leader of the House say that last year the sum of \$6,000 was voted for overtime, but that in truth and in fact it was \$8,560 for overtime because of this year's vote, \$3,560 had to go to meet overtime from last year. It is not true to say therefore that overtime is almost twice that of last year. In truth and in fact it is less than it was last year because when you take \$2,560 away from the \$10,000 and add it to the \$6,000, you will note that you have in overtime this year \$7,000 as against \$8,000 last year.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: As I said, Mr. Chairman, the hon. members is a financial genius, and I do not intend to dabble with figures with him. I know that when I speak, I speak the facts, and according to the Estimates, I see that in the overtime vote in the Estimates approved for 1969-70 under Head 28 - Overtime - there was no statutory expenditure. By that I take it that no money was

voted when the Estimates were passed in 1969-70; but in the column "Other Expenditure" there is a sum voted of \$12,000. If you spend \$12,000 in 1969-70 for overtime and you have already voted \$12,000 this year which was obviously based on the Supplementary Estimates for last year, this year's estimate of \$12,000 was obviously based on the figure in the Supplementary Estimates in 1969-70. In addition to that figure of \$12,000, you are asking the Committee to vote \$10,000. I am not a financial genius but that is almost 100%. \$2,000 more would make it 100% increase. So in all for the period 1970-71 you have spent \$22,000 on overtime and this must be compared with \$12,000 in 1969-70.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, let us take the figures that the hon. member has mentioned. He said that there was a vote of \$12,000 last year and a supplementary also of \$6,000.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Let me read this from the Approved Estimates 1969-70.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, the Approved Estimates for 1969-70 were approved in March last year. The point I am trying to make is that over and above the provision which we had in the Approved Estimates for 1969-70, there was additional \$6,000 voted for last year, and apart from that, we have had to take \$2,560 from this year's Estimates to add to that; so if you had \$12,000 approved in 1969-70 and then a supplementary of \$6,000, that would be \$18,000.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: With all due respect, either the Government Printery is responsible for what they print or they are not responsible because if there was another amount of \$6,000, and this is where the Minister and the Leader of the House are being mistaken, obviously the overtime vote for 1969-70 was not \$6,000 at all as the Leader of the House said but in fact \$12,000, because if these Estimates are correct, in the period 1969-70 there was no statutory provision, but your Supplementary Estimate was \$12,000; so this must be your Supplementary Estimate for the period 1969-70.  
11.40 a.m.

Under Overtime in the Estimates for Other Expenditure there is an amount of \$12,000; that must be your Supplementary Estimates for the year 1969-70.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I wonder if we are not at cross purposes; normally you make provision in your Estimates for overtime because in the course of the year you must pay overtime, therefore when you are dealing with your Estimates you make provision for overtime for overtime but if you find that your overtime vote is going you come for a supplementary. What I am saying is that if the hon. member has there provided in the Approved Estimates \$12,000 for overtime, overtime is not a statutory vote.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: The Leader of the House has the Estimates before him and he can see in the 1970-71 Estimates under Statutory Expenditure that there is a vote of \$12,000. I think these Estimates have been printed incorrectly.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: If I can help the hon. member, as was pointed out, you provided in 1969-70 \$12,000 when the Estimates were approved for overtime, then during the year you found that the \$12,000 was over committed and you came for a supplementary of \$6,000.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: If that is so the Minister would agree that the Estimates would have to say it here, but there is no provision here indicating the amount spent last year was more than \$12,000.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: We are dealing with the Printery. The Printery can only print what is given to it, so do not push the blame on the Printery to say that the Printery is at fault. Let us get this matter straight; \$12,000 was provided, that was spent and we had to come here for a supplementary of \$6,000 which made a total of \$18,000. We then found that that was not enough and we had to go into this year's provision and take out \$2,568 so in truth and in fact the overtime for 1969-70 amounted to \$20,568. The point I am making is that it is not true to say we are spending 100% more on overtime because we would have to be spending over \$40,000 on overtime and that is not true. We have spent \$2,568 out of \$12,000 leaving a balance of \$9,432, and we are now asking you for supplementary provision of \$10,000 which would bring the amount to be spent this year for overtime to \$19,432 which is far less than last year, \$568 less than last year, so it is not true to say that we are increasing overtime this year by 100%.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: The point which I was making is that one has got to find out the cost of all of this overtime, whether it is due to a shortage of manpower or whether it is due to incapacity or inability of machines to get through the work during the normal working hours. One has to do some sort of survey, and I think the Government should have this survey done to ascertain whether the overtime is due either to the shortage of manpower or the failure of the machines to cope with the work, because if it is a question of the failure of the machines to cope with the work, then the solution would be obvious, that is, you would have to get additional machines. I was glad to hear the Hon. Minister say that they are expanding the building, and if it is question of shortage of manpower then rather than continue with overtime work, some sort of survey should also be done to ascertain whether it would not be cheaper to increase your staff at the Printery, taking into consideration the fact that you are expanding.

Looking at the figures for overtime work for the last ten years you can ascertain what your overtime expenditure would be and you should do some sort of survey analysis to find out how much it would

take to increase the cost of employing three or four more people to get all this work done. When this is done you may find that if three or four more people are taken on to do certain jobs you can cope with it, because it is all right for other people to get overtime, but what one would like to see is that if this situation can be remedied, rather than having one set of people drawing all this money when other people are unemployed, you can employ other people to get some of this money. You should also try to acquire new machinery, and I would ask the Government to ascertain the real cause for this overtime.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, even with the extension and improvement in the equipment, even with additional equipment the programme of Government is such that as long as you have a Printery you must make provision for overtime. The Printery has no means of knowing what will be full needs for regulations in respect of public health laws. For example, you have a situation where the Printery can be called upon to make amendments during the course of a year to National Insurance regulations, and the Printery would have no reason to know how many pages they would have to provide for National Insurance regulations to take care of the amalgamation of employment injury benefits with the National Insurance regulations, and this is what has been happening this year. The Printery would not know how long the Opposition would keep us in here talking over a partial Resolution, the Printery has no means of knowing that a Bill of two clauses would keep us in here for three hours, and therefore that means additional work, and at the same time the members of the House, including myself, would be concerned about the fact that we are not getting the Official Gazette or the Minutes or what have you as quickly as possible.

11.50 a.m.

You have a situation where they may be called upon to provide Public Health Regulations. They may have six or eight Bills in their hands and estimate that it will take so much paper and so much labour. Eventually they may find that, after the Law Officers have gone into the matter, the paper and the labour have trebled what they had anticipated. You have the question of printing invitations for functions, and you have to print things for conferences not provided for. You have to take all of these things into consideration and give the Government Printery a reasonably free hand with overtime.

You go to the Printery with something you want done in a hurry such as the Public Health Regulations or the National Assistance Regulations; you tell the Government Printer that the work must be done by Monday next week, so what must he do? The work cannot be done in normal working hours; therefore they must step up their workload and employ people to do overtime work. We may find that, in the interest of the public, we may have to come here and have an emergency debate on something in this House. There may be an epidemic and the Government Printery may be called in to do work. Whether or not we extend the Printery and provide more machinery and staff,

we will still have to make provision for overtime. We may be able to reduce overtime when we increase the staff and provide more machinery, but we cannot wipe out overtime altogether. This is one of the arms of the Government that must operate in emergency cases. An officer at the Ministry may phone the Government Printer and ask for 2,000 copies of a document, whether it is a White Paper or otherwise, and ask that it be ready by next week. The Government Printer will have to put people to do the work, because he is working with us and we dictate the policy.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, if ever there was a case made out by any hon. member why we should establish a Printery for Parliament alone, the hon. member who has just sat down has made it out. We need a Printery for Parliament alone.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I would like to make this point. We on this side are not arguing against that. The time has come when we have to give consideration to providing a Printery for Parliament, because when you have people like the hon. junior for St. Peter and myself, when we begin to talk we do not want to stop.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is no point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: It is a point of elucidation. When we talk for two or three hours on a Resolution, you cannot expect the Government Printery to do all of the work, and we should have our own Printery.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister having agreed with me on that point, I wonder whether he will try to agree with me on the other points. Firstly, to find out if each member of the staff at the Government Printery is gainfully employed for a full 8-hour day, or for as many hours as he is on the premises; to find out if the machinery at the Government is in full-time production, and to find out whether it is producing at full capacity. If that is not so, why not? If you find that some of the machines are not producing satisfactorily, let the Minister tell us how long they have not been producing I know that parts were ordered from Puerto Rico for a long time. Have they received them yet? I want to hear the Minister's reply in a much more serious vein. Are you saying that none of this money that is asked for is to pay for work done at the Government Printery on a Sunday.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of elucidation, Mr. Chairman. My information is that no double time rate is paid, and I have made that crystal clear. I know that, in accordance with the labour legislation of this country, if you employ people to work on Sunday you have to pay them double time. If you employ people to work on Bank Holidays they will get double time. I am advised that no double time is paid at the Government Printery. It has been intimated to me that no Sunday work is done. If people work on Sunday, you will have to pay them double time.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister saying that Sunday work was done, but it was paid for at time and a half? In other words, is the Minister admitting that Government has been robbing the workers?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The Minister is not admitting that the Government has been robbing the workers. The Minister has said that, as far as his information goes, no double rate was paid at the Printery. I cannot see no worker standing up in a day like this, when we have so much confidence in workers, and be robbed when he works overtime. The workers of this country are too secured in their jobs today, and they are too intelligent to accept this sort of behaviour.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister still has to tell us if the printers and the cameramen at the Government Printery or members of the staff have ever had to work on a Sunday. Have they been called out to work on a Sunday and were not paid? If you did not pay them double time, did you put them to work on a Sunday and pay them time and a half?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I understand that there is a fixed rate agreed upon by these workers. The hon. member must understand that Government workers are either represented by the Trade Unions or the Civil Service Association. 12.00 noon.

Government workers are represented either by the Civil Service Association or the Barbados Workers' Union or both and the terms of their employment are laid down and agreed to by the Unions, and if there is a breach of those terms, my knowledge of my fellowman in this country is that he would not stand for it. As I understand it, all Government workers have fixed terms under which they are employed, and there is a fixed rate for overtime which has been between the worker or his representative and the particular body or agency concerned.

Mr. HINDS: Am I to understand from the Minister that the rate that has been agreed on is fixed in such a way that it is applicable whether that overtime falls on a Saturday or Sunday?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The point I am making is that there is agreement between worker and employer, and the worker is represented by his Union, and unless an appeal was made to us by either side, we could not get here and adjudicate an agreement between a worker and an employer, because we believe in collective bargaining.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, we are not seeking to adjudicate anything between worker and employer. All we are concerned with is whether it is true or not that work has been done at the Government Printery on a Sunday.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I have made the point that work has been done, as I understand it, but it

was done in accordance with the terms of agreement between the worker and the employer.

Mr. HINDS: Since the Minister is now admitting for the first time that work was done on a Sunday, was it paid for at double time rates?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I know that the rate paid is the rate agreed upon between the worker and the employer. The only people I know who are not represented are some of the girls in the shops in Swan Street and so on and domestic servants, but most of our workers are represented by the Barbados Workers' Union, and as I said, I believe in the principle of collective bargaining and I know the hon. member believes in that too; but the whole point is that if there is an agreement between a particular group of workers or their representative and the employer, who are we to get here and question it? There are certain things which we ought to do and certain things which we ought not to do, and until there is a breakdown in negotiations when the workers cannot get together with their employers, the Minister of Labour cannot intervene unless they appeal. As far as the Minister of Labour is concerned, he has had no appeal made to him about any grievance with the workers at the Government Printery, and in as much as there is an agreement between their representatives and the Government in respect of their terms of employment, I do not think we should question it here.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I am not concerned with the workers or the agreement. I am concerned with the money we are asked to vote here today, and I want the Minister to tell me how much of this money is to pay for double time and how much for time and a half.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, it is unreasonable for the hon. member to ask me how much is to be paid for double time because this is only an estimate. We do not know how many times an officer may be asked to come out on Sundays. The hon. member himself may be one of the cause of the officer having to come out and work on Sundays, but the point is that we cannot say how much of this money is to be paid for Sunday work. We are not dealing with actual expenditure.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I think the contention of the hon. junior member for St. Peter is that he is apparently aware rightly or wrongly that on some occasion or occasions workers at the Printery came out and worked on Sunday and did not receive double time rates. I think the hon. member has had it explained to him that as far as workers at the Government Printery are concerned, their overtime rates are fixed by agreement by the Association that represents them. This has to some appreciable extent freed the Government Service in that there is now an established Civil Service Association which can be rightly regarded as the body responsible for bargaining on behalf of Government and public servants. Therefore if it is that

a rate has been agreed upon and fixed by negotiation between those who are in the position of bargaining for these workers, and that rate is whatever it is and they have been paid according to what is provided in that agreement, there is no quarrel. If the hon. junior member for St. Peter intends to set himself up as a special bargaining agent on behalf of those servants, I do not believe there is any hon. member in this House who would come between him and them. This is a free country. Whatever expertise he has as a bargainer, Trade Union-wise, this Government would welcome.

Mr. Chairman, if it is true that any representation has been made to Government or to the Ministry of Labour that on any occasion in the past workers at the Printery working on Sunday were not paid adequately, then the hon. member has a strong case, but if any monies have been paid out in respect of overtime work on Sunday or other holidays and the workers have not made any protest along that line, the hon. member, I think, is in cold water and putting himself deeper in it.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. senior member for St. Andrew said that this is an estimate. No one knows how many Sunday hours or Monday hours have been put in this overtime.

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

Mr. HINDS: I am not giving way on this point.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I just want to clarify something.

Mr. HINDS: I am not giving way.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Government overtime rates are not fixed as time and a half or double time. There is an arrangement between the particular organisation and the Government Establishments Section and the C.S.A. of Barbados Workers' Union, and they have a fixed rate for overtime. For example, even currently negotiations are going on between the C.S.A. and the Establishments Section of the Ministry of Finance for an increase in the overtime rates. I think there is a special arrangement with Government servants and there are negotiations going on now between the Establishments Section and the workers in Government Departments for an increase not as double time or time and a half, but for an increase in overtime rates. So it appears to me as though there are fixed rates at which these people are paid overtime.  
12.10 p.m.

The question asked was whether they get it on Sunday or any other day, but it is a fixed rate for these people. If a man works for \$300 a month, there is a fixed rate for overtime, and my understanding is that the negotiations are now being carried out for overtime rates, and the overtime rates in Government as I understand it are not fixed by statute law, there is an agreement between the Government

printery and the Establishments Division. At any rate, they do not get less than time and a half. You will remember that there was an amendment to the Holiday with Pay Act and the average worker who was entitled, whether he worked for ten or fifteen years, to only two weeks holiday with pay in private enterprise, but that Government servants as long as they put in three years started off by getting three weeks holiday with pay.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am afraid that this is not the subject matter.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The hon. member is enjoying what I am saying and he has given way. The whole point is that there seems to be a special arrangement between the Establishments Section and the average worker, and these people get two pensions, one from Government and one from National Insurance.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister to taken seriously at any stage? In other words, is he right in what he has just said with respect to the arrangement on these rates for the workers at the Government Printery, or was he right when he said at an earlier stage that they were fixed? Was he right then or is he right now? (Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Both times). I believe him. Mr. Chairman, let us try to see if we can bring this debate to a close; what Government must do, and do quickly there you have the Government complaining that the Printery is presently being pressured by having to attend to such matters as the printing of public health regulations, invitations to functions, invitations to conferences and the like. That is exactly what the Minister told us, and we are inviting the Government to free the Printery of all things that are not absolutely necessary for the Printery to do. The hon. junior member for the City said that it is time that a survey be carried out, and we have heard the Minister say that they are going to expand the building and extend the work at the Government Printery; what is the reason for doing all of this? There is an answer. Mention of that by the Minister tells us that the present machinery cannot cope with the volume of work in the hands of the Government Printery, that is what the Minister is saying. The Minister further said, and we quite agree with him, that with an unexpected increase in the volume of work it throws an extra burden on the Printery and we are asking that the Printery be freed from such things as it need not handle.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Perhaps this would bring a close to the debate; what the hon. member is saying is currently being done, an application has been made for technical aid and we are getting a man down now to completely reorganise the Printery. Some of the things which the Printery is doing now, which clearly it ought not to be doing, will be channelled in the right quarter because this expert is coming down to reorganise it.

Mr. HINDS: Can the Minister tell us where the expert will be coming from?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: He is coming from Great Britain.

*The question that Head 32 - stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

Head 45 - MINISTRY OF TRADE, TOURISM, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND YOUTH AFFAIRS - was called.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 45 stand part. In moving this Head, I believe hon. members have read the note which I think is fairly informative and we are now providing for a Football Coach. This Item is listed as a new Item, and I understand that the Barbados Amateur Football Association and the Manager of the National Stadium will be jointly responsible for seeing that this Coach's services are fully utilised. This Officer is expected not only to improve the standard of football in the recognised clubs but also to improve football generally, even among the village clubs. In Barbados there is something called a minileague, and if hon. members would care sometimes when they have time off on Saturday afternoons to go to the Garrison, they would see youngsters playing football there and I understand that already the standard of football has appreciably improved. I myself have not had the time to visit the Garrison and see this Coach at work, but I understand he has good references and a good background as a Coach, and that he is of a very high standard as far as English football is concerned and a good teacher. He mixes well with the youth, and I hope I will be in a position to answer any questions hon. members may ask.  
12.20 p.m.

This is a new Item; it is deliberately marked new, and I commend my colleagues in Committee to assist the Government in making this new provision for the service of a Football Coach.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second this Resolution, Mr. Chairman, and in doing so I would like to say one or two things. Mr. Adams, the Football Coach, was with us for some time now. My understanding is that he has had certain difficulties. He is the type who is very ardent about his job, and any type of frustration which he meets will send him off the track. However, he has done a tremendously good job for the youth of the country. We have been able to compete with teams outside and hold our own and we are improving. What has happened is that there has been an arrangement whereby Government provides a vote which was a sort of subsidy to the payment of Mr. Adams along with contributions made by the Football Association, and I think the Chamber of Commerce was one of the organisations who also made a contribution.

However, there was a time in the history of Mr. Adams being here that he and some of the people in the various organisations did not see eye to eye. I think that Mr. Adams, quite rightly, and I say so advisedly, decided that he and only he should select or pick a team to represent Barbados. This is in accordance with the professional ethics of a Foot-

ball Coach. This, as I understand it, is the normal prerogative of a Football Coach to pick his team. (Asides.) You should refer to the way it is done internationally. This is what I understand, and you cannot blame me for saying what I understand. This is the point of view of Mr. Adams. However, I think they have jumped that hurdle. The B.A.F.A. contend that he should not pick the team, and he contends that he should pick the team. Anyhow, they have agreed on who should pick the team. Mr. Adams was frustrated, and he tendered his resignation to the Public Service Commission. (Asides)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: While a Member is speaking all other Members shall be silent.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Anyhow, for some reason or other Mr. Adams tendered his resignation and it was accepted. I think that salary also had something to do with it, in that when there was a salary revision in this country Mr. Adams' salary was not revised and he contended, and I agree, that the salary ought to be revised, as the cost of living was the same for him as for other persons, and if he got one salary prior to the revision of salaries, then his salary should also be revised. This provision here is to revise his salary. He had tendered his resignation because he could not work for that salary as well as one or two other difficulties.

After his resignation was accepted by the Public Service Commission, Mr. Adams asked to withdraw his resignation. It was recommended in the Ministry that the letter be withdrawn, but it was not entertained. It would have been farcical to have gone to the Public Service Commission again and say: "We are going to re-establish a post of Football Coach; we have a qualified Football Coach in the country and you must employ him." If you take the average youth in this country who can spell "football", he will tell you that we need Mr. Adams, because he is the only coach who has whipped up football in Barbados, and has improved the standard of football considerably. It is a question of getting around it. The matter was discussed in the Ministry, and it was felt that the only way to retain Mr. Adams' services was to let the Stadium Corporation employ him. We made an annual grant to the Stadium Corporation, and they will employ Mr. Adams. Although it is a Government matter he will not be paid directly from a Government Treasury source, but it will go to the Stadium Corporation and they will employ Mr. Adams.

Mr. Chairman, this money is to do something in the interest of this country, and if the Public Service Commission did not see our way to retain the services of Mr. Adams, a man who has been responsible for pushing football a long way and who can push it further in this country, then we have to do something about the matter. He will now be employed by the Stadium Corporation, and the money provided here will be passed on to the Stadium Corporation to pay Mr. Adams, together with the other perquisites such as the provision of a house, etc.

I think that hon. members on the other side are as keen in the interest of the youths in the districts that they represent as we are. I think hon. members on the other side will have absolutely no hesitation in supporting this Resolution. I do not think they would even debate it, because what we are doing in the interest of the young people of this country who are keenly interested in football as it is put to them by Mr. Adams. I recommend the Resolution to hon. members.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, it is very seldom that we get in Committee such a long speech by the Mover of a Head, or even a longer speech by the person seconding the Head. Let me be absolutely blunt. The Government do not have to sell us any idea about the appointment of a Football Coach in Barbados. We agree with it, but what we do not agree with is the manner in which Mr. Adams treated the Barbados Football Association. Not so long ago the Minister told us how one gentleman called Mr. Schofield, who was actually bringing money into this country, treated the Barbados Marketing Corporation, and the same Minister, who seconded the Motion to move this Head, was at pains to say that, if it had been reported to him, Mr. Schofield would have been sent out of this country. I stand here today and charge Mr. Adams with treating the Barbados Football Association in an even more contemptible fashion. Let us be realistic. 12.30 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, the hon. member said that I said that if I had my way Mr. Schofield would be out of the country because he treated the Barbados Marketing Corporation with contempt, and he wants to look at the Adams' incident in the same light. It was the Football Association that came to me in the Ministry and said that we should do everything we could to retain the services of Mr. Adams; so if they were all that mad at Mr. Adams they would not have come to the Ministry and made such a representation.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I would like the hon. member to find out how long ago these representations were made, and to ascertain the feeling of the Barbados Football Association today and see if they would ask him to retain Graham Adams as a National Football Coach. I have no doubt that what the Minister said is true. After Mr. Adams treated the Football Association with contempt, he walked around and abused certain members of the Association, but when he realised that he could not withdraw his application to the Public service Commission so easily, and it was going to accept his resignation, he realised what a stupid thing he had done and he started begging the members.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I want to go on record as saying that the President, Vice-President, Secretary and other members of the Football Association made representation to the Ministry and to me personally when I was Minister for sports long before Mr. Adams had asked to withdraw his resignation. You will remember, Mr. Chairman,

when we had United Nations year; you will remember when the Mini League organised a week of sport and there was football at the Garrison. That was before Mr. Adams asked to have his resignation withdrawn, and when I opened the week of sport, the members of the B.A.F.A. came to me at the Garrison and suggested that we do all we could to retain the services of Mr. Adams. I told them to let us have a meeting on it and they came in a week or two after to discuss the problem with me together with representatives of the Stadium all of whom were very anxious that we should retain the services of Mr. Adams. It is not true to say therefore that it was only after he went around and talked.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: The Minister does not know how many times Mr. Adams threatened to resign before he sent in the letter of resignation. I can tell the Minister that he threatened to resign as coach on numerous occasions, even when the players went to Martinique or Guadeloupe, because he was not allowed to pick the team. No coach can pick a football team. The English coach does not pick England's Football team, but Mr. Adams thought he could come down here and lord it over Barbadians. If the Minister checks his records, he would see why Mr. Adams had to leave Bermuda. It was because he could not get along with the Bermuda Football Association, and that is the very reason why he has to leave Barbados also. Mr. Adams is not a fantastic coach. (*Asides*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: While an hon. member is speaking, all other members shall be silent.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Let me say this: when the other people in the Ministry of Sports got an increase, Mr. Adams thought he could blackmail the Football Association and the Barbados Government by telling them that if they did not give him an increase, he would resign. But he did not realise that Barbadians are different from the English people he had to deal with before, and this is why his resignation sent in, because the Government did not at that stage agree to give him an increase. When his resignation was sent in and he realised they were going to accept it, he went around to the members of the Football Association and asked them to get the Government to re-consider his position. Before the Minister engages Mr. Adams' services for one more year, I would like him to check with the Council of the Football Association and see if they want to keep Mr. Adams for a whole year. I grant you that since the arrangement with the former Minister, all has not been well between Mr. Adams and the Football Association, and I am glad to see that you are only voting this money to the end of March, but I understand from the notes that they intend to keep Mr. Adams for a year. Mr. Adams may know a little about coaching as compared with Mr. Robinson and other Barbadians, but he is no fantastic coach, and if the Government is going to spend money on teaching people to play football, they should get a proper coach. I agree with voting money for a proper Football Coach, because you should dispense with the services of Mr. Adams.

Now, Sir, I am glad to see that the Government has seen fit to provide the services of a Football Coach. Some time ago as President of the Basketball Association of this country, I went to the Minister who was then the hon. junior member for Christ Church. He did not actually turn up at the meeting; he said he had a Cabinet meeting; but a delegation from the Basketball Association had an interview with the Permanent Secretary, Mr. Burton, and we asked him then to provide the services of a Basketball Coach. That was some two or three years ago. I understand since that no Basketball Coach has ever been appointed, but there is a Netball Coach. I want to say now that Mr. Foffie Williams has let it be known that as long as I have anything to do with the Basketball Association, we cannot get a Basketball Coach. He said this openly in the Department. Is this the way the young people of this country will be treated? Just because I am President of the Basketball Association, Foffie Williams can say they will not get a Basketball Coach. Sir, basketball is a game that is being played in all the housing areas in this country. We had the services of Mr. Erskine Dottin, but he has now left Barbados on an assignment. He has been given a scholarship at, I think, Jackson State University. I would urge seriously on the Minister to think of providing a coach and to contact Mr. Dottin. I do not know when he is going to qualify, but recently I had a letter from the University stating how well he was doing, and I would seriously ask Government to consider at this stage contacting Mr. Erskine Dottin and try to make arrangements for him when he qualifies to return to Barbados. I am going to show you what sort of man Foffie Williams is. Because of Foffie Williams, this country has lost the best of its athletic coaches, Jim Wedderburn. It was because of the nonsense Foffie gets in the Department and does that Mr. Wedderburn had to leave this country. This is a man who has an M.Sc. from a University, who was accepted as being the best athletic coach in Barbados. 12.40 p.m.

Do you think he left Barbados because he wanted to go to America and work for more money? He did not leave the Sports Department and go straight to the United States, he left the Sports Department and went to work at Combermere, and after that he got fed up and went to the United States, but this was because of Foffie Williams, and this is wrong. All he is doing is to make sure that certain people get certain things, and other people who are more knowledgeable than him, are being sent out of the Department. This is the case with Jim Wedderburn.

I want to find out also from the Minister when they are so many people in this country capable of coaching athletics, including the same Jim Wedderburn, why it was necessary to employ an English woman at a salary higher than what is being paid to any of the other Coaches. These things cannot be right, Mr. Chairman, this is a lady whose contract at the Alexandra School ran out and the Government saw fit to employ her and pay her more money than they are paying Barbadian nationals. How can a man like Wedderburn who holds an M.Sc.,

in physical education feel under those circumstances? He is not the only person who cannot get along with Foffie Williams; take the cricket Coach in the person of Charles Griffith who was taken on there as a Coach, and for a number of months Foffie Williams refused to allow him to coach, and the only job assigned to him was to look after the playing fields. That is not right, and Foffie Williams only did this because he does not like Charles Griffith. Charlie Griffith was coaching the B.C.L. and Fiffie Williams told him, he could not coach these people any more; these things cannot be right. I need not tell the Minister who the B.C.L. people are, and you cannot have an obstructionist like Foffie Williams in a Department, it is all wrong. When you have two expatriates receiving more money than the Barbadians, how do you think this will operate? Let me ask one last question; I would like to know from the Minister if Mr. Foffie Williams is paying rent for the Government house he is living in at Blenheim, and why is it that he is given permission to live in that house. I can tell the Minister as a fact that Foffie Williams does not look after the playing field at Blenheim and it is in a very bad state today, so do not tell me it is because he is looking after the playing field. I think the Minister should look into these things.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I do not usually speak on these matters but it is clear that the Government really needs a policy in relation to the Sports Department. There is something fundamentally wrong with the Sports Department in Barbados, the turnover of staff is quite great, and it is a great pity that we in Barbados have lost the services of someone of the calibre of Mr. Wedderburn, because not only did he contribute to athletics, but he played a vital role in encouraging the young people to take part in such activities as the cadets and other young things. There is no doubt about it, the personality of the Sports Officer is such that he does not get along well with any of his colleagues; that is true, and in those circumstances it is the bounding duty of the Government and the Public Service Commission to see if it is not possible to deal with him by transferring him to another department, because one man should not be allowed to frustrate Government policy. I feel that if there was cooperation in that department a lot more could be done for the encouragement of sport throughout Barbados. There is a large number of areas in Barbados where people used to play cricket and other games, but for some reason or the other there does not seem to be the degree of organisation coming from the top to give encouragement to people in outer areas to participate. That happens in our area of Christ Church, and I feel that the only solution to this problem is going to be when the Government has a conference with these respective Officers and try to find a solution to the personality problem that exists.

The Government took over the tennis courts, and look at the position of the tennis courts now, they are utilised once in a blue moon and that is not right, because the tennis courts are there to encourage people to play tennis. Many people would like to be

able to play tennis in various areas other than Bridgetown; up in Christ Church, a place with a population of over 40,000 people, and we have very little sporting facilities up there. I have made suggestion after suggestion in here that it was possible to use part of the Southern District Council grounds for netball, basketball and tennis courts, and absolutely nothing has been done about it. There is land within the Government area and belonging to the Government, so there is no question of acquisition costs, all it needs, is a little levelling and the laying out of the court. This is what the Sports Department is supposed to be doing, going around trying to see what available area there is and trying to encourage maximum participation; instead of that, they are wasting their time with a lot of inter-departmental rows and inter-personality rows.

I had one dealing with Mr. Williams and when he saw that I was dead serious, what I wanted went through, because Springfield Club wanted to use the Garrison and it took them nine months to decide to let the Springfield Club use it, but because the Attorney General had a club from Brittons Hill who wanted to use the same place they were given first preference, but when I went back into the department we got it solved because I insisted that at least they had to let us share the ground because we had asked first and in as much as it is Barbadian property I do not mind how many clubs use it, but the point is that we are using it now. That is the only dealing I have had with the gentleman but if what the hon. member has said is true, that he says that as long as Mr. Mottley is President of the Basketball Association they will never get a Coach, let Foffie Williams know the D.L.P. will not be in power for ever and he had better watch himself otherwise he will not have a job. If you play with the political sword and you wield it, it can chop you too, so let him understand his job is to look after promoting all the sporting services in Barbados and not to advance any political view. If he has political views let him come out on the platform and advance them, so let him understand that very clearly, that the member is an elected head of the Association and his duty is to deal with it objectively and not with any political considerations, so he had better be careful.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I will add my quota to this because I think Mr. Williams is travelling on very, very dangerous ground. Mr. Williams some years ago worked for the Vestry and the City Council; the name "Mottley" to him seems as though it is like a snake or something, I do not know why.  
12.50 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, I would like the Hon. Minister to hear this: I do not care about Mr. Williams nor anybody else who has a job like Mr. Williams. Mr. Williams feels that because he went to Combermere School that I was to recommend him for promotion over people who studied and got certificates as Sanitary Inspectors. He went to Combermere School

and left with his birth certificate; he carried it in and he left with it. Mr. Williams got into his office and said openly: "As long as Mottley has anything to do with it....." Somebody was moved from the City Council and appointed to work in Mr. Williams' office, and he looked at them and told them: "As long as you have anything to do with Mottley, you cannot get anywhere in this office." The Minister of Community Development will tell you that the person asked for a transfer as a result of the manner in which she was being treated. He got in the office and said that openly. He is a civil servant and he cannot do that sort of thing. I admire a civil servant who might have certain political views but, as far as he is concerned, when it comes to duty he carries out his duty as a civil servant, without letting the fact that a man belongs to another political party interfere with his work. That is how it should be. You cannot prevent a civil servant from having his political views, but when you have an ignorant civil servant, this sort of thing will happen. He is very ignorant. I knew Foffie Williams at a time when he would have cut off the heads of the Leader of the House and the Prime Minister for Mr. Freddie Millar.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That has nothing at all to do with Head 45.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: I know that as well as you do.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am very proud that the hon. senior member for the City knows that as well as I do, and I expect him to restrict his remarks to Head 45.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Foffie Williams cannot get on with a National, and because he cannot get on with a National, he has to go and get somebody else to put in the job at a higher rate of salary. Nobody can agree with that, and Mr. Foffie Williams had better watch himself. Mr. Foffie Williams does not have the ability to run a civil servant who has ability and who can stand up on his feet and talk back. He is nothing else but a groundsman, and because he has been pushed forward into some job he is giving people trouble. The hon. Minister for Agriculture knows that what I am saying about Mr. Wedderburn is true. Do you think Foffie Williams is in Wedderburn's street? It is true that the only thing Foffie Williams could do was to play cricket at Empire. When we were playing Trinidad, Williams and Martindale made a name for themselves, and they could have given the job to Martindale although he is a bit old.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I see in the Note that this National Football Coach is to provide for the availability of expert football coaching at all schools. Now I rise, in the first instance, to say that if the Note is correct there will certainly be discrimination against the schools in St. Joseph, because I have asked a question in the House hoping that the Ministry would provide a reasonable playing field for the Blackman/Horse Hill area.

Now, if we look at the schools in St. Joseph, we will find that the St. Elizabeth School has been built for a number of years. Work has been started on the school and nothing has been completed; therefore, the children at the West St. Joseph School cannot use the playing field and would not be in a position to avail themselves of this expert coaching. It is now public knowledge that the new St. Bernard's School which was opened in November during the bye-election - it was lauded and hailed as a gift from the Canadian Government, and they opened it at a time when they hoped to catch votes. They have left remnants of the building around that school. Every time the rain falls water floods that area. Although the school is on a large area, the children there cannot avail themselves of any games such as expert football coaching or any other game. I am surprised that nobody has yet complained of having a nail punch, or of falling down and cutting his foot, as a result of the way in which the school was left.

Mr. Chairman, West St. Joseph School has been there for a number of years. There are two fields on the approach to West St. Joseph School, and I am sure the Government can use their powers to compulsorily acquire one of these fields. It would give the School a view to the main road, and it would provide adequate playing fields for the people in the area. I would hope the youthful Minister of Youth will go with me - (*Asides.*) The hon. member would prefer me to say the old man Minister of Youth, but if he will go with me I can show him of what I am speaking. I hope that he will do something quickly, so that the children in St. Joseph will get some of this expert training.

Mr Chairman, let us look at the Department which administers the coaching. Now, I know the case of Jim Wedderburn personally. It is what I consider to be one of the heart-breaking cases, where a National with the highest qualification in his profession has been forced to uproot his home from his father land to go somewhere else to work for recognition. Mr. Wedderburn was a Jaycee at the time I was a Jaycee; he worked tirelessly with the Queen Show Competitions at Kensington. He was so frustrated that he was offered at least three jobs in the United States, which he turned down, before finally accepting this job. He went to Combermere a frustrated man; he is not happy in teaching classics, and I can tell anybody that. He is most happy in doing what he is qualified to do like all of us.

The position is that Mrs. Wedderburn left Barbados a week ago to take a young child at the age of five to resettle in a little village on the borders of Canada. All that lady is saying is: "My God, how am I going to react to the cold? I have to run out of my country." He has openly expressed his own feeling. He says: "When the situation is correct, I will gladly come back to serve my people and my country." That is the sort of thing we have to protect.

Mr. Chairman, the problem in this matter is like most things today. When certain old men find that a youth has been qualified and can do a job better than themselves, the old men seek to suppress the young men. This is the Ministry of Youth, and any old man who seek to keep down a youth, the Government should be bold enough to deal with him.  
1.00 p.m.

The Government in 1961 said that this was the day of youth, and they should be bold enough to remove the old men. I do not say to remove the Minister because we must temper youth with age and experience, but we must not allow age to keep down the youth and to drive them away from our shores. Whenever you look around you see Barbados, Trinidad and Guyana asking its qualified youth to return to the country in order to enhance its position; but in Barbados we have cases where the young people are running out of Barbados to somewhere else. I suggest to the Hon. Minister to carry out an investigation, and as the Leader of the Opposition has said, if the fact as related here are true, you should make the necessary changes by way of transfer or whatever is sufficient to satisfy the needs of the community. No one man should stand in the way of progress in this community, and I would hope that the Hon. Minister would especially look into the case of Wedderburn, a man who refused several jobs in the United States hoping that he would have been able to make a reasonable life in Barbados. He has not gone there for money. What we must understand is that every time a national of this country or every time a West Indian has to leave his native homeland to go somewhere else, he has to sell out his goods at a loss, he has to re-establish a home in lands to which he is not accustomed. He had to meet a lot of expenditure and equip himself with winter gear and he has to re-adjust into a new society; and he will never be accepted in any society outside the West Indies, because we know that if it is in Britain, they will tell him that it may be his Queen but not his country; if it is the United States, there is discrimination, and I feel strongly about a coloured Barbadian National being forced to go and accept an appointment in an American school because in his own land he has been given problems, and nobody can say that he is a man with whom one could not get along. So why should he have to go? If there is a man that people cannot get along with, it is that man who should go.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one point. Hon. members on the other side contend that the Chief Sports Officer has been responsible for the leaving of Mr. Wedderburn and frustration in the Department. Now the post of Chief Sports Officer is an established post filled by the Public Service Commission. Now the Public Service Commission is an independent body which is governed by the Constitution of this country. Any Minister who attempts to question the authority or do something which would be suppressing the Public Service Commission, would be accused by the other side of meddling with the Constitution of the country. What is striking strange to me is to hear hon.

members on the other side in one breath say that we want to change the Constitution, and in another breadth call on us to do something which is not our constitutional right to do.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: On a point of order, nobody has called on the Minister to fire Mr. Williams. I have called on the Minister to have an investigation made.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The hon. senior member for St. Joseph said that we should remove the man.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, first of all I am the junior member for St. Joseph and secondly I said that the Minister should cause an investigation to be made, and if it is found that a man cannot get on with his fellowmen, they should not go, it is he who should go. I have not called the Minister to fire anybody.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Point made.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, the whole tenor of the hon. member's address is that Mr. Williams should go. One hon. member said we should transfer Mr. Williams. Where are we going to transfer him to?

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, the Hon. Minister is misquoting me constantly. I said that if it can be dealt with through transfer or by whatever means, this should be done, but there should not be somebody there to frustrate the work of the Department. I have not called on the Minister to transfer him. I asked him to call for an investigation, and arising out of the investigation any action can be taken that is deemed necessary.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: It shows that the hon. member does not know what he is saying because in one breadth he said the man should be transferred. There is only one post of Chief Sports Officer in this country and there is a man appointed to that post. Anyone who knows anything about the Constitution of this country would know that if you want to remove the man, what you would have to do would be to pay out compensation to him. It is all right to talk about an investigation or what have you. All of us have our faults. I suppose Mr. Williams may have his as you have yours and I have mine, but that does not mean that you can come here and call on people to push a man out of a job that way.

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

Hon. N. N. R. HUSBANDS: I beg to second that.

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

## SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended for one hour.

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

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

1.10 p.m.

*On resumption*

Mr. SPEAKER: When the sitting was suspended the House was in Committee; automatically thereto it reverts.

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

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, when one looks at the role of sport in the entire West Indies, one has got to come to the conclusion that it is perhaps one of the greatest avenues of social ability. Had it not been for cricket perhaps there would not have been a great Everton Weekes or Garfield Sobers today, and in many other games certain other prominent West Indians would not be heard of, and that is why I think the greatest care possible should be taken when dealing with sport in this country. Far too long sport has been taken merely for the sake of having a Sports Department and a Sports Officer, and it is time for somebody to go around to Harrison College, Lodge and some of the Comprehensive Schools. That is not the role of a Sports Officer at all; if the setting up of the Sports Department is really going to be meaningful it must reach out to other districts of this country. It must go, as it were, in the highways and by-ways to bring out the young people of this country and give them an opportunity to make a contribution to this country. We have examples in Sobers, Weekes and various other people who have made their contribution, and had it not been for cricket we would not have heard about them.

When you look at the Sports Department of this country which has been in existence from as far back as when the Barbados Labour Party set it up, what real contribution has it made during the past 10 years? Let us take lawn tennis; is there really any need or necessity for young boys to be playing road tennis today in Barbados? Is there any need for these young boys to be engaged in such a hazardous sport as road tennis? The answer is obviously no. The Government is not only at fault for this, the commercial sector must also bear some responsibility for the failure to provide proper sporting facilities throughout the length and breadth of Barbados. Let us be realistic; lawn tennis in this country today is still a game which is merely played by the middle class and upper class. How many people from Chapman Lane or from any district in the real country areas have an opportunity to play lawn tennis? I accept that you are providing lawn tennis courts at the Garrison Savannah, but that it not satisfactory in itself, what about the young boys in St. Lucy, St.

Andrew, St. Joseph, St. Philip and St. Peter? These young boys, unless they have a middle class background they do not have any opportunity to really participate in games like lawn tennis, this is almost non-existent.

We have on this side been calling on the Government to remedy this situation, and I myself have always been critical of the Government's idea of a playing field, because merely to acquire a piece of land and leaving it there is ridiculous. You must provide facilities and you must provide technical know-how to assist these people. I would like to know what is the position with the Water Polo Association and with the Swimming Association? The members of the Swimming Association have been dependent on North Point only to find that the man is bankrupt now and had to leave for another place. In what fields of sport other than cricket and football have Barbadians really made any headway in relation to world sports? The position with athletics is ridiculous because there were no facilities, but merely building a stadium is not going to be the answer, because you have to get out into the districts, into the housing areas and bring out from among the housing areas the best of the youth so that you will be able to make the best possible use of your stadium.

I could go on. You take hockey which is played in the centre of Bridgetown, but what about boys in the country, do they not need an opportunity to play hockey? The same thing applies to basketball; absolutely no opportunity is being given to these chaps. While I am on my feet, I would like to say that representation has been made to me that quite some time ago the Elks Sports Club had rented a playing field in Chapman Lane and had asked the Government to provide a hard tennis court. They have also asked that an extension be made to the pavilion and nothing has so far been done by the Government. Even though the Government has not yet made up its mind about an official policy with regard to Chapman Lane, because from time to time statements have been made which have no relation to a policy for housing in Chapman Lane, but the Government must realise that human beings live in Chapman Lane and that some facilities have to be provided for them. Some time in June last year I had to ask the Chief Fire Officer to pump water off this field, and if you visited the playing field during the month of June you would have wondered where the chaps usually play, but the young chaps decided that the only way they could keep the pool of water from becoming too infested was by bringing fish onto the playing field. Rev. Morgan is not one of my supporters, but I recognise that Mr. Morgan is trying to do his best with the limited facilities provided in Chapman Lane for the Elks Sports Club. I myself tried to get something done, and I am now asking the Government to seriously consider the request made for a hard court which can be used for tennis, for basketball and for netball, and also to give some provision for extending the pavilion in that area. I think in an earlier debate the senior member for St. Andrew said that there was no room in the City to provide playing fields and that is the only way you could provide playing fields

in Bridgetown would be to have them in the air, but there is land in Dunlow Lane which is at present used by the residents as a playing field. It is not enough to provide a king size cricket field but it is enough to play football, and it is enough to provide playing facilities for the number of people living in that area.  
2.20 p.m.

I am asking the Government to look into the possibility of providing a building for them in the area. It would give the Government a place to build some sort of recreational facilities and a pavilion and Community Centre for the people in the area. When one goes to Dunlow Lane, one finds the people playing draughts or dominoes under the street lights, and this is not really fitting in this day and age. I would also like to ask the Government to look seriously at its policy of sports and try to assess what the Sports Department has achieved in this country. It has achieved very little, as far as I am concerned, in the past ten years. We have to set our goals much higher; we must organise Community Sports so that sports can really be an avenue of social mobility for the people in this country.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I am very happy that hon. members of the Opposition have had ample time to express themselves as fully as they did on this Head. I will begin at the beginning. Substantively this Resolution deals with the appointment of a Football Coach and payment of his services for the remaining months of the financial year. The Committee has understood all that we want to do, and there is no real opposition to this. However, when it comes to the administration of the Sports Department, there has been some measure of criticism. I will have that examined as minutely as I can, and I promise hon. members on the other side that I will do all in my power to have all the possible rectifications of those grievances expressed in a constitutional manner. I do not hope to do it unconstitutionally, and I do not think my friends in the Opposition would want me to do so.

The hon. junior member for the City made mention of the provision of basket ball and netball facilities, a playing field, etc., in his constituency. I would invite the hon. member not to feel frustrated. If he has made representations in the past and thinks that he has reason to become frustrated, I assure him that he has no further need of that. I would welcome, at any time, a delegation headed by the hon. member to my Ministry where we can calmly and intelligently ferret out all of the alleged grievances and ferret out everything on which he thinks the Ministry has fallen down, as far as making such facilities available to members and especially to the youths of his constituency.

Mr. Chairman, I would say this for the benefit of the junior member for St. Joseph who I see is taking a few notes. He has recently expressed his doubts as to whether a man of my age would make an efficient Minister of Youth.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I have never yet expressed any doubts over the Minister's efficiency as a youthful Minister. What I am waiting to see is how he would operate in an area of youth considering his age, but I have no doubt about his capabilities because those are well known to me.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I will remind the hon. member that the greatest part of my life has been spent in the service of youth, and now that we have an 18-year old franchise I will have to court the youth as much as any other member on that side. That being so, I think we will pass on. A lot of criticism has been hurled, at least, against the present Chief Sports Officer, and a lot has been said about Mr. Wedderburn's resignation from the Ministry. Those are matters that I am ignorant of, and hon. members know that.

I assumed office in the Ministry in 1971. It is always difficult for a Minister, whose main concern is policy, to get into matters dealing with personnel. No Minister likes to do that. There are times when a Minister is, unfortunately, dragged into such an affair, but it is most unwelcome. Now that Mr. Wedderburn is gone, I hope that he will soon find things suitable for him to return to Barbados under a more favourable climate, as it has been alleged - as far as I am concerned nothing is proven and I do not think it was necessary for Mr. Wedderburn to run. If I were in his boots, I would not have run. It would take a lot to make me run from Barbados, especially if I were in Mr. Wedderburn's position.

Mr. Chairman, I know Mr. Wedderburn; I have not come in direct contact with him; I remember when I was a member of the Governing Body of Lodge School I had to deal with Mr. Wedderburn's application for permission to study, and I had to fight hard for him on that occasion. That is all I know about Mr. Wedderburn. I heard that he is an efficient physical trainer, well qualified, and I am sorry that we had to lose the services of such an efficient coach. That is all gone now, and we have to look to the future.

The hon. senior member for Christ Church spoke a lot about the utilisation of grounds for the youth of Christ Church. Again, I invite the hon. senior member to come or send a delegation to me as Minister of Youth Affairs, and I promise him that his delegation, whether he is in it or not, will be well received and most courteously accepted. I will do all that lies in my power as a responsible Minister of Youth Affairs to assist the youth in every constituency in this Island. I naturally must take a wide and global view of all that affects the young people of Barbados. I cannot look at it parochially, and I cannot look at it just from the point of view of St. Peter. As a matter of fact St. Peter is one of those unfortunate parishes. I believe it is the only one that does not boast of a single playing field.

2.30 p.m.

I am not looking at it from the point of view of serving St. Peter first; I am going to serve the youth of Barbados; the youth of St. Joseph, of Bridgetown,

of Christ Church and of every parish will get fair and similar treatment from my hands as Minister of Youth Affairs. All the points raised by the hon. junior member for Bridgetown and by every other member of the Committee have been well taken. I do not know what confidence they have in me, but I hope they will repose some appreciable measure of confidence in me.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Is the Minister in a position to say whether or not Mr. Adams has tendered his resignation again recently?

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: I understood that only a while ago, when we were in Committee that he has again sent in his resignation.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Do you see that what I said about Mr. Adams is true?

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: The hon. member is well informed. I am not here to thrash out any claims for individuals. All I know about Mr. Adams is that it has been reported that he has done a good job coaching the youth in football, and I have heard that there has been a remarkable improvement in the standard of football as played in Barbados. I know that it had very badly deteriorated, and I was happy to hear that under the regime of Mr. Graham Adams as coach that considerable and remarkable improvement had been accomplished. I am unbiassed and I must remain unbiassed, but as far as Mr. Graham Adams's inability to get on with others is concerned, I am not interested in that. I regret that may be so. The hon. junior member for Bridgetown spoke long and wide on general facilities for the young. He brought in something about a tennis coach and a basketball coach, and I would like the hon. junior member for Bridgetown to renew his visit to the Ministry in connection with basketball at his very earliest opportunity. I hope I have told the Committee as much as they like me to say. If I have left out anything, I would not mind sitting for a while before the question is put and having a particular question or two put to me.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister would like to tell us a little more. In as much as this money is being voted for a National Football Coach, and I think the Minister said he is aware that Mr. Adams has tendered his resignation, could he say when this resignation comes into effect?

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: I should think this is being passed for the three remaining months of the year; so the resignation should be in effect from this month. I do not know what guarantees were given to Mr. Adams. It may be that he has already worked for some part of the last financial quarter of 1970-71. Hon. members must bear in mind that they are not necessarily making provision for Mr. Adams but for a coach. Whether or not Mr. Adams is in the picture, somebody would have to act in that capacity now that I have been informed during this debate that Mr. Adams is leaving the Island later this month. I think it is a fine administrative point, because it would be very bad if we can get somebody for the remaining

two or three months of the year and we refuse to vote this money because Mr. Adams may be leaving towards the end of this month, because I think the coaching services should go on. This is really something new, and in the Estimates for 1971-72, provision will have to be made for a coach for the entire year.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: What I should like to get straight from the Minister is what is meant by the sentence at the end of the second paragraph of the note which states that it is proposed that Government should undertake to provide coaching services at a national level for a period of at least one year in the first instance.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: This was not done yesterday, but at the time when it was done, there was the presence of Mr. Adams in the country as a coach. The point is that if Mr. Adams goes, you would still have provision to employ another coach. We are making provision to employ an additional coach, and the idea of getting somebody for a year in the first instance is because we want to get a Barbadian trained. We have already approached the training section in respect of this. He would be sent abroad for two or three years as the case may be to be trained as a professional coach. In my view we need more than one, but I do not know who will be chosen. The Public Service Commission will have to decide on the personnel. We do not have a post of coach as such, but if we have provision here to employ a coach, we can appoint a Barbadian, send him out to be trained, and use the acting allowance to bring in somebody on contract to take care of the coaching sessions while this officer is out on training.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: In answer to the query by the hon. junior member for Bridgetown as to whether the Chief Sports Officer pays rent for Blenheim, the answer is that he pays a rent of \$40 per month. I should say that some time ago an officer in the Sports Department was trained for a very short period of three months. It is thought by the Football Association that short term training is not good enough and that we should look forward to having young men trained for longer periods than three months, perhaps two or three years, and that is what is operating in the minds of the Sports Department Personnel.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Now that Mr. Adams has gone and we have put money in the Estimates for a coach, I do hope that the Government will undertake as soon as possible to get another coach on a three-year basis, while somebody is being trained. I would like to suggest to Government that they do not have to go to England for coaches. It is well known that the South American coaches are much better than English coaches. Trinidad is a classic example of it; they use South American coaches.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: I suppose the only thing that might go against us here is the question of expenditure. You aim at quality of course, but you have to look at the size of your pocket.

2.40 p.m

I would think that South American Coaches, if we think in terms of Brazil, would be much more at a premium and would be much more expensive to hire than English Coaches. I see the hon. member is nodding his head, I do not know but he may be more knowledgeable than I am; I said I would suppose so, knowing the standard of football in Brazil. I am not a pundit on this, I am not making a declaration, I am only making an assumption. I say that the standard of football in the South American countries are compared with that in England is better, and it may be that it would be more expensive to bring a Coach from South America than to bring one from England, but I do not know.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, what I have to say is that I have not heard the Hon. Minister even commit himself in respect of the situation as it exists in St. Joseph. The most I have heard him say is that you cannot look at it as a parochial question but more as a global matter. Unfortunately St. Joseph, I believe, is the worst of all the schools the Minister might have to deal with, the playing fields are not yet fixed, and I think this is something urgent which I would really like to hear something about because the children of St. Joseph are being deprived of facilities because of the condition of the playing fields at practically all the schools. On the other hand, the Minister contemplates what it is going to cost, between bring a Coach from England and bringing one from South America, but my view is that one can never spend too much money on education. If we are going to have a national stadium which is now in existence, we are hoping to have games at a national and Olympic level, because I know the stadium was changed from a \$750,000 to a \$1 1/2 million one because it was said they wanted to have a stadium of Olympic size and capacity, so we cannot now say that it is going to cost too much to bring proper training facilities to the people of this country if at the same time you are hoping to entertain Olympic standard sports and not train your nationals to that standard. It is a waste of time.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: I was only making an assumption, I said it may be that the services of a European Coach would cost less than the services of a South American Coach, that is all I am saying. As far as the hon. member's point regarding games at primary schools is concerned, I will promise the hon. member that I will take up this matter with the Ministry of Education because, properly speaking, it has to be done at that level first, and I will tell the Minister what turn the debate took in this House and ask him to try to speed up the matter of having the playing fields put in order as soon as he can. I do not think there is anything else I have to add to this debate, and I hope the Head may now be passed.

*The question that Head 45 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

Head 24 - DEPARTMENT OF ARCHIVES - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Head stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

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

*Head 17 – PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE – was called.*

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, this amount of money is required in settlement by the Government, upon the advice of the Government's legal authorities, of a claim for personal physical damage which came from an accident to Mr. Daraley Greenidge some time in 1969 when the falling limb of a tree broke through and damaged his car. I do not now if there are any questions hon. members wish to ask, and I beg to move that this Head stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, there is only one point I am worried about and it occurs in Note 13(b). It would appear that the Government is paying money to five house owners who have removed their houses from west of the Government's stone crusher because of the dust created by the plant at Mangrove which has affected their homes. I know there is a Head dealing with Town and Country Planning, but I am a bit worried over this compensation; not that I have any hard feelings against those persons who are going to be paid, what I am worried about is that the stone crusher is still there, and west of the same equipment I notice a plot of land which I believe used to belong to Mangrove Plantation and which was a grasspiece has now been subdivided and one house at least is in the course of construction on this plot of land. If the Government is paying compensation to five owners whose houses have been removed, I wonder what is going to happen when houses are reconstructed on this plot of land, because it is west of the same crusher and I think the Minister responsible is aware that a person who builds his house in a position near the crusher, despite the fact that the crusher has been there before, holds a good claim of action and injunction against the Government crusher for pollution or nuisance, and I wonder what is going to happen. I wonder if Town Planning recognised this from the beginning, I wonder if the Government appreciated this, and I can see that year after year we are going to be asked to provide money to pay compensation to these people.

2.50 p.m.

The house under construction is a stone house, and the dust from the stone in the crusher is going to blow all over that area. It is directly west of the Government's crusher, and it looks as if Government are in for a bad time from this particular one. I wonder whether there is any co-ordination between the Government and the Department concerned. I wonder if the Government knew that the land was going to be sold. It is my view that the Government should have acquired the area in order to avoid possible action. I wonder if the Minister can tell me what is the position.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, there has been some idea of removing the Mangrove Crusher Plant from the site where it is situated in St. Philip. I do not have the file here with me, Mr. Chairman, but there are about five to seven residents living on that particular site and due to the dust, although every possible precaution has been taken to eliminate it, it has still proved a hazard to the inhabitants living around that area dependent on the direction and the velocity of the wind. There are proposals to remove and re-site the entire Crushing Plant somewhere at Seawell. It has not yet been possible to do so due to pressure of work. A few of the residents have been removed already, and we have been considering compensating those who are presently living there.

The Housing Authority is giving an estimate as to what it will cost to remove these houses for the purpose of compensation. I felt that if a person had already moved due to a nuisance from this plant, he should also be compensated. I have taken the matter to the Cabinet, and there is a decision to compensate those who have already moved as well as those who will have to move. I feel that a financial burden has been created on those who had already moved. If people had to move from a site where they were living due to a Government's nuisance, I could not see why they should not be compensated. I know that consideration has been given to removing the plant at some future time. It is like cement, Mr. Chairman, you can practically stop every crevice or crack in an area where fine dust is being used, and for some reason or other you will still find it seeping through. I should like to assure the hon. member that we on this side feel that anything the Government has which is a nuisance to people, then the people should be compensated.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I am not worried about the compensation. I think the hon. member is correct. If the Government's machinery causes a nuisance to anyone in the enjoyment of his home, obviously the Government will have to pay him compensation. I wonder how soon the Government is proposing to move this crusher. I think the hon. member for St. Philip is well aware of the fact that there are about ten or twelve houses on this corner site, and I wonder if the Government has contemplated moving before the houses become occupied so as to save themselves further payments of compensation.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, I, too, am worried about this matter. There are approximately 12 houses which will be erected in the very near future. As a matter of fact, they have started on one building, and I am wondering what will be the position when these people build their homes. There was some rumour that the Government considered that they should get rid of these plants. I do not know if that statement is authentic or not, or on the other hand, if the Government intends to remove the plants from there. I shall be very grateful if the Minister will explain to us what is the position. Hon. Members: "You were not listening to the Minister."

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I will start off by saying that law, although sometimes good, could be a bit of a nuisance. What the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has said is quite true. Take for instance, an aeroplane flying over my house, or flying in a particular direction to get to the base to land. If I built a house in the area in which the aeroplane is flying over, I can ask the Government to bring restrictions on the aeroplane and it will have to take a different route to go to the base (*Asides.*) Of course this is true; you must go and study law. If there is a nuisance created by water running anywhere, or a nuisance such as the hon. member complained of; if people deliberately went and built houses in the area they can bring an action against the Government and they would have to be compensated. The hon. member is perfectly right in this matter. When he questioned whether there is any co-ordination between the Government and the various Departments, it is hard for me to say whether or not the Town Planning Department knew about this before. As the hon. Minister has pointed out before, it was agreed that the Mangrove Crusher Plant would be phased out because it is a nuisance, and no matter how they try, they just cannot control the dust.

Mr. Chairman, there are two wall houses in the area and the hon. member might know of this. You cannot move a wall house. There is also another factor to be taken into consideration. It has been discovered that it would be much cheaper either to move the Crushing Plant from there and carry it to Seawell, or to get rid of it altogether. After this was earmarked to be done, it was then discovered that the suppliers of crushed material could not supply the Government with enough material for various jobs. In the circumstances, it was suggested that the Crusher Plant should be kept a little longer. The Crusher Plant will have to go, because the Government cannot continue compensating people all the time. The people knew that it would have been a nuisance, but they decided to build houses there. It means that if they complain about the nuisance the Government will have to close down the Plant.

The position was that the Government had planned to get rid of the Crusher Site, as the hon. Minister has said, by either selling it or moving it down to Seawell. As a result of that we would have been able to help the outside suppliers of material. The shortage in the supply of crushed material is the reason why it was kept a little longer.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I am at a loss to think why the hon. Minister, who has just sat down, always seems to think that the law was made for some persons and not for others. The hon. Minister does not understand the fundamentals of law.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I may not understand the fundamentals of law, but I am, certainly, not an idiot.  
3 p.m.

I am not saying that law was made for certain people and not for others. We know that the law was

made for everybody, but it does not mean that the law is always right. There are some stupid pieces of law, and that is why we are amending some now. Why do you think they are amending the law in Trinidad dealing with divorce? Laws have to be amended because people find that they become antiquated, so if they become antiquated, it means they were stupid. There was a law in which a man would be charged for knocking down a wood dove, but the same may be acquitted for knocking down a man; so why tell me I do not know about the fundamentals of law. Are you an expert on law now?

Mr. BOLDEN: For the benefit of the hon. member, I am no expert on law, but what I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that every person is entitled to enjoy every square foot of their land without having any worries from the person next to him. I am asking about the relationship between Government and Town and Country Planning, because if the Government owned the Crusher Site first, they should have known that the land was going to be sold.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order, I am not going to let the hon. member get away with this. Does he think this is Government by conspiracy or secrecy or is a gestapo Government or the one in South Africa where the Government peeps into everybody's business? How would the Government know that the land was going to be sold? How does the hon. member know that the land was not handed over to somebody? For all you know this might be a deal.

Mr. BOLDEN: I know who the deal is between, and if you want me to tell you, I will.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is no point of order.

Mr. BOLDEN: If there was coordination between Government and Town Planning, this could not happen. Town Planners have powers to either agree or disagree with certain development in certain areas; so the Hon. Minister cannot fool me off with this. I own five acres of land in St. Philip which they told me I could not sub-divide, although there is nothing around me to stop me from sub-dividing it. The Town Planners could have told the people who sub-divided that corner that they could not sub-divide it yet. The same thing happened at Cole's Pasture. The man who bought Cole's Pasture and applied to Town Planning to divide it in one-acre housing lots was told that he could not sub-divide it, but here it is, a corner has been sub-divided and the Minister is saying that people knew the crusher was there.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order, what the hon. member fails to understand is that he is accusing the Government. I am a part of the Government as well as the other Ministers here. The Civil Servants are not the Government. After all, let us be reasonable. As I said, this is not Government by conspiracy, and we do not expect Ministers to pry on Civil Servants to find out what they do. The Town Planner has a right to make his own decisions. If he has made a decision that aggrieves a complainer or applicant, then this person has a right to appeal to

the Minister, otherwise maybe the Minister does not know; so do not accuse the Minister, because when the hon. member accuses the Government, he is accusing me and the other Ministers when we do not know anything about it at all. Do you mean Civil Servants have no right to do something sometimes?

Mr CHAIRMAN: That is no point of order.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister appreciates who is responsible for the various Government Departments. I am not against the persons who have bought the lots, I am not against persons who are putting up houses, because everybody wants to put up a stone house these days. All I am looking at, is the method of sub-dividing. There is a Government crusher above there, and you are paying compensation, but the Minister is saying that people know the crusher is there and still put their houses there. They are entitled to put their houses there, but Government should realise that these people have got a valid claim against Government as soon as they are worried by dust coming from the crusher. *(Asides.)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: While an hon. member is speaking, all other members shall be silent.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, for the hon. member's information, I would like to quote from the file. Chattel houses were removed from the site, but there is apparently a wall house which cannot be removed. The note on the file reads: "While the stone crusher plants at Chance Hall and Prospect have ceased to be operated by the Ministry, the plant at Mangrove is still in operation. It was found impracticable to stop the operation of the plant at Mangrove in view of the current shortage of stone products in consequence of the building boom in the private sector. If the plants were closed, the Ministry would have been faced with a shortage of stone products and this would have affected our works programme. The Chief Technical Director has also reported that it might soon be necessary to re-activate the asphalt plant at Mangrove in view of the Ministry's heavy road programme. The Ministry is currently looking into the question of comparative cost of resiting these plants as opposed to purchasing the stone buildings mentioned in paragraph 10 above which will be affected by their operation. A Cabinet paper in this connection will soon be submitted.

Mr. Chairman, not only have they removed houses from this site because they still have to operate the plant, but it is the intention as soon as possible to remove the plant from the area, and included in that, is consideration for purchasing the stone building that is in this area. The one person who had not removed his house came to the Ministry asking for financial help to be able to resite his house; so I said that if you were going to resite one house because the owner was unfinancial, what about the others who had to move during the pressure? I thought I might as well go to Cabinet with a direct case and seek compensation even for those who had already removed, and this is how this came up. Those who

have already removed and those who are presently there, will all be compensated, and consideration will be given to purchasing the wall building that cannot be removed.

Mr. BOLDEN: If the Hon. Minister would give way, is he saying that the Government is contemplating purchasing the wall house in the area?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Yes. I think about five or six houses have been removed, and there is a wall house which you know would not be able to be removed and Government is considering purchasing that. As Minister responsible, I will put proposals to Government that it would be no use allowing other buildings to go up there which might create a nuisance and become a liability to Government. What I understood the hon. member to say is that if the land is sold and other people go there and put up houses we would be faced with the same direct problem again.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, that is exactly what I was trying to say. If Government is contemplating buying the wall house in the area and you have just opened a development where people can put up wall houses, Government will soon find itself purchasing the twelve new wall houses going up on the site; one new one which has just been put up in the other corner and the existing wall house which cannot be moved, the owner of which has just put on an extra piece as a shop. I now know the reason for the addition, because obviously this person knows that Government intends to buy the house, so he tacks on another piece to make it bigger waiting for compensation. There is no coordination between Government and Town Planning because I notice that the houses have been rushing up very fast on the site.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, I have mentioned to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that Government is considering removing the Mangrove Crushing Plant from that site.  
3.10 p.m.

Due to a shortage in material for construction work in private enterprise, Government has found it hard to be able to receive materials as required. We have got two alternatives, either remove the crusher from where it is and put it somewhere else or discontinue operating on that site, because it is no use paying compensation to one set of people because you would have to go on paying compensation.

*The question that Head 17 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

*Head 11 - PENSIONS - was called.*

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 11 stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, this Item, pensions, I believe gives us an opportunity to make it known

that the time has come when Government must consider the question of pensions on a much broader basis than at present. For instance, as obtains at present in the Government service if a person joins the service at the age of 21 or thereabout and put in 20 years service and then discontinues that service, that person is not entitled to a pension if the person withdraws from the service, but if a person joins the service at a much later age and puts in merely 10 years service and retires at the age of 55, having put in 10 years the person is entitled to a pension. Our view is that the years the person puts in the Government service should never be lost to that person because it is service anyhow. What we feel should be done is that if a person puts in any number of years and withdraws from the service for any reason before reaching the age when a person would normally become pensionable, those years should be kept and as soon as the person reaches the pensionable age the person then should receive their pension on those years.

I hope that I have made myself clearly understood to the Government, because I feel that there is much dissatisfaction throughout the Government service now where this matter is concerned. I have known in my own constituency there happens to be a person who put in either 12 or 14 years in the teaching service of this Island, left the teaching service and then entered the Ministry, but leaving at that age to enter the Ministry the person was not entitled to a pension nor has the person been given any compensation for the 12 or 14 years the person spent in the service. Our view is that as soon as the person reaches the age of 55 he should be receiving a pension on those years, never mind that the service was put in nearly 20 years previously. It is service that has been rendered and should not be forgotten, and we are asking Government to reconsider its present pension scheme where persons would in the future not lose their service after it has been rendered to the country.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to draw to the attention of Government the hardship which is being met by several persons who were employed under the Old Local Government system, I know for instance of at least three cases where people have been transferred after the Vestry was abolished to the Bridgetown City Council, and these people had worked from the old Vestry days on to the Local Government system and now that it is Central Government they have all applied for pensions. Some of them have been discharged and some have been made to retire compulsorily, and this is three years now that these persons have not received any pension, gratuity or anything. I have made enquiries and I have been told that they are trying to trace the time these people were employed with the Vestry, they cannot find the books and people would not come forward to tell them whether they knew them or not. I hope the Government can find some method for compensating these people because some of them have reached the age where they cannot seek employment and they are only waiting and hoping that one day they will get a pension. I know one man who has worked for 32 years and up to now has not received any pension. I hope the Minister will look into this and do something about it.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I am getting up so often now that the hon. member is liable to think that I am an expert on every matter.  
3.20 p.m.

The real gist of the matter is that some of these people have outlived their time. When I say that, I mean that the people who are able to swear to these affidavits stating that the workers had worked for that length of time have long gone to the great beyond, and others who might be willing to swear to the affidavits have decided not to take a chance. Swearing to an affidavit is a serious matter; they may go and sign and later find out that they have made a mistake.

Mr. Chairman, I will give the hon. member an incident that happened to me. There was a gentleman who was pressurising the Prime Minister and he stated that he had worked with the Government and it was unfair to deny him a gratuity or pension. The Prime Minister asked me to see about the matter, and I went into it most thoroughly. We had an affidavit signed to prove that the man had worked for a period of time. However, when somebody investigated the matter further, it was found that for a portion of the time, the man was working at the Queen's pleasure at the Prison. That will give you an indication of the trouble one can find oneself in when one tries to help friends. It is not that we would not like to help these people.

If the junior member for Christ Church were present, he would tell you that, when I was a Parliamentary Secretary, we made several amendments to the Pension Act in order to help these people. The hon. junior member for St. Peter was interested in a gentleman called Mr. Newsam. I am glad that this question has been raised, because I had forgotten to tell the hon. member that the reason Mr. Newsam had never got his pension was due to the fact that Mr. Newsam was never appointed. He acted for a long time and, when he was sent for his medical examination in order to be placed on the Unestablished Staff, it was discovered that he was a diabetic. I think his family will get the money eventually, however. As a result of that, we have made so many amendments to the Pensions Act that I doubt whether there is any other piece of legislation with more amendments than that Act. I will check this matter again and let the hon. member know the true position regarding Mr. Newsam. Anyway, Mr. Newsam has long gone, too.

Mr. Chairman, even when the junior member for Christ Church was the Minister, we even went so far as to have the Act amended so that once a person had been working with the Government for five years, although he would not be entitled to a pension, he would be given a gratuity. We really bent over backwards to help these people, but the problem is that nobody is willing to sign these affidavits. If a man signs an affidavit and he makes a mistake, he can get himself in trouble. On the other hand, the Auditor General will not pay, and you cannot give him a directive. I do not even think he has to take a directive from the Prime Minister.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, there is one other case on which I would like the Minister to comment. There is presently obtaining, especially in the Department of Communications and Works, an arrangement whereby people serve for many years with their horse and carts, and after these people have served for a number of years they are neither given a pension nor a gratuity. These people are politely told by the Government that Government had employed the horse and cart and not the man driving the horse. If that is so, then it is only decent that the Government should, as from tomorrow morning, tell all of these people who bring their horses there what the position is. Let them leave their horses at the Pine and go back home.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. If we were to do that, I wonder whether the hon. member would volunteer to come and feed the horses. The hon. member is not practical; we did not make the law. I have gone into this matter, and I feel that the people who bring their horse and carts there work much harder than the people who work with the hoe and pick. The most the fellows with the hoe and pick do is to stand up on them, but the man with the horse and cart has to load and unload the cart himself, and nobody helps him do that. He also have to see after his horse and cart. I agree with what the hon. member has said, but this is the argument presented to me: If the Government were renting a lorry to do this work, would the Government have to compensate the lorry driver, too? That was a logical argument. The argument was that the Government was renting the vehicle and not employing the man. If the Government rented a lorry from you to do certain work and you sent a man to drive it, do you expect the Government to compensate that man? It is not that I do not want to do it.

Mr. Chairman, there is an old gentleman by the name of Hezekiah Forde, and I would do anything to help him because it is a strain on me. He was working until he reached the age of 75 and he cannot do any more. I have done everything possible to help him. When we first came into office a lot of things that we learned late we did not know early. Even if I had known the position at the time and I had told him to get the Superintendent to put him down as a cantonnier or casual worker, he still would have been out of it because he is 75 years of age. When he came to work he was 65 years of age and that was the retiring age.

However, there were several people who preferred to work the horse and carts because they did not know that they would not be entitled to a pension when they had to retire. It is not an imposition that we have placed on these people. We came and found it, I thought it was unfair and I went into the matter, but I had to accept the argument and any reasonable person will have to accept the argument put forward that if the Government rented a lorry to do work the owner could send whoever he like to drive it. If the Government rented a lorry for a year and the owner sent 365 drivers to drive the lorry, do you mean to say that the Government would have to pay the 365 drivers compensation?

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, if the Government rented a lorry, it is known that care would be taken by the owner to estimate the cost of the driver, the cost of wear and tear and everything, but in the case of a donkey and cart nothing is taken into consideration. What I am urging upon the Minister is that in the case of Hezekiah Forde and those people, we on this side feel that they are entitled to something. Let us accept that they have been underpaid and give them one-half of what they have earned in the past over the period of time. Bring down a Bill or a Resolution to pay these old people one-half of what they had been paid for the number of years they had been working, and we will support it on this side of the House.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, it was only about six weeks ago that I had a long talk with Mr. Thompson, who is now in my Ministry but was then in the Ministry of Communications and Works, on this matter.  
3.30 p.m.

In St. Andrew there are between six and eleven of these people who are affected. This thing was going on for about three years, and they were trying to arrive at a conclusion, and the latest report I have got from Mr. Thompson is that he had made representation to the Establishments Section of the Ministry of Finance and thought that his recommendations would be accepted by the Establishments Section. This meant that some sort of compensation or *ex gratia* monthly payment would be made, especially since most of these people who were engaged with these carts were elderly people. Mr. Thompson did recommend that some sort of assistance be given, not necessarily a pension but some assistance on compassionate grounds should be given to them. I can think of people like Eileen Smith and others from St. Andrew who did nothing else throughout their lives. I know a man who worked from the time he was twelve or thirteen doing this sort of thing and he is now over 60. All he has done was to look after his cart as his father before him used to do. We are concerned about this matter, and I would say that the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Communications is genuinely interested in getting something done about it, and Mr. Thompson assured me that his proposals would meet with favourable consideration from the Establishments Section; so I think we need not fear because something will be done.

Mr. Chairman, I have my constituents who are suffering, and you know I would not leave any stone unturned where my constituents are concerned. There are several of us whose constituents are involved in this matter, and are suffering genuine hardships, and I do not feel good to know that I can eat and my constituents cannot eat. None of us feels good about this, but you must appreciate the fact that in the Government Service the Senior Civil Servants go by the strict letter of the law. If the Ministry of Works puts up proposals to the Ministry of Establishment, the first thing they meet that Ministry with is "no". If you put up a proposal to the Ministry of Finance, immediately it is "no". You have to convince them

that they should see your point of view. However, Mr. Thompson assured me that in collaboration with one senior officer in the Establishments Section he has put up these proposals which he feels will meet with favourable consideration. This was only six weeks ago, and you know that the Government machinery is slow, but I am satisfied that something is going to be done because I do not allow them to rest. I call the Ministry of Communications at least twice a month on this matter, and I think hon. members ought not to worry because we are going to have something done about it. Even if we had to take it upon ourselves in here to set aside all the advice the Ministry of Establishments would give, all the legal implications, ramifications and suggestions by the legal authorities that we cannot do that, I think we are running the country and it is time that we take these matters which affect the very heart of the people if something is done for them.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister spoke about proposals which are being worked out, but I would like to draw attention to those persons who were employed particularly in the almshouses since there has been an amalgamation and renaming as District Hospitals. I have before me the facts of a particular case of a man who worked at the St. Joseph Almshouse from 1931 to 1969. He was told to retire when they were transferring the patients from the St. Joseph Almshouse. He has been to my office not less than six times already, and I have been calling the senior Executive Officer of the Ministry, and all I have been hearing is that they are checking. I consider this real slackness. I had to say to the senior Executive Officer that if he had not been paid any money from 1969 he could not tell me they were checking. I am sorry the Minister of Health is not here, but I hope that whoever is representing him today will draw to the attention of the Minister not only this particular man's case, but that none of those people who were employed in the almshouses have been compensated.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order, the Minister has absolutely nothing to do with pensions. When a member of the public retires from the Government Service, this information is automatically sent to the Establishments Section and the Chief Personnel Officer to deal with, not the Minister or the Ministry. All the Ministry does is to say that the man worked for so many days and send it on, but it is the Personnel Section and Establishments that deal with this. The hon. member should not accuse the Minister, because all he can do is to ask a question.

There is another point I would like to make before I sit down. The hon. member has to remember that there is no branch of the Civil Service that is set up as a Pensions Branch. Eventually I believe this will have to come about, because everything that comes down here from establishing an office, to money for travelling is done by Establishments. When it is not Establishments, it is the Personnel Section. I think they are doing a wonderful job. I know it is hard on the poor people who should really get a pen-

sion, and there are some who have been waiting for three or four years, but you have to remember that sometimes they do not have all the figures straight and it requires sending back here and there to get the matter rectified. These are the problems with which they are faced. You should not accuse the Minister because he does not know when a man retires unless it is a personal friend, and the Minister will have to do like anybody else by ringing Establishments and asking the position relative to this particular case, and they would tell you that it is being looked after. If this is being done, the Minister cannot go and look after it himself. After all he is a Minister and not a Civil Servant; but I feel that in order to expedite this matter, we will have to set up a branch to deal strictly with pensions for these poor people.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, before I came to this Chamber, I thought I understood what was meant by Ministerial Government. The last week has brought home forcibly to me that Ministerial Government, as I know it to be, no longer exists in Barbados, because I was always of the opinion that when a Minister comes to this House he takes full responsibility for the efficiency or inefficiency of the Government Departments, but all I have been hearing is that I should not blame the Minister. It has now reached the point in my conclusion that if one wants to talk, one has to go and call the Civil Servant's name and bring him in here in politics.  
3.40 p.m.

If I wanted to, I could have called the Civil Servant's name who gave me information, but my understanding of Ministerial Government is that you direct your enquires to the Minister, and as the Leader of the House did last week, he accepts blame; that is my understanding of Ministerial Government. If a department falls down the Minister responsible takes the blame for it or defends it if he thinks that the criticisms are wrong.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, nobody is trying to absolve any Minister of blame. I know Ministerial Government as good as he or better because I am a Minister, so I am supposed to know Ministerial Government better than he. The Minister is responsible for everything, but not like one day somebody from the Opposition asked me who was conducting a particular route bus and I had to tell him to go out there and check. While the Minister is responsible for running his Ministry and must therefore take the blame whenever there is a falling down of the Ministry, what I was trying to tell the hon. member was that even if the Minister went into the Establishments office and he said he wanted to know about John Jones' pension and they told him they are handling it, he would have to be uncouth, impolite or all kinds of bad names you could think of to tell them he was not satisfied and that something further should be done. You must remember that a bucket cannot be more than full because the more water you put into it, it will run over because the bucket is

already full, and if the man is doing something else and says that is being attended to, what more can the Minister do but to come in here and tell you that the matter is being looked after? The Minister, like the Civil Servants, is just another man and he cannot do so many things at the same time.

I was not trying to absolve any Minister from blame, I know we have to take full responsibility for things, but when we try to handle our Ministries the way we should, we hear people like the hon. member for St. Joseph talking about interference. This is the kind of thing you get, they are always approbating and reprobating at the same time. If you think your criticisms are going to run us or allow you to get the Government by default you have another thought coming, because I have told the hon. member already that in a bye-election everybody can help you, but in a general election it is every man for himself and God for all.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister keeps talking about the Civil Servant being another man; I agree with this, but the people I am talking about are also men and women. This particular man was told to resign in January, 1969, and this is now February, 1971, two years later. This is also two years since the Almshouses in St. Joseph and St. John have been closed down and these people have not received pension, gratuity or anything at all. I must address my enquiries to the Minister and if he cannot get the work done, he has got to be responsible to Parliament. All I am saying is that it is about time the Minister gives us complete answers, and if the department is not working he has got to deal with the department, he cannot come in here and say the people are men while the people are outside hungry. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture admitted that he would not like to know he is eating and his constituents are hungry. People are faced with the problem that having worked for Government all those years, now they have come to enjoy the fruits of their labour and to relax, they have to be walking up and down trying, begging and asking questions to get the little bit of pension, and things are not too easy today. I would like the Minister to do something so that these people can get their pension, gratuity or whatever they are entitled to have.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I share the views expressed by the junior member for St. Peter when he expressed concern about the change in policy of the Government with regard to pensions. I believe that as far as the Judges are concerned there is a Bill which states that if a Judge who has been practising at the Bar for so many years becomes a Judge and serves a certain amount of years, at the end of this he is entitled to receive a pension. I think this is a good idea, and it is an idea which the Government can usefully carry into other sections of the service, particularly in those sections where professional people are required, in places like Highways and Transport where you need technical people, and other aspects of Government where technical people are required. The reason for this is that you

may find a person who may have served a number of years in the private sector, and who may require for one reason or another to give of his knowledge and experience to the Government. Unless some provision is made whereby the years that he spent in private practice is taken into consideration, you are not going to encourage people with technical know-how to come into the Government service.

On the other hand, the other idea of people who would have served for a number of years but perhaps after qualifying in one technical field or the other may feel like spending 15 years with the Government, and I think provision should be made for such a person if after 15 years with the Government decides to leave. I think it is only right that his pension should be protected so that when he reaches the age, whatever age it might be, he would receive his pension. This would place him on a somewhat similar footing as that of a member of the House of Assembly. A member of the House may be elected at 25, he may serve 15 years and at 40 he may lose his seat, but this does not mean that when he reaches the age of 55 he will not receive his pension because his pension is protected and would depend on the number of years he would have served as a Minister or a member of Parliament. Therefore I would like to see Government seriously consider making provision that if a person serves 15 or 20 years and leaves the service at 40 that the years served and the time given to Government should still be pensionable, and when he reaches the age of 50 or 55 he should be in a position to receive his pension. This would place him in a somewhat similar position as the politicians. 3.50 p.m.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, this is a matter which I have taken up with the Establishment already. I had a clear case. There was a gentleman who served in this community unstintingly for about thirteen to fifteen years. I am speaking of Mr. Keith Johnson from the Waterworks Department. He got a better offer outside and he accepted it. He was the Chief Engineer of the Public Works Department. There are quite a number of other people in the same position. We are looking into this matter. I do not agree with the hon. member talking about politicians doing this and that. Let me tell the hon. member that he has just entered politics, and if he does not give away half of what he receives from the Government I do.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I do not think the junior member for St. Thomas was paying attention to what I was saying when I used, by analogy, the politicians. I am not criticising politicians; I merely referred to them by way of analogy. I said that the same way a politician may serve for 15 years and then lose his seat before reaching the age of 50, he could still get his pension when he reached the appropriate age for retirement.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member had no right using that as an analogy, and

I am not accepting that. A lot of people have the misguided idea that politicians can come in here and talk themselves hoarse and go back out naked, and then people get and laugh at them. I can tell the hon. member that I am pushing this matter, and I agree with some of what he has said. The argument was that Civil servants had security of tenure of office and they could not be dismissed easily, whereas a politician is here today and somewhere else tomorrow. I agree that there are some people who have given of their very best to the Government and then they get a job outside of the Civil Service and lose everything, but I do not consider that is fair to them.

Mr. Chairman, my argument is that if a cantonnier or casual worker can work for 5 years at Highways and Transport and is entitled to a gratuity, then I do not see why a man like Mr. Johnson and others should not get some sort of compensation or gratuity. I have already drawn the matter to the attention of the Establishment, and I will make another check to find out the position.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, what the hon. member has said is quite true. We on this side of the House have drawn this matter to the attention of the Government already. This is the only way you are going to get people to devote some part of their working life to the Government. If they have this pension facility where they can move in and out of the Civil Service, it will be better for all concerned. There may be some people in private enterprise who would like to come and work for 10 years, but you will not get them unless you change your policy. In that case you will not have the benefit of the best advice. The People will make a sacrifice for a few years, but they are not going to work like in the old time days when people thought that in the Government was the best place to be employed, and you could work for 30 years and then get a pension. The young people do not think like that nowadays.

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

*Annexed Estimates - Post Office - was called.*

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Annexed Estimates Post Office stand part.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, in the case of cycle allowance for Postmen, I have it on good authority that for the past two months Postmen have been signing pay sheets at their Department as having received their cycle allowance, but in truth and in fact they have not received any allowance. I would like to have some explanation by the appropriate Minister on this.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know from the Hon Minister what progress this

Government has made regarding the erection of a new Post Office building.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I did not hear what the hon. member has said and I would like him to repeat it.

Mr. St. JOHN: What progress has the Government made with the erection of a Central Post Office in Bridgetown? From time to time, we have in here Resolutions to cover irregularities at the Post Office and so on. I do not believe that a Department can be properly administered unless it is properly housed. The time will surely come for the Government to see that, until they can get the administration of all aspects of the central administration of the Post Office in a building, no proper supervision can take place. I understand that a big amount of revenue is lost because of the manner in which the Post Office in Barbados is set up today.

Mr. Chairman, the Government should have a look at the Courtesy Garage which is for sale, and it is an obvious area for the Government to buy. (*Asides.*) I do not know what price they want for it, but it seems to me that it is an obvious area for the Government to buy. It is a large area, and it has a road around the area. I happen to know that in that area most of the places have a convenient basement; you can go down to 9ft.; you have a soil which is not water-logged, and it is suitable for underground parking. You can have no better area in the centre of Bridgetown and next to Government buildings. You have the Waterworks Department, the Courts and the Library there, and Government should look at it. There is scope for expansion in roads, because I see that Geddes Grant is pulling down the wall in front of the building. You cannot have the Post Office properly administered, no matter how good your officers are, if you have half here and another half somewhere else. You have all of these problems in the office because of the lack of supervision, and you cannot continue like that. If you look at the other Utility Companies you will see how they have centralised their organisation, and the great amount of attention they pay to accountancy. The accountants in these utility companies get as much money as the engineers, because they realise that no business can be run properly without finance. It is only the Government of Barbados who feel that they can run business properly without having proper accountants and accounts. That is the problem in the Post Office, and I am sure you are losing revenue. I have heard so from good authority.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister would be in a position to tell us who is responsible for the upkeep of the Post Office vehicles.  
4 p.m.

The note says that the cost of keeping the Department's motor vehicles in good working order has increased substantially due to their age. Due to

unexpected increased maintenance costs during the earlier part of this financial year, the original provision under this item has proved inadequate to meet expenditure to the end of the year.

Then we come to Item 43 - Reimbursement to Bank of Nova Scotia. Surely the Minister would feel obligated to tell us in Opposition something about this. After all it is a case of \$2,250 arising out of cases where the Bank of Nova Scotia tendered a draft for \$8,422 overpaid to the Post Office. Who actually has the money? Why are the taxpayers called upon to repay it? After all, Mr. Chairman, that is exactly what the hon. senior member for Christ Church was just telling you. (*Asides.*) It is not finished because the taxpayers have been called upon to pay it. Do you mean this is the beginning of the end? We are not concerned about the case. What is the outcome of the case?

Mr. Chairman, we have got to look at these matters in an entirely different light. We cannot have situations such as this where you merely suspect a Civil Servant of this or that, he is arrested and charged with the offence, then he is acquitted and the taxpayers are called upon to pay all the money. There can be no two ways about it. If the Bank overpaid the Post Office to the tune of \$2,250, somebody must have that money. It ought to be found somewhere. If the Clerk actually handling the transaction or somebody involved with the money transactions of the Post Office does not have the money, surely somebody must have it. I very well remember a case many years ago where a chap by the name of Thompson working in the Post Office had been suspected of all sorts of crime and accused of carrying away all sorts of money. I had an occasion to interview that young man and others, and I want to say that all Thompson knew about it was that he was serving in the Post Office, and that in many cases the people who actually do the carrying away job are never the people who get arrested in these matters. There is no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that we have got to do some tightening up somehow somewhere in the Post Office and in Government Departments as a whole where money is concerned. We cannot continue to allow thousand upon thousands of dollars to be taken and carried away and then we as members of Parliament go digging deeply into the taxpayers' pockets to make refunds for such losses. They do not speak well for us. We would just like to hear what enlightenment the Minister can give us on a matter so important as this is.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, speaking under Post Office, I would like to draw attention to the state of affairs which exists at the Post Office at Horse Hill, St. Joseph. I wonder if the Minister knows if there are any plans for improving the facilities at this particular place. It was quite evident during the last election that when something like 150 pieces of mail were sent to the Post Office extra to the regular supply of mail that there was mail lying all about the ground. There are not enough sorting racks and there is nowhere to store packages. I was the most surprised person to think that the Post Office would

exist under such conditions. Postmen have complained that they have to spend longer hours on their duties because there is not enough room and facilities to operate in the Post Office. I wonder if the Minister responsible knows of any plans for resiting this Post Office because it looks as if there is very little room for expansion on this particular site, and I hope the Government has some views on resiting, and either build or provide proper facilities for the Postmen in the area.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, with reference to the question asked by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, I can say there are no plans for resiting or making alterations to the St. Joseph Post Office. The hon. senior member for Christ Church mentioned having the entire postal services amalgamated in one building where one person would have far better control, rather than having postal services scattered in various sections around the site. I would like to inform him that a number of properties at Cheapside have been purchased. I think the hon. junior member for St. Peter will know quite well where the old Fire Brigade Alley used to be, where some of the buildings were demolished and properties purchased during the time of the construction of the Deep Water Harbour. The properties have been bought from there right up to the market and that is the site for construction of a new Post Office. It is on the seaward side and would be in conjunction with the back of Cheapside and linking the area with the buses at Pelican Village. The hold-up has been due to the lack of architects in the Ministry of Communications and Works. We have been short of architects in the Ministry and this is why no demolition has taken place for the reconstruction of the Post Office. At present there is only one architect on the staff of the Ministry, another is on study leave in Israel and is expected to return in June, and there are four vacant posts in the Ministry of Communications and Works.

4.10 p.m.

This is the area that was scheduled for a completely new Post Office from, there where the old Fire Brigade Station was right up to the building by the market. Those buildings have been purchased by the Government as far as I know and there is nothing in the back of them but Government land, and this would be a fair site for the Post Office. With regard to the question asked by the junior member for St. Peter about the Postmen at present signing vouchers, I am trying to get information on it but I have not yet received it. I have sent to enquire about it.

With reference to Item 43 - Reimbursement to the Bank of Nova Scotia, on 3rd December, 1969 the Bank of Nova Scotia wrote the Postmaster General as follows: "On 21st October, 1969 we tendered our draft No. 292674 dated 1st October, 1969 for the amount of \$8,422 (E. C.) in exchange for stamps in the following demoninations:

|                      |         |
|----------------------|---------|
| 600 stamps at \$5 00 | \$3,000 |
| 600 stamps at \$2.50 | \$1,500 |
| 600 stamps at \$1.00 | \$ 600  |
| 600 stamps at 50¢    | \$ 300  |
| 600 stamps at 35¢    | \$ 210  |
| 1,000 stamps at 25¢  | \$2,500 |

As shown above we erroneously calculated 1,000 - 25 cents stamps as \$2,500 instead of \$250 which was over paid to the stamps seller at that time. This error was not located until the 29th October, and on the morning of the 29th one of the Directors of the Bank and his cashiers, when they checked, found a difference in the amount that was over paid on the 21st October. In those circumstances, we hereby make a claim for the sum of \$2,250 over paid you and would appreciate your settlement at your earliest opportunity. "The actual mistake was made by the Bank of Nova Scotia when they calculated 1,000 stamps at 25 cents to be \$2,500 instead of \$250. Mr. Chairman, the Postmaster General checked and did find the cheque and since then a prosecution has taken place which was brought against one of the employees of the Post Office in connection with the \$2,250. It was proved and the Post Office was satisfied that the Bank of Nova Scotia had made a genuine mistake and that the money was paid to the Post Office, and the Government had no alternative but to honour the debt of \$2,250 that was over paid to one of its employees, therefore this is the reason why we are here asking for this sum to pay back the Bank of Nova Scotia.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister can tell us if the Post Office carries any Insurance against this kind of loss or anything like that.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, I cannot state off-hand, but I would hardly think so because in a case like this if their money was insured against that type of loss a claim could have been made on the insurance company rather than on the taxpayers of this country, so I must assume that; otherwise if it was insured against theft, pilfering or anything like that, rather than come to the taxpayers to vote money to pay this they would have drawn on their insurance company.

Mr. HINDS: Does the Minister not see the necessity for trying to relieve the taxpayers of this type of burden? It is high time that Government, in the discharge of its functions, whether in the Post Office, in the Treasury, the Waterworks Department or any other Department handling large sums of money like this, should try and have some insurance company cover their money from the time it is received by the cashier until it is deposited elsewhere in a Bank or something. After all, it is pretty easy for some people to merely come here and to ask for money to reimburse the Bank of Nova Scotia, or to

pay this kind of indemnity or whatever it might be. When it is all totalled up, it comes out of the taxpayer and when we find that Government is lax, that Government is not discharging its full functions, we have not seen up to the present moment with all this amount of stealing going on in Government Departments, that Government is learning by any of these mistakes, and we are calling on the Government to do something about it now, so that we might have some measure of relief for the taxpayers in the future. It is just not good enough to have situations like this obtaining day after day.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member knows the Government carries its own insurance as far as buildings and some other insurances are concerned, but the amount that is lost annually and the amount of business Government would have to cover by insurance, I am perfectly sure if you take it over a number of years the premiums would be far more than what we have had to pay for compensation. In other words, it is self insurance, and the amount you would have to pay in premiums and the other amounts on various establishments the Government would have lost money through places like the Post Office, the Port and others would be far more in premiums alone in a year or two than they would pay in compensation.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, our knowledge is that the truth is seldom told about what is really lost. One might hear that a person is put before the Court charged for stealing and the amount involved is \$50, but in truth and in fact there might be enough \$50's to cover \$5,000 or \$50,000 and much more than this. 4.20 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, one might hear that a person is put before the court charged with stealing \$50, but in truth and in fact the amount may be \$500 or \$5,000. The Minister knows what I am talking about, and I do not want to go further into the matters. Seldom do we ever hear full details of matters of this sort.

*The question that Annexed Estimates Post Office stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

An Hon. MEMBER: Head 10.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: That is passed.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: My information is that Head 10 was passed without division. If one checks with the Official Reporter, one will find that his notes show that Head 10 was passed.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, what did you say?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I said that the Official Reporter has in his notes that Head 10 was passed without division. I know myself that it was passed, and the Official Reporter verifies it.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, you very well remember that, on the last occasion we met here, there was some doubt as to exactly what had transpired. Immediately after you had learnt what you have just said, I feel that it was your duty to have told hon members what information you had received. But that is not the point, Sir. What the Clerks-at-the-Table have recorded is what matters in a case such as this. We are not going to sit here and allow the Chairman of Committees or any other officer to ignore the record of the Clerks-at-the-Table. That is exactly why the Clerks are there, and Your Honour must, on this occasion, bear in mind that they are officers of credit, and you should not seek to discredit them. It might appear to be a matter which the Chairman, I am sure, does not want discussed. We are asking that, in fairness to the proceedings of Parliament, the records of the Clerks be accepted as the official records on an occasion such as this.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, surely a part of the proceedings of Parliament must include the Rulings of the Chair as well as anything else, and the facts of this matter are that this Resolution was put to the vote at the time when the Committee was in a state of confusion. It was put when the hon junior Member for Bridgetown was addressing Your Honour. There is good precedence in this House for Motions being put by the Chairman and the Speaker while hon. members were addressing the Chair. I do not like this particular situation, but there are precedents. So far as I am concerned, I am inclined to accept Your Honour's Ruling in this matter.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: We should always bow to the Chair's Ruling. If a matter is being discussed, the question is put to the Committee, the Clerks do not have it recorded and it does not appear in the Minutes, what happens? This is a simple point, and nobody is trying to belittle the Chairman. The Clerks said that they did not record the Head as passed, and the Chairman is saying that the Official Reporter has informed him that the Head was passed. Let me ask you this question, with the greatest respect. What do you think of the Clerks? The Clerks are the guides here. The Leader of the House knows this as well as I do, and I think that the Head should be recommitted.

Nobody can stifle his conscience by saying that the Clerks, when asked on the last occasion, said that it was not passed. If the Clerk said that he had it recorded, we could talk until tomorrow and the only thing we could do is to have the Head recommitted. Because it was drawn to your attention by the Official Reporter.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This is what I have said: I know that Head 10 has been passed. It is not a matter of whether it has been recorded or has not been recorded. I put it to the vote, and I declared "the Ayes have it." There was no division called for at the time, and I declared the Head passed.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr Chairman, there is no doubt that you did put it to the vote, but if any person looked at the Minutes he would see that the Head was not passed. At the time you put the question pandemonium broke out. The Clerks have it recorded that you put it to the vote, but they did not record it as passed. When you put the question, did you hear "Aye"?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Will you say that nobody said "No"? I know that the senior member for St. Peter and the Leader of the House know that you must rely on what the Clerk has recorded in the Minutes. I am not doubting the integrity of the Official Reporter, but you must rely on what the Clerk has recorded in the Minutes.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman. If an hon. member made a slip of the tongue in here, the Members on the other side would say: "Mr. Speaker or Mr. Chairman, I object to that." Invariably, if there is a misunderstanding between the Speaker or the Chairman and the person speaking, what happens is that the Members call for a report of the Official Reporter and not the report of the Clerk. Are you going to remove the credence of the Official Reporter?

4.30 p.m.

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am on a point of order. The Chairman says it has been passed. The Official Report on the proceedings states that it was passed. All that has happened is that in the pandemonium that took place it could have slipped the hearing of the Clerk, but the Official Reporter had to be listening through all this pandemonium and he has down the result as it was. The only conclusion we can arrive at now is that if the Clerks do not have it recorded, they did not hear. You should read the official report of the House.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: It is not a logical argument by the hon. member.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Right now I would point out that there is absolutely nothing before the Committee; so I see nothing that the hon. member can talk on at this point.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Then all the members, who spoke, spoke on nothing!

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

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY rose.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Resolution for \$994,900 do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the words "do now pass" be deleted and the words "be now recommitted" be substituted

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I beg to second the motion made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr CHAIRMAN: The Resolution cannot be re-committed because it has not been passed.

Mr. St JOHN: My motion is that Head 10 of the Resolution for \$994,900 be recommitted.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I beg to second that. Mr. Chairman, in supporting this motion to recommit Head 10, I am somewhat at a loss as to what really took place, because we are making nonsense of the proceedings of this House. As far as I recall, earlier in this sitting, the Leader of the House moved a motion to postpone further consideration of Head 10.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Head 10 has already been passed. If there is a motion for the recommital of Head 10, I will put the motion.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: We seem to be making nonsense of this whole procedure. We are asking to recommit this Head at a time when, as I understand it, it was on Wednesday or Friday evening that the Leader of the House moved to postpone further consideration of Head 10. Sir, this is in Hansard. After doing all the other Resolutions, when we resumed Committee of Supply it was pointed out that when the Sitting was suspended the House was considering Head 10, and it was pointed out that if we wanted to continue, it would be either on Head 10 or we would have to postpone it. Now rightly or wrongly the Leader of the House moved at that stage further consideration of Head 10 be postponed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If the hon. member would give way, it could not be so because in each when we reported to the House, we reported the passing of so many Resolutions and the postponement of one.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: No, Sir. You will recall what we were doing immediately after we finished the Resolution which dealt with foreign affairs and we were discussing the question of the two redidences of the High Commissioner in London. Anyhow, the Leader of the House got one of the other Ministers to start back on this and I think it was the hon. junior member for St. Michael.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If the hon. member would give way, that was a different Resolution. External Affairs does not come under this Resolution.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: That is what I am saying. The Leader of the House had piloted all the Heads under the other Resolutions and I remember him saying that he was tired and he asked the hon. junior member for St. Michael to start with Head 36 - Waterworks, and it was pointed out to the Leader of the House that when we were in Committee on this Resolution, we had not passed Head 10 and therefore we could not go on to Head 36. It was at this stage that the Leader of the House rose and moved that further consideration of Head 10 be postponed in an effort to deal with Head 36, and I remember very well the Leader of the House telling me that he wanted the hon. junior member for St. Michael to do those Resolutions because he wanted to have a breather.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If the hon. member would give way, if the Committee will recall, we started this particular Resolution on Tuesday, and the incident with the hon member and the Chair occurred on Tuesday afternoon. We had passed, I believe, one other Resolution or two others and in the Report to the House we reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply, the postponement of one and that the Committee asked leave to sit again. This is the form in which we have been making reports to the House - the postponement of a Resolution, not of a Head.

4.40 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr Chairman, the hon. senior member for Christ Church moved that Head 10 be recommitted and the hon. member for the City has seconded it. My understanding of Standing Order 26 (4) tells me that the hon. member cannot speak on it because he is reflecting right now on a vote of the House in this particular section. If you read 26 (4) it reads: "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." What is happening here is that the hon. junior member for the City is reflecting on a vote, because the mere fact that the senior member for Christ Church could move that Head 10 be recommitted means that they have accepted that the House has taken a vote on it. The Head has been passed, and if the hon. member wants to recommit it he will have to second the motion but he cannot reflect on a vote of the House. I am not saying we will not agree, but he is breaking Standing Order 26 (4) and I do not think you should allow it, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: This is not a vote of the House.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Of course, the House is in committee. Right now we are in Committee but we are still in the House so it is still a vote of the House. The hon. member cannot say that we voted in Committee, are we not a Committee of the House? We are not members of a Committee, we are mem-

bers of the House of Assembly. Any vote of the Committee is the vote of the House and the hon. member is reflecting on a vote of the House. I ask you to rule, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Two hon. members are on their feet.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The hon. member can speak after the Chairman rules.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: The hon. member has called upon you to rule, Mr. Chairman, but what has he called on you to rule about?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I made a point of order, and he has got to rule on my point of order; I will ask the Chairman to rule on the point of order I raised.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: But I am on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Rule 26 (4) says it shall be out of order to reflect on any vote of the House or attempt to reconsider a specific question upon which the House has come to a conclusion during the current session, except upon a subsequent motion for rescission. In my view, this Head which has been recommitted has not yet passed the House.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I bow to your ruling.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: As far as I can recall, and I think I am right in saying this, on Wednesday when we came back the Leader of the House rose in his place and asked to postpone further consideration of this Resolution; on Friday, after dealing with the other Resolution which involved the Ministry of External Affairs and which we dealt with from the time the sitting began at 4 o'clock until I think after dinner, then it was pointed out to the Leader of the House, and at that stage you said you were under the impression that the Head had been passed. Then the Leader of the House rose and at that stage asked that further consideration of this Resolution be postponed. This is why I say it is making nonsense of the whole proceedings because you cannot move that a Resolution be postponed and now come back today and say it has been passed.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to draw to the attention of all hon. members my ruling that Head 10 has been passed. I am now listening to what debate can be offered on the recommittal.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I am stating that I am supporting the recommittal and I was indicating that the reason why I am asking for the recommittal was because as far as it would appear from the records and your own ruling it has been passed, but one takes into consideration the fact that the Leader of the House on Friday rose in his place..... (Asides.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: All hon. members must observe 29 (6).

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: There was some discussion at the time as to whether we will accept the record of the Clerks or whether we will accept what the Reporters had.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If I recall correctly, the hon. junior member for Christ Church asked for a temporary postponement because he was not sure whether it had passed or not. In my opinion there is nothing called a temporary postponement and I ruled that Head 10 was passed and should not have been postponed.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Now you recall that somebody asked for the temporary postponement of it; how can you get a temporary postponement on it after it had been passed?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This was to check the records, and the records reveal that Head 10 had been passed.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: There is nothing in the world to prevent me from talking on the main Resolution  
4.50 p.m.

Put the question for the recommittal, and then we will get up and talk on the main Resolution until Sunday. Nobody can stop us from doing that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Head 10 be recommitted. Hon. members in favour please say "Aye" and hon. Members against will please say "No". I think the Noes have it.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Divide.

*The Committee divided and voted as follows:*

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

NOES: Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Mr. WEEKES; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS; Hon. N. W. BOXILL and Mr. LOWE - 7.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am advised that 5 hon. members voted "Aye", and 7 hon. members voted "No". I declare the "Noes" have it.

*The question that a Resolution for \$994,900 do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of one Resolution, with amendments, in Committee of Supply.

Mr. WEEKES: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution be now read a first time.

Mr. WEEKES: I beg to second that.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, before the question is put, I should like to say a few words. We are asking you to Rule as to whether the record of the Clerk-at-the-Table is correct, or whether that of the Official Reporter is correct. We feel that in this case enough opportunity was not given to us to discuss an Item under Head 10 of this Resolution, and it would be rather difficult for me to exercise my conscience in voting for the first reading of the Resolution.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: You cannot tell the Speaker what went on in Committee.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: I am not telling the Speaker what to do; I am merely thinking aloud. The question is that we did not have an opportunity to exercise our right to....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. You cannot allow the hon. member to get up and complain to the Chair for the Chairman of Committees. He cannot reflect on the Chairman of Committees. The hon. member is out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I note the point the hon. member has made.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Technically speaking, and in truth and in fact, there is absolutely nothing before the House other than that the Motion for the Resolution to be now read a first time. The hon. member is not speaking on that, because he said: "Mr. Speaker, before the question was put."

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I object to that most strongly. I am speaking on the Motion that this Resolution be read a first time.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Your Honour, I never become incensed; I always contain myself. The hon. senior member for the City is now attempting to bring to your knowledge that the Chairman of Committees....

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am doing no such thing. He cannot accuse me of being a nitwit. I am not trying to bring to the attention of the Speaker anything the Chairman did wrong in Committee. How could I be so stupid?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am now trying to ascertain whether or not it is a point of order  
5 p.m.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Your Honour, whenever the Chairman reports, as Speaker, you assume that everything has been done in order; that is, an ordinary assumption that the Speaker puts and the most favourable construction a Speaker can put on a Report given by Mr. Chairman; so there is no question of going over what happened in Committee when Mr. Speaker presumes that everything has been in order.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Is the hon. member saying that I cannot speak on the motion that the Resolution be read a first time?

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion as I understand it is that the Resolution as amended be now read a first time.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: And I am speaking on that.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is the motion, which motion has been seconded, and any hon. member is entitled to speak on that motion.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: I am entitled to say that I do not agree that this Resolution should be read a first time, because there was some misunderstanding. Are you going to tell me that I cannot speak on that? I am not a green horn.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I rise to state my objection to the Resolution being read a first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I point out to the hon. member that he is entitled to say why he objects to the Resolution being read a first time, but not on a point of order. The hon. member was speaking and he has given way; but on a point of order, the hon. junior member for St. Peter may not make that point. He may do so in his substantive speech, but the motion now before the House is that the Resolution as amended be now read a first time.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: I am saying that I object to the Resolution being read a first time on the ground that there are parts of the Resolution in which there has been a misunderstanding. This is no reflection on a vote of the House.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with a section of the Appropriation Bill. This is a Resolution governed by standing Order No. 60, and as I see it, when a motion comes out of Committee of Supply, it is the function of the Minister to put the question to the Speaker and such motion shall be decided upon without amendment or debate. This is Standing Order No. 60 (11), and this is where they call for the third reading of the Appropriation Bill. If you look at Standing Order No. 61 - Supplementary Appropriation Bill - you will see that it says that whenever the Minister of Finance introduces a supplementary Appropriation Bill, the provisions of Standing Order No. 60 (Appropriation Bill: Committee of Supply) shall apply to the stages of this Bill. This is part of a money Bill.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, this is a motion for first reading, not a third reading.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: What I want to determine from the Speaker is what is the position in respect of first and second readings of these Resolutions because the Standing Orders here are silent. I am told to look at Standing Order No. 60(2). This reads as follows:-

"After the motion for the Second Reading of the Bill has been proposed and seconded, the debate thereon shall be confined to the general principles of Government policy and administration as indicated by the Bill and Estimates."

I see no provision in Standing Order No. 60 in respect of first and second reading.

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Andrew is making his point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: My point of order is that I have not seen anywhere in Standing Order No. 60 where provision is made for first and second readings, but I see provision made for the third reading. I want to know if the first and second readings are governed by the same principles as the third reading, and if this is the case, it means there can be no debate. I await Your Honour's ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: My ruling on the motion which is now before the House is that there is nothing in Standing Orders to preclude debate on the motion that the Resolution as amended be now read a first time; but I will point out that the fact that there may be discussion on the motion by the Hon. Leader of the House does not mean that what took place in Committee may be gone over in the House, not even indirectly, impliedly, vaguely or remotely.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, on a further point of order, I understand that where the Standing Orders of this House are silent, we go by May's. I would like to hear what May's says on the first and second reading. I cannot read too well, and I want to be told by the Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have noted the point of order, but my ruling is that there may be discussion on the motion that this Resolution as amended be now read a first time, but there must be no attempt however cleverly during that discussion as to whether this Resolution as amended be read a first time to repeat what took place in Committee.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: I was dealing with the motion that the Resolution as amended be read a first time.

5.10 p.m

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: I was giving my reason why I felt I should not vote that the Resolution as amended be read a first time. There seems to be some misunderstanding, and that misunderstanding might be with me, as to whether certain portions of that Resolution were clearly defined as passed and recorded at the table by the Clerk. That being so, Sir, you will agree with me that all the rules and regulations are not being kept, and we are only trying to get your ruling on a matter of this sort. I can say there was a misunderstanding. (*Asides.*) Am I right in saying that there was a misunderstanding? I am not saying that the Clerks or the Reporters went wrong, there could have been a misunderstanding by me. There was some misunderstanding on certain portions of the Resolution, and I am not even going to mention the particular item in the Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: Quite properly so.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: There seems to have been a misunderstanding, and where there has been such a misunderstanding members are entitled when they come to the first reading of the Resolution to discuss their reasons for objecting to or supporting the motion for the passing of the Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: That has been very cleverly done.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have already stated those portions on which there seems to have been a misunderstanding.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order.

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

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I do not like people playing the fool. The hon. member, immediately after the senior member for Christ Church came in.....

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: If this is so, I have not given way.

Mr. SPEAKER: To be perfectly on the safe side, and in view of what has happened before.....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I am on a point of order, everyday I come to this Chamber the behaviour is going further and further down and it can be because of one person.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no point of order.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I have not made the point of order yet.

Mr. SPEAKER: But the hon. member must make the point of order.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: But you must wait, you cannot tell me what to do.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must state his point of order.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, you have to wait until I develop my point, you cannot hurry me. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: You cannot tell the Speaker that). Get up and tell him to put the question as you did last time. My point is that the hon. senior member for the City had concluded his speech, because he asked the Leader of the Opposition if he was ready.

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

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I am not finished, so how do you know it is not a point of order; I made my point succinctly. The hon. member waited until the Leader of the Opposition came in and then he asked the Leader of the Opposition if he was ready and sat down and Mr. Speaker deliberately asked the hon. member if he had completed. This is the House of Assembly, this is not a joke Chamber, we expect to have some decorum in this Chamber.

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

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Do you understand it? All right.

Mr. SPEAKER: Some time quite recently a point arose as to whether an hon. member had given way or not. (*Aside*) If hon. members do not hear me through this microphone there is something wrong with such hon. member. (Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Or the Speaker.) Some time ago at a previous meeting there was the question as to whether an hon. member had given way or had concluded his speech, and merely as a precautionary measure I was asking the hon. member if he had given way.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: The mere fact that you have accepted a point of order shows that I had not concluded. You could not have taken a point of order unless I had given way.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has to give way on a point of order, and an hon. member, if he has sat down on a point of order, can continue his speech. I understand the hon. member to say he had completed his speech, and that, I understand has been recorded.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: I hope, Mr. Speaker, that you will take what is recorded at the Table. I am going to bow to your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for Christ Church.

Mr. St. JOHN: As I was saying, the reasons why we on this side of the House cannot accept this first

reading is because we notice that included in this Resolution for \$900,000 is a sum under Item 27A (New) - Contingencies of Head 10 of \$5,706, which sum is an amount of money to come out of the taxpayers of this country to cover up the cost of irregularities which have taken place in the Treasury and we on this side of the House would like to know what plans the Government has for preventing a recurrence of this matter. This is very important, because we do not want in the future to have the taxpayers of this country paying money regularly to deal with these irregularities, and we would hope that now that this matter has been brought to the attention of the Government that instant steps will be taken by the Government to ensure that the procedures for the payment of money are such that the situation would not recur as has taken place. 5.20 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I was saying earlier that there are reasons why I may not be able to vote for the first reading of this Resolution. For instance, I enquired of the appropriate Minister as the reason why postmen were asked to sign vouchers for two months for sums of money which they were not receiving in respect of allowances, and I have had no reply from the Minister. I understand that the Minister was getting the information, but I do not know from where he was getting it. Up to this moment the information has not come to hand, and we would certainly like to be advised as to the true position. If you ask a postman to sign for his cycle allowance for this month and next month and do not pay him, then the time will come when you will ask him to sign for his salary and he will not get it.

I can cite an instance, Sir, that occurred to a poor pensioner in the Treasury when the increases were to be paid out. The pensioner went to the Treasury to receive her increase in pension, but not fully acquainted with what was going on she took what the clerk gave her by way of cash. The mistake she made was that she turned away from the clerk, and then discovered that she did not have enough money in her hands. She did not leave the building, but when she went to the clerk who had paid her, as one would expect, the clerk said that he had paid her all.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has made his point, but I would advise him that he must not go into detail in matters which arose in Committee.

Mr. HINDS: This matter did not arise in Committee, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am trying to point out to hon. members that details must not be gone into at this stage. The hon. senior member for Christ Church put the point of view, as I understand it, succinctly and very conclusively as to why he was not supporting the Motion. I am asking the hon. member not to attempt to go into details.

Mr. HINDS: I do not think that I have gone into details so far, Sir. If for instance, I had asked if a sum of money had been voted for Mrs. Orie Browne to pay her all that was due to her, I might be thought

to be going into details. What I am asking is, if Government is doing anything to save the taxpayers from this unnecessary expense that we are called here time and time again to provide for. We are hearing from Ministers, merely for the sake of convenience to expedite matters, all sorts of things when in truth and in fact they have no intention of doing anything whatsoever to improve things.

Mr. Speaker, there are obvious reasons why hon. members on this side are showing a reluctance to support this Resolution and its first reading. The Hon. Leader of the House knows that we have not been afforded ample opportunity to exercise our democratic right.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am asking the hon. member not to allude to what took place or did not take place in Committee.

Mr. HINDS: I am just telling Your Honour that I am now affording myself of the opportunity to exercise my democratic right to state some of the reasons why I am reluctant to support the first reading of this Resolution. There are many outstanding points which the Ministers have been reluctant to give information on to hon. members on this side.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I point out to the hon. member that he is not entitled on this particular Motion to go into that; he can go into it otherwise by substantive Motion.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I cannot say that one of my reasons is that Ministers have been reluctant to give information to hon. members on this side.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may say it, but he cannot go into details on this Motion.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Obviously there is filibustering on this matter, and I beg to move that the question be now put in accordance with the appropriate Standing Order.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Motion be not put.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: That is unfair.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the Motion must be put without any further debate.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, why should hon. members on this side be heckled like this? You will understand that there are hon. members on that side who are prepared to attack Your Honour right, left and centre, and that is what they are aiming at. They are not concerned with our going into details or otherwise. It is a question of the taxpayers'

money frittered away unnecessarily, and we have to protect the taxpayers. It might not suit every member on the other side to think of the burden of the taxpayers, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Two hon. members are on their feet.

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

Mr. HINDS: We have had evidence of....

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

Mr. HINDS: Yes, Sir. One will appreciate the fact that we have had evidence of Government trying in every possible way to prevent the Opposition from having a full opportunity to deal with all aspects of the matters that were brought before us. A large amount of money is involved in this Resolution. It is \$990,531.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I have said on a point of order and the Speaker will not look at me.

Mr. HINDS: This is a tidy sum in any man's money.

Mr. SPEAKER: But I am afraid that the hon. member may not so proceed on the Resolution which is before the House.  
5.30 p.m.

I will point out that a motion having been made the member rising in his place may claim to move "That the question be now put", and unless it appears to the Chair that such motion is an abuse of the Rules of the House or an infringement of the rights of the minority, the question shall be put forthwith.

Now my ruling on this is that the motion being merely that a Resolution as amended be now read a first time, in view of the fact that the Leader of the Minority Party in Opposition and the Leader of the Official Opposition have spoken, and in view of the restrictions which appertain to this particular motion that a Resolution as amended be now read a first time, there will be no infringement of the rights of the minority or any abuse of the Rules of the House if I put this motion.

*The question that the "Question be now put" was put and not carried, the House dividing as follows:-*

AYES: Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Mr. WEEKES; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON; Mr. YEARWOOD; Hon. N. W. BOXILL; Mr. LOWE and Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS - 8.

NOES: Mr. BOLDEN; Mr. HINDS; Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY;

Mr. ADAMS: *(on being called to vote.)* On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am in a little difficulty here because I heard the Clerk say that the motion is that the Resolution be now read a first time. As I understand it, the motion is "that the question be now put" and eight or nine members must vote in the majority for it. I am respectfully submitting to you that if the wrong question has been put, you have to start the division over.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am advised by the Clerk-at-the-Table that what he put was "that the question be now put".

Mr. ADAMS: In that case I vote "no".

Mr. St. JOHN: *(on being called to vote.)* "No."

Mr. SPEAKER: I am advised that eight hon. members have voted "Aye" and six hon. members have voted "no".

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, wouldn't the Clerk be directed to take note that the motion is lost? I have not heard any declaration.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion has not been carried by virtue of Standing Order No. 32 (5).

*The question that the Resolution as amended be now read a first time was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, you cannot do that. It is dishonest. *(Members rose.)*

Mr. SPEAKER: *(Rising)* I see four hon. members on their feet.

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

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, please put the question.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already put the motion of the Hon. Leader of the house that the Resolution as amended be now read a first time.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Resolution as amended be now read a second time.

Mr. WEEKES: I beg to second that.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I want to record my objection to voting for this because at every single stage of this Resolution the Government has made every attempt to ensure that the Opposition does not debate this. Why is it that money is being stolen from the Treasury of this country and the Government is doing every single thing possible to ensure that we do not debate it? This is

being grossly unfair to the Opposition of this country. You had a Resolution called the Parliamentary Privileges and Immunities Bill introduced in an attempt to suppress the Opposition in this country.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid a discussion on that cannot arise on this motion.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I am not discussing that; I only mentioned it to say something else. I say, Sir, that the Government has introduced a Bill called the Parliamentary Privileges and Immunities Bill in an attempt to stifle and restrict discussions in this Chamber.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may not refer to this matter which is not the subject of discussion. He is entitled to say why he is not supporting the motion.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I am stating the reason why, and one of the reasons includes an attempt by the Government to suppress the level of criticism in this Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER: But the hon. member may go no further than saying that.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: How do you mean I cannot go further?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am merely pointing out that the hon. member may not go further than giving that as a reason. He may not go into the details of this Resolution.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Right throughout this debate the Opposition has been hampered by bad ruling by the Chairman of Committees.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not entitled to say that. These rulings can be questioned otherwise.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Every single attempt has been made in here to suppress the Opposition. It was made during the time we were in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may not deal with what transpired in Committee.

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking that the hon. member withdraw the words about bad ruling by the Chairman of Committees. I am asking that the words be withdrawn.  
5.40 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member be so good as to state the precise words to which he takes objection?

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr Speaker, I think it is in your power to ask the Reporter to give the words.

Mr SPEAKER: It is in my power, but if the hon. member could help I would appreciate his assistance.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: The words were that the Opposition had to put up with bad rulings from the Chair and I am asking that the hon. member be asked to withdraw them. (*Asides.*)

Mr. SPEAKER: The house is not in recess.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, let me say this.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am awaiting the words from the Reporter.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I go by precedent, and precedent took place just now when I was standing.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have seen the verbatim report of what was said by the hon. junior member for Bridgetown, and I quote. "Right through this debate the Opposition has been hampered by bad rulings by the Chairman." Standing Order 35 states: "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." Furthermore, Standing Order 26(5) states: "It shall be out of order to use offensive and insulting language about Members of the House", and in my view to say that of the Chair, other than in a debate on a substantive motion in which everything may be said, bad or good, these words are out of order and I ask the hon. member to withdraw them.

5.50 p.m.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I accept Your Honour's Ruling, and I withdraw it. We must congratulate the Chairman for the expeditious manner in dealing with the Resolution, and for all his good Rulings throughout. He dealt with the matter in such a manner that we took four days to do the Resolution. I congratulate him on that. As I was saying, Sir, right through this debate we were suppressed in attempting to debate and to put reasons before this House concerning the debate in its entirety on one of the Heads in this Resolution. I wonder what is the reason why the Government does not want the Opposition to discuss it.

Sir, it is strange when you have a Criminal Assize where you have three civil servants at one time before the Criminal Assizes. That must in itself reflect a new standard of morality in the Civil Service.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid the hon. member is now going into reasons for the decision at the Assizes, and that is transcending the immediate Resolution before the House. The motion before the House is that the Resolution be now read a second time.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: The people are getting off.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: As I was saying, Sir, one can only speculate as to the reason why the Government does not really want a full discussion on this Resolution. It has been said that the civil servants are thieving because the Ministers are thieving and are not getting locked up. That has been said and it is well known, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must know the law of defamation well. One cannot say that so and so said so and so and get away with it in the law of libel. The hon. member must not say that it has been said that Ministers are thieving, if that means stealing. He cannot say that, because there are several Ministers in the House and he is using, obviously offensive and insulting language about members of the House.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Never once did I say anything about the Ministers of Government, Sir. I said that civil servants are thieving, because people say that the Ministers are thieving, Sir. I did not say anything about these Ministers in here.

Mr. SPEAKER: I concede that the hon. member did not say "Ministers of Government". If the hon. member will assure me that he did not mean Ministers of the Government.....

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: I cannot assure you of anything, Sir. I can say what the people say.

Mr. SPEAKER: Ministers in Parliament are hardly taken.....

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Sir, I cannot question your intentions, or your Ruling, and I do not see how you can question my intention for something. I am saying that Ministers are thieving, and that is using Barbadian language. If I had said that the senior member for St. Andrew was stealing, then that would have been offensive, and I would never have said so.

Mr. SPEAKER: It would be more offensive.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I refrained from saying so.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must make no imputation even directly or vaguely.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: That is not an imputation, Sir. What I was saying to you is that I would know better than to say so in the House of

Assembly, at this stage at any rate, I will deal with that at a later stage.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to say why I cannot support the second reading of the Resolution, because when we look at the whole sum of money we see \$7,956 which relates to irregularities. Mr. Speaker, irregularities in the Treasury mean that money has disappeared and cannot be accounted for. I do not want to cast any aspersions in any directions, and I do not want to think that the money was lost by felonious means. All I would like to know is that Government is doing something to protect the taxpayers from having constantly to replace money which has disappeared through irregularities. There is no doubt about it, Mr. Speaker, there is current talk that there is \$1 million difference between the Auditor General's Office and the Bankers to the Government. This matter will certainly come back to this House as an irregularity.

Now, as member of the Opposition, we have some concern about where this money is coming from. The moment we have to keep putting money into the Auditor General's hands to replace money which is lost or money which cannot be accounted for, it means that the taxes on each and every one of us will be raised. If it does not come by way of increased taxation, then it means that something which is absolutely necessary and could have been done would not be done. Something would have to be put off from this financial year to the next financial year. These are the things that worry me.

Mr. Speaker, I must record my opposition, because I have not heard anybody from the Government side make any suggestions as to what recommendations the Government hopes to implement in an effort to stop, using the words of the Hon. Prime Minister, "this raid upon the Treasury by certain officials." I do not know if civil servants are involved, and I am not here to speculate.  
6 p.m.

I do not know if there are bad calculations. That is another question for the Auditor General. All I am concerned with is the way it is put here, because it says "irregularities", and it means that money has got to be put back. Something which should have been done might not have been done or may have been put off for some other time, and I would truly like to know for the benefit of the poor people what is the position. The sum is \$7,956. The hon. senior member for St. Andrew as a financial wizard, as a man operating in certain aspect of community life, would know that this sum could buy most probably two good 16 x 9 houses with kitchen and shed painted to accommodate two good families, but here it is, instead of that this money has got to be voted out of the Treasury again to replace this money which has disappeared.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I want to be as short as possible, but I fear I must dwell to some extent on matters that have caused the greatest possible trouble both in Committee and in this House. The particular two Heads which I am submitting as

shortly and succinctly, and I hope hon. members will believe me, as sincerely as possible, should not have come before the House when they are also before the Courts of Assizes. They should never have been brought before the House at all in the same month as the Courts of Assizes were sitting. There are some expressions used in one of the Addenda that come near to contempt of Court in my view, because talk about the Government owing the Bank of Nova Scotia is one of the reasons I will find if hard, where a Civil Servant has produced an Addendum that reflects on an issue on which the jury has to decide, to support such a Resolution. For that reason I am saying that hon. members were not given an adequate chance of dealing with the issue; I am not saying that it is the Chairman who did not give them an adequate chance, because anybody can make a wrong ruling in marginal situations. Judges nod, Homer nods. Is that right, Mr. Speaker? I do remember the hon. senior member for St. Joseph saying once, if you do not mind me referring to it, what a good Speaker you were, but in a particular incident you did not just slip, you fell down. So anybody can make a mistake.

Mr. SPEAKER: That was his opinion and he is known to make mistakes.

Mr. ADAMS: A lot of heat has been generated in this House unnecessarily by reason of not postponing or deleting these Heads so that they could be dealt with in other circumstances.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may not dilate on that now.

Mr. ADAMS: I am not dilating on it. We are asked to pass a Resolution for \$X. I am just pointing out that it was possible for a Court to have made an Order for payment of at least \$2,250 for compensation at the time that this was being debated, certainly when it first appeared before the House, and it would be improper then to pass a Resolution to pay to the Bank of Nova Scotia something which the Court had already ordered to paid. I am just suggesting that all these points could arise. I am not entirely blaming the Chairman, but I must say that it would be difficult for me to vote for a Resolution if I believed that so many wrong rulings had been made to make it impossible for it to have been debated properly.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is, I presume, speaking generally.

Mr. ADAMS: Very generally. It would be difficult for any hon. member, and the hon. senior member for St. Andrew and the hon. junior member for St. Thomas I am sure will agree with me, if he feels that he is of opinion that a ruling is mistaken. I will not say wrong because I do not believe there have been any malicious rulings in this House. If an hon. member feels a ruling is mistaken, it colours his whole attitude towards the debate. You must get bad behaviour if a series of what you believe are mistaken rulings appear to bear hardly and heavily upon

you; and it is not only the quality of the judicial integrity which all the presiding officers of this House bring to the Chair; it is the quality of tact that sometimes gets Resolutions through. Hon. members all should ask why should this supplementary estimate for \$994,000, less than twice an hon. member's overdraft, has taken four days to debate. All of us should go home and think about it. It is less than \$1 million, and \$1 million is going for grass now in Barbados; it is regarded as nothing. It is not the Opposition's obduracy alone that has created this situation. All of us have some part in it. What is it the poet Donne said? "No man is an Island". In this Honourable House, "No man is an Island", neither is the Opposition a series of little rocks in the Parliamentary procedural sea, and the public looks at all of us. I have never yet seen, not perhaps since the incident with the Mace, the public sit down and direct all its obliquity on the Opposition alone or on the Government alone for the state of disorder in Parliament. Everybody comes in for it, and Parliamentary Institutions themselves come in for some doubt.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe it is out of order to refer to films at the cinema. I saw a film yesterday which deals with disorder in Parliament, corruption in Parliament and so on, and what happened on that particular occasion: Parliament itself was dissolved with England's only dictator throwing the Mace on the floor and saying "take that double away". All of us have a duty to the public of Barbados.

Mr. SPEAKER: Was any guidance given in that film as to how one should vote, whether a Resolution as amended be now read a second time?

Mr. ADAMS: One hon. member said that if you cannot make a profit out of being in Parliament, why be in Parliament at all. This was in the film. But that is only by the way. The guidance which that film gave me to vote on this Resolution is that bad behaviour in Parliament stems on all sides, and sometimes if you cast a protest against all those responsible, and the only protest sometimes you can cast maybe against even some of the very worthy things that are contained in this, like the \$3,900 to pay Mr. John Banfield and his acolytes for presiding over the St. Joseph by-election .....

Mr. SPEAKER: That would be a detail in the matter which was before the Committee. We are now merely concerned with a motion that this Resolution as amended be now read a second time.

Mr. ADAMS: I wish to support to the full the argument raised by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, on the first reading of this Resolution. I was not aware that it is normal to speak on first reading of a Resolution, and by this I mean no reflection on those hon. members who have spoken or on the Chair for allowing them to speak. I will only say that I have been introduced to a new facet of Parliamentary practice today; but nevertheless useful contributions were made on the first reading. I support what the Leader of the Opposition has said,

what the hon. junior member for St. Peter said, and I even support the point of order made by the hon. senior member for St. Andrew, because it gave me and the hon. junior member for St. Thomas an opportunity to learn that you need nine votes to support a closure. (*Asides.*)

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I heard an hon. member say that I got away with murder because I was dealing with an idiot, and pointing at you, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: If that hon. member rose and said that, he would be out of here quickly.

Mr. ADAMS: If I said it sitting down, I hope you would put me out too, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Whoever said it, would be put out unless the Marshal and the Police Force are not powerful enough.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, there is always a great temptation to reply in detail to all the speeches we have heard on the other side on this motion. However I shall resist this temptation. 6.10 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, there is of course a great temptation to reply in detail to all the speeches we have heard on the other side on this motion, but I shall resist this temptation, and although I believe the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has not made a contribution to the debate on the second reading of the Resolution, I would like to take this opportunity to answer the point which he made when we debated the first reading of the Resolution, because we on this side regard it as the only relevant contribution made at this stage.

The hon. member sought to know what it was Government could do in respect of these matters which are causing so much distress at the Treasury. I wish to say this first of all, the Government is as concerned as the hon. members on these matters, indeed is more so, because we have the responsibility to answer for them in Parliament; secondly, to take a certain practical step, it has been decided that a member of the Public Service who has just returned from a course in the United Kingdom and who is well qualified should be seconded to the Treasury to do nothing else but to make a special effort to advise and overlook and examine all the procedures which the Treasury uses for the receiving and paying of money in order that incidents and occasions which we have been discussing should be reduced to a minimum, so if the fabrications and falsifications or attempted embezzlements take place, his business is to rectify the procedures which would make it possible for their reduction. Mr. Calvin Springer, I believe, is his name, and special duties assigned to him would be to rectify and bring up to date these procedures which would obviate these difficulties which we have had.

*The question that the Resolution as amended be now read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution as amended be now agreed to.

Mr. WEEKES: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, this concludes our business for this Special Meeting. Your Honour

will recall that we had put down two other Items, one, an amendment to the National Insurance Bill, and the other one is an amendment to the Harbours Act. We are not now proceeding with those in as much as both of those Items appear on tomorrow's Order Paper. We have now come to the end of this meeting.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I will remind hon. members that the House has been adjourned till tomorrow at 12.00 noon and 12.00 noon tomorrow it will be. 6.17 p.m.