
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

THIRD SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 25th May, 1971.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.15 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. PALMA, (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. FERGUSSON, (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P.; Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD, J.P., (Chairman of Committees); Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; Mr. C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P.; Mr. ELLIOTT D. MOTTLEY and Mr. C. L. BOLDEN, LL.B.

Prayers were read.

Mr. SMITH entered the Chamber and took his seat.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Annual Report of the Barbados Tourist Board for the year 1968-69.

Annual Report of the Barbados Tourist Board for the year 1969-70.

Mr. ADAMS entered the Chamber and took his seat.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, I beg to give notice of the following:-

A Bill to repeal the Overseas Service Agreement Act, 1963 and to provide for the implementa-

tion by the Government of the Overseas Service (Barbados) Agreement 1970 and for purposes connected therewith.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 151, asked by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, is ready.

Hon'bles A. DaC. EDWARDS and N. W. BOXILL entered the Chamber and took their seats.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:-

"WHEREAS there is no facility at present existing in the New Orleans area in the City of Bridgetown;

AND WHEREAS it is very essential to have some form of recreational facilities for all the citizens of Barbados;

AND WHEREAS it is universally considered that there should be some form of recreation to foster a healthy mind in a healthy body;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the Government take immediate steps to erect a social centre and pavilion so that the residents of New Orleans may have all the accepted and available recreational facilities for their use."

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

QUESTIONS

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

"To ask the Appropriate Minister:-

Is the Minister aware of allegations that during the course of surcharging certain stamps at the Government Printery in March 1970 deliberate errors were manufactured with a view to an enhanced value on the philatelic market; and if the Minister is satisfied that any such allegations are false will the

Minister take steps to publish a statement to that effect in the appropriate quarters?"

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

"To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. Is the Minister aware of the fact that the workers employed by the Ministry of Communications and Works demolished the steps of certain of the residents of Bannister's land in the Parish of St. Michael when the roads in that area were being repaired?

2. If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, will the Minister give instructions that these above-mentioned steps should be reconstructed at the earliest possible opportunity?"

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, a Bill to repeal the Overseas Service Agreement Act, 1963, and to provide for the implementation by the Government of the Overseas Service (Barbados) Agreement 1970, and for purposes connected therewith, was read a first time.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 5 be the first Order of the Day.

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

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

THE POST OFFICE (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1971

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 5 is the instant Order of the Day, and it stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works, and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Post Office Act, 1911. When this matter was previously discussed, the hon. junior member for Bridgetown was addressing the Chair. He may, if he thinks fit, resume.
12.25 p.m.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on the last occasion when this matter came before this Assembly, what at that stage gave rise to some concern as far as the Opposition was concerned that you were now moving from the Governor-General and putting in the hands of the Minister, power to open, delay and detain mail, and under the Post Office Act the Governor-General could act under an express warrant in writing whereas this new Act only requires the Minister to direct the Postmaster General in writing. What has been causing us some concern is the fact that under the original Post Office Act which

we are now seeking to amend, the Governor-General may only act by an express warrant in writing, and what is interesting here is this, that in the express warrant as signed by the Governor-General the reasons for the Governor-General directing the Postmaster General to detain or open a letter would have to be recited in that warrant, and this is a discretion which is now being made in this proviso to be granted to the Minister.

There is no requirement on the part of the Minister to state in his authorisation to the Postmaster-General to detain or to open a letter, his reasons for so doing, whereas under the express warrant, the way the warrant should be drafted there would be a recital in which the Government-General would have to state the purpose for his so acting, but if this amendment goes through as presently drafted it would not require the Minister to state the reasons for so acting. I think this is wrong because it is a departure from the existing practice, and if the Minister could state or give the House some reason for the departure from this practice, if he wanted to think that there should be an express warrant by a Minister or that the Minister should state in writing the reasons for so acting, that will be more acceptable to the Opposition rather than merely stating that the Minister can direct the Postmaster General in writing without requiring the Minister to give the reasons for so acting. I am not accusing the present Minister of acting or that he would act in such a way that he would just direct the Postmaster General to detain or open the letters of a particular person, but unless the law states clearly that the Minister must state his reasons for so directing the Postmaster General, then you will find that some future Minister, not necessarily the present Minister of Communications and Works, could very well direct that the Postmaster General detain some letter without giving any just reason. I think the Minister should check the legal aspect of it because it does not as such give the Minister any power to do anything, all it does is to exempt certain conduct from criminal liability, because it is well accepted that at common law, not even the Crown has any authority to intercept any letters whatsoever, and all that this Act is doing is to state that if the Postmaster acts under the express warrant of the Governor-General, then the Postmaster would be exempt from any criminal liability.

Let us look at the situation - and I am not accusing the Government of anything - but let us look at the election circulars which are being sent out. I want to make it quite clear that I am not accusing this Minister of doing this or having any intention whatsoever of doing this, but one can easily see where election circulars are to be sent out and a Minister decides he wants to get the Government Party circulars sent out first, he issues a statement to the Postmaster to detain circulars from the Opposition Party, as the Act is drafted at the moment the Postmaster General would have no choice but to detain those letters because the Minister does not have to give any reason for so acting, all he would have to say is to detain the letters of the Barbados Labour Party. At the moment if the Governor-General does it, in

his warrant he would have to recite his reasons for so doing, and I would like the Minister in his reply to tell me on how many occasions within the last 10 years the Governor-General has used this Act. I could tell him, but I would like the Minister to tell us, if he has it in his possession, to read the type of warrant as signed by the Governor-General. He used it on two occasions, and in any warrant signed by the Governor-General the reasons for his so doing must be stated. If you drafted the legislation in such a way as to say that the Minister should state the reasons for so doing, the Minister can say he has reasons to believe that certain material which is prejudicial to the safety of the State is being posted, then the security of the State would require that the Minister and the Postmaster General act in such a way. 12.35 p.m.

If, as is stipulated under one of the Acts - the Pool Betting Act - the Postmaster General is given power if he thinks that there is some fraudulent practice involving the revenue of this country going through the post, for instance, the pools being sent out of the country without the proper, requisite stamps being paid, then in those circumstances, the Minister would be able to set out his reasons for opening the letter. But merely to allow the Minister to do that in writing, in my submission, is not sufficient. (Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: "Do you have more confidence in the Governor-General than in the Minister?") No. The hon. senior member for St. Andrew obviously is not following what I am saying. What I am saying is that once the Governor-General acts under an express warrant, an express warrant is such that he will have to set out certain recitals, and the recitals in the warrant must set out the reason for the Governor-General so acting.

Mr. Speaker, if you say "under the direction of the Minister in writing, "then the Minister need not state his reason for so acting because the law, as it is drafted, does not require the Minister to state the reasons. If you draft legislation in such a manner as to state that where the Minister has reason to believe that there is some fraudulent practice involved with the revenue, or that materials such as pornography and marijuana were being sent through the post, then I agree that those would be good reasons, but it would be stipulated that the Minister should set out his reasons for so acting. It should not be left to the arbitrary decision of the Minister to say that election time is coming up and that Opposition circulars should not go out before Government circulars without having to state the reason. That is what we are complaining about. You must stipulate in the legislation the reason for the Minister so acting. This is quite simple, and nobody would be against it.

Mr. Speaker, you are dealing with the freedom of the individual and the power of the State, and it is a ticklish situation. Now, one must bear in mind that, under the Crown Proceedings Act of this country, no individual can sue the Crown for any damage to a postal packet. If you open a postal packet containing money or some article which is damaged, then the

person to whom it is addressed has no remedy against the Crown; therefore, this is not a matter to be looked at in any light fashion. It is not a matter to be looked at merely as transferring power from the Governor-General to the Minister. We are not against the transferring of power to the Minister. All we are saying is that, in transferring the power, the Minister should be guided by the something the Governor-General was guided by.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to find out from the Minister the number of occasions on which this proviso was used by the Governor-General, as well as the reasons why they were used. Is the Minister prepared to tell the House why they were used? Mr. Speaker, although they talk about Ministerial responsibility to Parliament, one often hears that it is not in the interest of the State or in the interest of the security of the State for them to disclose certain information. Even if a Minister is responsible to Parliament, one still hears that he cannot disclose certain information, because it is not in the interest of the State.

With regard to communications, this is a very important topic, because it deals with the freedom of the citizen and the power of the State. There is always that thin line where the power of the State must encroach upon the freedom of the individual; therefore, one has to be very careful as to the point where the power of the State encroaches on the freedom of the individual. With reference to the section dealing with communications, one often hears about complaints of telephones being tapped in this country, but the Government have not yet admitted it. It is well known that, during the Black Power scare last year around the month of April at the time when the Public Order Act was passed in this country, people complained that conversations on the telephone had been tapped and listened to, but the Government did not see it fit to make a statement on this.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member should know better than to make irresponsible statements on the Floor of the House. If he has any evidence that telephone lines have been tapped, he should bring it in here and expose it. The hon. member is making allegations that he cannot substantiate, and I am asking him to desist from making them. (*Asides*)

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. Let the hon. member proceed. (Hon. N. W. BOXILL: "Anyway, you will not be here next time.") (Mr. St. JOHN: "What is that? Are you saying that the Speaker will not be coming back? I know that you will not be coming back.") Let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Government of this country are not prepared to admit certain things. I know for a fact that during the Black Power scare certain telephones were being tapped, and that the Security Police in this country were watching the houses of certain people who, they thought, were associated with Black Power. The

Government know it is true, but they are not prepared to say the number of times....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I must, again, rise on this. I am not defending anybody, but I am a member of the Government. The hon. member cannot say that he knows for a fact that telephones have been tapped and the Government have refused to do anything about it. First of all, I do not know of any apparatus in the whole West Indies that can tap a telephone. That is nonsense the hon. member is talking, and I have to get up and refute that statement. The hon. member must desist from making these irresponsible statements.

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

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, at the London Independence Conference the man who said that the telephones were being tapped was the Prime Minister of Barbados himself.

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

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, even if the Prime Minister said that, what has that got to do with it? (Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY rose.) Wait, I am speaking.
12.45 p.m.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Don't say wait. This is the House of Assembly. Where do you think this is? Under a tamarind tree?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I was on a point of order and you will sit down. Even if the Prime Minister had said that, what does that mean; that it is so? I am saying that I was Minister of Communications and Works for quite a long time and I am saying categorically that no telephones in Barbados have ever been tapped. It is nonsense for anybody to get in the House and make that statement.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: I want to say that a then member of the Senate, Mr. Leacock, who was Chairman of the Telephone Company pointed out that the apparatus in this country was not there for tapping.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order. I will ask the hon. member to proceed with his speech, and hon. members who have not yet spoken will know to avail themselves amply of the opportunity to do so.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would have expected the denial as regards telephone tapping during the black power scare would have come from one who was responsible for security and not necessarily from the Minister of Housing. But that is only by the way. I state as a fact whether the hon. member accepts it or not that during the period when there was a black power scare in this country,

the security branch of the police in this country was tapping the phones of certain people whom they felt.... (Hon. N. W. BOXILL: They cannot do it.) How do you mean they cannot do it?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I must rise again. The only person who would have the equipment to tap the telephone lines would be the Telephone Company. No security branch could do anything like that, and they could only do it with the connivance of the Government. Do you mean that the Government was conniving with somebody to tap somebody's telephone?

Mr. SPEAKER: Again there is no point of order. The hon. member has made his point, but I will ask him to stick to the substantive Objects and Reasons.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I just want to say that even in England it is accepted that you indulge in telephone tapping in certain instances. Nobody could be against it where the security of the State is involved, because obviously then the Home Secretary in England under his warrant grants telephone tapping. It is done also in Australia under the warrant of the Attorney General. Whenever it is done in England and Australia, the responsible Minister makes a statement about it in the respective Chambers, but what we find in Barbados is that you get denials all along. We know better than this.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with this Bill. The general public feels that there is an attempt made in this Bill by Government Ministers to open their letters especially with the 60,000 odd people in England sending money back here in letters to be able to tap these letters and see what money they are getting, and seeing if they might be able to get them to pay income tax. I have heard this from people all over the place.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order, what the hon. member has said is so puerile that I have to get up. The Government would not have to open somebody's letters to know what money he is getting because he would have to go to the Post Office to have it exchanged. The hon. member should not make these statements either. Of course, like father like son. The son makes an irresponsible statement and the father is trying to make one too.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: It is made in here on the Floor of the House and it can be made anywhere else. The idea of opening people's letters is to see what money they are getting. (A VOICE: It is childish.) It is not going to be childish on a public platform. (Asides) You cannot talk on a public platform; you bark.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member does not appear to be addressing the Chair.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: I am addressing the Chair, but the hon. member tries to interrupt.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to intervene in this debate, but I have heard so many things

and I have read in the newspapers an explanation given by the Minister concerned in advance of any explanation he may care to give to the House, an act which I have always thought to be fraught with constitutional impropriety, and therefore I would like to give my views generally on the desirability of having a proviso like this in a law of Barbados at all. This proviso can only exist in the law because existing laws were exempted from the Bill of Rights contained in the Barbados Constitution at the Independence Conference in London. A general power to open people's letters is contrary to the United Nations Bill of Rights. It is not allowed or permitted in any civilised country. It exists in Barbados only because Barbados was a colony and was not regarded as being populated by people who had to have the same rights as Englishmen. There is no power in Britain generally to open letters at the will of a Governor, a Minister or anybody, and in the United States of America it is against the United States' Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, do not let us misunderstand this. The power we are now discussing is specifically contrary to the Constitution of Barbados, and it is legal only because it was passed before the Constitution came into effect. Do not let us confuse ourselves by the marginal note to the section that says that postal packets supposed to contain dutiable articles may be detained and opened by the Postmaster. There is a general proviso saying that nothing in the Post Office Act shall supply to the opening, detaining or delaying of a postal packet in obedience to an express warrant in writing under the hand of the Governor. We are now giving that to a Minister. Do not let us misunderstand it; the power was wrong in the hands of the Governor as far as I am concerned. They should never have had this power. It was a part of Barbados' colonial heritage that the English Governor in Government House could order the opening of any letters.

Mr. Speaker, the former Leader of the Opposition has had experience in 1937 and his wife has had experience of coming to the very post office and enquiring for letters which she knew were there and being informed by postal officials subsequently that the letters had been detained for political reasons by Sir Mark Young. So when I tell hon. members that this is a dishonourable power disgracefully exercised in the past and kept only by British colonial powers for the purpose of suppressing political dissent in Barbados, I am telling you something of which I have personal knowledge. This is a power which we should be repealing altogether, not giving to a Minister.
12.55 p.m.

There is no limit whatsoever in this Post Office Act, no limit of any sort, no fetter of any sort on the Minister's discretion, no matter what the Civil Service advisers tell the Minister. As I say, Mr. Speaker, my father has had the experience of having letters from my father to my mother detained here in this Post Office in the year 1937, so this is not anything that we in the Opposition are just getting up and chit-chatting about for the sake of saying

something. This Bill when passed will permit the Minister of Communication and Works to decide that any letter addressed to any person in Barbados may be delayed, detained or opened; get it quite clear, read it carefully. The section authorises the Postmaster General on his own initiative to open suspected dutiable packets; it forbids any public servant to open any postal packet other than the Postmaster General opening dutiable packets, and then it goes on specifically to exempt from the operation, specifically to exempt from crime liability the opening of any letter, and the Government now wants this in obedience to a direction in writing under the Act of the Minister, that is exactly what the situation is.

Hon. members opposite must sit down and look into their own hearts and say to themselves "we say all these wicked things about the Opposition, if we believe them, can we trust any of those members of the Opposition over there not to open all our letters and read them when we are in the Opposition?" I am not saying I do not trust the hon. junior member for St. Michael, I personally believe the hon. junior member for St. Michael would not open my letters just for the sake of politics, even the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, but I believe he would have opened a letter addressed from me to Mr. Milton Wiles, Redman's Village, St. Thomas.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should not make that statement. I will ask him to withdraw it, he knows I would know exactly what would be in the letter from him to Mr. Wiles, so I would not open it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member should not suggest that another hon. member would improperly open any letter; I ask him to withdraw that.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the remark Sir, we are passing an Act which says it is proper to open any letter, so how can I be suggesting anybody would do it improperly? We are now passing a Bill saying that the Minister can give a direction in writing to open, detain or delay any letter, so what is the impropriety in that if the laws of Barbados says it can be done?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order, they did not say any Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: Anyhow, we have not passed it yet.

Mr. ADAMS: The Minister has just properly pointed out that the Act does not say any Minister, well he is no longer the Minister of Communications and Works, I was merely speculating, Sir, that should he become the Minister of Communications and Works in the distant future that some such incident might take place. I would ask the Government seriously to consider this, carry it back to the Postmaster General and ask if this power without any fetter whatsoever is a desirable power to put in the hands of a Minister. I pledge that if I ever have an opportunity to do it in respect of the Wireless Telegraphy Act that I am

going to get a person called "Slims" authorised by the Chairman of CBC to visit the house of every hon. member who voted in favour of allowing a search to be made at any hour of the night for a television licence; I would have "Slims" authorised to visit the house of every hon. member on that side at 2 o'clock in the morning to see if they have an unlicensed television set. They had better be careful that some future Minister of Communications and Works does not open every letter addressed to all of them for a week if they vote for this now, just to show how power can be abused if they do not try to put a fetter on it. If you do not put fetters on the exercise of these oppressive colonial powers, you put temptation into the hands of persons who may be subject to temporary strain one way or another. Think of the windfall, think of what was going on during the windfall.

I will ask the hon. member to look up this matter; let him deny that letters were opened and detained during the windfall crisis. I believe that it was done then perhaps with a little more *finesse* and more a matter between the Commissioner of Police and Sir John Stow than a matter with any Minister, but let him deny that, and that turned out to be nothing, that was no political crisis in Barbados. Letters were opened during the windfall crisis, man, behave yourself, you know that too.

Mr. SPEAKER: To whom is the hon. member referring as "man".

Mr. ADAMS: I am sorry, Sir.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: The hon. member asked me to deny something, and I am going to deny it. As far as I know, letters are being opened every day because if I write you a letter you have to open it to read it. If you mean letters were being opened in the Post Office illegally during the windfall issue, I would have to deny knowing anything about that.

Mr. ADAMS: This is not the Minister's responsibility, so I quite believe that it may have been concealed from him. They were still colonial days, but that is what the power exists for. I heard the talk about the telephone tapping; it is widely believed that telephones are tapped in Barbados, and just before the St. Joseph bye-election the Telephone Company was visiting a house occupied by the Hon. Leader of the House, they were climbing up the pole, playing with the wire attached to the telephone of the house occupied by the Leader of the Opposition, the junior member for St. Joseph and myself, and the more we telephoned the Telephone Company, all the General Manager could tell us was "I do not know about that, I am going to ask Mr. So-and-So if the telephones are being tapped." Now you tell me, Sir, could the General Manager of the Telephone Company say that he would have to ask somebody if the telephones were being tapped if there was no telephone tapping in Barbados? The only way he could not give us an answer and would have to find out about it is if there is apparatus for tapping telephones. By appara-

tus I do not mean physical apparatus which exist in more than one office in Bridgetown, I mean a system by which telephones are tapped.

The principle of this amendment deals with the right to receive communications as laid down in the Constitution, we know that, this has nothing to do with the right to send communications through the post and receive communications. We are talking about a principle now, I do not believe the hon. member is serious, I wish the hon. senior member for St. Andrew was in his place, I believe he, Sir, during the days when he was not a Minister, was suspicious that his telephone was being tapped, so do not let us get on any high horse and pretend that these things cannot happen. Why I have digressed slightly on the telephone is this, if the Government is insistent on passing this section it ought to set out a statement of policy indicating the guide lines which the Minister will follow in the exercise of this brutal and arbitrary power to interfere with people's letters that the House of Assembly is now being asked to give him. In Britain there are statements on telephone tapping and the opening of letters indicating the manner in which the Home Secretary and the Postmaster General proceed before such things are authorised. Telephone tapping is not in itself as illegal as opening letters is under this self same section, but nonetheless even when you are carrying out something that is merely a trespass and not necessarily a criminal action but is an infringement on the right of the citizen you ought to have guide lines to do it. The Minister ought to give an undertaking that he will lay on the table of the House or he will make a statement showing what lines of policy the Government intends to follow in the exercise of this power if granted to the Government.

1.05 p.m.

It is not good enough for the people of Barbados to be told that the Minister of Communications can write and direct any employee in the Post Office to stop them from getting a letter. The Minister can write and stop anybody in Barbados from getting a letter, if we pass this Act. The fact that the Government could do it before, makes it worse and not better. Everything the Governor could do before was not good. We got Independence to get rid of some of the things that the Governor could do before. We did not get Independence to put such tyrannical powers, as Colonial Governors were given, into the hands of Ministers of the people. Power comes from the people; let power be exercised responsibly over the people.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the Government to give assurances in writing that there will not be arbitrary opening of letters, and I would welcome a statement from the Government that they will lay on the Table of the House every three months a short statement showing on how many occasions the Minister has had to authorise the opening, detention or delay of a postal packet. There is no reason why we should not know that, and we should not have to wait for questions, the answers to which might be as evasive as many

answers we get in this House commonly. If the Government insist in this power at this time, let it, at least, be carried out in a manner befitting their responsibility to the people of Barbados.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I am not replying on behalf of the Government; I am replying as a member of this Chamber. Both hon. members who have spoken (the hon. junior member for the City and the hon. senior member for St. Thomas), know full well that this amendment is in line with a series of amendments during the Colonial days which were operated by the Governor-in-Executive Committee.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir. This is the Governor in his own discretion. He had an unfettered power to open letters.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is missing the point which I am making. I said that like several other Acts which we had to amend where the power was delegated to the Governor-in-Executive Committee, it is now delegated to the Minister. Years ago when Mr. Keith Walcott was chief cook and bottle washer, you never heard anybody say that too much power was vested in the hands of one man. Mr. Keith Walcott was the Attorney General; he was Leader of the House - (Asides) Because you were not around, it does not mean that it never existed. They used to write their own cheques, and then come here and approve them. I never heard anybody accuse them of being dishonest or outlandish, but now you have your own people in a position to operate these things you have no trust in them. The hon. members who have spoken have tried to give the impression that the Government is bringing down legislation to open every Tom, Dick or Harry's letter when somebody writes in a letter: "I love you" and puts a lot of Xs in it.

Mr. Speaker, we are supposed to be responsible people. I hope the hon. member is listening carefully to me. I said that we are supposed to be responsible people, but I am not saying that all of us are responsible, therefore, because the elections are around the corner, we should not try to make capital out of every little thing. They know as well as I do that these amendments have to be made whether or not they like them. It is merely a question of delegating power, that probably was delegated to one section of the community, to the Minister responsible for such things.

Now, when the hon. member is talking about putting too much power into the hands of one man, he must remember that nobody voted for the Governor-General. The people voted for the Minister. All of us in here were voted for, and we were not nominated. All of us came here with more than 1,000 votes. If 1,000 people had confidence in you to go to the polls and vote to put you in power, are you going to tell me that we should not have confidence in ourselves? Must we go on with this nonsense trying to stigmatise each other? I am now going to point out to the Chair that what the hon. senior member for St.

Thomas has said is absolutely untrue. Any Postmaster General, whether he is here or in Timbuctu, has it in his power, if he suspects that pornography is being sent through the mail, to....

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I heard a remark about something which the hon. senior member for St. Thomas said was untrue, but I did not catch it. I would ask the hon. member to withdraw it, especially since he is now seeking to justify it by an argument which is in direct contradiction of the section of the Act which we are now amending. The section of the Act we are now amending says that the Postmaster General can open only for the purpose of detecting evasion of duty. All he has to do is to open the laws of Barbados to the section, and he will see that he is talking nonsense. I would ask him to withdraw the statement that what I said was untrue, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not, in my opinion, out of order to say that a remark made, or a statement made, is untrue. Let the hon. member proceed.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, to what is the hon. member objecting?

Mr. ADAMS: I do not believe there is really any contention between us. I would suggest to the hon. member that what he is really arguing is that the Postmaster General ought to have the power to open suspected pornography. The Postmaster General of Barbados only has the power of opening suspected dutiable goods. It might well be that there is a good case to be made out for amending Section 43 to say that pornography, dutiable offensive matter of some sort, such as a dirty letter which would dirty a postman's bag, should be opened by the Postmaster General. I am not referring to security, because I do not agree that the Postmaster General has any right dealing with security. It might be good to amend the section to give the Postmaster General that power, but it does not exist in this Act. At the moment all the Postmaster General can open a letter for is dutiable articles.

Mr. Speaker, I heard the hon. junior member for the City say something about pool betting. Unless the Postmaster is given power under the Pool Betting Act, he cannot open pools going overseas unless he is given power by some other Act.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: The hon. Minister will reply to that. I was merely pointing out that the amendment states:

"This Act may be cited as the Post Office (Amendment) Act, 1971.

2. Section 43 of the Post Office Act, 1911 is hereby amended by deleting the words "an expressed warrant in writing under the hand of the Governor-General" appearing in the second proviso thereto and substituting therefor the words "a direction in writing signed by the Minister."

1.15 p.m.

What I was pointing out to the hon. senior member for St. Thomas and the hon. junior member for Bridgetown is that any Postmaster General in any part of the world has a right, if he suspects that pornographic literature or evasion is going through the post to seize it. For instance, we all know the position with the Irish Field Sweep. He has a right to seize these things.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, in the 19th Century Lord Campbell, Lord Chief Justice of England, has said that it was illegal at common law to open letters. There has been a whole Royal Commission in Britain in which witnesses for the Government have argued that there was a royal prerogative to open letters, and the Commission found against it. In the Crown Proceedings Act of 1947 in Britain, the Government found it necessary to put in a section saying that the Crown shall not be liable for damage for anything done in relation to letters. The Minister is wrong. For over 100 years in England it has been held that it is illegal at common law to open letters and the Post Office Act of Barbados makes it further illegal.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has made his point of law. Let him not proceed to make a speech.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I would even draw something else to the Minister's attention. Is he aware....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, will you ask the Clerks or the Marshall to bring the laws to me?

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, while the hon. member who has been kind enough as to give way is looking at the Act, I would ask the Minister to deal with another point. There is a similar power in other Acts that are not being amended.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, just let me deviate for a moment. I want it to be made explicitly clear that when I am addressing this Chamber and ask for something, I want it brought to me in the same way as it is brought to the Prime Minister. The hon. member was passing me the Laws and I asked that they be passed to me and everybody is sitting down looking at me.

Mr. Speaker, section 43 concerns the penalty against Post Office employees for opening a postal packet. It says: "If any person employed in, by, or under the Post Office, contrary to his duty opens or procures or suffers to be opened any postal packet in course of transmission by post, or wilfully detains or delays, or procures or suffers to be detained or delayed any such postal packet, he shall be guilty of a misdemeanour, and being convicted thereof shall receive such punishment by fine, or imprisonment, or by both, as to the court shall seem fit."

This is a person working with the Post Office, and of course the hon. member would know that this exempts the Postmaster General under the direction

of the Minister. This is a commonsense thing. I did not write this; so I do not know why the hon. member sent this to me. The hon. member should not try to give the impression to the Chamber and to the general public that it is the intention of this Minister or any Minister for that matter to open people's letters willy-nilly. You can only open a letter if you are suspicious. I am going to ask the hon. member something now. Is the hon. member going to tell me that if the Post Office suspects that a parcel contains a time bomb that he should not get permission to open it?

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, I am suggesting that a better amendment would be to amend the Act to give the Postmaster General, if he reasonably believes there is some offensive matter which would surely include a time bomb, power on his own initiative to detain the letter; in other words, to go and throw it in the Careenage before it blows up the Post Office or as the case may be. I would be perfectly happy to see the postmaster General have that power subject to the direction of a Minister, not necessarily as a rider, but subject to the performance of his office.

Mr. SPEAKER: No doubt such an amendment will be proposed when we go into Committee on this Bill, if we do.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: As I pointed out to the hon. member, all we are doing is amending Section 43 which I have just read. "Provided that nothing herein contained shall extend to the opening or detaining or delaying of a postal packet returned for want of a true direction, or returned by reason that the person to whom the same is directed is dead, or cannot be found, or shall have refused the same, or shall have refused or neglected to pay the postage thereof, or the opening or detaining or delaying of a postal packet with the consent of the person to whom the same is directed, or without such consent should the same be suspected by the Postmaster to contain any article or thing liable to duty of customs...."

I do not see why hon. members on the other side are raising so much argument about this because section 43 is almost specific and all the amendment is doing is removing the powers from the Governor-General and placing them under the Minister. As I said in my opening remarks, elections are just around the corner and everybody is trying to stroke the pump and try to make people believe that somebody over here wants to open somebody's letters. I will warn the hon. member however. I heard him say that if he had the opportunity he would send Slims to search somebody's house at 2 o'clock in the morning. Send him to my house first; he would not go at anybody else's.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, in introducing this Bill I think I made it clear that since independence there have been 140 instances in which power that was vested in the Governor General has gradually been vested in the Ministers under whose portfolios these duties fall. Now the hon. senior

member for Bridgetown made a comment that there was a rumour around Barbados that this is to give permission to open people's mail from overseas. Mr. Speaker, it is a commonly known fact not by the members of the Government and Opposition but by the public in general that money goes through the mail, and it would be peculiar with the amount of finance coming to this country from the United Kingdom, the United States of America and other countries that a Government would now seek to do this. I have been Minister of Communications and Works for the second occasion in ten years, and if any member of the Government wanted to use authority to open mail due to the revenue coming to this country through the mail not by postal order or bank draft, it would be silly to do it now, because in the past when people were making far more money in the United Kingdom and the United States, it is a well known fact that everybody in Barbados around Christmas time received money this way, and that is why on occasions people have lost mail and there have been charges in the Post Office against postmen for interfering with people's mail, because around a certain period somebody would put a \$5 or \$10 note in the letter and sent it to his poor old family which would relieve him of having to go to the Post Office. These are recognised facts; you do not have to be a Minister of Government to know this, or you do not want to use the powers vested in you to abuse something like this, it is known throughout the entire Island that money comes in the ordinary mail, possibly not even registered to people, so I do not think his idea could go very far with people when he said it is going to be used on platforms. They can use it on platforms and we can counter use it, and this is why I want it on the record now. I do not think the people in Barbados are so stupid for all these years to know this was going on and think that Government now after ten years in power would want to bring in legislation, or to use legislation that is already on the Statute Book to abuse this power. I would have that power now as Minister of Communications and Works, because the Governor-General, as is set out clearly in the law, at my request has to issue a warrant in writing to the Postmaster General to open any mail. It is only vesting the power now in me to tell the Postmaster General to open mail instead of having to pass it through the Governor-General, but the power is vested in me as it is now to ask the Governor-General to have mail opened.

1.25 p.m.

That is the position as it is now, it is not at his request, it is the Governor-General given that authority at my request as Minister of Communications and Works. Mr. Speaker, the Governor-General now has authority to issue a warrant instructing the Postmaster General to open, detain or delay a postal packet, and conditionally the Governor-General can only exercise this function on the advice of the Minister. As it stands now I would have to advise him that I want particular packets of mail opened and then he passes on the warrant in writing to the Postmaster General, but it must be at my request.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Sir, would the Minister state whether he would not in those circumstances have to state the reasons why he wanted to have the packets opened?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I would issue the instructions that I want them opened and I would not have to tell him why, and then he issues the warrant to the Postmaster General.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: On a point of order, the Minister just said that the Governor-General would have to come to him.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I never said the Governor-General would have to come to me, I said it would be at my request. I can request the Governor-General to issue a warrant to the Postmaster General to open mail, but the request will come from me that I want the mail opened. This is not the first time we have come here to delegate powers from the Governor-General to the Minister, and it was very surprising to me to hear all these objections when we came here on several occasions since Independence vesting certain powers in the Ministers that were formerly vested in the Governor-General.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: On a point of order, will the Minister state whether the express warrant as issued by the Governor-General has to stipulate the reason for the Governor-General so instructing the Postmaster General? I would also like to know if he can give us the occasions on which it was done and the circumstances under which the express warrant was issued.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is a lawyer and I think he should be more versed than that, I never had the good fortune to practice law and I have never been familiar with it, but I can say this, this is the second occasion I have been Minister of Communications and Works since 1961, and I have never had to make any request and I am sure my other two colleagues, the hon. junior member for Christ Church and the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, who have been Ministers of Communications of Works, I am sure neither one of them had any reason at any time to have any mail opened or to issue any instructions to have any mail opened. As a matter of fact, there is absolutely nothing on record under this section since 1961 that it has ever been used. I have checked, and there is nothing on the records since 1961 that anything under this particular Act has been invoked; nothing under this specific Act for opening anything. It would have to be on record in the Ministry and there is nothing since 1961 under this particular section of the Act.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: On a point of order, the Minister is harping that not under this particular section of the Act that the Governor-General issued a warrant to open letters; I know it was done on two occasions recently.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not point of order.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir, will the Minister agree that previous to this any Minister could ask the Governor-General to open letters, not the Minister of Communications and Works alone? That may be what is deceiving the Minister, that it has not been the Ministry of Communications and Works in the past that has asked for the warrant.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I know it was never issued under any instructions of the Ministry of Communications and Works, and the common practice is that the Minister that is responsible for it would have to direct or communicate with the Postmaster General as the Head of the Department of which the Ministry of Communications and Works is responsible for, so I do not see how somebody else would have that right. Perhaps they might call on the Minister, but the Minister of Communications and Works would have that right to issue instructions to the Postmaster General because it is in his Portfolio. Mr. Speaker, I think this is one of the instances of making much ado about nothing.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: If I may just draw to the attention of the Minister that if he wants to amend the Act, he may need to go back to the draftmen so that he could then have two amendments made at the same time, because even if he does not amend this Act to make the Postmaster act under the direction of the Minister rather than the Governor-General, he may find it necessary also to amend section 5 of the Pool Betting Act, 1960, because there the Postmaster may on warrant in writing under the hand of the Governor-General open or cause to open any postal packet received, and this is limited to the transmission by post to a destination outside the island in contravention of a section which states that money must be paid for pools, and that is what we are talking about.

1.35 p.m.

You should give specific power to the Postmaster General to open letters for a specific purpose, such as to ascertain whether pools are being sent out of the country in contravention to the Pool Betting Act.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid the hon. member is making a speech now, which I would suggest he reserves for Committee when he produces his amendments.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is, "That this Bill be now read a second time." Hon. members of that opinion will please say "Aye", but hon. members of a contrary opinion will please say "No". Methinks the "Noes" have it.

An Hon. MEMBER: Divide.

The House divided and voted as follows:

AYES: Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Mr. SPRINGER; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON; Mr. LOWE; Mr. WEEKES; Mr. CORBIN; Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS; Mr. YEARWOOD; Mr. HOPPIN; Mr. SMITH and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS - 12.

NOES: Mr. ADAMS; Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY; Mr. CRAIG; Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY and Mr. HINDS - 5.

Mr. SPEAKER: It has been reported to me that 5 hon. members voted "No", and that 12 hon. members voted "Aye." Accordingly I declare the "Ayes" have it.

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

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

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

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to be long on this, and I am going to try not to repeat the arguments on second reading. I would ask the Government to refer this matter to their advisers and have a comprehensive section drawn up along these lines embodying Section 6(3) of the Pool Betting Duty Act under which it is still for the Governor to authorise the warrants, if it is thought that pool betting is being carried on illegally. I wonder if the Minister knows that? Embody everything in a section; authorise the Postmaster General to open pornographic letters and offensive material; have that in a properly codified section of an Act which you can refer to when you want to know how to operate.

Another thing I should like to tell the Minister is that he should not come into the House and tell hon. members and the public that he and the other Minister are the two Ministers who have also occupied the Ministry of Communications and Works and can say that no warrants have been issued under this section since 1961. I can tell you the last warrant that was issued. It was issued by a man who wanted to get back a letter he had written - it was an order for goods from overseas. Do not say no warrants were issued. We can tell you the last warrant that was issued. It is only misleading the House to come in here and say that. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the Government do not regard this just as a

casual exercise changing Governor to Minister. When you get down to it, it may not have been the best thing, because there may be occasions of national security when it is not the Minister of Communications and Works who should be charged with the duty of authorising the opening a letter. It might be the Prime Minister or the Minister of Home Affairs who might have such very secret information that he and the necessary officials alone should know the transaction. The present law permits or permitted another Minister to have access to the Governor or the Governor-General to ask for a letter to be opened. It may well be that that is a power that should have been preserved rather than merely casually transferring it to the Minister of Communications and Works.

Mr. Chairman, just to take an extreme example. Suppose they suspected the Minister of Communications and Works of plotting against the Government and suspected that he was getting information through the mail. He and he alone can authorise the opening of his own mail. Is that not an absurdity? Would it not be an absurdity for that to be the case? Please do not believe that no Minister of Government can ever be suspected of plotting against the Government. We have the Prime Minister's word for it that the senior member for St. Andrew was planning to roll over the Government at Christmas 1969.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That has absolutely nothing to do with Section 2 of this Bill.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, suppose the senior member for St. Andrew had then been acting as Minister of Communications and Works?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That has absolutely nothing to do with Section 2 of this Bill.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, I am arguing that the power should not be given to a single Minister of Communications and Works, and I am drawing examples to support my argument. I think an example has been drawn, and I do not have to press the matter any further. My argument is that it might be necessary to investigate the mail of the Minister of Communications and Works; you cannot investigate it if you pass this section in its present form, and I am saying that this is feasible, because the Prime Minister has accused one of his own Ministers of plotting against him in the past. I heard the Prime Minister myself, Sir. Those are the points I would ask the Minister to bear in mind.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is, "That Clause 2 stand part." Hon. members in favour will please say "Aye", and those against will please say "No". I think the "Noes" have it.

An Hon. MEMBER: Divide.

The Committee divided and voted as follows:

AYES: Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Mr. SPRINGER; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Mr. LOWE; Mr. WEEKES; Mr. CORBIN; Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS; Mr. SMITH and Hon. A. D. C. EDWARDS - 10.

NOES: Mr. ADAMS; Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY; Mr. HINDS; and Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY - 4.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am advised that 10 hon. members voted "Aye" and 4 hon. members voted "No". I declare the "Ayes" have it.
1.45 p.m.

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative the House dividing as follows:

AYES: Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Mr. SPRINGER; Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Mr. CORBIN; Mr. YEARWOOD; Mr. WEEKES and Mr. LOWE - 9.

NOES: Mr. ADAMS; Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY; Mr. HINDS and Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY - 4.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill do now pass.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

AYES: Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Mr. SPRINGER; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Mr. LOWE; Mr. WEEKES; Mr. CORBIN; Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS and Mr. YEARWOOD - 9.

NOES: Mr. ADAMS; Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY; Mr. HINDS and Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY - 4.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 2.30 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.

1.55 p.m.

On Resumption:-

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, before you commence, you had promised at our last sitting that you would give a ruling on a resolution of which I gave notice and on which the junior member for St. Lucy requested a ruling. I would like to hear your ruling now, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am grateful to the hon. member for drawing that to my attention; the matter will be rectified at the next meeting.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order, if what you are saying is true, and I have no reason to believe it is,.....

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

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Withdraw what, I am not saying it is not true, I said that I have no reason to doubt what you say is true.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has said he has no reason to believe that what I say is true.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: No, I never said that. (Asides) I have been told by my colleagues that I did say that; I am sorry, I really meant to say that I have no reason to doubt. I meant no offence to the Chair, and I apologise.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have accepted the hon. member's explanation.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, but I am going to draw something to your attention which I think is a contravention of the rules of the House. Since you said you would give a ruling on this and you have not given a ruling yet, it was in the newspaper, the Advocate, on Wednesday of last week; do you not think then this is a breach of privilege that the Advocate should be printing something that really was not before the Chamber?

Mr. SPEAKER: I will give that matter my attention and will rule on both at the next meeting of this Chamber.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: As you wish, Sir.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: This is now Question Time. No. 137 standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

What are the academic qualifications, or what certificates or diplomas are held by those persons attached to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital whose duties are of a dietary nature?

2. Is it a fact that Government accords the distinction "dietitian" to persons who have received their training either in Britain or Canada and not to persons trained in the U.S.A.?

3. What, if any, has been Government's experience with persons trained in the United States of America and serving in Government Departments and performing such functions that dietitians perform?

4. How many dietitians have been attached to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital Kitchen Department for the period 1st August, 1969 to 30th September, 1970 inclusive?

5. Have persons who are "qualified" dietitians, been employed by Government as Catering Officers or Supervisors during the period mentioned at No. 4 above?

6. How many such persons have quit the job?

7. Is Government aware that a dietitian, trained in Britain and attached to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, has been ably assisted in her work by a refresher course from a United States School of Dietetics which has had the distinction of offering Barbados a number of efficient dietitians?

8. Is Government aware that therapeutic dieting, the most essential characteristic in Hospital dieting, is absent from the dietary attention given at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and should be corrected without delay?

9. Would Government seek advice on No. 8, avoiding wherever possible, the body of persons at present constituting World Health Organisation being responsible for such matters in the Commonwealth Caribbean?

10. If the answer to No. 9 is in the negative, will the Minister please state why?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the reply is as follows:

"The academic qualifications of those persons attached to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital whose duties are of a dietary nature are as follows:-

(a) Qualified Dietitians (2)

3-year Diploma in Dietetics (post-secondary education) Leeds College of Technology England, with additional one year internship - one person.

4-year Bachelor of Science in Dietetics (post-high school education) from La Valle University Canada, with additional one year internship - one person.

(b) Catering Supervisors (7)

One year Diploma in Dietetics from New York Institute of Dietetics with 6 months internship - one person.

Certificate in Domestic Science and Home Economics from the Barbados Housecraft Centre - five persons.

Certificate in Domestic Science from the Evening Institute - one person.

Certificate in Food Service from City and Guilds - one person.

Diploma in Domestic Cookery from City and Guilds - one person.

2. No, Sir. The term "dietitian" connotes a person with degree-level training.
3. None, Sir.
4. Two, Sir.
5. No, Sir.
6. None, Sir.
7. No, Sir.
8. No, Sir.
9. Government is always willing to seek technical advice from whatever source it may be obtained.
10. Does not arise."

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, are we to understand from the Minister in his reply to paragraph 9 of the question that the Government is prepared to accept advice whether good or bad irrespective of the source?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Certainly when the reply reads that the Government is always willing to seek technical advice from whatever source it may be obtained, the inference is that it is good advice, it does not say advice that is not constructive or which does not assist Government, so it is implied that it is from a source that is knowledgeable and which will improve the conditions of the institution. It is good advice; it is sound, proper and knowledgeable advice of a constructive nature and nothing destructive. 2.45 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: What was the Minister's reply to Question No. 4? Will he repeat what he said?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The reply to No. 4 is 2, Sir.

Mr. HINDS: Could the Minister tell us on what authority does he base his reply that the word "dietitian" refers specifically to someone who has had training in dietetics at degree level?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the qualifications demanded for the post of Dietitian in Barbados are that the person must be a member of the British Dietetic Association or its equivalent, and has had experience in catering on a large scale. To qualify as a member of the British Dietetic Association or its equivalent demands a 4-year degree level course at an accredited College or University. Dietitians are of two types, administrative and therapeutic, as the hon. member knows so well.

Now, we have only one Dietitian left who is duly qualified, and the other lady has gone. When I made reference to a Bachelor of Science in Dietetics from La Valle University, Canada, which is a 4-year full time course with 1 year internship, I am afraid that we have lost that lady and she has gone.

Mr. HINDS: Was the 1-year internship spent in Barbados? Is it true that the officer referred to had absolutely no practical experience whatsoever? Can the Minister bring us up to date on this?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, my advice is that the party in question had a Bachelor of Science in Dietetics from La Valle University, Canada. It was a 4-year full-time course with one year internship spent abroad. I have nothing in the file to indicate that the one-year internship was spent here.

Mr. HINDS: Will the Minister deny that there is presently employed on the staff of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital a Dietitian who has been trained in the United States and served as a Dietitian at Joint Disease Hospital in the United States, but is now employed at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital as a Supervisor and paid as a Supervisor? This is an embarrassing situation, when I am asked to name people. I have asked questions here, and the Minister had every right to have things investigated. He should have carried out a full investigation.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I have a whole list of everybody employed here. A full investigation has taken place, and I can give you chapter and verse on it.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, does the Minister have in his file that an officer who is serving at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital as a Supervisor has served at the Joint Disease Hospital of the United States of America?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, without calling any names, apart from the two Dietitians whom we know of, I will now repeat the qualifications of the Catering Supervisors. I am doing this now not from the question itself, but from the information tendered. I have their names, but I will not necessarily have to call them. The first one has a Diploma in Dietetics from the New York Institute of Dietetics - a 1-year full-time course with 6 months internship, and a certificate in Domestic Science from the Evening Institute. The second person has a

certificate in Domestic Science and Home Economics from the Barbados Housecraft Centre. The third person has a certificate in Food Service from City and Guilds, and a certificate in Domestic Science and Home Economics from the Barbados Housecraft Centre. The next person has a certificate in Domestic Science and Home Economics from the Barbados Housecraft Centre. The next one a certificate in Domestic Science and Home Economics from the Domestic Centre. The next one a certificate in Domestic Science and Home Economics from the Barbados Housecraft Centre. The next one has a certificate in Domestic Science and Home Economics from the Barbados Housecraft Centre and Diploma in Domestic Cookery from City and Guilds. I do not know if that answers the hon. member.

The hon. member has referred to someone who is a Dietitian. To be a Dietitian you must at least put in a 3-year course. I take it that the person to whom the hon. member is referring has done a 3-year course. I am afraid I have not on my present list anyone who has done a 3-year course and who is a duly qualified Dietitian, apart from the first two whom I have mentioned.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister trying to establish that to be a Dietitian you must be a member of the British Association of Dietetics? Is that what the Minister is trying to establish, that no matter how qualified you are, you are not a Dietitian unless you are a member of the British Association of Dietetics?

Mr. SPEAKER: He never said that.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I never suggested that. I said "or its equivalent". It is just that the American Course, from what I see in the files and from what I have got by way of answers, is a one-year course, but a one-year course does not make you a Dietitian. Maybe the 3-year course in the States makes you a full-fledged Dietitian, but the 1-year course will make you a full-fledged, good, Catering Officer.

Mr. HINDS: Is the Minister satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that his investigating officers did not accord his Supervisors the same diligence and attention whilst conducting their enquiries as they did in respect of the officers that the Minister calls "the two Dietitians?"

2.55 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: These matters are investigated along the regular Government lines. I am not expected as Minister to go around and ask the people themselves. This matter is referred from the Ministry to the Hospital Director and he and the matron will make all the necessary investigations and minute us back. I do not know what manner was adopted in interviewing the dietitians as distinct from the manner adopted in interviewing supervisors and catering officers. I was not there; so that is not a fair question. Mr. Speaker, you should protect me.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister admit that the replies he gave in respect of the dietitians disclose that the interviewers were pretty thorough in that in one case the Minister was able to state that a particular dietitian had served four years at La Valle University and that she had a one year internship to her credit? What I am saying in respect of a dietitian who is presently employed as a catering officer is that the Minister has not been able to disclose that as a result of his investigations this officer has to her credit having served as a dietitian at a recognised institution like the Joint Disease Hospital in the United States of America.

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the question?

Mr. HINDS: That is what I am asking the Minister if he is satisfied about, that is, that his interviewers were not as thorough in respect of the catering officers as they were in dealing with the two dietitians. I do not see what protection he is asking you for.

I wonder if the Minister would agree that we both ask that these questions be allowed to remain on the Order Paper so that we can continue our questioning. There are something like ten questions which I tabled in respect of this, and I have not really begun to ask supplementaries.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, these questions were asked on 11th December, 1970. Today is the 25th May, 1971, and the replies were ready for the last two or three weeks and were laid here last week; so all I am saying is that the hon. member has got his replies. This is his pet subject in any case and one on which he spends a lot of time and in which he specialises. He should not need any time to study the answers. He is an expert on this. He knows more about it than any of us including myself, and he really would not need time to refresh himself. These are his questions, not mine, and we have gone all out to give the replies in detail. The hon. member is asking about a particular lady. When did she join, after or before December? Has she got a three year degree or diploma course?

Mr. HINDS: The tables have now been turned. The Minister is now asking me the questions. That is the reason why I am asking that we defer any further questioning. It is not because I want to brief myself; I can carry on the questioning, but we have some work we would like to press with today and I would like to do justice to this, and that is why I am asking that we defer this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would suggest to the hon. member to carry on with the questioning until the time allowed which is 3.15 p.m. if he does not finish before.

Mr. HINDS: All right, Mr. Speaker, the Minister can lay his answers.

Mr. SPEAKER: Parliamentary Question No. 151 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

QUESTION RE SOCIAL CENTRE AT BATHSHEBA

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows:

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

(a) Will the Minister renovate the Bathsheba social Centre at Bathsheba, St. Joseph, and have it returned to the residents of the area for use as a Community and Cultural Centre?

(b) Will the Minister insist that the said building be used for no purpose other than as a Community and Cultural Centre with the residents of the area having full and free access thereto?

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, the reply is as follows:

"It is presently being considered that the Bathsheba Social Centre should be demolished and a new one erected for the use of the residents of that area.

Any such centre provided at Bathsheba will be used for purposes according to the community development programme of this Government."

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister state what are the present uses of the existing centre at Bathsheba?

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: I do not think that this centre is used in the normal way because it has been discovered that this centre is in a dilapidated condition and quite unfit for normal use as a community centre. It has actually been recommended for demolition. I understand that it was used for some other purpose other than the ordinary community centre, but if according to what the survey reveals... (A VOICE: I do not want the survey.) I am talking as a Minister of Government. Do not tell me what to say.

Mr. SPEAKER: Members not addressing the Chair....

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: I have no account here of how the centre is being used. As a matter of fact, I do not think it should be used since the report I have here would tend to make me believe that the centre is quite unfit for use as a community centre. I understand it is used as a camera centre which is not a community development purpose.

If there are any further supplementaries, I will help the hon. member if I can.

Mr. BOLDEN: Is the Minister aware that the centre is being used as a tailor shop and is in the exclusive possession of one man?

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: I am not aware.

Mr. BOLDEN: Will the Minister state the policy of Government in respect of the use of this building which is now being used as a tailor shop and whether any rents have been paid by the occupant?
3.05 p.m.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: I am not aware.

Mr. BOLDEN: Will the Minister state the policy of Government in respect of the use of this building which is now being used as a tailor shop, and whether any rents have been paid by the occupant?

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: This building is unfit for use as a community centre and is to be demolished. When you are going to demolish a place you do not have a policy for using it, what nonsense is that?

Mr. BOLDEN: The nonsense of some people causes others to wonder, Mr. Speaker, will the Hon. Minister state..... (Asides)

Mr. SPEAKER: I am the sole judge of what is out of order, and as happens in the House of Commons in London and in Ottawa, occasionally a sentence is uttered preceding the question to make the purpose of the question plain.

Mr. BOLDEN: Will the Hon. Minister state if the person occupying this building is paid as a Government servant?

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: I do not know of any person occupying this place.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would state whether he carried out an investigation into the use of the same building, because if he did I am quite sure there would have to be a caretaker there.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has put his question and is now proceeding to make a speech.

Mr. CRAIG: Can the Minister state whether or not any investigation was carried out into the use of the same building and what are his findings?

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: If any hon. members want to discover if this place is being used other than the normal use as a community centre, I am telling them I have no information here on my file that it has been used for any such purpose nor did the original question, a copy of which I have in front of me, imply that it has been used as a tailor shop or for some other purpose.

Mr. BOLDEN: Will the Minister state for the benefit of the House whether his investigation revealed that it is used as a tailor shop?

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: The investigation reveals that this place should be demolished.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I am not dealing with what should be done with it, I am asking if the present investigation revealed that the building is still being used as a tailor shop, I do not want to know what the recommendations are.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: The hon. member asked that question already and I told him I was not aware of any such thing being revealed, certainly not from the file in front of me.

Mr. CRAIG: Would the Minister be able to state then what is the present use of the building and who is the person using that building?

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: The building is unfit for use as a community centre; it is proposed to demolish that building and erect a suitable community centre for the residents of that area.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Would the Minister be so kind as to state how long the Government was aware that the building was unfit for use as a community centre?

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: This Ministry was aware that the Bathsheba Social Centre was in a serious state of disrepair since July, 1969.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Would the Minister be so kind as to state the reason why nothing has been done since July, 1969 until now?

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: I am not in a position to give the answer here and now.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: But the Minister will agree that nothing has been done so far.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I asked a question just now which the Minister did not answer, whether the Minister would state for the benefit of the House if anyone is paid by Government in respect of the use or care of this building.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: I do not know if a caretaker is employed, I will get the information, I am not a walking encyclopaedia.

Mr. CRAIG: If the Minister carried out investigations, is the Minister stating now that as Minister of this Portfolio that he does not know if there is a caretaker there now?

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: The building is to be demolished, what do you want a caretaker for, for ruins? What kind of thinking is that? St. James thinking?

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, is the Hon. Minister telling this House that there is no caretaker down there? Can the Hon. Minister from his investigation tell this House if there is a man occupying the building and what is done in the building?

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: The hon. member knows that there is a caretaker and is asking me if there is one? That question should be ignored and I do ignore it.

Mr. CRAIG: Is the Minister aware that there is provision in the Estimates for a caretaker at the same social centre? The Minister said just now that there is no caretaker there.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: I never said there is no caretaker there.

Mr. CRAIG: You did.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: I did not, I said I am not aware.

Mr. CRAIG: You did.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: I never said that. 3.15 p.m.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, would the Hon. Minister state the Government's policy in respect of the closure of this building? How soon will it be closed, if it is unfit for use? *(Asides)* I am asking how soon will it be closed, since it is unfit for use as a Community Centre?

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position here to tell the hon. member off my bat how soon it will be closed. The officers of my Ministry will make such a recommendation to me in due course. That is how things are done in the Government.

Mr. BOLDEN: Will the Hon. Minister tell this House whether or not he is a Minister of the Government in respect of this portfolio?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid it is now 3.15 o'clock, and Question Time has now expired. This Question will remain on the Order Paper as well as...

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, may I move an extension of Question Time for 15 minutes in order to get finality on this matter?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid I cannot accept that Motion now, as 3.15 p.m. has passed. Now is the time for Private Members' Business. May I have an intimation as to what is proposed to be proceeded with under Private Members' Business?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The Motion regarding shrimp.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 13 is the first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business, and it stands in the name of the hon. and learned member for Christ Church, the Leader of the Opposition, and it is to resume debate on the Resolution deploring the incompetence in the management of the Barba-

dos Marketing Corporation, the grave loss of employment that has occurred, the grave loss of revenue to Barbados, and calling upon the Government to take steps forthwith to restore the shrimp industry.

When discussion on this matter was adjourned, the Hon. and learned Leader of the Opposition had spoken and moved - he had been seconded by the hon. senior member for St. James. The hon. senior member for St. Andrew had addressed the Chair, and the hon. junior member for St. Peter was speaking and he may now resume. (*Mr. HINDS indicated dissent.*) Any other Member? Is it that the hon. junior member for St. Peter does not propose to address any further?

Mr. HINDS: No, Mr. Speaker.

RESOLUTION DEPLORING INCOMPETENCE IN THE MANAGEMENT OF BARBADOS MARKETING CORPORATION

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, after hearing the Minister of Agriculture in his able address to this Chamber a few weeks ago, I do not think it would be necessary for me or anybody else to say anything. He was so lucid and factual in his approach to the whole matter that it, as I would say, went beyond party politics. When I am through here today, Mr. Speaker, I will show to this Chamber the inconsistency of some members of this Chamber, especially when they see a crowd.

Now, after the Leader of the Opposition had introduced this Resolution, some village idiot told a friend of mine that tears came to his eyes. Maybe that was the result of the bad way in which the Resolution was introduced. It could be for several reasons, but I do not know what is the reason. I have not seen him since to find out what came to his eyes after hearing the Hon. Minister outlining the whole procedure of this matter.

Now, the introducer of this Resolution, who is a lawyer and who has a slight bit of intelligence - he is not overloaded with it as he and other people want to believe; he likes to rant and rave; he keeps a lot of noise thinking that he is making a point, and sometimes he fools some of the unwary who can be fooled anyhow. The hon. member knows as well as I do that the shrimp fleet that was operating here under the then Manager or the present Manager, and quite a number of people saw what happened not yesterday, or day before, or yester-year, but also saw what happened with the whaling boats that went off Peru. Now, Peru has extended her coastal waters to 200 miles offshore. Everybody, including the village idiot whom I have spoken of earlier, knows that Barbados does not produce one shrimp. The shrimp that comes to Barbados comes from off the Amazon. Anybody who knows anything about geography will know that the Amazon is in the territorial waters of Brazil and Guyana.

3.25 p.m.

Under the circumstances there was the likelihood that if it did not happen today or tomorrow, it was bound to happen sooner or later that Brazil like anybody else would extend her territorial waters. The only country that cannot extend its territorial waters for this long distance would be Barbados and the other West Indian Islands, because if we say our territorial waters are two miles, St. Vincent would belong to us and we would have part of Trinidad, and Tobago would belong to Barbados again.

When the hon. member comes in here with this Resolution, I will say this for him as I have said on the floor of the House on more than one occasion. It is the duty of every Opposition to make the Government that is in power uncomfortable, but it is also the duty of the Opposition not to become obstructionists, but to be constructionists. It is their duty to help the Government because whether it be this Government or any other Government in power, you must remember that we who live here have to live under this Government whether it be Communist, Socialist or Capitalist. The Government that is running the country is your Government, and if you went to Russia tomorrow the Government there would be your Government and you would have to accept the laws and rules of that Government until you could do better. When the hon. member brought this Resolution, he thought he was scoring a big point.

As I have said already, Mr. Speaker, money is a funny thing. A parent would have a child which he would bring up from infancy and sent to a University, pull strings and get a good job for him, and then somebody comes along and tell that child that his grandfather had left \$5 for him when he died, and do you know that the child would go home and ask about the \$5 that his grandfather left and remind his parent that he did not give it to him? Money is one of the greatest things on earth whether you like it or not. When you see a circus, horse racing and people taking chances, these chances are taken not for fame, but for money. Money, they say, is the root of all evil. I do not contribute to that statement because I like a tree, but people do things for money, and when a man needs money or finds he is being robbed of money, he loses all sense of proportion. As long as he hears that there is money there for him, he does not mind how it is to come out, he has to get this money. Normally the people who work in the shrimp industry are no different from any of us. I am sure that all of us in here get more money than the people who work in the shrimp industry, but every month religiously we want to know when is pay day. Realising that they were going to lose their jobs as a result of the fleet not operating here, the people in the shrimp industry naturally felt they would have to go to somebody to agitate in order that it would give them something worth while to hold on to. Well the Leader of the Opposition took it up. Nobody can blame him for this. He is a Parliamentarian and that is what he is here for. You could not expect one of us on this side to bring in a Resolution like the one the hon. member has brought in; so the hon. member see this as a means of scoring a point in order to

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, it is Tuesday, 18th February, 1969.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. If the debates are printed in *Hansard* already and we have not received them, then if he has something typewritten there it will have to be make a document of the House. It would not be the *Hansard*, Mr. Speaker. (*Asides*)

Mr. SPEAKER: I have asked Mr. Deputy Clerk to ascertain whether the *Hansard* has been printed. My advice is that the 18th February, 1969, should be printed, but I have no authoritative information. That is all the information available to me. (*Asides*)

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: We want to see the *Hansard*.

Mr. CRAIG: He cannot type something out of *Hansard* and then read it in here without making it a document of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is only one Clerk available at the moment, and he cannot leave the Table.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, nobody can read from a Reporter's typewritten copy unless he makes it a document of the House. You will have to rule on this, because it is not the *Hansard*.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no need to shout; that prevents clear thinking. Now that there are two Clerks available at the Table, I will ask one of them to be so good as to ascertain whether the *Hansard* for that date has been printed.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: May I continue?

Mr. SPEAKER: It would seem so.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member need not tear off his shirt. He can have the copies when I am finished with them. I am just trying to show that people must be more consistent. (*Asides*)

Mr. SPEAKER: Only the hon. junior member for St. Thomas must I now hear.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: And see, too. The hon. member says that he did not hear me say anything. It is quite likely that he needs a hearing-aid; that is all there is to it. I can repeat what I said just now. The hon. member said at the time that we should chase out the stinking shrimp boats. He said that by pushing out the fishing boats we were making room for the shrimp boats. The hon. member is now saying something different.

With regard to the Leader of the Opposition, I heard him on the floor of this House using quite a number of words, which I would consider to be unsavoury, such as dishonesty and so on. (Mr. St. JOHN: "But it is true"). What I am going to say now

is true, too. When people talk of dishonesty they should really look around, because there could be nobody in the world who could be more dishonest than a person who takes money to do a job, and then refuses to turn up to do it. I say no more. (*Asides*)

Mr. Speaker, I rise to second the Amendment to the Resolution.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL took his seat.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY rose --

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I am not finished.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: No, Sir. The hon. member sat down.

Mr. SPEAKER: As far as I am concerned, if any hon. member sits, apparently, temporarily and no other member rises, he may jump up again.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not doubting that for a moment, but I did not see the hon. senior member for Bridgetown. I know that the hon. senior member for Bridgetown will not say that he saw me looking at him, if he did not see me looking at him. I have that confidence in the hon. senior member for Bridgetown.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: I want to tell you something. I sat here and heard when he was told to sit down, because they wanted to put the vote. They realised that the Leader of the Opposition was not here to reply.
3.55 p.m.

The hon. member did sit down. (*Asides*) I have never been afraid of anybody in here. He sat down. (*Asides*) I do not give a damn what you have to say.

Mr. SPEAKER rose.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. senior member for Bridgetown please sit. There will be no question put at this stage; let us get that clear. I did not see the hon. junior member for St. Thomas sit, but before I heard any other hon. member address the Chair or before I saw any other member rise, I saw the hon. junior member for St. Thomas rise again, and therefore as far as I am concerned... (A VOICE: That is not right, Mr. Speaker.) I am saying what I say and what I heard, and that hon. member may resume his speech.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: The hon. junior member for Bridgetown ought to be the last person to come in here talking any nonsense, because I have seen on more than one occasion when he sat his father told him he had not finished speaking and he started to speak again.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do not let us have any re-
criminations. Let the hon. member continue his
speech. (*Asides*)

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: There is nobody who dis-
respects the Chair more than you. I have never been
named.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition in his
speech was talking about dishonesty, but I say, Mr.
Speaker, that there is nobody who is more dishonest
than people who take money for jobs and refuse to
turn up to do them. I will say this for the Leader of
the Opposition; he likes power so much, and they are
so power hungry on that side, that when he was
accepting whatever he accepted from the shrimp
people, he did not look around to see he was the
person who was putting Barbadians out of work. The
hon. member said here that he apprehended the shrimp
boats that were to come into this Island in place of
Bajan Seafoods. (*Asides*)

Mr. SPEAKER: Members not addressing the
Chair, please observe the appropriate Standing
Order. (*Asides*)

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the hon.
member called me an idiot. If I am an idiot and have
reached so far, if I had sense I would be Lord Chief
Pope. He has sense and cannot reach as far as I
have. Something is radically wrong with this society.
(*Asides*) Sonny, why don't you reserve your voice.
You will need it because you have nobody to help you.
(*Asides*) Let me tell you something; when you are
talking, just look back and see a person similar to
me, a self-made man, one of the people who struggled
to make you what you are. So be off when you are
talking. It is people like myself and your father who
try to make people like you something, and then you
try to lord it over us now; but you cannot lord it
over me.

Mr. SPEAKER: I presume the hon. member has
finished addressing the Chair.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: No, Mr. Speaker, but I
must deal with him. There is no disrespect in dealing
with him in the way I think he should be dealt with.
The Leader of the Opposition is so power hungry
and likes money so much - I too, but not that I would
do anything for it - that he did not look around to see
that by accepting the position with Schofield who had
his own interest at heart.....

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I object to that. The
hon. member is misquoting and making a false
accusation against me. I have never worked for
Schofield. Schofield's legal adviser was Wilfred K.
Fergusson, not Harold Bernard St. John. I worked
for C. I. T. Finance Corporation who were the
mortgagees of the boats, and the people did not pay
the the \$2,000 a month repayment; so do not allow
the hon. member to say that I worked for Schofield
because that is an abysmal lie.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. mem-
ber cannot say that what I said is an abysmal lie.
I am asking you to ask the hon. member to withdraw
that.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not out of order to say that
something is a lie.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Referring to something
spoken by somebody as being a lie means that the
person is a liar.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a different thing. A lie
is simply a thing which is untrue. A lie is an untrue
statement.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I persist in making an un-
true statement. I persist in saying that he was
working for Schofield. Let him get up and object.

Mr. St. JOHN: I say that is an abysmal lie for
anybody to say that I worked for Schofield. Wilfred
K. Fergusson worked for Schofield.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: It is your word against
mine. I am saying that you worked for Schofield
and maybe you are too ashamed to admit it.

Mr. St. JOHN: I am not ashamed to admit it.
The Hon. Leader of the House, the Minister of
Agriculture and all the other people over there know
that Wilfred K. Fergusson worked for Schofield,
and what is more, Mr. Fergusson wrote in his
capacity as legal adviser.....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, what is the
hon. member speaking on?

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

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I was on my feet addressing
you, but he got up to harangue as is his wont. Every-
body knows what you are. (*Asides*) Nobody can feed
me. I have told the hon. member on the floor of this
House already that I do not see how he can represent
poor people, because he was born in aristocracy. On
the other hand, he is so well off that he did not look
around to see that the people whom he was putting out
of work by his actions are the people who are ex-
pected to come and support him to run a country.
(*Asides*) You went to a University where you were
taught a little law, but I went to the University of the
World where I have studied everything and I know
how to put my facts. You say it is a distortion, but it
is a fact. (*Asides*) I do not mind whom I sound like,
so long as I do not sound like you. My English is per-
fect and in the right place.

I will repeat again that the hon. member likes
power so much, and he is so well off, being born in
aristocracy and being a member of the plutocrats...
(*Asides*) That is nothing to boast about. (*Asides*)
That is your fault.

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members not addressing the Chair, please be inaudible except they rise on a point of order. Let the hon. member who is addressing the Chair keep to the subject.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I am dealing with the shrimp industry and I am dealing with the hon. member who brought in the Resolution. I am saying that the hon. member did not look around to see that the very people whom he claims to be representing are the very people whom he caused not to be in work today. 4.05 p.m.

I am keeping to the subject, we are dealing with the shrimps and I am dealing with the hon. member who brought in the resolution; perhaps I am dealing with him too adroitly. The hon. member did not look around to see that the very people whom he claims to be representing are the very people whom he caused not to be working today, and he is coming with this fictitious idea that if this person had money to finance it, etc., but they had money to pay the people though. The hon. member went out of his way to put poor Barbadians out of work, working for a foreign company - this is the irony of it - and now he is telling me he is a lawyer; so he will go and represent Vorster in South Africa if he shoots somebody, like the other one went up in St. Thomas to represent Swain. You are a lawyer, that is your job; you can fool the public with that but you cannot fool me. As I said before there are some people who will do anything for money; there is nothing too low for some people to do for money.

Mr. Speaker, may I draw your attention to the way the hon. member is sitting down in this Chamber? Will you ask please to look around and face you even if he does not wish to face me?

Mr. SPEAKER: What hon. member is that?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: The Leader of the Opposition, he cannot sit down in here as he likes, it is disrespectful to the Chair. Mr. Speaker, do you mean that you are not going to rule on something which I have drawn to your attention and which affects the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: Let me say this, so far as I am concerned, when I look around the hon. member is not backing me, but he is in a rather different position from some hon. members occasionally.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I never said the hon. member was backing you, I said he was not looking in your direction. He was backing me, he could always back me but I am speaking about you, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member does not have to have his eyes glued on me, but he must not turn his back to the Chair, no more than other hon. members when they are at the Press table, which so often occurs.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, it is either one or the other or it is both,

and in my opinion it is both. It is love for money and power that caused him to come in here with this resolution instead of trying to get together with us to see what could have been done. He should have warned Mr. Schofield that he was doing the wrong thing, but he did not want to. He said he was not working for Schofield but I am saying that I know he was working for Mr. Schofield.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I object to the hon. member saying that, I say that the hon. member is telling a patent lie when he says he knows that I was working for Mr. Schofield.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Do you mean I did not know? I believe he was working for Mr. Schofield.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I again object to that and I accuse the hon. member of being a patent liar.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. member to withdraw the expression that an hon. member of this House is a patent liar; it is not out of order to say that a thing is a lie, as I understand it, is merely an untrue statement, but to say that a person is a patent liar is an indication that that person is not merely making an untrue statement but that he is making it with full knowledge.

Mr. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member says he knows that I was working for Schofield, and I say when he says that he knows he is guilty of telling a patent lie. I withdraw the remark.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I suggest to hon. members that there is no point in one hon. member saying that he knows that another hon. member is working for "X" and the other hon. member saying he does not work for "X". It has been said so many times already, may I suggest that there is no point repeating it as there is so much more to be said in this debate?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the hon. member withdraw those remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER: That has been withdrawn.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I am sorry, I did not hear.

Mr. ST. JOHN: I say you know you are telling a patent lie.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Fergusson is being paid officially but you were being paid unofficially. Mr. Speaker, I will show you the damage that the Leader of the Opposition in consort with others have done to this community; I notice where the name of Barbados has been so stigmatised in Washington that people who wanted to come down here to invest in the shrimp industry are a bit scared because a lot of money was made out of it, but the lawyers made the money.

Mr. SPEAKER: That might be qualified, perhaps certain lawyers not all.

Mr. BOXILL: Those who were involved, but I am saying these are people who want to propel themselves in front of society as leaders, but they cannot even lead a rounders team. Here it is that the good name of Barbados has been besmirched in the United States because of this same shrimp business, because people will not tell the truth, because of people coming to Barbados and trying to treat Barbadians as though they were second class citizens in their own country, and as soon as you do not accept this you hear all sorts of things. Let me tell the Hon. Leader of the Opposition something, I heard him say something about the C. I. A., but the hon. member knows as well as I do that what I said when I first spoke about the shrimp fleet is true. Mr. Schofield was looking for a way out, the hon. member knows this too.

4.15 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to read another part of the debate by the hon. junior member for St. Peter. (Mr. CRAIG: Sit down!") Why does the senior member for St. James want me to sit down? I saw him get up in here and talk himself hoarse. I had to beg him to save his voice. (Asides) This is what was said by the junior member for St. Peter, Mr. Speaker:

"Mr. Speaker, perhaps the position of the Hon. Minister of Fisheries and also that of the Minister of Communications in charge of the Port, can be well understood and perhaps appreciated, because, if one looks at the Order or the Notice which has been sent around, it shows quite plainly that what the Minister of Trade said in reply to some Press enquiries was that they are not aiming at fishermen. In the last paragraph of a release from the Government Information Office it says that it would impose no hardship on fishermen. That is all right, but what we must understand is that the Minister is well aware of the fact that the hardship which will be created will be on the fishing-boat owners. Hon. members on that side will certainly try to dissociate themselves from what I am going to say now; but the whole plan of the Government is that certain members of the Government have an interest in what is called a floating type of canteen in association with a gentleman called Michael Michelow. They have already bought a ship which is now down the island and they are getting rid of the schooners for Michael Michelow and Company to have this floating vessel to come into the Careenage when they have the tourists and what not, and sell refreshments".

Mr. Speaker, I remember that some years ago when the Minister of Communications decided with the instruction of the Cabinet to make a bigger parking area where the Independence Car Park is now. Just to show you how people can disseminate bad news to their own thinking. They said that the reason it was being filled in was that J. N. Goddard intended to buy the building in front of B. W. I. A. or B. O. A. C. (Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: "Who said so?") Everybody said so who did not know any better including yourself. When you get these erratic statements made on the floor of the House so that the Press can print them, then some people do not understand what is

going on and they tend to believe a lot of nonsense. I have read what was said by the junior member for St. Peter. All of us know about the junior member for St. Peter. When he is not attacking Hettie Deane at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, he is attacking somebody else, but the only place he does not attack is the place he knows best. (An Hon. Member: "Where is that?") That is the kind of thing we have to put up with.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition knows full well - I would say that he knows better than I do on this score, because he was involved in it, despite his denials.... (Asides) You can say whatever you like; I am entitled to say what I like. I do not listen to you. When you get up to speak, what you have to say is so asinine that I do not worry to listen to you. Do you not see that I usually go outside? (Asides) Are you going to curse my mother? The Leader of the Opposition knows that he was only trying to think that he could win a Government by default.

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, the whole Opposition has been made up of people trying to create strife in the community. You will note, Mr. Speaker, that at one time it was the windfall issue when the former Leader of the Opposition was telling the people not to cut the canes. I am wrong; he was going into the cane fields and telling the people to cut the canes. When the next issue came up when they were asking for more money, he was telling them not to cut the canes. That is the way you will find these people operating. They are fooling some of the public, because they cannot fool all of them. (Mr. ST. JOHN: "You cannot get back in St. Thomas.") You will have a hard job. I am not worried about St. Thomas, but I am worried about Christ Church. I will be up there every night helping "Peanuts" to defeat you. It is a means of livelihood to you and not to me.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is playing cheap politics. He runs in here with a Resolution, after encouraging Schofield to pull out....

Mr. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I object to that. That, again, is another abysmal, lying statement made on the floor of this House. I do not know anything about Schofield; I have never talked to him in my life. (Asides) I would not like you to turn into a pillar of salt, because nobody could use you, but you should really be turned into something for making a statement like that in the House. (Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: "Shut up!") When I reach the age or the stage of senility like you, I will shut my mouth. I know what I am talking about. How do you mean that you do not know Schofield? (Asides) Bringing a document in here does not constitute anything. Look at how many times people have murder cases and they have others helping them with the cases. What are you trying to tell me? You have never helped anybody with a murder case then? I do not doubt that, because you are not so good as a lawyer; you can fool whoever you can, but you cannot fool me. You have barely made it. You have made a lot of

noise and fooled a lot of people who do not know what is going on, and you have got away with murder. You cannot fool the people over here who have to deal with you. *(Asides)* You are laughing, but it is true. You can put me in court for saying that, or make me withdraw it.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat that the hon. member knew what the whole position was, but he thought that you could get a Government by default. Have you not seen what happened with Eric? He got 36 seats. *(Asides)* The hon. member's welfare is my welfare; he cannot get a seat in Christ Church this time. 4.25 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are we still on the Marketing Corporation?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: We are on the Marketing Corporation and we are on the shrimp business. You know you have to go far afield to catch shrimp; so you have to let me go out and come back in occasionally. The Leader of the Opposition says that he has some reply. Personally I will say to him that despite what his reply might be, it does not affect me one way or the other, but as a Barbadian I will say to him that I think the time has come when an issue like this should be placed above party politics since this is dealing with people's livelihood, and this is not a matter of policy as such. The hon. member knows as well as I do that the Board did not act wrong in any way. *(Asides)*

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER No. 18

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Order No. 18 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 4.45 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.

On Resumption:-

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

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, before we took the suspension, I was making the point that this matter is a matter that goes far beyond party politics, and I am therefore appealing to all hon. members to

let us get down to brass tacks and see what can be done in order that we can start re-employing some of these people. I should like to add that the Government is not unmindful of its responsibility and tried its best to place the majority of the people who worked in the shrimp industry in other gainful employment, but since there was no fixed salary in the industry and people used to get some overtime, I think the time has come when we can get together and try to see if we can get somebody to do shrimp processing again.

I want to say also that it is rather remarkable that on a Resolution as important as this that affects so many people's lives - with 500 people employed directly and probably another 200 or 300 indirectly which means that if you multiply by four or five you can see the results - the members of the Opposition would not even wait to give the hon. member the support he needs in a measure like this.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to read the amendment:-

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

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

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

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

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

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

AND WHEREAS the said boats have been re-possessed by their owners;

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

BE IT RESOLVED that this House deplores the grave loss of employment that has occurred, the grave loss of revenue to Barbados, and calls upon the Government to take steps forthwith to restore a shrimp

industry on terms much more favourable to Barbadian participation, and in an atmosphere free from racial discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks, I beg to second this amendment to the Resolution.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, one of the great attributes of democracy is that there are always two sides to the story. I sat patiently and listened to the speakers on the other side use this occasion for the purpose of propounding some of the most nonsensical theories, and also for disclosing some of the most fantastic facts that one could ever imagine.

The Hon. Minister of Agriculture spoke in the course of this debate, and I want to say here, Mr. Speaker, that no speech by any man could ever be made which would disclose greater defects in character than the speech made by the Hon. Minister. No speech could be made by any man which would disclose a lack of understanding of fundamental moral principles like the speech made by the hon. member, for after he spoke, anyone could see and judge and understand the standards which he abides by.

Mr. Speaker, it is a patent lie for any hon. member to get in here and say that at any stage I worked for Schofield. The lawyers in Bridgetown who worked for Schofield was Wilfred K. Fergusson, and there is more than one document on the files in the Ministry where Fergusson was correspondent as the legal adviser to Bajan Seafoods Co. with the Barbados Marketing Corporation, with the Prime Minister and with the Minister of Agriculture, and I am going to put on the floor of this House.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, I want to get it clear, Mr. Speaker, whether the hon. member is saying that I said he worked as a legal adviser for Schofield, because he mentioned the Hon. Minister of Agriculture in his address.
4.55 p.m.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member was not here but the hon. junior member for St. Thomas said so and the hon. member said that he knows it is true. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member could not know that it is true because the hon. member knows that it is untrue, and he has not produced one bit of evidence to suggest that it is true, but I will produce my evidence now. Mr. Speaker, I lay on the table a photostat copy of a letter from Mr. Hurley, now Manager, to Mr. W. K. Fergusson. We go further, there are others. On 19th March, 1970 the same legal adviser to Seafoods wrote to the then Hon. Minister of Agriculture, but what the members on the other side fail to realise in this matter is this, that far from acting from any political motivation we on this side did everything in our power to bring it to the attention of the other side that something was wrong and that they were being carried for a ride by Bruce Procope, Carlton Brathwaite and Fletcher Baker. That is why I asked questions long before in here pointing and suggesting to the then Minister of Agriculture to investigate

the *bona fides* of this Company. Why does the Hon. member not talk about those questions? They concealed the true facts from this House, they refused to answer the questions, so what else can we accuse them of then but gross incompetence when you were told that something was going wrong, that the people who were masquerading as people with money were bogus gangsters, that Carlton Brathwaite and Bruce Procope were only front men.

The Hon. Minister came in here and admitted that they were standings for foreign interest. Question No. 115 reads as follows:-

To enquire of the Minister of Agriculture:-

Will the Minister state:

(a) whether the Barbados Marketing Corporation owes the Barbados Light & Power Co. Ltd., any bills for electricity; and if so, what is the amount due?

(b) whether the Barbados Marketing Corporation owes the Frick Corporation any bills for maintenance and/or technical advice; and if so, (i) the amount due and (ii) how long has the said amount been outstanding?

Question No. 116 reads as follows:

To enquire of the Minister of Agriculture:-

1. Will the Minister state whether it is a fact that a Company called Bajan Sea Foods Limited has been granted a contract by the Barbados Marketing Corporation to process shrimps at the premises of the said Barbados Marketing Corporation?

2. If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, will the Minister state:

- (a) Who are the Directors of the said company;
- (b) What is the paid-up capital of the said company;
- (c) the name of each and every local agent of the said company from the time it started to negotiate for the said contract;
- (d) whether the said company owns any boats, and if so, how many;
- (e) the port or ports of registry of the said boats;

and anybody with any kind of sense if they look at the next part of the question would have seen the purpose of it,

- (f) whether there is or are any encumbrance or encumbrances on any of the said boats;
- (g) how many of the said boats have arrived in Barbados?

3. Will the Minister state whether the company or corporation known as "Out Riggers Inc." has any connection with the said Bajan Sea Foods Limited?

and we go right through pointing, telling, showing the ignoramuses in the Ministry of Agriculture that something was wrong there, and you come in here and say that we acted over here with malicious motives. Never has there been a more unjust and depraved accusation that is imaginable.

In March, at the time of the Appropriation Bill - look at page 1270 of the official debates for March 1970 - the hon. junior member for St. Peter and other members of this side contributed to a debate under Agriculture and pointed out, in March, 1970, that this company, Bajan Seafoods, that we had information on this side that it was a bogus company, and this is what the then Minister of Agriculture said - and I will here deal now with the specious excuse and show the reasons why we could never accept any amendment as moved - because at that time this is what the then Minister of Agriculture said: "Mr. Speaker, I have not heard....." (This is the Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS speaking). (*Asides*) The senior member for St. Peter then, I was only quoting the debate, just to show who it was that was speaking, just to show how many mouths with which the Government speaks..... "I have not heard of any estrangement in relations between Barbados Seafoods Ltd. and the 200 or more workers that it employs. I have been made to understand that when this company first operated relations between the Management and staff, were more cordial than they are. Let me inform the House that I have been told that the workers of the Barbados Seafoods Ltd. are organised workers; I do not think that any knowledge of any industrial dispute has been brought before the Labour Commissioner or the Minister of Labour in this respect at all." He goes ahead: "I have had no intimation there is any dispute between the Barbados Seafoods Ltd. and its 300 or more workers, nor have I been informed that any inkling of such a dispute has been reported to the Labour Commissioner or to the Minister of Labour. In other words, I have heard nothing to disturb my peace of mind, to make me believe that anything like a strike is threatening." That is what the Hon. Minister said.

5.05 p.m.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. What I said then was that it was to the best of my knowledge and information, and I still stand by that statement as a factual and honest statement at that time. I had no information otherwise.

Mr. St. JOHN: Up to now he does not have any.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, that is unfair to me. If I informed the Chamber that, at the time of speaking, I was speaking to the best of my knowledge and with all my knowledge, do you mean

to say that an hon. member can get up to cast aspersions when I still have no intimation? Is that necessary? Is that fair?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is now going beyond a point of order. Let the Hon. Leader of the Opposition proceed.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, the other side thinks that, when they come in here and attempt to attack us by making false accusations and false suggestions about my motives by introducing race in the terms of the Resolution, they are going to make political capital out of that. But let me tell them that it is not race that this election will be fought on; it is being fought on honesty and dishonesty. Whether you are black, whether you are white, whether you are green, or whether you are blue, if you are fundamentally dishonest there is no society, whether black, yellow, green or blue, where you can operate without honesty and integrity in its administration. Trace all of the ancient cultures, whether it be African, Indian or Chinese; look at all of the ancient philosophers of whatever colour, and you will see that there is one thing at least all of them have in common and it is the normal code that honesty is the best policy.

Mr. Speaker, it was cheap of the hon. Minister of Agriculture to suggest that I was responsible in any manner for the workers losing their jobs.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I want the hon. member to make a distinction when he says the Minister of Agriculture. Does he mean the present Minister of Agriculture, or does he mean the Minister of Agriculture who spoke at the time of the debate to which he made reference?

Mr. ST. JOHN: I will not bother with him at all. the position is this.....

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member said it was cheap of the Minister of Agriculture. Now, he has made some reference some time ago to a speech made by a former Minister of Agriculture; so I want to know, when he says cheap of the Minister of Agriculture, whether he is making any reference to me in my erstwhile position as Minister of Agriculture. That is all the clarification I need, and I think the hon. member could be decent enough to say so. That is all. Is that too much for you?

Mr. ST. JOHN: As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, one of the problems of any sociologist or any person who has had any experience about the reading of morals is that some people find themselves in positions; they make money their God, but they have never had the culturising influence of an education to understand what is right and what is wrong. That is the problem with the Hon. Minister of Agriculture; he does not understand.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture made

accusations in here which were founded; which were true, and the Hon. Minister of Agriculture still maintains that the person who saw to it that those boats were withdrawn from this country is the person who put the Barbadians employed in the shrimp industry out of employment.

Mr. ST. JOHN: I say that it displays a fundamental ignorance of the concept of the duty and the moral standards that a lawyer has to obey. If the hon. member knew anything about ethics; if he had ever been exposed to one iota of ethical standards in his life, he would know that a lawyer cannot refuse a brief. As I have said, the Hon. Minister has lost the benefit of a culturising influence of an education. To him money is a God. When he comes in here and says that he owes \$550,941 and does not disclose his assets, then I say that he is a bankrupt, a nonentity and a risk. I accuse him in here now that 6 months before he was not brought back in here as a Minister he had an overdraft at the bank and could not pay his debts. Let him say what are his assets today. Let the public know what are his assets today to balance the \$550,000 debt. Let us know whether he has been guilty of a gross abuse of office, or whether or not he is dishonest. Unless he does that, the question mark shall forever remain on his breast.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Anyone can see that those are the words of a hurt and angry man.

Mr. ST. JOHN: Not of an angry man, but of a man who is seriously concerned.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member had got the land cheap and had made \$50,000, he would not have been saying so now.

Mr. ST. JOHN: The Hon. member can say what he likes. During the course of this debate the hon. member was forced to reveal to the public of Barbados the extent of the magnitude of his liabilities. He can never get away from the fact that occurred in Parliament. Mr. Speaker, it will definitely not rest in Parliament. I accuse the Government, from the Prime Minister back down, of knowing from the very beginning that Carlton Brathwaite and Bruce Procopé had put up not one cent in money in this Company. They never put up any capital, but they were covered by the Marketing Corporation, because certain members in the Barbados Marketing Corporation were yard fowls members of the Democratic Labour Party, and they were motivated by pleasing the bosses of the Democratic Labour Party for the patronage which is distributed by the friendship in the Democratic Labour Party. That is why I accuse them of incompetence.

Mr. Speaker, we go further, and this is the point no member on the other side has ever answered. How is it that Bruce Procopé could be a shareholder in Bajan Seafoods Limited negotiating a contract with the Barbados Marketing Corporation and at the same time be Chairman of the Port Authority in Trinidad

which had a joint Company with International Foods Limited, and they were setting up a trawler base at La Bas, Trinidad? Do you see the conflict of interest? Not one of them on the other side has replied to that point. The Hon. Minister talked for 3 1/2 hours or 3 1/2 days, and he has never replied to that point. 5.15 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The hon. Minister makes the business of the Government his and not other people's business.

Mr. ST. JOHN: This is not the Government's business. The higher the monkey climbs the more he shows his tail. The Government would be competent where a man comes telling it that he has this company with all this money and at the same time he is in charge of a competitive organisation, he has no money in fact, but when the boats leave Barbados they are operating at that same terminal today in Trinidad. The same boats that were operating in Barbados that were not good enough to supply shrimps to the Marketing Corporation are the very boats that are operating with others in Trinidad.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: If the hon. member wants to talk about honesty, he would say under what conditions the boats operate there, and he would be able to point out that the boats which are now operating in Trinidad are operating under better terms, because the ice, etc. are cheaper, and they are making more money in Trinidad. The operational cost in Trinidad is cheaper and they are nearer to the fishing banks. The cost of fuel, for example, is lower. (Asides) It is bound to be honest because you were dealing with a point of dishonesty.

Mr. ST. JOHN: You talk as much as you like, but you have to listen to me now. If you are saying that is the reason why the boats left here, it only shows how foolish your Ministry was, because that was the very point they were advancing, that in view of the differential in cost you could not get so much for processing. The more you talk the more you expose yourself.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, the hon. member is talking with two tongues, because he himself said in a debate in here last year that the Government should make them pay more if we felt it was worth more. In March last year when the Estimates were being discussed, the very hon. member who is now talking through his hat said that we should make them pay more as long as we felt they should pay more.

Mr. ST. JOHN: That is an abysmal lie.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I want to quote from page 1468 of the debates the speech of the hon. senior member for Christ Church.

"Let us not forget that if you have all these shrimp boats on your hand, it is vastly strange that

you only now have come down to this area; remember we had one of these fast-talking operators in the shrimp industry already and we were very lucky that at that time the confidence of the owners was not so shaken and we were given a second chance. It is now some three to four years that this industry has been built up, and I am not telling anybody to swallow anything that the existing operators tell them, but have a thorough investigation into the economics of it. If you feel they can pay more, demand that they pay more; but be not seduced by the fast-talking operators that come around here; they believe that these countries are very easy. Call for bank references, previous knowledge of the industry, and you will see how fast they will run away."

The hon. member discovered they were making money, we told them they had to pay more money, and they refused to pay, and this is what the hon. member said.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, the more the monkey climbs, the more he shows his tail, because the fast-talking operators we were talking about were Procope and Carlton Brathwaite.

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

Mr. ST. JOHN: I am being heckled by him.

Mr. SPEAKER rose.

Mr. SPEAKER: I see two hon. members on their feet.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, the fact that the fast-talking operators the hon. member had been mentioning then were Carlton Brathwaite and Bruce Procope does not alter the fact that the hon. senior member for Christ Church pointed out to this Government that we should make them pay more if the economics of the industry showed that they could pay more.

Mr. ST. JOHN: That is a abysmal lie. I said you should investigate it properly, but the trouble is that the Government is incompetent to investigate it because if Government had investigated it, you would have found on the question of the credit of the company that it had no money at all and the paid up capital was nothing.

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

Mr. St. JOHN: I am making my speech. How could there be a point of order? I must have broken the Standing Orders.

Mr. SPEAKER rose and both Hon. members sat.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, the hon. member said it is an abysmal lie. I was quoting from what the hon. member said here, and if it is an abysmal lie, the hon. member told it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point made.

Mr. St. JOHN: Is that a point of order? That is a point of foolishness. (*Asides.*)

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members not addressing the Chair.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, the more we go into this debate, the more we will see that it was March last year when it was drawn to the attention of the then Minister of Agriculture that this company that was making all of these wild promises was not a company that was capitalised, that it had no experience in the industry, and Government should not have been taken in by them. What has happened? Let us look at the factual situation as to what has happened in Barbados today. For the last six months no shrimp is being delivered.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, no shrimp is being delivered because the hon. member repossessed the boats.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, as I told the Hon. Minister, if he does not pay Barclays the \$500,000, I will sell him out too because the first law of honesty.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Does the hon. member admit that he sold out the boats and stopped Barbadians from being employed in the shrimp industry?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no point of order.

Mr. ST. JOHN: That is no point of order, that is an asinine statement that comes from a cheap mind, because the hon. member does not believe that if you borrow you must repay.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, I believe that if you take money from people to do their work, professional ethics mean that you should do the work. Nobody would lend that type of money to persons who do not have the reputation for repaying. Go and tell that to your brother who cannot pay his debts. (*Asides*)

Mr. SPEAKER: We are approaching a stage of grave disorder. Will hon. members try and contain themselves, else it is inevitable that this sitting will be suspended.

Mr. ST. JOHN: They want a war.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask hon. members to try and contain themselves, and if a point of order is mentioned, I will ask the hon. member who says "point of order" to try and ensure that it is a point of order and not a speech in reply. I will ask whatever hon. member is addressing the Chair as far as possible to confine himself to the motion and the facts. 5.25 p.m.

Mr. ST. JOHN: That is exactly what I mean, the hon. member is a man who justifies a person who borrows money and does not repay it; that is the hon. member, only a cheap mind would feel that if you borrow you do not have to repay.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, the cheapness begins with him and his family, because his brother owes me money and will not pay me.

Mr. SPEAKER: That can be no point of order.

Mr. ST. JOHN: You see, Mr. Speaker, they can share lashes but they cannot take lashes; only a coward and a cheap mind would introduce somebody else's family in here, but let me tell you this, that you had a brother who stole income tax money.

Mr. SPEAKER: No, no, no, let us keep this debate to a proper level.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, let the people in the Gallery know that they should not get into this, the laughing is for us.

Mr. ST. JOHN: I go further, Mr. Speaker, never has there ever been a Minister of Government in Barbados that had to come in the House of Assembly and confess that when he drives about in a motor car people look at him and say "Joy, you stole that money."

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order, let the hon. member know that Cox was accused of stealing a whole house, so let him withdraw that statement.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no point of order.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: It is true, though.

Mr. ST. JOHN: I know that Hon. Minister was accused of stealing green bananas.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I stole green bananas and another hon. member and myself ate them.

Mr. ST. JOHN: You cannot think that you have a monopoly and come in here making false accusations.

Mr. SPEAKER: I warn hon. members for the last time.

Mr. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I want them to understand clearly on that side, especially the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, that the speech he made revealed that he was characterless as a man.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I object to that statement made by the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: I entirely agree with that, and I will ask the hon. member to withdraw that statement.

Mr. ST. JOHN: I withdraw that, it reveals that he has no wit of understanding of proper moral principle.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, I want to speak to the hon. senior member for Christ Church who said I have no understanding of proper morals.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Mr. ST. JOHN: The truth is, Mr. Speaker, that the Government is prepared to accept a Marketing Corporation acting in a manner which does not speak well of them. They were the people who knew all the facts, it was the Government, the then Minister of Agriculture who knew all the facts, he was warned in here in March and in June; he was so incompetent.... (*Asides*) Did not know what,... they all knew, but the position was that under the Democratic Labour Party regime foreign people were able to use stand-ins as described by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, and because of the stand-ins they were able to get the Government to act against the interest of Barbados.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, if the hon. member is speaking about foreign operators, he admitted on the floor of this House to me that he worked for a foreign operator and put Barbadians out of work, because he admitted he seized the the boats, so he contributed to people being out of work more so than anybody else.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no point of order.

Mr. ST. JOHN: Do not mind the hon. member.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I understand the hon. senior member for Christ Church to have just said that the then Minister of Agriculture knew all the facts and was trying to conceal honest, true and valuable information from this House. I can tell this House this, that is quite untrue, unfounded, unfair and unjust, I acted to the best of my information then available. I say this, that the representative of Schofield, a lawyer whose name was mentioned on the floor of this House by the hon. senior member of Christ Church, was much more generous than he, that gentleman on one occasion told me, "Mr. Minister, I think you are quite innocent in this matter" and he meant not only innocent but ignorant, and I can assure this House, and I do not care how much the hon. senior member for Christ Church tries to tarnish my character, and he may be quite adept at that, because lawyers deal with criminals, you know. I never paid a lawyer in my life because I have never had any cause to and I will never have any cause to, but I cannot get in here and say what he did, that I tried to mislead the House, and the hon. member is wrong, unfair and unjust to make that statement.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is making a speech; that could never by any stretch of the imagination be a point of order.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, how could an hon. member defend himself if he was not lengthy?

Mr. St. JOHN: The most amazing thing in this is, Sir, that as the Hon. Minister said, the then Minister of Agriculture in the House, that an assurance was given that there would be no unemployment. 5.35 p.m.

The Hon. Minister of Agriculture said that an assurance was given that there would be no unemployment. What is the position in the industry today? They were never able to fulfil their obligations to produce shrimp. They never had any experience in the shrimp industry. *(Asides)* Mr. Speaker, I do not care how many times they repeat that I repossessed the boats. You can only repossess a boat pursuant to legal right so to do. I did exactly what the Government does to the people who do not pay their rents in the Housing Schemes.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, The only difference here is that when we collect rent, we do not put people out of work. (Mr. BOLDEN: But you put them out of the houses.")

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Mr. St. JOHN: That is so blatantly silly *(Asides)* I did exactly what the Hon. Minister did when he was at Federal High School and the children did not pay their school fees - he put them out in the sun to bake.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: The hon. member is not right, because this is a completely different thing. If, as he claims, the hon. member used to put children out of school when they did not pay their school fees, it means that three months had to pass, but the hon. member was so eager for power and money that he did not give the shrimp boats a chance to operate to find out whether they would be able to pay. He seized them immediately, and they never had a chance to operate.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, that is complete, unadulterated ignorance, because in the terms of the mortgage they had to be given notice of default. The hon. member is only a half-baked lawyer.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL rose --

Mr. SPEAKER: Two hon. members, again, are on their feet.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL took his seat.

Mr. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, it is amazing that the Government have not brought an action for breach of contract against Bajan Seafood Limited. That is a criminal act on the part of the Government for failing to do so. They say that they have a legal agreement with Bajan Seafoods Limited. Why is it that the Barbados Marketing Corporation did not put them before the Court? There is no doubt about it that you suffered damage. Do you know why they were not put before the Court? It was due to the fact that Procope and Carlton Brathwaite are the Prime Minister's friends and are the shareholders and directors of that Company. *(Asides)* I do not know Schofield. Ask Capt. George Fergusson or ask the hon. junior member for Christ Church. The hon. junior member for Christ Church was Schofield's real friend. (Hon. N. W. BOXILL: "He was your client".) You know that is a lie. I challenge you to produce any document to prove it.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that I have almost reached the end of my inexhaustible patience. The next time I rise, I will state when the sitting is suspended to.

Mr. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, they can come in here and make all the accusations they like, I challenge the hon. member to produce documentary evidence that I was the lawyer for Schofield, or stand condemned as the greatest liar in history. *(Asides)* You walk in here and make accusations and you know that they are untrue. You know that it is an abysmal lie. I accuse you of lying unless you can produce the evidence. I have already produced my evidence to show who was the lawyer. The Hon. former Minister of Agriculture has said who was the lawyer for Schofield. I do not work behind the Scenes like....

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Let the hon. member repeat what he has just said.

Mr. SPEAKER: There can be no point of order asking an hon. member to repeat what he has said.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. If so many people are talking at the same time, it is but fair for me an hon. member to request that he be permitted to hear what has been said. That is unfair to me.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member make his point of order *(Asides)*

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: That crude being over there will not keep quiet at all. I want the hon. member to repeat what he has said.

Mr. ST. JOHN: I said that you said that far from being involved in this matter, the lawyer for Schofield, a gentleman whose name I have called, told you that he was convinced that you were innocent - innocent out of inability to understand.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: On a point of order. Innocent out of inability to do what? I have said already that lawyers are accustomed to dealing with criminals; lawyers cannot deal with gentlemen, especially criminal lawyers, because their ability cannot rise above that of criminal law. Not one of them on that side can rise above criminal law. They are lawyers in here in front of laymen, but in Coleridge Street they get turned upside down. I do not know what the hon. member wants to infer - slander and insults; a pack of cheap guys that we have to call learned hon. members.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, another point that should be made here is that even up to the 13th June, 1970, proposals were made by Seafoods that they should be allowed to operate in conjunction with the other Company.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. By the Barbados Seafoods or the Bajan Seafoods Limited?

Mr. St. JOHN: By the Barbados Seafoods to the Marketing Corporation. The Hon. Wilfred K. Fergusson wrote them.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member will recall that I pointed out here that the Barbados Marketing Corporation had accepted the proposal that they would operate in conjunction with Bajan Seafoods; the Manager of the B. M. C. went out and met the Barbados Seafoods in the United States, and it was agreed that they would operate in conjunction with Bajan Seafoods and they did not honour their agreement.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the hon. member that he should read the letter of the 13th June, 1970, and see that the Corporation said that they would have to get the consent of Bajan Seafoods.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It was agreed that both Companies could operate, and the B.M.C. bought the equipment from the Barbados Seafoods for \$135,000 so that every Company could operate. (Mr. St. JOHN: "That is not true.") The facts are there, and there is documentary evidence to prove that I have said. (Mr. St. JOHN: "I have the facts here.") You have Schofield's facts.

Mr. St. JOHN: I know all the facts; every letter I have produced here is a letter written by the Barbados Marketing Corporation.
5.45 p.m.

What is the position now? Tell the public of Barbados how much shrimp was produced in the last four months.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, you could not have shrimp produced when you got rid of the boats. I will say a million times that the hon. member got rid of the boats.

Mr. St. JOHN: What kind of ignorance the Hon. Minister trots out of his mind! If I got rid of the

boats, is the hon. member saying that I got rid of all the shrimp boats in the world? If this company had money they would go and buy more. This sort of cheapness that was trotted out, happens to criminal lawyers and other lawyers all the time. People feel you should not defend a person who is in trouble depending on the personality of the person. The first ethic of a lawyer is that he has to do his duty to his client, and as I told the Hon. Minister and the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, if he does not pay his hire purchase debt and they bring the cases to me, I will give him time to pay it, and if he does not pay, I will sell him out.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, did you give the Bajan Seafoods Co. time to pay? You didn't. You were so much after the heads of the people involved that little or no time was given to them to honour their obligation, and the whole point is that the hon. senior member for Christ Church in his capacity as a lawyer did not pay any attention to the representation made by Bajan Seafoods that the boats were faulty and that Outriggers would not look after the ships as they should have done. They could have been made seaworthy, but the hon. member did not give them time. He was so much at the necks of these people, and he so much wanted to destroy the the industry for political and other reasons, that he got rid of the boats.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Mr. St. JOHN: That is completely and abysmally untrue because they were given six weeks to pay. Procope came up here from Trinidad to meet the representatives at the Holiday Inn, and Maurice King, and Procope were present. My client came down from America to discuss with them the terms of the payment and they were given six weeks to pay.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, they were given six weeks to pay, but in six weeks Bajan Seafoods were negotiating with these people who manufactured the boats for giving them faulty boats, and the time for negotiations ran out. They should have been given six months.

Mr. ST. JOHN: What nonsense is the hon. member talking? They were given six weeks. They had a lawyer from America called Bob Jones with them who said he would go to Nassau and get hot money, but he came back from Nassau and said he could not raise the money. All the time the boats were on dock here.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, up to now Bajan Seafoods did not object to paying the money, but the hon. member was not willing to give them time to pay what they owed, because they were negotiating and they said they were willing to pay, but they had to put the ships in proper order. Ask the hon. member if this is not the case.

Mr. ST. JOHN: Let us be cool and calm and analyse the patent nonsense the hon. member has just said. If he is saying that the boats were not in proper order, what did he want time to pay for? If the boats are no good, they are no good.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, the boats were not irreparable.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order, the hon. member is not correct in saying that the boats were no good. The boats had a fault that quite a number of boats suffer from. The boats were leaking through the stern tube. That is a matter that could have been rectified quite easily, but the hon. member in his quest for power.....

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no part of a point of order. The hon. member has made his point.

Mr. ST. JOHN: They can say I had a quest for power. I say they are cornered today in this debate because in spite of the incompetence of the Marketing Corporation, the Minister of Agriculture and the Department of Agriculture, the fact that in Barbados if you are a friend of the Prime Minister you can get away with murder, has been exposed in the shrimp debate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the position is this; it is very unfortunate that the Marketing Corporation is being allowed to bankrupt Barbados. Here I want to deal with the Minister of Agriculture again. I ask him to deny if he has not got a report from the United Nations on fisheries development in Barbados in which it is stated that it will cost \$50,000 to put the shrimp plant in repair.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, the hon. member made that statement without having the true facts. The U.N. Fisheries project is an independent organisation and a Caribbean project. The facts are as reported here in a letter dated 11th May from the Manager of the Barbados Marketing Corporation when I asked for information.

The Letter reads as follows;

Permanent Secretary,
Ministry of Agriculture,
Crompton Street,
St. Michael.

Dear Sir,

As requested, I forward information relevant to the state of repairs of machinery and equipment in the Shrimp Processing Plant.

B.M.C. has on its staff an Engineer, an Assistant Engineer and three (3) technicians, responsible for the maintenance of all equipment at the Corporation. Since July, 1970, when our Shrimp Plant ceased operation, this Section was included in the Maintenance Programme, and steps were taken to keep the machinery in proper working order.

The work done on the Shrimp Section during the last ten (10) months included the re-conditioning of the floor in the Cold Storage area, replacement and alteration to electrical fittings, repainting of all machinery including piping, painting the entire roof of the building to prevent rusting, changing all defective rubber hoses of freezing boxes, dismantling, examining and replacing worn parts in the compressors, repainting the said compressors, removing metal bars from the door in order to comply with provisions of the Factories' Act, and at present, work is being done on the linking up of ammonia lines to make the Plant more flexible.

Refrigeration was not applied to the boxes in the Cold Storage for some time now since it was necessary to clear the lines of ammonia in order to carry out the above alterations. However, part of the compressors in order to remove moisture which may accumulate.

The only visible sign of deterioration is the rusting of 2 of 5 metal conveyor belts and the centre pieces (6" x 12") of two (2) out of ten (10) peeling and deveining tables. The removal, cleaning, and re-conditioning of these tables and surfaces was scheduled to commence on Monday, 3rd, 1971. This work is now in progress and the cost of carrying out this exercise is estimated at less than \$1,000.

The manifold of one of three compressors was damaged in February last year. Close Examination has revealed that it should be replaced. This part is now on order and it is likely to cost in the vicinity of E.C. \$8,000. The absence of this part will not prevent the Plant from being put into operation immediately if it was necessary to do so.

The Plant is opened daily and interested parties can arrange with Management to inspect the said facilities.

Yours respectfully,

General Manager.

EFH: gs

c.c: Hon. Minister of Agriculture,
Chairman and Dep. Chairman.

Mr. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, this is the same General Manager that was at the Marketing Corporation when all the problems with Bajan Seafoods arose, I accuse him today of grossly misleading the Ministry because he knows that that plant is in an unfit state to produce 42,000 pounds of shrimp, and it can only work at 15,000. It has never been repaired, it would cost \$50,000 to put it back in the condition for the specification for which it was made, and he is a dishonest young man if he tell you all that.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I do not think that it is fair for any of us to get in here and accuse an officer

of dishonesty when it is known that the officer cannot come in here and defend himself; I think it is dishonest on the part of any of us to do it.

Mr. ST. JOHN: When they give information, which they know is wrong, to mislead the House, I accuse them of incompetence and dishonesty.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, an invitation is put out now to the hon. member or any other member of this Chamber or any member of the public to go visit the plant to see who is right and who is wrong. He accepts information from one Anderson or somebody down there at U. N. Fisheries rather than going and getting the facts; why not come in here and ask me as Minister? You got somebody to give you some fictitious statement and came in here and misled the House saying it would cost \$50,000; it is dishonest, and I will say so any time.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Mr. ST. JOHN: I will never take the word of the General Manager, because he was the man down there all the time Bajan Seafoods was operating, and they were operating under his eyes. He knew that they had no money at all and he did not bring it to Government's attention. If he did, then Government is at fault, that plant cannot produce at 42,000 pounds as the specifications are made for, that is the point and I repeat it is gross dishonesty for any General Manager or anybody to tell the Minister that it would cost only \$1,400 to put that plant back in the condition where it can produce at full capacity. They know that too, but they want to hide it from the Ministry because they will expose this fact that they were getting money and they should have kept the shrimp plant in proper condition, but the Marketing Corporation was losing so much money they did not have the money to pay for electricity and elementary maintenance of the plant. Why is it that the hon. Minister of Agriculture has not yet answered Question No. 115 on the Order Paper? After nine months why is it not answered? Because it would prove that you owe Frick Corporation money and the plant wants maintenance. Let the Hon. Minister get up and deny that at the time that plant was bought, at the time when the shrimp boats left here it was only capable of producing 15,000 pounds of shrimp per hour. Let us get the facts; they have not paid the people at the Marketing Corporation, if they are going to give the Minister information let them give him proper information, do not let them come down here and fool people. If the Hon. Minister introduced him in the debate by reading out his name I will deal with him because he introduced him.

If he had a survey done by mechanical and refrigeration engineers, that would be a different matter because they would be competent to give an opinion, but as soon as you step outside your field and you mislead the House you must be dealt with. The tragedy of all this is this, that if honesty had been the best policy in this the Government would have had all the facts at their disposal and would have been

in a position to give a proper opinion and decide upon a proper basis of action, but the Marketing Corporation has always been suppressing facts from Government because they were covering up their own incompetence. This is only one thing, the pork processing plant is exactly the same thing, that is rusting in Barbados too, the same Bruce Procope is connected with the pork processing plant. The foundations have been dug months ago and nothing has been done.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, for the information of the hon. member, he spoke about producing 42,000 pounds per day but the capacity of the plant is only 25,000 per day, which would take about 10 hours and would involve about two hours overtime per day to keep at its maximum. Consequently they operated the plant at between 15,000 and 20,000 per day; I do not know where the hon. member got the information from about 42,000 pounds per day. I am getting the facts from the people who have to deal with it, he is getting the information from pimps and his yardfowls.

Mr. ST. JOHN: I am not getting an information from pimps, I say as a fact that the specification for that calls for 42,000 pounds per day; that is what it is supposed to do. Let the hon. member answer the question now whether he owes Frick Corporation money for maintenance or whether it has been paid and then we will see the tragedy of it all.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, if I answer it now what is the point of answering his question? When I am ready I will answer the question.

Mr. ST. JOHN: You had 11 months to answer it.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: And you cannot tell me as Minister when I must answer it, if I do not want to answer it, I will not answer it.

Mr. ST. JOHN: If you do not want to answer it you do not have to answer it, and you cannot stop me from saying that both Ministers, the Marketing Corporation and the Ministry of Agriculture were incompetent on the basis of the evidence in this respect.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I do not understand where the hon. member got the information from that we owe Frick Corporation money; he comes in here with half-baked information which is not factual, and before he comes to me and enquire exactly what is the position he comes and talks about owing Frick's money, but we do not owe Frick's any money.

Mr. ST. JOHN: You see, Mr. Speaker, since 30th June last year we asked a question and it is now nearly 11 months and the Hon. Minister is now able say that they do not owe Frick's any money, it is obvious that they have paid him. Obviously, you must have paid them in the interim.
6.05 p.m.

Mr, Speaker, we in this side want to make it clear that we have always regarded the Barbados Marketing Corporation as a body which has a vital and important part to play in Barbados. That is why it grieves us to have to expose the Corporation all the time. When we expose the Corporation, we are not motivated by any desire to hamper or injure it, but because we feel that the Corporation should be kept upon the straight path. *(Asides)* We have the facts, How many shrimp boats do you have now?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: How can we have them, when you took them away?

Mr. ST. JOHN: How much shrimp did you process last year? Why do you not reveal in here how much money the Barbados Marketing Corporation has lost from the inception until today? Well over \$3 million!

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Ask the hon. member how much the Jamaica Marketing Corporation, the Guyana Marketing Corporation and the Trinidad Marketing Corporation have lost? When compared with those Corporations, the Barbados Marketing Corporation is a moderate loser. If a Marketing Corporation is to carry out the function that it is there to carry out, then it must lose money. The hon. member knows that is true. The hon. member has agreed with me that he cannot expect a Marketing Corporation to make money, if it is to do the job it is established to do. Do not talk about the losses experienced. The point is what can be done for agriculture. It is supposed to be the pivot around which agriculture must spin, and therefore it is a money spinner.

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

Mr. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, the Barbados Marketing Corporation is not only losing money but it is throwing it away.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member has changed from throwing away to losing. What does he mean? He must be specific in what he is saying. Because I have scored a point on him saying that any corporation will lose money, he should not now turn back and say that it is throwing away money. Be specific and be firm.

Mr. ST. JOHN: I am saying that if you had made proper investigations you would not be losing money to the extent of what you have lost in the shrimp industry up to now. You cannot deny that. Now, 5¢ or nothing is still 5¢. You have your 5¢, but you have got nothing. Anybody with any kind of sense would have seen to it before he decided on the contract - I accuse the Barbados Marketing Corporation of selling out the interest of Barbados by not bringing a law suit against Bajan Seafoods Limited for a breach of contract.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, how often must the hon. member repeat that? I thought he was a lawyer. This is about the hundredth time he has said one thing over and over again. *(Asides)* I gave a good speech; one that you cannot match; you will never be able to make a speech like that.

Mr. ST. JOHN: I agree with that, because I understand morals and honesty. I would never use the facts and use the justification that the hon. member made. Do you think I would have come in here and confessed that I owe \$500,000?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: You are too incompetent to do that.

Mr. ST. JOHN: I have never taken up the Housing Board machinery and carried it down to Melbourne Investment property.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: You ran somebody through the window with a cutlass though!

Mr. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, the position is positively clear that the amendment is a specious amendment, and it is an attempt to bring a red herring across the trail of the true facts. If you are going to cover up incompetence, Mr. Speaker, we cannot make any progress. This debate has contributed to public standards in Barbados, because the public know that there are certain people whom they have to watch now. From now on Procope will never be able to negotiate a deal in Barbados again. From now on the public will know that he is nothing but a gangster and speculator and a stand-in, as described by the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is, "That the words proposed stand part". Hon. members in favour will please say "Aye", but hon. members of a contrary opinion will please say "No". Methinks the "Noes" have it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Divide.

The House divided and voted as follows:

AYES: Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS; Hon J. C. TUDOR; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Hon. N. W. BOXILL; Mr. WEEKES; Mr. LOWE and Mr. HOPPIN - 8.

NOES: Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY; Mr. ST. JOHN; Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY, and Mr. BOLDEN - 4

Mr. SPEAKER: I am advised that 8 hon. members voted Aye and 4 hon. members voted No. I declare the Ayes have it.
6.15 p.m.

The question that the words proposed to be inserted stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

AYES: Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS; Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Hon. N. W. BOXILL; Mr. WEEKES; Mr. LOWE and Mr. HOPPIN - 8

NOES: Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY; Mr. ST. JOHN; Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY and Mr. BOLDEN - 4.

The question that the Resolution as amended stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS RESUMED

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

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 6 be the next Order of the day.

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 am asking leave to take charge of this Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to take charge of this Bill standing in the name of the Rt. Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, and unless there is any objection, leave will be granted.

Hearing no objection, leave is granted the Hon. Leader of the House to move the second reading of a Bill to amend certain enactments relating to the grant and payment of pensions and gratuities to persons employed in the service of Statutory Boards.

STATUTORY BOARDS (PENSIONS) (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) ACT, 1971

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Bill is as follows: It has been thought desirable that we should make some amendment to the Statutory Boards Pensions Act, 1969 and the Statutory Boards Casual Employees (Pensions) Act of the same year to allow the insertion or deletion as may be required from time to time of office specified in the Schedule of these Acts. It is therefore proposed to include in the Schedule to the Statutory Boards Pensions Act, 1969, the following offices as being eligible for pensions because they were inadver-

tently omitted from the Schedule when the legislation was enacted: Watchmen, Sanitation services and the Children's Homes and Day Nurseries, and various categories of attendant at the Children's Homes. We feel that these should be pensionable posts, but they were inadvertently omitted from the Schedule in 1969, and we would like to put them on now.

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

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: 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 Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on the Bill.

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I believe we will need a Temporary Chairman.

I beg to move that the hon. junior member for St. George be appointed to act as Chairman in the absence of the Chairman of Committees for the remainder of this day's sitting.

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 on the Bill, Mr. HOPPIN in the Chair.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 inclusive were called and passed.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 8th June, 1971, at 2.30 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 adjourned the House accordingly.
6.25 p.m.