THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1971 - 76

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION OF 1971 ~ 76

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 7th August, 1973

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.05 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour N. G. A. MAXWELL, L.L.B., (Speaker); Hon. C. E. TALMA, C.B.E., (Deputy Prime Minister and Leader of the House); Mr. R. ST.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology); Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN, (Deputy Speaker); Mr. J. M. G. M ADAMS, M.A., (Leader of the Opposition); Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, (Minister of Health and Welfare); Mr. A. MORRISON; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., M.A., (Econ.), Minister of Education, Youth Affairs, Community Development and Sport).

Prayers were read.

MESSAGE

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay Message No. 1/1973, from His Excellency the Governor-General advising of his forthcoming absence abroad from 14th August, 1973.

The Message reads as follows:

"HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL

TO THE HON'BLE THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

His Excellency the Governor-General has the honour to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that, accompanied by Her Excellency Lady Scott, he will be absent from the country on a private visit to Taiwan and New York, U.S.A. from 14th to 31st August, 1973.

2. Under the provisions. of section 29(l)(a) of the Constitution the Honourable Hilton Augustus Vaughan, O.B.E., Q.C., has been designated by Her Majesty The Queen to perform the functions of the office of Governor-General during my absence from Barbados.

A. WINSTON SCOTT Governor-General."

DOCUMENTS LAID

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following

The Treaty Establishing the Caribbean Community, including the Agreement establishing the Common External Tariff for the Caribbean Common Market.

An Account of the Transactions in Rum in the several Districts of the Island for the quarter ending 30th June, 1973.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Mr. BOLDEN and Mr. LOWE entered the Chamber and took their seats.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. R. StC. WEEKES:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following

Resolution to approve the expenditure required to supplement the Annexed Estimates, 1973-74, Part II - Capital, of the Port Department as shown in the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following

Resolution to approve the lease of approximately 5 acres of land north of the National Stadium at Codrington, St. Michael, to Key Homes (Barbados) Ltd.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, just before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I just crave Your Honour's leave to draw one point to your attention. There were a number of questions on the Order Paper for as long as eleven months, and it so happened that the Replies were laid during the last sitting of the House when I was not present. I think it would be accepted that I was on some form of Parliamentary business, and I am sure you will agree with me that I could not be on Parliamentary business in two places at the same time; so the opportunity was taken then to lay a whole lot of Replies to questions that had requested Oral Replies. I feel you will agree with me that such a circumstance did not become all of us in a state such as this. In view of the fact that I had been present at several sittings of this House during the past eleven months when these questions were on the Order Paper and it has been found possible on the one occasion I happened not to be present to table the Replies, I wonder if Your Honour would agree that despite the fact that the Order Paper has been printed without these questions remaining they could still be considered as remaining on the Order Paper, and that I could have Oral Replies given at the next sitting of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Unfortunately I cannot agree. There was no formal request by the hon. member to have leave of absence granted, and even though the hon. member was away on Parliamentary business, I gave permission for the Minister replying to lay the Replies. I think it would be useful in future if hon. members who would find themselves in such circumstances would formally ask for leave of the Honourable House.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, this raises a very important matter. Some time ago there was a question asked to which the Acting Minister of Communications and Works was only able to answer one of the questions in the Reply which was brought down and he gave the undertaking to the House that he would have answered the other questions at the next sitting of the House. That question was removed from the Order Paper, which means that those Parliamentarians who sought to get information by way of Oral Replies have now been deprived of the opportunity of doing so, although the Minister gave the undertaking that he would answer the questions. This raises the question as to whether or not this should be on the Order Paper.

Mr. FORDE entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let me enlighten the hon. member.

Mr. BOLDEN:

This particular instance did not occur on the last Tuesday when the Opposition exercised the right of walking out of the House. These were questions which should have been answered the following Tuesday, but which were removed from the Order Paper although the Minister did give the undertaking that he would have answered on the following Tuesday when the information was available to him. His excuse, as I well remember, was that he was given the file on the morning and he 'did not have time to peruse the file. I am not saying that there were replies which should not have been laid. I am dealing with the undertaking given by the Minister because of the unfortunate position he found himself in having to answer questions and only getting the file on the very morning he came to Parliament.

Hon. R. St.C. WEEKES:

Mr. Speaker, last week I brought down the file to deal with the matter and the members of the Opposition walked out; consequently I have not been placed in a position to give them the answers and I do not have the files here today, and besides the questions are not on the Order Paper.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am informed that the Replies to the Questions asked by the hon. member for St. Joseph were laid, because before hon. members exercised their right to walk out, the Government benches had informed members that the Replies to certain Questions were ready, and so the Replies were laid.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, I am dealing with the Question asked by the hon. member for St. George North. One Reply was given, but there were other Oral Questions.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The answer to that question was laid on the last occasion in the hon. member's absence and in accordance with the Standing Orders.

Mr.. BOLDEN:

I am just trying to get it right. You said it was laid on the last occasion which means it would be among the papers which were sent out, but there is nothing here.

Mr. SPEAKER:
Will you discuss it quietly with the Clerks at the Table and not engage the attention of the House on it?

Mr. CRIAG entered the Chamber and took his seat. 12.15p.m.

Mr. ADAMS:
Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, 16th July, in the 8 o'clock news bulletin the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation - I heard it myself - broadcast to the nation that you Sir, ordered me to take my seat on certain matters, relating to matters of privilege, and that I did not take my seat, and that after I got up again you called on me to take my seat again and that I got up and left the House.

This is inaccurate. I got up to speak to a motion and after Your Honour told me to take my seat I took my seat. I got up to speak again, and as I understand it, the broadcast is-actually accusing me of a criminal offence because I believe that it is an offence against the Parliamentary Privileges and Immunities Act to disobey the Speaker, or it can be an offence certainly, an offence on which I could not only be suspended from the House, but suspended from my salary if the necessary steps were taken, and I would ask Your Honour please to investigate this and deal with it in accordance with the law, because I am submitting to Your Honour that the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation has broken the law apart from abusing its privileges of coming to the House and reporting debates.

I notice that sometimes I get a very adverse tone of reports from the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation, very adverse indeed, and I have been waiting until they allow their hostility to degenerate into inaccuracy and defamation; and on this occasion I would ask Your Honour to exercise your privileges of the House and your honoured person by dealing with the News Editor or whoever is the appropriate person in due course.

Mr. SPEAKER:
I think it is now for the hon. member in accordance with Standing Order 79(3) to move that the matter be referred to the Committee of Privileges.

Mr. ADAMS:
I do so move. I move that the matter be referred to the Committee of Privileges and I would ask Your

Honour to exercise Your Honour's authority under Rule 76(4). I ask that the matter be referred to the Committee of Privileges and the necessary persons summoned to appear before them in due course.

Mr. CRAIG:
I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER:
I rule that a prima facie case has been made out, and the question is that the matter be referred to the Committee of Privileges. (A VOICE Divide) I think the Ayes have it.

Mr. ADAMS:
On a point of order, Sir, Your Honour has said the Ayes have it. The hon. member who called Aye, who voted Aye in my hearing called "divide", If the Ayes have it, the Ayes cannot divide, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER:
A division has been called for.

Mr. ADAMS:
On a point of order, Sir, Am I mistaken in viewing a reference to the Committee of Privileges in the same light as the second reading of a Bill? That a motion to refer a matter to the Committee of Privileges is never voted against once Your Honour has ruled?

Mr. SPEAKER:
That is what is exercising my mind.

Mr. ADMAS:
That you attend the Committee of Privileges and discover whether it is a matter of privilege. What Your Honour has ruled is that it should be referred to the Committee of Privileges.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let me confer with the Clerk of the Table. A division having been called, it must be voted upon. The question is that the matter be referred to the Committee of Privileges.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Before you put the question this matter of privilege should not be put by way of motion at all. It is a matter which should normally go to the Committee of Privileges without any motion as such. If a motion is made you are at liberty to vote against it.

Mr. SPEAKER:

There will be a vote. If members think that it should go to the Committee of Privileges it should go. There will be a vote.

The question that the matter be referred to a Committee of Privileges was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:

NOES:

Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, Hon. R. StC. WEEKES, Mrs. BASTMOND, Mr. LOWE, Mr. HOPPIN and Mr. MORRISON - 9.

ABSTENTION:

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD - 1.

AYES:

Mr. ADAMS, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. FORDE, Mr. HINDS and Mr. BOLDEN - 5.

Mr. ADAMS:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I will be seeking to bring a prosecution against the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation and I am asking for your consent. You do not have to take the vote of anybody for consent.

Mr. SPEAKER:
Nine hon. members having voted No and five having voted Aye and one having abstained, the motion has been resolved in the negative.

Mr. ADAMS:
Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, what do we do now in the House of Assembly? If the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation is free to misrepresent the proceedings of the House and a majority of those adverse in party spirit to those who have been misrepresented can decide that it should not go to the Committee of Privileges, I am asking Your Honour to entertain a motion for the deletion of Order No. 76 from the Standing Orders altogether.

Mr. SPEAKER:
The hon. member is now out of order. I can well understand the indignation of the hon. member.

Mr. ADAMS:
I have never heard of this in Parliament in my life. There is one set of privileges for the Government and another for the Opposition.

Mr. SPEAKER:
The hon. member has made his point. 12.25 p.m.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

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

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 2 on the Order Paper, standing in the name of the Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology, be the first Order of the Day.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE NOTE TO ITEM 11 OF HEAD 101 -MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY IN PART II - CAPITAL, OF THE APPROVED ESTIMATES 1973-74

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:
Mr. Speaker, this Resolution seeks to amend the note to Item 11 - Purchase of Livestock and Livestock Research - under Head 101, Part II, in the current year's Capital Estimates. It is proposed that compensation should be paid to those people who lost their pigs and pork as a result of the recent outbreak of swine fever. Compensation will be paid for pigs slaughtered in accordance with Section 10 of the Animal Diseases and Importation Act, 1942, where pig keepers were ordered to slaughter their animals on the instructions of an Inspector. In these proposals it has been agreed to pay the local expenses of Veterinary Officers who came here from Canada; the expenses of Inspectors who were

appointed to do certain work, and compensation to pig keepers who had their pigs destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, there were 940 pigs ordered to be slaughtered under the Act. There were 16,784 pounds of pork and 350 pounds of pork fat which had been seized because it was felt that some of the pork and pork fat held in the cold storage might have been carrying the disease. The pork and pork fat were burnt and buried in lime, and it is proposed to pay for them at the rate of 87 cents per pound as the law provides. The law provides that pork taken, slaughtered and buried be compensated for at two-thirds the value of the pork at the time when it was taken. The total amount involved is $113,462 made up as follows: -

Compensation for pigs slaughtered in accordance with the provisions of the Act $83,677

These would be approximately 940 pigs from farms throughout the country. I refer to small pig keepers throughout the country, and, when one considers that we have only had to slaughter 940 pigs out of a pig population of over 33,000, I think that the country and the pig keepers ought to be congratulated on the way they have co-operated with my Ministry in eliminating and eradicating this disease.

The remuneration paid for pigs was on this basis: We estimated that a full-grown pig would be between 45-75 Lbs; a half-grown pig would be bewteen 76-99 Lbs; a three-quarter grown pig would be between 100-130 Lbs; a ready-to-market pig would be between 131-180 Ibs, and pigs over that, weight would be considered to be full-grown pigs. Piglets were considered as pigs from birth up to 44Ibs.. This has been recommended by the Senior Agricultural Officer responsible for livestock, Mr. Patterson. He recommended thai all sows slaughtered under the Act ought to be paid for at the price of a full-grown pig and that would be $250; the young sows that Were not yet bred would be $150 each; three-quarter grown pigs would be $95 each; half-grown pigs would be $70 each, quarter-grown pigs would be $50 each, and piglets would be $25 each. These are pigs from 441bs down to birth.

Mr. .Speaker, an additional 25% to 30% is added to the price for pigs killed after the 18th May, 1973. Hon. members will remember that there was an increase in the price of pork as a result of the increase in the price of pigs from the 18th May, 1973, and it would be unreasonable to pay farmers, whose pigs were ordered to be slaughtered after the 18th May, 1973, the same price as those whose pigs were ordered to be slaughtered before the 18th May, 1973. There are two price structures: one price structure for pigs before the increase in the price, and another price structure for those pigs after the increase in the price. 12.25 p.m.

There were 74 farms involved in the outbreak, and there were 18 supermarkets or sellers of pork from whom pork was confiscated, burnt and buried, and there was one supermarket with pork fat. The amount paid for compensation for the pork was $14,689.58, and the remuneration paid to the inspectors who were paid in accordance with the maximum fees paid to veterinary officers of the Ministry was $4,731.07; the local expenditure for the technical assistance personnel was as follows: accommodation $7,677.11 and transportation $2,687.10 making a total of $113,462.49.

Mr. Speaker, I have given the House a breakdown of the criterion used for arriving at the cost of the pigs and pork that were ordered to be destroyed under the Order, and I am asking the House to agree that the compensation be paid from the Livestock Development vote which is in the region of $200,000 and that the note be amended to accommodate the same. One of reasons why we are paying for this under the Livestock Development vote is because we are given from Canada $560,000 Can. which I propose to deal with later today under a Bill to amend the Canadian Loan Act, and this we feel is adequate to meet the cost of livestock development, and we were advised by the Director of Finance and Planning that it is quite in order to pay the compensation from this vote

I know that hon. members on the other side will have something to say on this matter and about the fact that pig-keepers in the Island are experiencing difficulty in getting their pigs off. They will not be telling me anything I do not know. We have succeeded in my Ministry to get the Barbados Marketing Corporation to purchase a considerable amount of pork from the people I understand they are only taking pigs up to 200 pounds, but we have been in touch with Trinidad where there is a shortage of pork. We know that Trinidad has been importing pork from Jamaica who had a surplus of pork, and the Parliamentary Secretary who represented the Minister in St. Vincent did talk to the representatives from Trinidad about the surplus of pork in Jamaica, and it is my understanding that Jamaica is sending some pork to Trinidad from the surplus pork. We in the Ministry, in order to help the pig growers, have been in touch with Trinidad to see whether we will be able to export some of the surplus pork to Trinidad.

I am also aware of the fact that members on the other side may say that the pig industry is on its way out. I am giving hon. members the assurance now that whilst it may appear that the pig industry is on its way out, I am preparing the wicket to see that the industry does not die in this country. Only this morning I had discussions with the Chief Agricultural Officer, the two Deputy Chiefs and the Permanent Secretary on our strategy for the revival of what appears to be a dying industry in this country. I am sorry if I am knocking the stumps from behind the bat of the Shadow Minister of Agriculture, but I want to assure him that the pig industry is not going to die in this country, and he himself will congratulate the Ministry on the efforts which it is making when I tell him of the efforts we are making. He knows I do not hide anything which happens in the Ministry of Agriculture from -him-As far as I am concerned he is the Shadow Minister of Agriculture and officers in the Ministry are instructed to give him any information which he wants at any time he asks for it, and he can be told what efforts we are making to see that the pig industry does not die. He knows what the problem is. I do not think there is any need to

go over it here in this Chamber, but he knows that I am capable of solving that problem, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I give him and this House and the country as a whole the assurance that the swine industry in Barbados will not die, and that I have plans afoot that I have already begun to initiate action on, in which I will take further action to see that the pig industry does not die.

I know that at this moment there is a problem as far as pig feed in concerned. I know that between Wednesday and Thursday last week people in this country could not get pig grower, sow feed and so on, and that the only thing that they could get was a little B.A. feed. I also happen to know that the reason they could not get this feed was because of a very heavy increase in the price of soya bean meal in recent days. Hon. members would be pleased to note that I have instructed the Chief Agricultural Officer to see that 1,000 acres of land in Barbados are planted in corn which will be a supplement for the energy input in the feed. 12.45 p.m.

We have gone further. There was no seed corn in the country for planting, and last week we called Jamaica and we called Venezuela and we asked them for assistance with corn. The ADC itself has been instructed to plant at least 500 acres of corn.

Now, we have been importing corn at a price of over $13 per 100 pounds. We feel that we can produce corn on the stalk with a 15% moisture at between 10 cents and 11 cents per pound, and this will give us the equivalent of the corn which we import at 13 cents per pound.

At 15% moisture it takes 68 pounds of corn on the cob to give you a bushel of 56 pounds. We have gone into this and shown that the farmer can get 10 cents and 11 cents per pound for corn, and this will be very encouraging for the farmer because last year what the farmer got for corn at 15% moisture was 7 cents per pound, so it will pay the farmer now to put in corn.

I assure hon. members on the other side - I do not have to assure my colleagues here because they are aware of what is going on - that we will reduce the dependence on importation of quite expensive energy inputs for animal feeds. I will see to it that the farmers in this country produce the 1,000 acres of corn which can satisfy the needs of the country.

We are waiting until the shipment comes in from Jamaica. I understand that we will get it later in the month. Thank God we have got some rain last weekend and we are hoping to get a little more rain so that when this corn arrives we will be able to put it in - at least 1,000 acres - so that we will be able to

solve some of the problems which we have in the feed industry of this country.

I may go further and state that I am having discussions now with at least four companies who are interested in establishing additional mills in the country; but we are going through their applications and scrutinising them very carefully, and if we do agree to additional feed mills being brought in, we will have to be assured of the fact that they will be using local inputs, so that the cost of the end product will be as low as humanly possible and in the interest of the farmers of this country.

With these few words I hope that I have satisfied and convinced members on the other side that the Ministry is doing something to solve the problem of feed for animals in this country, and that they will give this Resolution their blessing.

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

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

Mr. BOLDEN:
Mr. Speaker, sometimes it is very difficult to understand the Ministry of Agriculture of ths country, and today is one of those days when I am at a loss because I believe that the Department of Agriculture is also at a loss.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister for Agriculture was at pains to point out the various methods of payments which the Government is going to use or the recommendations which they have accepted for paying the pig keepers who have lost their stock through the recent outbreak; but even taking the Minister's figures which he has just quoted, I must admit that I at a lost today because my papers .have not yet arrived in the post, and the first time that I am seeing this Resolution is now.

If we look at the prices being paid for pigs, it conflicts violently with the control prices which are supposed to be operating in the country today.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

On a point of order, let the hon. member be reasonable. I have explained, Mr. Speaker, that there are two price structures those for pig farmers whose pigs ware slaughtered before the 18th May when the increased price was put on pork and when the price was the old price. For pig farmers whose pigs were compelled to be slaughtered after the 18th May, they were given between 25% and 30% increase. When you say $250 you have to add 25% to 30% to that. I hope that that elucidation will help the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Even so, Mr. Speaker, taking the increased price of $25 for the piglet, and taking the rate factor that 44 pounds is considered to be a piglet, and taking the controlled price up to now you will see that the Government has got to utilise the electronic machines, they have to work out proper prices to help the Ministry of Agriculture and the Department of Agriculture to solve their differences. Even that is not going to come out right.

Let us go further. The Minister was at pains to tell us that the pig industry is not going to die. I have never heard of a pig that goes into hibernation and life stops until something is done. Probably the ones that they are going to bring in now can achieve this extraordinary feat, because that is the only way you are going to save the pig industry.

There are pig farmers who are crying today that they are losing $3,000 a month keeping pigs. They cannot get rid of the pigs to begin with because the butchers are offering them ridiculous prices, take it or leave it, and if they carry them to the BMC the BMC will say we do not want them, or sell them at our price. You cannot starve the pigs because they will die from starvation, and they are dying as fast as they can.

Read the newspapers and you will see that those people who are best able to keep pigs are now disposing of their breeding stock. That is the answer to what is going on. The Minister can tell us that he has made plans this morning, but that is not telling the pig farmers what is going to happen.

I say that this is a very serious matter. It is more serious than probably the Minister understands. We are in a serious position. In six months from now we will be importing pork far less trying to sell surplus pork; and the Minister knows that we are at a point where everybody is disgusted and those who are not disgusted have reached the point of frustration. You walk around the villages and you hear people saying that when they get rid of this pig, never another in their backyard.

The Minister also speaks about the feed industry. We know for a long time what has been happening to the feed industry in this country. The question of examining applications does not solve problems. In 1971 I said in here that there was going to be a shortage of material ingredients for feed in this country - a world shortage. I asked if they were planting corn and soya bean, and said that it was time that that the Agricultural Department got up and taught farmers how to grow corn on an all the year round basis.

I was told that it was being done. Now today I am hearing that instructions have now gone out that over 1,000 acres of corn are to be planted. 12.55 p.m.

They told me everything was being done. I have not yet heard the Minister say one word about how much soya bean was produced or planted in this country. I have been told that corn is going to be planted all the year round; that C.D.C. is going to put in 500 acres, but I have heard nothing about soya bean. I want to hear what is going to happen to the Agricultural Stations that are there doing absolutely nothing. What are you going to do with those lands? The lands should have been planted. This should not have been a new enterprise at this stage. All of these things should have been done last year. Last year when I said that the people in the Ministry of Trade did not know what was going on, a lot of people on the other side jumped up and said that they knew what was going on. If the Ministry of Trade controls the licences for the importation of things in this country, why did not the Minister of Trade pass to the Ministry of Agriculture a note that there was going to be a world shortage of grain so that the necessary steps could have been taken to import certain ingredients for feed? Probably the Minister of Agriculture knows why, but I say that it is a condemnation of the Government that they are not acting in the interests of the people and they cannot explain to the people why this shortage arises.

Now, the Minister says that he is doing his best. On the one hand, you are told that they have a proper agricultural policy, and on the other hand, you can see the complete reverse of that. I do not think that the Minister really intended to bring this Resolution here today. I said in the last debate dealing with the pig industry that I was going to vote against an amendment to the Act, because I realised that they were only dealing with certain sections of agriculture in this country and that they should have been a proper policy covering the entire spectrum of agriculture.

They now come back here with a further amendment to the Act to give pig keepers money in the hope of solving a problem, At the time I drew to the attention of the Minister what was happening to the poultry farmers in this country, and he said that he was advised that certain poultry fanners in this country had their fowls destroyed because they had not inoculated them against the Newcastle Disease. I told the Minister at the time that he was wrongly advised. I then asked a question whether the Minister would amend the Act to lay Regulations on the Table whereby, if we had another attack of Newcastle Disease in this country, the poultry 'keepers would find themselves in the same position as the pig keepers. In answer to Question No. 97, which dealt with the same matter, the Minister replied as follows: "As soon as I am advised that it is necessary." He tells us that he has a Comprehensive Agricultural Policy. Question 97 was asked by me on the 29th May, 1973. It reads thus

To enquire of the appropriate Minister: Would the Minister state how soon he intends to lay on the Table of this Honourable House regulations providing for the control of poultry in this Island as is provided for under Section 24 of the Animals (Diseases and Importation) Act, 1949?

The Minister replied: "As sooh as I am advised that it is necessary." Have the Officers advised the Minister on this matter? On the last occasion the Minister said that he was advised that the poultry farmers lost their flock because they refused to have them inoculated against Newcastle Disease. I will offer to lend the Minister a document which proves that nobody inoculates chickens against Newcastle Disease until the twenty-first day. I would like him to ask his Advisers who is right or wrong.

We cannot have a one-sided Agricultural Policy. Some time ago the Leader of the House told us that he was amending the Act until he was able to bring down a comprehensive Act. The Act is being amended bit by bit. If you are saying that you are having a Common Market; if you are encouraging local farmers to produce more and at the same time you are creating a market for outside farmers as against the local farmers, how can you say that you have a comprehensive Agricultural Policy? I should like the Minister to tell me who advised him as to how these things should be done. The Minister responsible for Agriculture is able to lay down a policy in the Department. It is the Minister's duty to lay down such a policy, I should like the Minister to tell me whether his Officers have advised him that it is not yet necessary to lay all the Regulations in this Chamber which will control the whole aspect of the food situation in this country.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I should like the hon. member to repeat what he has just said. I did not hear him.

Mr. SPEAKER:
That is a novel point of interruption.

Mr. BOLDEN:
Mr. Speaker, I should like the Minister to tell us whether his Officers have advised him that it is not yet necessary to lay all i the Regulations on the Table. The Minister can have all the technical advice he wants in the Agricultural Department. I have been hearing very serious rumours that there is conflict between the A.D.C. on the one hand, and the Agricultural Department on the other hand and that is not good for the country. The A.D.C. seems to have taken over the operations of the Ministry of Agriculture. What are the technical boys in the Agricultural Department doing? You are planting cotton, and the A.D.C. is dealing with it. You are planting corn and the A.D.C. is dealing with it. You will soon plant agriculture, and the A.D.C. will deal with that, too. I have not yet heard that there are Agricultural Instructors attached to the A.D.C.; so how are you going to disseminate the information gathered at the A.D.C. through the Agricultural Department?

Now, the Minister said that he told them to give me information, but you cannot get any information from the Agricultural Department. The Agricultural Officers do not know what is going on. The Minister can get up and say what is going to happen, but I know that we are in a very serious position. The Minister said that we are going to import animals from Canada to replace the animals which were lost by the pig keepers. I am convinced that, if you put money in the hands of these people, they are not going to buy any new animals. This matter seems to go back to the question which I raised in this House about quarantine facilities some time ago. Where are your quarantine facilities? The Minister said that he was going to relax the Rule relating to quarantine facilities. What is the position now? All of these things are important matters in this particular crisis.

Sir, every pig keeper in Barbados is telling you that as soon as he gets rid of the pigs he has he is finished with pigs. If you import new ones, will the pig keepers take them? Do you have the quarantine facilities for them? The Minister says that the industry is not going to die, but I should like the Minister to tell this Parliament of the plans which have been made. The Minister should be aware of the fact that the price of grain has gone up in the United States last week. The price of chicken has risen to 98 cents per pound in New York last week end, 1.05 p.m.

People are cutting back their stocks. The quota of hatching eggs for Barbados has been cut in half within the last two weeks. The Minister should be aware of this and that we are in a crisis position. You must at this stage encourage those people who are in the industry to stay in it and you cannot encourage them by words only. I have said before that there seems to be a policy around here of telling people that you are looking after the consumer. They do not talk about the supplier or the man growing the stuff, but I would like those person who use those words to remember that the consumer is a supplier and the

supplier is also a consumer; so we are in a critical condition.

I am not going to vote against this, because if a man has lost his stock he is entitled to compensation, but I would like the Minister to say whether or not he is serious about his answer to Parliamentary Question No. 97 tabled by me and I would like to hear him say what plans he has for the revival of the pig industry before it is too late. There has been talk about a pork processing plant which should have come into operation this year. It means that these things have been pushed back for another two or three years because you cannot build up the pig population that would supply the country with pork under five years, and if people are getting rid of their stock, I am sorry to think of what is going to happen in this country.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few comments on this matter. I believe I have told this House already that one of our problems with pig rearing in Barbados is that we have for too long been specialising in keeping the wrong type of pig. We have learnt from the Minister here of the large quantity of pork fat that can be found for throwing away at one time or another. That is one of the problems that is encountered by almost everybody who has been engaging in pig rearing for a period of time, and I am sure that the Minister ought to have investigated by now that there is still available to us a pig known as the Jamaica Black which does not grow as big as the pig that we rear here, does not take as long to reach maturity, and one thing we have been told by the Vets is that for breeding purposes the Jamaica Black has been known to give a litter of twelve to thirteen, though a smaller pig, and the possibility of rearing a larger percentage of that litter as against a. much bigger sow having a similar number is much greater and more advantageous. In view of the fact that maturing does not take as long, one does not lose the amount of time and use as much feed that many people complain of in the case of these large sows and boars that we have here. That is why you will find that there are so many pig-keepers who have during the past weeks and months been brought to the point of frustration where the butchers, speculators and the like have made all sorts of ridiculous offers. They have reached the point where some of them do not feel they would worry with this business any longer. This brings me to the point, Mr. Speaker, when I heard the Minister of Agriculture say he is going to see to it that the industry does not die, I believe he means well indeed because as far as the small man who kept it alive all these years and made it to be worth millions to the Barbados economy is concerned, it is a dying industry, but I believe the Minister really means that for those people who now have their hands to pig breeding, being of sufficient substance, it is not a dying industry. It is no longer left to the backyard people and it is for that reason that the Minister will see that it does not die. We are glad to see and to hear that the industry is not going to die, but we still believe that the industry as a whole owes something to those poor people whom you and I know would rear a pig or two in the backyard. It is unnecessary for me even at this point to stress the reliance they have had on these for the assistance of their children, and I feel that something can be done if the Minister says that the industry is no longer dying.

Mr. Speaker, we are glad to see that these people who loss their animals as a result of the

announcement that there was an outbreak of swine fever are to be compensated. I believe that efforts should be made wherever possible to encourage those people who have been keeping animals in the past to do so for more reasons than one, because part of what they were able to feed the animals with in past years, if they stop keeping them now, is still going to be available to them and they would have it to waste, and if for no other reason, they should be encouraged to carry on the keeping of these pigs which would provide them with something in the long run provided that the other necessary ingredients which would help to make the pork the type of meat one would really want it to be are given, because we believe the Minister will one day really and truly come to the point of the ham-processing industry he has long been mooting, and it is true that we will have to be gearing ourselves to the rearing of pigs and feeding them the particular type of diet to get the type of carcasses which are required for that type of industry. We would be glad to see that the people are encouraged by any step that the Government might take. I do not know if importing pigs from Canada is going to meet the requirements. I do not know how well the people will be able to get along with these. For one reason or other we seem to be tying ourselves to Canada, but I believe that during the course of the day we may get some sort of explanation as to what are the reasons why this has been so.

However, I am glad to see that compensation for the loss of pigs slaughtered and pork that has been found necessary to be dumped will be made available, and I would hope that the Minister really does something more than talking and making us promises that his Ministry is going to do this and that. We want to see them brought to fruition so as to get the whole industry in motion because it is an industry that is vital to the existence of our poor people in this country, and the sooner something is done the better for all of us. 1.15 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, in my opening remarks I mentioned that I did knock the wickets from behind the Shadow Minister for Agriculture with one ball. I spoke about pigs and piglets from birth up to 44 pounds but the hon. member could only talk about piglets from 44 pounds. He does not see that there is a ratio from two to three pounds up to

44 pounds. Whether a piglet is three pounds or

45 pounds farmers are getting the same price as for pigs at 44 pounds..

When you get a litter of pigs seldom does a piglet weigh 44 pounds, but from the date of birth onwards the farmer gets $25 with an increase of 20% or 30% after the 18th May.

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of elucidation. The Minister is so engrossed with what he has come here to say that he has not taken the time to understand my argument. I am saying that if you take 44 pounds and work out 25% on the 44 pounds - he should know agriculture better than me - if you realise that after May Day, after the price increase, it takes longer to raise a pig to 44 pounds, the pig keeper is still suffering.

There is no question of the pig being two weeks old. It is the whole method of working out compensation for the piglets in comparison with the price fixed by the Ministry of Trade.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, it would be humanly impossible for a person who went to a farm and saw pigs to weigh every one. You must arrive at an average price, the average date of birth and arrive, as I have said, at an average price to the farmer; and the method used is based on the most convenient method that can be used.

The hon. member says that pig farmers are losing $3,000 a month. I am yet to be satisfied that there is any pig farmer in this country who is losing $3,000 a month. It is all right for a pig farmer or any farmer to walk about and air off his mouth. Some of these Very farmers who are now walking about and talking, you cannot take their words and that is what makes some of them suffer.

Some of them went to the Ministry and they gave an undertaking to honour the agreement saying that we will keep our export market and then they went back and hoarded their onions instead of honouring their agreement. Those are the very farmers that the hon. member is talking about.

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of elucidation, I am not speaking about onions.

Mr. SPEAKER:

There is no point of elucidation.

Mr. BOLDEN:
The Minister is accusing me of defending farmers who are hoarding onions.

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

Mr. BOLDEN:
The Minister was talking about the hoarding of onions.

Mr. SPEAKER:
Let the Minister proceed.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:
I said that some of the very farmers who are walking about talking about how they are losing $3,000 a month are farmers whose words the Ministry cannot take because after coming into the Ministry and giving an undertaking that they would honour their agreement under the Carifta programme they did not honour that agreement.

The hon. member raised the question of soya bean and corn and said that he wanted to know what is happening with soya bean.

Mr. BOLDEN:
I would like to speak on a point of elucidation.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:
I am not giving way.

Mr. SPEAKER:
Let the Hon. Minister make his point first. He is not giving way.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

The hon. member said that in 1971 he came here and talked about the growing of corn. He is Shadow Minister of Agriculture. If he wants to speak the truth he would be in a position to say that we are.....

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, I am objecting to that. The Minister is imputing that I am lying. All that he has to do is to go and look for my speech and look for the Minister's reply.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let the Hon. Minister withdraw his remarks.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I will withdraw, but I have not accused the hon. member of speaking an untruth. I said that if he wants to speak the truth he could look around and see what is happening. I withdraw the remarks. If the hon. member is doing his job as Shadow Minister of Agriculture he will look around the country and see that not only in 1971, but before 1971 farmers were producing corn and they had a guaranteed price. Corn was dried at Mount Wilton by three corn driers supplied by the Ministry. They are now at Colleton. Farmers had been advised prior to 1971 about putting in corn.

What has been happening since 1971 was the spacing of corn. We have brought in corn planting machines so that the corn can be adequately spaced and we have been getting as high as 75 bushels an acre. At present we can produce corn in the country where there is proper spacing. In the past, corn was planted throughout the plantations between yams. You go through St. George Valley where they had thrown out land and they would put in corn. Yams was the principal crop in the preparation land and every six weeks apart they would put in corn.

That is not producing corn on any really productive scale. We have changed this situation, and we have advised farmers as to how corn should be planted and we have made planting equipment and material available and we have made corn driers available to the planters.

If the hon. member was doing his job he would see that farmers have been producing corn for the locally operated feed plant. What is happening is that we have not been producing enough and not

planting a large enough acreage because the farmers were not satisfied that the price offered to them was adequate. 1.25 p.m.

What I am saying now, Mr. Speaker, is that they have been instructed to grow corn all the year round.

Mr. BOLDEN:

That is the very point I was telling the Minister about. The Minister is misquoting me, probably, in order to get Press coverage. From 1971 I asked the Ministry to instruct the farmers to grow corn and soya bean all the year round. If the Minister has waited until now to instruct the farmers to grow corn all the year round, then he is late. He is merely trying to get Press coverage by misquoting me.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, I do not have to depend on Press coverage. Everybody knows that I know my job, and the hon. member knows that, too. He seems to be lacking in the knowledge that, before action is taken on the large-scale production of any commodity in agriculture, research work has to be carried out. He has not given consideration to the fact that the Ministry of Agriculture has had to carry out research work in the Ministry. We have two sets of research work going on we have research work done directly by the Research Officers of the Ministry and the A.D.C. The hon. member has criticised the action of the A.D.C., but he is ignorant of the fact that the A.D.C. carries out the activities of the Research Programme of the Ministry of Agriculture. As far as any conflict between the Ministry of Agriculture and the A.D.C. is concerned, this is the farthest thing I have heard from the truth for a very long while. As a matter of fact, I do not think there could be closer collaboration. There has never been closer collaboration between A.D.C. and the Ministry of Agriculture than there is now.

As far as soya bean is concerned, when the hon. member raised the point I told him - I did not have to refer to anybody to answer any question - that the soya, bean on which research work was done was edible soya bean for human consumption, and that we were then doing our first Research Programme on soya bean for animal consumption. We are not yet satisfied that it can be produced commercially. It may, perhaps, prove more expensive than other grain. We know that we can produce corn at competitive prices with the imported corn, and that is why we are going ahead with the growing of corn.

The hon. member spoke about poultry farmers, but I do not see how poultry got into this debate. I will push that aside and point out that, when the Swine Fever broke out, there was provision in the Act and I made an Order. If there is another outbreak of Newcastle Disease, I give the hon. member the assurance that, if I am in the Ministry, I will make the appropriate Order. There was no Order before the outbreak of Swine Fever.

Mr. BOLDEN:
On a point of order. The hon. Minister is wrong, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER:
The hon. member is quite out of order.

Mr. BOLDEN:
Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister should not be allowed to midlead the House.

Mr. SPEAKER:
He is not misleading the House. Please take your seat!

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:
Mr. Speaker, if I had said that the hon. member was misleading the House, he would have asked me to withdraw my statement. I would not ask him to withdraw that statement, because he knows that his statement is far from being true. The hon. member says that he cannot get information from the Ministry of Agriculture. This is the first time that I have ever heard, during the past year, anybody making a statement to the effect that he cannot get information from the Ministry of Agriculture. I have had no complaints. The farmers have been satisfied that they have the co-operation of the Ministry of Agriculture, and it-is strikingly strange that, after I had issued instructions to give the hon. member information, he is now saying that he could not get any information from the Ministry of Agriculture. I think the fact of the matter is that he has not sought information from the Ministry of Agriculture. I am of the opinion that, if he had sought information from the Ministry of Agriculture, he would have received it.

The hon. member also spoke about the importation of animals from Canada to replace the animals destroyed and about quarantine facilities. When we import cows, pigs and so on, we provide quarantine facilities for one month for the animals. (Asides.) We do not have quarantine facilities for imported dogs. We do not import pigs from anywhere that it is suspected that pig diseases can be found. I should like to let the hon. member know that the revival of interest in the pig industry will generate amongst the young people. We have 36 4-H Clubs with a membership of over 2,000. We propose that everyone of those 4-Hers must be interested in some form of agriculture, and we have begun a policy of passing on pigs and sheep for breeding purposes to the 4-Hers.

This time we are going further, Mr. Speaker, and carrying out a programme of training for our Agricultural Extension Officers in Animal Health and Animal Nutrition. These Extension Officers will be advising the 4-Hers and people throughout the country how they should keep these pigs and other animals at as low a cost as possible. These Extension Officers will be specially trained, and a diploma will be given to them in Animal Health and Animal Nutrition. We propose to start this programme as soon as next month.

The hon. member would be enlightened to know that we propose to embark on a new agrarian policy which would involve the small farmer who, today, is working on plantations on some of the Crown lands. 1.35 p.m.

In this event a man would have so much land for poultry, so much for pigs, so much for the sugar industry if he wants to remain in it, and also land for cooperatives because I feel very strongly that the land owned by the Agricultural Development Corporation is put to the wrong use. A.D.C. is not performing the function for which is was established and it should be there to guide the small farmer especially. This is how we feel about it. I want just to clarify one other point made by the hon. member where he talked about A.D.C. doing all the work. The research work is done by the Ministry of Agriculture. There are only two qualified technicians in A.D.C., and these are the General Manager and the Extensions man, Mr. Garvey, so how is it fair for the hon. member to say that all the work in the country is done by the A.D.C.? What happens is that A.D.C. does the applied research work of the Ministry, but the qualified professional officers are the slaves in the Ministry of Agriculture doing the work. After they have done their research work they pass it on to A.D.C. advising to put in ten acres of this and so on. (A VOICE: Slaves?) When I use that term, I mean they work very hard in the Ministry of Agriculture doing research work. I am satisfied that the hon. member is enlightened and has learned something from this reply.

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

THE TREASURY BILLS (LOCAL)(AMENDMENT) ACT, 1973

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the next Item stands in the name of the Prime Minister and is to move the second

reading of a Bill to amend the Treasury Bills (Local) Act, 1922.

I am asking for leave to take this item in the absence of the Hon. Prime Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER:
If there is no objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Speaker, this is a straight forward matter. As the Objects and Reasons set out, the Bill would amend the Treasury Bills (Local) Act, 1922, by substituting for the words "Financial Secretary" wherever they appear therein the words "Permanent Secretary, Finance",

Hon. members will remember that quite recently there was a reorganisation of the Ministry of Finance by Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No.4) Order, 1973, which replaced the post of Financial Secretary and Deputy Financial Secretary by those of Director of Finance and Planning and Permanent Secretary, Finance, respectively.

The Minister of Finance and Planning considers it appropriate that the Permanent Secretary, Finance, should undertake the duties formerly delegated to the Financial Secretary. That is all there is to it. I do not think there will be any objection to this.

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

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

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

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. LOWE in the Chair:

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, 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. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

THE SAVINGS BANK (AMENDMENT)(No.2) Act, 1973

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Speaker, the next Item No. 4; stands in the name of the Prime Minister, and is a Bill to amend the Savings Bank Act, 1914.

I am asking leave to take this Item in the absence of the Prime Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER:
If there is no objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

As the Objects and Reasons set out, this Bill would amend the Savings Bank Act, 1914, to provide inter alia for an increase of the staff of the Bank and the emoluments payable thereto.

This is bringing in line the emoluments which have just been made in the revision of the salaries which have taken place in the entire Government Service and in this House to the staff of the Government Savings Bank to bring them in line with what has taken place in other sectors of the service. I do not think I need to elaborate on that. Wherever the words "Financial Secretary" occur, these will he changed to "Permanent Secretary, Finance",

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

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Hon. C E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. LOWE in the Chair. 1.45 p.m

Clauses 1 to 5 inclusive of the Bill were called and passed

The Schedule was called and passed. '

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA. seconded by Hon. A. DaC:

EDWARDS, Mr CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill irf Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Choir and reported accordingly.

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

THE AIRPORTS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1973

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the next Item that the Government proposes to deal with is Item No. 5 standing in the name of the Hon. Prime Minister and Minister, of Finance. It is a Bill to amend the Airports Act, 1970, I ask leave to deal with it in the absence of the Prime Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER:

There being no objection, leave is granted.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

This is a simple amendment. The Bill seeks to amend the Airports Act of 1970 in order to extend to the authorised officer as defined by the Act, in respect of breaches of the Act or the regulations, all the powers of arrest conferred on a member of the police force under section 21 of the Police Act, 1961.

The Bill, Sir, as I have said, seeks to extend to the authorised officer and his agents, the security guards, the power to arrest at Seawell International Airport. At present the Airport is experiencing great difficulty in obtaining the desirable measure of control at the Airport, especially in the regulating of both private vehicles and taxis.

This problem has now been intensified because the Royal Barbados Police Force has not always been able to have extra personnel available to attend to such duties. That matter is being investigated. In order that the authority of the Airport Manager be strengthened, the Bill seeks to empower him to arrest anyone who contravenes or fails to comply with any regulations made under section 4(1) of the Airports Act, 1970-16.

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

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

Mr. HINDS:
Mr. Speaker, I believe that all of us appreciate the difficulty which the Airport Manager or anyone charged with similar responsibilities might encounter in discharging his duties at the Airport; but I believe that a lot could be gained if there was at any time an opportunity for an interchange of ideas between Airport Managers in the area. I believe that a lot could be gained which would assist, let us say, our own Airport Manager to deal with some of his problems as they crop up from time to time.

I went to the Airport in Jamaica recently and I learned that the Manager at the Airport there had been Airport Manager for over 30 years, and there had never been any communication between himself at any level and the Airport Manager of Barbados or of any of the Airports in the region. Immediately as I learned that, the thought came to me that there is a lack of communication and coordination at some point, and the time must arrive when all of these Managers who are charged with the same sort of responsibility at one level or the other, depending on the size of the Airport, should exchange their ideas.

An Airport Manager with 30 years experience must have something that he can pass on to others that will assist them as they go along in the course of their duties. I believe if what I say now is acted on something could be done whereby our Airport Manager could gain from the experience of others, and some of the problems that he is encountering now he may be able to solve and learn from time to time from other Airport Managers because they have overcome similar problems.

Despite the fact that there are regulations on the Statute Book, there may never have been an opportunity to actually apply them. I would urge on the authorities to give some consideration to the fact that all of the Airport Managers in the area could be brought together at some time in the not too distant future to exchange ideas and to see whether one can assist the other at some point in the exercise of their functions in so important a matter as airport management.

Mr. BOLDEN:
Mr. Speaker, this gives me an opportunity to say something that I have just learned at the Airport. Apparently, they had been taking on some Customs officers quite recently, and there is a general

complaint that most of the new officers who are appointed have no idea whatever of what they have to do. I believe that it is time that some sort of training be given to these officers when they place their applications at the Airport or at the seaports because they need to be very vigilant nowadays.

I was at Seawell about four weeks ago when I had cause to leave the country. An officer was sitting at the door, but any Tom, Dick or Harry was passing through. I have raised this question here before that as long as you have a certain complexion it looks as if you can walk all over Seawell Airport and nobody stops you. This is something that I am very worried about.

I would also like to take this opportunity to dilate on the statement just made by me. The question as I see it is that certain people seem to be quite willing to allow any Tom, Dick or Harry who says that he is a visitor to walk through the Airport without even searching his bags; but the same people would hope and wish that every Barbadian who appears at the Airport whether going in or coming out should be searched from head to toe.

The Government has got to come to some decision about this, as to whether the health of the nation means more than the tourists who pass through Seawell Airport, and whether they are entitled to pass through with their bags intact. I saw this at Seawell the night I came back in. A lady said "I departed from New York with my bag in my hand, and you are not in a position to search it."

I hope that the Government will take the opportunity to train this personnel who work at Seawell and the Bridgetown Port in the carrying out of their duties. 1.55 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, this is the most that I will have to say on this Act. I hope Government will take quick action in this matter, and let all passengers know that when they land at Seawell or elsewhere their bags are entitled to be searched whether they are Barbadians or they come from Timbuktu. With regard to those organisations who talk about allowing people to walk through quickly, I want to say that I went to Puerto Rico a Sunday night at ten o'clock and it took me 11/2 hours to get through the Customs. The bags of all passengers were searched. There was a big sign to the effect that, in order to keep drugs out of the country, passengers are asked to abide with the Rules and Regulations and to co-operate with the Customs Officers. I want to know how all of a sudden Barbados must be a free Port for dope.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to see these Officers trained, and I do not want to see them making any unnecessary arrest. I do not believe half of them know how to make a proper arrest. I want them to be

trained, because I do not want them to cause the people of Barbados any embarrassment. If they are right, they are right, but if they are wrong they are going to cause embarrassment, and I should like to see the Government put some sort of training into operation.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Speaker, sometimes, it is necessary to increase the powers which are given to officers who keep the peace and exercise certain regulatory functions so that they are in a position to enforce legislation that may be vitally necessary for security and other reasons. I believe that the propose amendment to the Airports Act is of very far-reaching significance in that it gives to Security Guards and other officers powers to arrest that, in my view, a Parliament should not lightly grant over the average citizen. I am not arguing in this case that it may not be necessary to grant these powers, but I am perturbed at the fact that whereas the regular Special Constable and the Police Constable are trained in their duties, particularly in their duties of arrest, there is, as the hon. member for St. Joseph has said, no provision for similar training of Officers who are attached to the Airport and Seaport. Within recent months I think this year, it is well known that there was a transfer of Customs Officers and Security Guards from the Airport. This occurred, I understand, after one such officer was rude to the Prime Minister.

Now, it is unfortunate that it should only have occurred then, because by and large I would like to say that the officers at the Airport do exercise their discretion properly and do show some consideration in dealing with very difficult circumstances. But it has been well known that some of them either through over-enthusiasm or lack of proper training, have not always acted in the same manner. I am not one for making complaints about myself, but I have personal experience of this occurring. I have seen other citizens, both Barbadians and visitors to our shores, in embarrassing situations because of this over-enthusiasm or misuse of power, and I am therefore counselling the Government very seriously that, wherever it is giving the power of arrest to persons, it should make sure that they know the law; they know when to exercise the ultimate power, and that they know when to use their discretion.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Standing Orders not having been suspended, two o'clock is the breaking point.

MOTION OF PRIVILEGE RE REPORT IN THE ADVOCATE

Before the sitting of the House is suspended until 2.45 p.m , I would crave the indulgence of the House to advert to the question of privilege which was raise before the commencement of Government Business. The Motion was moved by the Leader of the Opposition and duly seconded in terms of

Standing Order 76(3). This is the first time that the question of privilege has engaged my attention and the attention of the Clerks at the Table since these Standing Orders were revised. What weighed very heavily in our minds was the use of the word "motion" in Standing Order 76, and it was then our opinion that a motion should be given the same way as it was given normally in other sections of the Standing Orders of this Chamber; hence, that being so, a break was allowed and a division was taken on the matter.

Now, hon. members have entrusted me with being the custodian of the privileges of this House and the privileges of all hon. members. In the light of mature consideration with the Clerks at the Table, I should like to give some guidance to hon. members when, in future, questions of privilege arise before this Honourable Chamber. According to Standing Order 76(2):

"Any Member desiring to raise a matter under this Standing Order, shall first obtain leave of the Speaker..." and it goes on.

For the guidance of hon. members, I should like to obtain some reasonable prior information of the matter which it is sought to raise as a question of privilege before this House. Not notice, or not leave by way of notice in the sense in which it is given in dealing with sections and questions when in that section three days' notice must be given specifically of the question which the hon. member is seeking to raise. I do not adhere to any such hard-and-fast rule by a member seeking to raise a matter of privilege, but I would appreciate from Members of the House some prior intimation of the matter which an hon. member is seeking to raise.

Standing Order 76(4) is very much on all fours with Standing Order 42(4) of this Honourable Chamber. Standing Order 76(4) states:

"There shall be no debate on a motion under paragraph 3 hereof, but if the Speaker decides that a prima facie case has been made out, he shall rule accordingly and refer the matter to the Committee of Privileges."

Now, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition says that this matter was raised last Tuesday and, after consulting with the Clerks at the Table, I have decided that a prima facie case has been made out. The Words of that Standing Order are identical with a priori because it touches a matter of the privileges of this Chamber, and it must apply in this case with no less force than it applies in the case of Standing

Order 42(4). the motion on the matter raised under Standing Order 76 must go as a matter of privilege. It mandatory to the Committee of Privileges, 2.05 p.m.

I am fully satisfied myself that a prima facie case is made out and in saying so I now recommit this matter to the further consideration of the House, and I do so with deel consideration, and in my duty as Speaker recommit this matter brought by the Leader of the Opposition and the matter raised stands and refers to the Committee of Privileges.

In due course hon. members will be appraised of the deliberations of the Committee of Privileges.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER:
This sitting now stands suspended until 2.45 p.m.

On Resumption:

QUESTION TIME Question Time was called.

Mr. SPEAKER:
There are no questions for Oral Reply.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER:
It is now Private Members' Business time.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, it seems that a convention is developing by which the Leader of the Opposition of course in consultation with Private Members of the House has control of the order of Private Members' Business. It also seems that this convention only applies when Oppposition Resolutions are on the Order Paper. The situation is that I would like to deal with two Bills one of which stands in the name of the hon. member for Bridgetown who is not here; and I would also wish to deal with Order No. 1. Now I do not know what we can do with Order No. 2 today, but I anticipate that the House having given the matter a second reading that it would be short. I would like to get that out of the way and then proceed to No. 1. I throw this out for consideration of hon. members.

The order of priority under the Rules is that a motion of No Confidence is given a general priority. If Order No. 2 is going to be short, I would like to deal with that first. I would have to hear from the Leader of the House what is Government's attitude at this stage. As I conceive it, we are in Private Members' Business time and we can go down 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, because I am not going to subject myself to the humiliation of being told that I am interrupting the order of business and then having some person from the other side voting against the order that I select.

Mr. SPEAKER:

As I understand the prerogative and the privilege of members, members in whose names matters stand in Private Members' Business can raise them as they think fit. That is your privilege.

Mr. ADAMS:

The first two matters are in my name.

THE MINORS ACT, 1972

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, dealing with Order No. 2 which I propose to deal with first, this is to resume consideration of a Bill to amend the law relating to the age of majority to persons who have not attained the age and to the time when a particular age is attained, and for connected purposes. This is a Bill of which I gave notice over a year ago to reduce the age of majority in Barbados from 21 to eighteen and to amend certain Acts consequentially. A Select Committee was appointed. It was impossible to get a

sufficient number of members of the Committee to meet and under Standing Order No. 62(6) the Bill was committed to a Committee of the whole House and I do now move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

Mr. FORDE:
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. LOWE in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called.

Mr. ADAMS:
Mr. Chairman, Clause 1 of the Bill reads

"This Act may be cited as the Minors Act, 1972, and shall be read as one with the Infants Act, 1958, as hereinafter amended."

Modern nomenclature revolts to calling persons of the ages of 20, 19, 18 or 17 as it will be as infants, which is the old English expression. As recently as 1958 the Infants Act was passed and the present Clause 1 of the Bill is to change the "infant" in law and use the word "minor" for a person who has not attained full age.

I beg to move that Clause 1 stand part.

Mr. FORDE:
I beg to second that. 3.00 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, this Bill of which notice was given on the 1st August, 1972, should be read together with the Infants Act, 1958 as hereafter amended. Now this matter, Sir, this Bill which was introduced by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was, as I have said, given notice of on the 1st August 1973. The Bill was read a first time on the same day and was then sent to a Select Committee. I see from die Order Paper that on the 19th June, 1973 the Bill was committed to a Committee of the whole House. We had a Select Committee which did not meet and report.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, the Leader of the House cannot question the fact that the Bill was in Select Committee. The rules say so.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, this is a matter which is being considered by the Government, at this time. As far as we are concerned we cannot support the passing of this Bill at this stage because the age of majority is 21 years all over the world and not 18 years which we see.....

Mr. ADAMS:

The hon. member is reflecting on a vote of the House. The House has given this Bill its second reading and there is legislation in force that the age of majority should be reduced. He is therefore reflecting on two votes of the House and I am saying that he is out of order. It is not true that the age of majority is 21 years all over the world.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman. I beg to move that consideration of this Bill be postponed.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that. If hon. members want to speak on that, let them speak on that. We move that further consideration be postponed and no one can tell us that we cannot do that.

Mr. ADAMS:

I am on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
Will the Hon. Minister take his seat.

Mr. ADAMS:
There is no Bill before the House. It has been given its second reading

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:
Hon. members on the other side.....(Asides). I know what I am saying and no one is going to put words in my mouth. The hon. member moved that Clause 1 stand part of the Bill. We on this side know that Clause 1 is now in the Bill and we are moving that further consideration be postponed.

In dealing with Clause 1, Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with Clause 1 of a Bill. A Bill comprises Clauses. This is a Bill. You cannot get Objects and Reasons or a Clause apart from a Bill. When the hon. member moved that Clause 1 stand part, Clause 1 is part of the Bill; so it is only nonsense for anyone to get up and say that we cannot move that further consideration be postponed because there is no Bill, If there is no Bill, how can there be a Clause? I would think better of a man who says that he is a lawyer. (Asides) We are moving that further consideration be postponed. I am submitting that although I am not a lawyer.

Mr. BOLDEN:
The Hon. Minister cannot submit that because he is wrong.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:
A Clause is part of the Bill. Take out all of these Clauses and you do not have any Bill. If you are not discussing a Bill, what are we doing here today? I beg to second the motion moved by the Hon. Leader of the House.

Mr. BOLDEN:
Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister seems to have gone off his regular course today. If it has been moved that Clause 1 stand part there cannot be two motions before the House. You have to dispose of one first. There cannot be two motions at one time.

The Government must admit to the public that they do not know what is going on and now that the Opposition is trying to bring Barbados in line with all progressive countries they are going to get up and say that further consideration should be postponed. They are not doing their work, the Opposition is doing it for them and they do not want that to be shown up. Clause 1 has got to be called.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I would like to draw your attention to Standing Order 49(5), and that is the only way I see it. The Order says "A clause may be postponed unless upon an amendment thereto a question has been fully put from the Chair."

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Chairman,.....

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, what has the Hon. Minister risen on?

Hon. A, DaC. EDWARDS:

What are you rising on?

Mr. BOLDEN:

To ask what you have risen on.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Chairman.....

Mr. BOLDEN:

What is the Hon. Minister rising on? I would like to know.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

All hon. members will sit. I am prepared to hear the point that the Hon. Minister has risen on.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:
Mr. Chairman, I accept your ruling and I would like to amend my motion.

Mr. BOLDEN:
On a point of order. The hon. member made no motion concerning this Bill.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
I have already said that that is completely out of order. 3.10 p.m.

Mr. HINDS:
On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I would like to draw to Your Honour's attention to Standing Order 49(5) which was read from the Chair just now

"A clause may be postponed unless upon an amendment thereto a question has been fully put from the Chair."

I want to submit that the clause has not been properly printed. I am submitting that the Rule has not been properly printed. What is missing therefrom is the word "not". It should read "A clause should not be postponed...." This thing is improperly drafted.

Mr. CHAIRMAN; I want the hon. member to understand that I am not prepared to be the judge of the House. These Standing Orders were passed by the House. You have a Standing Orders Committee, and you must; move a Motion that these Standing Orders be referred to the Standing Orders Committee to be amended. I have no power to insert or take out words.

Mr. HINDS:
Mr. Chairman, you now stand in the position of a judge.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
I have already ruled.

Mr. HINDS:
You have not yet ruled, Sir. You have not even heard what I have to say. You are in a position to insert a word that was inadvertently omitted. That is the position of a judge. I am not trying to mislead the Committee. This Rule 5 should be read and reread. I am sure that the word "not" is really missing. You are in a position, Mr. Chairman, if it has been drawn to your attention and it will make sense of the whole exercise that we are dealing with this evening, to authorise the insertion of the word "not".

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
I am of a different opinion from the hon. member.

Mr. ADAMS:
Mr. Chairman, dealing with the same point, if you looked carefully at it you will see that a three letter word is missing. The word "not" should have been there, but it was omitted in the setting up of the type. The amount of space would seem to indicate that. You can call on the Clerk for the original draft as passed by the House. We are entitled to look at the original draft as passed by the House. The copy before us is only for our guidance. We are entitled to look at the original Standing Order, signed by the Speaker, to see if the word "not" is there.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
I am not prepared to rule that the word "not" be inserted. If the word "not" is to be inserted it must be inserted by the whole House and not by the Committee because the House passed the Standing Orders.

The Original Standing Orders which have been passed are those which I have in my hands.

Mr. ADAMS:
With great respect, Mr. Chairman, I must point out that Mr. Speaker did not sign this copy. He must have signed the copy which will be found in the Library or somewhere. That is the copy to which I am referring.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
That is the reason why I said that I was not.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Your Honour could not be more correct. You cannot now, sitting in your Chair, amend these Standing Orders unless the matter is referred to the Standing Orders Committee which deals with these matters. In order to rectify what is, apparently, doubtful to most of us, I beg to move that Clause 1 be postponed.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:
Mr. Chairman, I beg to second that. That is exactly what I was trying to do when I got up to speak earlier.

Mr. ADAMS:
Mr. Chairman, Your Honour will have to rule on the motion, and I am submitting that the Rule should read "A clause may not be postponed...." If you accept a proper copy of the Standing Orders, which Mr. Speaker has signed, you will find that the word "not" is in there. It is not a question of an amendment to the rules. It is a matter of English; you do not use the word "unless" without the previous word "not". It should read "A clause may not be postponed unless upon....." It is true that the

Leader of the House is an Attorney at Law but it is very long since he has practised and he will know that, without reference to Parliament, Judges have added words, taken away words and added new lines, Sir, in Acts of Parliament which they realised had been printed and a line had been inadvertently left out. I appeared in a Court many years ago in which a Judge in the Supreme Court added a whole line, which he believed had been left out by the Government Printer. It is not something unsual. You will not have to send it back to Parliament, the Judicial Advisory Committee, or anybody else. This is an ordinary function of a person whose duty it is to interpret Rules, Statutes and Orders as well as other written documents. I am submitting that to you, Sir, and I am going to speak on the motion. I am submitting that the motion is out of order, but, should Your Honour rule that it is in order, I am going to speak on it.

The evident wish of the Government to postpone this Clause is their wish not to discuss the giving of 18, 19 and 20 - year old Barbadians the full right of adulthood. It is quite obvious that the Government have known of this since December, 1971. Members on their side have supported a Resolution calling for the age of majority to be reduced to 18. It is quite obvious that, although I have introduced this Bill

over a year ago, the Government care so little about the young people of this country that they have not given the necessary consideration to the situation in order to deal with it today.

I have no doubt that when this Bill is finally passed the Government Information Service will put out a Release emphasising the speeches of members on the other side of the House, but it will not emphasise the fact that the Government had this matter for two years and that they are not yet ready to deal with the Bill. Dealing with this Clause in particular, this Clause does not say anything about the age of 18. In introducing this Clause I indicated that the nomenclature "infant" is no longer considered suitable for use in the case of a 20-year old married woman. It is no longer considered suitable in Parliamentary language or in public life. The word "minor" is the accepted term in the English language for describing persons of those ages. This is what this Clause deals with. If, as the Leader of the House is suggesting quite mistakenly, there is still an issue as to whether 18 or 21 should be the age, then the Leader of the House can deal with that later on in the Bill. 3.20 p.m.

All modern legislation in all Commonwealth countries with which I am familiar, and I imagine the hon. member for Christ Church West who is very familiar with drafting problems and the work of Parliamentary Counsel will confirm this, speak today of minors and not of infants. It may seem to the Government that there are certain matters they may wish to postpone.

The former Attorney General now Minister of Communications and Works did indicate in a speech earlier in here that he had seen similar Jamaican legislation and the Schedule to the Jamaican legislation which gives a list of Acts to be amended was very much fuller than this Schedule. That is a point that deserves consideration; that is a point that deserves notice, not necessarily by us in here, but by Parliamentary Counsel. I have done my best. I drafted this Bill myself. I have gone through the laws of Barbados and endeavoured to find all those which needed amendment because I have put a general power in the Bill, but there are also special amendments. It may be that since I am not a full time Parliamentary draughtsman I cannot spend two weeks or a month dealing with anything else but reading over the laws of Barbados in connection with this. There are people paid at Government Headquarters to do this. I am not paid to do it, but I would be prepared when the time is reached for dealing with the Schedule to support a postponement of further consideration of the Schedule. I am saying what somebody who had had constitutional responsibility for law reform has said. If he has said he has seen another Bill and that the Acts mentioned in the other Bill are more extensive than these and these should be more extensive, proper weight should be given to his opinion.

Mr. Chairman, this Bill has already been to the Parliamentary draughtsmen. Perhaps I should mention something else. This very clause has been to the Parliamentary draughtsman and after some argument with him the clause was left as it was at the initial drafting stage with the Chief Parliamentary Counsel. I recall over a year ago that I spoke to the Clerk of the House about this initial clause and suggested

certain alterations. I am not sure that all the alterations are not embraced in it. It is coming back to me now because I think the Parliamentary draughtsman questioned whether it was necessary to change the title of the Infants Act, 1958, and he questioned some of the drafting and sent down another draft. I recall it quite clearly. It was so long ago that it did not come back to me at first because I was looking at the general principle and not at the narrow clause. I am suggesting to hon. members to consider their responsibility. They have already given a second reading to this Bill. I do not know if they are aware of this, but no other Bill dealing with the age of majority can be introduced in the House once a second reading has been given or refused to a Bill. You cannot deal with it again in the same session. You cannot vote against the Bill now and expect any other result but that the age of majority will remain 21 for the rest of this session. You have to have some sense of responsibility for dealing with matters of this sort.

The Bill is drafted in accordance with the proper drafting principles. This section reproduces similar sections in other Bills in Britain and in other countries where the age of majority has been reduced, and I would urge on hon. members to look carefully at the Bill. They have enough time to look at the Bill to see if there is anything offensive in it. The Cabinet had a year and a half to consider the principle of this Bill and could have given their approval of the principle. Look carefully at it and see if there is anything wrong. I believe that when hon. members have gone through this exercise they may be convinced that all that could hold up this Bill was to have a Report, and bear in mind that Parliamentary Counsel has already seen it and made no suggestions other than to this very clause. They will perhaps see that the Schedule is the only thing that could reasonably be postponed and perhaps not even that.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to be long speaking on the motion for postponement, but I should like to say as I said two meetings ago in this House that we are again witnessing Government's indecision as to whether it wants substantive debate on matters of Private Members' Business. If the Government is serious that it wants to have substantive motions being brought in here and dealt with, then it must adopt a different attitude on these matters. This is the third item that I have known of some substance that has come before this House in which the attitude of the Government is either to vote against the order of Private Members' Business, or to say they are not accepting something of substance because it has political implications, or to find themselves in a position that they have not had time despite the motion having come before this House for a long time ago in order to get business done. I would have expected that a Democratic Labour Party that calls itself in the forefront of advancement of young people would not only have welcomed a measure such as this, but would have gone out of the way to make its legal draughtsman available to a Private Member, and itself have brought down an amendment which can only be passed with the eighteen that they have over there to the Constitution of Barbados to make it possible for eighteen year olds to sit; as members of the Senate and as members of the House of Assembly.

Now the hon. member could not have put that in his Bill for the simple reason that it requires a

constitutional amendment for which the Government has eighteen that they can change the Constitution, or what would have been in better taste, they would have brought a joint Resolution to this House. What I am saying is that there are many items of Private Members' Business on which the hard line of which I spoke before is unnecessarily taken. Do not tell me that after this matter has been bogged down in Select Committee, the Select Committee has failed to meet, it was recommitted to a Committee of the full House because the Select Committee was not meeting, even today the Government is saying they are still considering the matter. It is because the Select Committee had not met for three calendar months that this matter came back before a Committee of the full House, and today we are being asked for a further postponement. I am not looking at this from any point of view of political expediency or wanting to get credit for speeches, but I believe seriously that the Government is adopting a wrong attitude on matters of this nature and that they are allowing short term political considerations or stark inefficiency from advancing in proper ways that they can help the country. I do not accept for one moment that the matter has gone before the legal draughtsmen, and I do not accept for a minute that it has gone before Cabinet. The hon. member knows he has had a Committee meeting on child legislation that has been bogged down in the Ministry for years for want of legislation to come forth, and do not tell me you are going to wait until the last moment when some hon. member takes his time on a matter that should not be controversial to ask for a further postponement. How much time does the Government want? This shows up the stark weakness of this House in that in my view this House has no legal draughtsman attached to it to give proper consideration to a Private Member.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe it is the Clerk's function or that the Clerk should be called on to be a legal draughtsman, but we find there is difficulty coming from the Standing Orders Committee where there may be words omitted and where in Parliament we have no legal counsel outside of the Clerks whose duties and functions are to guide the House in drafting amendments to clauses as we go on from time to time. Are we really serious? Are we really about the people's business? If the Government wants the country to be run this way we will continue to run it this way, but there are a lot of people who are becoming frustrated. It is a waste of time to come into Parliament every afternoon and every time we get to Private Members' Business you are going -to ask for a postponement. The Government does not want this clause, and if we are going to talk and talk interminately in order to talk out Private Members' time we could as well stop the House.

I believe that the Leader of the House should try to arrange with the Leader of the Opposition for a few days to clear the Order Paper under Private Members' Business so that at least regardless of whether they have substance or no substance we can understand the Government's attitude in voting on a matter rather than this piecemeal approach being adopted, otherwise we can only come in here to debate a matter which the Government wants debated. 3.30 p.m

Now, an hour and three quarters for Private Member's Business is not satisfactory. When they are going to bring up motions to meet with their continual postponements it is frustrating. As a young member of this House I am beginning to feel very fed up and very frustrated with this attitude. I think it

is very unsatisfactory that the Hon. Minister should be taking an unnecessarily hard line on matters that could have gone through smoothly and satisfactorily.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, this makes 14 occasions which show in no uncertain manner that the Government is unaware of what its responsibilities are to this country. It shows that the Government has run out of ideas, and as soon as the Opposition comes out with an idea the answer is that the Cabinet is looking at it and so the Opposition should not do it.

You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that when an amendment to the Affiliation Act was brought in by the member for the City of Bridgetown in which he sought to increase the miserly $5.00 for bastard children in this country.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Chairman, I submit that what the hon. member is saying is irrelevant to this debate. We are dealing with consideration of a Clause of a Bill to amend the law relating to the age of majority.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I will ask the Hon. Minister not to anticipate me. I being Chairman, will deal with all that.

Mr. BOLDEN:

I am dealing with the Government's motion to postpone a particular clause of a Bill which was brought here by the Opposition. If the Hon. Minister finds it too hard to swallow, let him go outside or call for a glass of water and swallow it. This is another occasion when we of the Opposition sought to relieve the burden on the Government - when the Government came to the House to raise everybody's salary.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Now you will get back to the Bill because I am not going to allow that kind of roundabout way of getting around the Clause and dealing with other matters.

Mr. BOLDEN:

I am dealing with the motion to postpone the Clause. The Government came in three weeks ago with a Bill with 315 pages. We asked them for a postponement for one week to consider its implications and the Government was not prepared to give that; but today the Opposition comes with a vital amendment which puts young people of this country in a forward position and brings Barbados in line with other Caribbean countries and the Government is asking at this stage for a further postponement.

But, Mr. Chairman, that is not all. When we brought in an amendment to the Married Women's Act to give legal childern more than $5.06 they voted against it. This is another instance of the Government using its numbers. As I said before, if the Government wants a dictatorship, if they want a one Party State.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. (Mr. BOLDEN Let me hear what rule I am breaking.) He said that the Government voted against increasing the amount from $5.00 to $10.00.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister is misquoting me. I said that the Government voted against a Bill that was brought in to amend an Act.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I am on a point of order, because, the Government did not vote against it. It is still being considered.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Chairman, there is no Bill to amend any Married Women's Act on the Order Paper.

Mr. BOLDEN:

The hon. member for the City of Bridgetown brought in two amendments to the Act. The Government voted for one and voted against the next one. How inconsistent can you be?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order,.....

Mr. BOLDEN:
What rule have I broken now?

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
Please take your seat.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
As far as the Affiliation Proceedings Act is concerned.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
That is not before the House.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
I just want to clarify the situation.

Mr. BOLDEN rose.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Sit down.

Mr. BOLDEN:
How do you mean sit down? You are not the Chairman in here.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
Both members will sit.

Mr. BOLDEN:

May I continue my speech? Senility comes at a certain age and some people seem to be endowed with a lot of it. They cannot even remember what they did. Every time that the Opposition comes in with a constructive idea the Government is willing to postpone it because they are looking for ideas now. The only way they can say that they did something is to say that the Cabinet is doing something about that.

If you look back you will see that this Bill went before a Select Committee. They refused to come out and meet, and under the rules it was referred to a Committee of the whole House.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I happened to be a member of the Select Committee on the Affiliation Proceedings Act. We met on several occasions.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I cannot deal with the Affiliation Proceedings Act. (Hon. A DaC. EDWARDS Why let them speak on it?) You cannot ask the Chair that. The hon. member was not speaking on the Affiliation Proceedings Act. 3.40 p.m.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Your Honour's ruling is entirely correct. The Leader of the House said that there was a Committee and it met. That Committee never met, and that statement cannot be allowed to go unchallenged.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, that Committee met...

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

On what are you speaking?

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, it is a typical example that the Government do not know what is going on.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Not only did the Committee meet, but a member of the Welfare Department was on it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Are you speaking on the Order relative to Clause 1?

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, I am still speaking, and he cannot get up in the middle of my speech. The operator turned off my microphone, and turned on the Minister's microphone. The Government will have to settle down and decide what they want of the Opposition. Are we only to come in here to make up a number so that the Government can then go outside and say that we did not divide the House on certain questions? Let us know the true position. On every Resolution and on every question asked, the Government want time to reply. They give us rude answers and so on. On Tuesday last when we were dealing with the Animal Diseases and Importation Act, we were invited by the Minister of Agriculture to ask questions. When we asked certain questions the Minister told us that he had not yet been advised to do certain things. Have the Opposition a role to play in Parliament any longer? I have constantly said that the Government must say whether they want a One Party state or a Dictorship. They do not know what is going on. I do not know why they do not send home the Leader of the House to take a rest.

The question that Clause 1 be postpone was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:-

AYES:

Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFQRD; Hon. R. St.C. WEEKES; Mr. SPRINGER; Mrs. EASTMOND; Mr. HOPPIN and Mr. MORRISON - 10.

NOES:

Mr. ADAMS; Mr. CRAIG; Mr. HINDS; Mr. BOLDEN and Mr. FORDE - 5.

Clause 2 was celled.

Mr. ADAMS:
Mr. Chairman, Clause 2 reads

"A person who is not of full age may be described as a minor instead of as an infant, and accordingly in this Act and in the Infants Act, 1958 "minor" means such a person as aforesaid."

I think the Clerk can now confirm that the Parliamentary Draftsmen have had a look at these particular Clauses and that they follow the normal language in modern legislation. Dealing with the same principle to which I referred when speaking on Clause 1, I would have thought that those who have the interest of the young at heart would have found this Clause acceptable. I would have thought that those who were capable of comprehending and drafting a Bill of 350 pages of small type in one day would, in 18 months, have been able to draft and comprehend what is meant by this Section. If the hon. member for St. Andrew refuses to be led by the hon. member for St. Michael North West, there is no telling what morass he may fall into.

In accordance with modern drafting, Parliamentary and descriptive practice I recommend this Clause to hon. members, and I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 be postponed.

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

Mr. ADAMS:
Mr. Chairman, I am going to speak on all of the Clauses. I am going to remind hon. members of their moral and political bankruptcy in postponing something that is obviously acceptable. This is what I would call high-class political ignorance and a contempt to themselves. It is a contempt to themselves when you have a contempt of the House of which you are a member, is my suggestion. People who say they were not brought in here in dung baskets must think, perhaps, that they would be qualified to come in here in dung baskets that they find it often necessary to bring this analogy into the House. They are

the people who are in support of the postponement of this Bill, and I regret that party spirit, or faction, is such that even the right-thinking members on the opposite side - members who know that the youths of Barbados are demanding a new deal and members who know that this Bill has merit and -who gave it their support 18 months ago - have to vote for the further postponement of the Bill.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Chairman, again, I just want to say that in common parlance today the term "infant" is one that is fast receding. I want to make a second point. If the Government intended to adopt this tactic to postpone every Clause, then one is surprised that they waited until the measure was referred to the Committee to be dealt with Clause by Clause, and they did not raise the matter when His Honour the Speaker was in the Chair and asked for a postponement.

I am led to believe that this Government are thinking on their behind rather than even on theri feet-arid through their heads. When matters come before the House for consideration, from time to time, you are getting ad hoc decisions in that particular corner, Sir. Sometimes they make these decisions without even asking other members how they feel about a particular issue. Unfortunately, party political decisions have gone to the extent in Barbados that people cannot even differ on consciences. This is a very sad occasion. Why did they not deal with the matter when Mr. Speaker was in the Chair instead of wasting time in Committee of the whole House? 3.50 p.m.

This is a classic example of the Government not knowing its mind and not being prepared. You will hear a lot about the Opposition not being able to discuss something in five minutes that the Government brings in here to ram down the throats of the people of the country, but they find themselves so unprepared that they cannot decide as a matter of procedure how they are going to get a matter stopped, and must go through clause by clause. The Government is afraid of the No Confidence motion; they are afraid of the debate on women, so they are going to postpone all of these. Postpone them until the five years are up.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Chairman, quite clearly I had no intention of getting into this kind of nonsense that has been going on this afternoon, particularly the nonsense we have heard from the hon. member for Christ Church West.

Mr. FORDE:

On a point of order, the hon. member is not entitled to call another hon. member's speech nonsense. It is unparliamentary and I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. member has complained. Would you kindly withdraw the remarks?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:
Of course, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
No hon. member speaks nonsense in here.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:
I have no hesitation in withdrawing the remarks even though they came from the hon. member for Christ Church West, but the hon. member knows...

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. member said he had no hesitation in withdrawing,

Mr. BOLDEN:
That does not mean that he has withdrawn them.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
Are you going to tell the Chair how it must interpret words?

Mr. BOLDEN:
Oh no, Sir. The hon. member said even though, which is compounding a felony.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
Will the hon. member withdraw?

Hon. P. M.' GREAVES:
I said I have no hesitation in withdrawing. I do not understand these silly attitudes.

Mr. BOLDEN:
What is a silly attitude, for a member to get up and say that a member has not withdrawn something?

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
That is not unparliamentary.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:
The hon. member for Christ Church West states that we should have taken objection at the time when the Speaker was in the Chair, but he should know if he reads the Rules that this is not possible. Let us look at the order in which this Bill came before this House. The Bill was given a second reading and committed to Select Committee. Under Standing Order 62(5) the Select Committee has three months in which to report. The Committee apparently did not report in three months' time and therefore it was committed under Rule (6) which says that where a Select Committee does not report to the House in the period set out in Standing Order No. 62(5) the House may commit the bill in a Committee of the whole House and the Powers of the Select Committee in relation to that bill shall cease.

What happened according to my Order Paper - I was not present at that time -,is that on 19th June the Bill was committed to Select Committee of the whole House, so the time for us to take the objections that we are taking is now when the Bill reaches the stage at which the House put it. The House put it in Committee stage, not with the Speaker in the Chair so the time to take objection to this is now.

I want to make this further point. At any time that they want to debate any censure motion, we on this side are ready. We do not choose when they should do their business. They choose their order and we are waiting for them to bring their censure motion. I do not know why they do not bring it. We are not postponing anything. Let them bring their censure motion.

The question that Clause 2 be postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative the House dividing as follows:

AYES:
Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Mr. MORRISON; Mr. HOPPIN; Mrs. EASTMOND; Mr. SPINGER and Hon. R. St.C. WEEKES - 10.

NOES:
Mr. ADAMS; Mr. CRAIG; Mr. HINDS; and Mr. FORDE - 4.

Clause 3 was called.

Mr. ADAMS:
Mr. Chairman, Clause 3 seeks to amend the title of the Infants Act, 1958. The principle is the same.

I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part. Mr. HINDS: I beg to second that.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that further consideration of Clause 3 be postponed.

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

The question that further consideration be postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

AYES:

Hon. C E. TALMA Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Dr. the Hon.. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Mr. MORRISON; Mr. HOPPIN; Mrs. EASTMOND; Mr. SPRINGER; and Hon. R. St.C. WEEKES -10.

NOES:

Mr. ADAMS; Mr. CRAIG; Mr. HINDS and Mr. FORDE - 4.

4.00 p.m

Mr. ADAMS:

Clause 4 is the operative part of this Act which seeks to repeal Section 3 of the Infants Act, 1958. It says "A person shall attain full age on attaining the age of eighteen instead of on attaining the age of twenty one; and a person shall attain full age on the date this Act comes into force if he has then already attained the age of eighteen but not the age of twenty one." There are one or two provisions which are made necessary to deal with persons who are now aged between 18 and 21.

Sir, I think that the Government wanted this Bill postponed. I hope that the Leader of the House is taking cognizance of this. He is my attorney in Cabinet. I hope that he is paying close attention. Clause 4(1) deals with youths between 18 and 21 when the Act comes into force, and I am proposing that they should become adults on the date that the Act comes into force if they are between the ages of 18 and 2l, if they have attained the age of 18 but not the age of 21.

In Clause, 3(2) I am suggesting that this should apply now to laws which apply to majority, and consequently to any documents like deeds, wills or other instruments not being a statutory provision which are made on or after that date. The reason for this is that if a man leaves a will saying that his child should get a property when he reaches the age of 21, that is his intention; and I do not think it would be fair to change the testator's intention.

That is the import of Clause 3, but it contains various other clauses, dealing with other matters. Clause 4(3) states: "In any statute or statutory instrument, where infancy or minority is defined, whether expressly or by necessary implication, by reference to the age of twenty one years there shall be

substituted a reference to the age of eighteen years."

Clause 4(5) refers to the Schedule to which I have referred already. In the Schedule the specific Acts refer to the age of 21 which this Bill seeks to reduce with prejudice to the generality of sub-section (3), in the statutory provisions specified in the schedule.

I beg to move that Clause 4 stand part. Mr. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Chairman, again I am moving that further consideration of Clause 4 be postponed. 4.10 p.m.

The question that Clause 4 be postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative the Committee dividing as follows:

AYES:
Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Mr. SPRINGER; Mrs. EASTMOND; Mr. HOPPIN; Mr. MORRISON and Hon. R. StC. WEEKES - 10.

NOES:
Mr. ADAMS; Mr. CRAIG; Mr. HINDS and Mr. FORDE - 4.

Clause 5 was called.

Mr. ADAMS:
Mr. Chairman, I daresay that hon. members will seek to postpone this Clause. Clause 5 (a) is to be included by necessary implication because it deals with the male infant of 20 and a female infant over 17 who want to get married. Once the Act is passed, Clause 5 will automatically operate, Sir, and there will be no point in having the original Clause. Section 43 of the Offences Against the Person Act is an exceptionally offensive Section of the law which dates back to the time before women were allowed to

own their own property. If a man carried away a-girl and married her all of her property became his. That is still part of the law in Barbados, Sir. I refer to the abduction of hieresses and so on. Barbados is the only country, I understand, in the whole Commonwealth which has had a prosecution, unsucsessfull, for this offence in this country or, indeed, since the passing of the Married Women's Act. It is offensive in itself, apart from its relationship to girls between the ages of 18 and 21. I wonder how many people realise that it is an offence to allow a girl of the age of 19, who has $100 in the bank, to come and live with a man in a house, or for a girl of 20, who has a $100 in the bank, to go and live with her boyfriend in a house? It is an Act over one hundred years old, and I submit that hon. members would be glad to repeal it rather than allow it to remain on the Statute Book.

I beg to move that Clause 5 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Again, Sir, I beg to move that further consideration of Clause 5 be postponed.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

Mr. FORDE:

Again, Sir, I want to say that there is another procedure available. At the time when it was moved that this be the Order of the Day, the hon. member could have moved a substantive counter motion at that stage, and then we would have understood and we would not have wasted the Committee's time- That is the first lesson. I will give him the next lesson, as soon as we reach the Schedule, as to how he could have saved the Committee's time.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Chairman, either the member was not in his place, or he was not listening. At no stage did Mr. Speaker ask that any particular Order should be the Order of the Day. He particularly told the Leader of the Opposition that it was his prerogative to choose which Order he wanted to deal with.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker said quite clearly that he was not going to state which would be the Order of the Day, and that Private Members could get up and deal with their matters as they felt like. The hon. member then moved that he would deal with Order No. 2.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:
Mr. Chairman, it was never put to the House 'That this be the Order of the Day".

Mr. FORDE:
Mr. Chairman,.....

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:
How many times will the hon. member be allowed to speak on this matter?

The question that Clause 5 be postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative the Committee dividing as follows:

AYES:
Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Mr. SPRINGER; Mrs. EASTMOND; Mr. MORRISON; Mr. HOPPIN; Mr. MORRISON and Hon. R. St.C. WEEKES - 10.

NOES:
Mr. ADAMS; Mr. CRAIG; Mr. HINDS and Mr. FORDE - 4. 4.20 p.m.

Clause 6 was celled.

Mr. ADAMS:
Mr. Chairman, Clause 6 is very simple. At the present time many legal commentators have expressed some difficulty with the fact that technically in law you do not attain a particular age on the anniversary of the date of your birth; you attain it at the first moment of the date before your anniversary, so that if you were born on 7th August, 1952, you became 21 years old at midnight on 6th August, where most people count themselves to be 21 on August 7. This will change that. It is neither here nor there, but it seems to be popular. It brings legal usage into harness with contemporary day to day use.

I beg to move that Clause 6 stand part.

Mr. HINDS:
I beg to second that.

Hon. C. E, TALMA:
Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that further consideration of Clause 6 be postponed.

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

The question that Clause 6 be postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:

AYES:
Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Hon. P. M GREAVES; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. R. St.C. WEEKES; Mr. MORRISON; Mr. HOPPIN; Mrs. EASTNDND and Mr. SPRINGER -.10.

NOES; Mr. ADAMS; Mr. CRAIG; Mr. HINDS and Mr. FORDE - 4.

The Schedule was called.

Mr. ADAMS:
Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this be the Schedule. I do not have to deal with other enactments. There are other enactments that have the age of 21 mentioned and I suggest at this stage that this be done here. This seems to be the only enactment that the Constitution permits you to move because you cannot

amend the Constitution by necessary implication, and that is the only way of reducing the qualifying age for persons to come in here at the age of eighteen - by a constitutional amendment.

Mr. HINDS:
I beg to second that.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Schedule be postponed.

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

Mr. FORDE:
Mr. Chairman, this Schedule is in the context of what has happened very adequate in the laws of Barbados except as I said I would have wanted the Government to be positive and to do the positive side of things, so that the positive side of things can be adequately rewarded and bring down with the approval of the whole House an amendment to the two relevant sections of the Constitution to permit eighteen year olds to sit in this House and in the Senate, and then perhaps we might not have the frustration of just having measures being postponed and an hour and twenty minutes of Private Members' Business time taken up with a fruitless exercise. Perhaps I could commend to the Government that in future if this is the attitude that they could have used Standing Order No. 47 from the first Clause of the Bill that was called, and asked for leave to sit again. If they knew it and did not use it, it shows how bad they are on this point. The hon. member cannot sit down and say he knew it if he was being very serious. The point is that he did not know it until he heard it from over here. Why should we ask for leave to postpone and leave to sit again when we are the people pressing for the motion? This would show you the time wasting procedure they are prepared to take to frustrate debate in this Chamber. You have eighteen seats; God help this country if they make the mistake of giving them eighteen seats again. It is the biggest mistake that has been made, and this is an example from this Government that they are prepared to waste an hour and a half of Private Members' time by postponing clause after clause. That is why I say they do not deserve any increase in salary, and my view on that is highly justified.

Mr. Chairman, the Government could have used Standing. Order No. 47 ever since when the matter came up in Committee, and to get there and say they knew it and did not use it shows to this House conclusively that the Acting Attorney General, the hon. member for St. Michael North West, could have advised the Leader of the House, even if he did not agree with the other point I spoke to him about a while ago, to use that Order in order to save this Committee's time. But he was prepared to frustrate the

Committee in what he believes to be an exercise of political upmanship. To me it is an exercise in political infantilism, because if you are going to waste an hour and a half of the taxpayers' time in going through this exercise only to prove a point, things have come to a bad past. I said so on the last occasion,. We spent an hour and forty-five minutes on the last occasion debating what should be the Order of the Day under Private Members' Business. This afternoon we spent one hour and twenty minutes going through clause by clause to postpone because the Government is taking a hard line. I think it is significant that everytime the hon. member for St. Andrew comes in here with a matter on agriculture and gives us a lecture for an hour that he takes a hard line thereafter. I do not know why. I like him when he is not being so hard line unnecessarily.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I would like to find out from the hon. member if he is speaking on the Schedule.

Mr. FORDE:

I am speaking on the Schedule and on the motion for postponement, and I am advancing as one of the reasons why the hon. member, seconded the motion is because his head is all agriculture this afternoon.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, I would like to draw to the attention of this Committee that I made it very clear that the Government had not yet considered this Bill in Cabinet, and they insisted on bulldozing this thing through and fell into a trap. It seems that they were not ready to deal with the No Confidence motion because they had the whole afternoon. It was for them to move that further consideration be postponed. We know of Rule 35 of the Standing Orders under which we could have postponed the debate, but if they care to waste time that way, it is their time they are wasting, not the taxpayers' time. You had your time and the Government will have its time until 9.30 tonight. We are willing to sit in here and do the people's work.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Chairman, I have not given way to the hon. member. I have great respect for him and he knows why; so he should not shout at me. 4.30 p.m.

I have not given way to the hon. member. The hon. member is shouting. I have the greatest respect for him and he knows why, so the hon. member needs'not shout at me. But the point remains - let me make the position absolutely clear - if the Government is responsible and seriously were holding to the point of view that they wanted this matter postponed, on the first clause being used they could use their majority for that purpose. It was the Opposition who wanted it discussed not postponed and it would not

have been correct for the Opposition to blow hot and cold on a matter such as this.

The point remains that the Government did not know the Order. The hon. member is going to say use Order No. 35. Order 35 is for dilatory motions, not things that are being delayed. This is the motion that he should use it on. But waste time, Sir. All I would say is that if the Government does not want any-consideration from anybody they would keep coming in in this way.

I think it is mighty strange, and I repeat this, that when you are dealing with a Bill of 315 pages that you want it to go through with all speed and we are going to hear all over the media how the Opposition is not serious, and they do not use their time. When on the other hand you want to frustrate the position the Cabinet would not have found time for a year and half to give consideration to improving the lot of 18 year olds and 21 year olds; but I bet you the next Manifesto you see the Government trying to take credit for it, and unfortunately the media is in such a state in this country that they may get away with it too.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS rose.

Mr. ADAMS:
How can the seconder of the motion speak again, now Sir?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:
I am the seconder of a motion to reply if the proposal is not.....

Mr. ADAMS:
I am making my speech.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:
You make your speech.

Mr. ADAMS:

We want more time under Government Business today because we have been forced to mark our disapproval.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
No point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:
I am speaking, Sir, making a speech.

Mr. ADAMS:
I rose on a point of order. Let the hon. member sit down and allow me to make my speech op the motion to postpone. There are certain matters - just get this quite clear that from the word "go" any hon. member on that side under rule 35(2) could have moved that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

I am convinced that there is not any way that the hon. member for St. Michael North West could convince you that he believes that they knew this at a quarter to four or half past three. There is no way that the hon. member for St. Andrew could make me believe when he was scratching around finding a way to avoid this charade that he knew that. He is only being wise after the event, and we are wiser in his ways than he may think.

Now, Sir, the Leader of the House says that they want to postpone the vote of No Confidence. I am going to take him at his word and ask for another half hour of Private Members' time to let me start my speech on it. I have my notes here, and if he is saying that we have gone through this I challenge him to allow us another half hour at least to let me finish it because I can finish it in half an hour.

Ski this is replying to what he said. There are certain times when you stand on principle, and the principle is this: I do not believe that this matter has not been before the Cabinet; otherwise members of the Government could not have voted for it when they first came in here. We cannot say that hon. members are lying. We are not allowed to say that the Leader of the House is deliberately lying because that is against the rules of the House. The Hon. Leader of the House has accused me of telling lies in here some time before now. He usually hears what goes on. I understand it is a different thing, but he hears.

This matter has been before the Cabinet on an earlier occasion. If members are prepared to say that they do not know that it has been before the Parliamentary Draughtsman, that it is a different matter. I cannot accept that the Cabinet has not gone into this matter of the Infants Act. I cannot refer to the earlier debate, Sir, because it is all in the same session, but the Leader of the House should recall that he spoke on this at the time. I just do not accept that excuse.

I believe that the Government has sat down on this for two years until it had forgotten what it is all about; and hon. members on the other side have the interest in the people so little at heart that they allowed matters like these which are fundamentally non-partisan, fundamentally for the good of Barbados, a measure which is regarded as socially progressive in all progressive countries of the world - they will heckle, Sir

The hon. member for St. Michael North West will say what Caribbean country. In Jamaica - I remember that the Advocate Newspaper gave it bigger publicity when the Leader of the Opposition in Jamaica introduced this Bill than it had when I had introduced the same one that we are now discussing. (ASIDE: It is not yet law.) It has been done in Trinidad. The hon. member is saying that it is not yet law. He will have to decide that with the former Attorney General, the hon. member for St. Michael South Central because he came in here and said that it was law and a better law than the one I had introduced. So I can only go by him.

To tell the truth, to tell the honest truth, as between the hon. member for St. Michael South Central and the hon. member for St. Michael North West I prefer the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, and the hon. member for St. Michael North West will know what an insult that is to him when I say so, because I have personal knowledge of what the hon. member for St. Michael North West is capable of and incapable of. I am not supporting the postponement.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

The hon. members sat on the other side and they knew and said that it was our intension from the beginning to postpone consideration of this. They tried to get around it by saying when the Hon. Minister moved that further consideration of a clause of the Bill be postponed that we were dealing with Clauses and we could not postpone consideration of the Bill. My friend, the hon. member for Christ Church West and the hon. member for St. Thomas; now get up and say that we have wasted time, and that we could have moved that you report progress.

It is not our Bill, Sir. It was for them if they saw that we had no intention of dealing with the matter today, and if they wanted to do the people's business that they talk so much about, instead of wasting an hour and a half of the people's time that they are paid for, it was for them to move that you do now report progress; but instead of doing that, look at what they have done.

Seeing that a division takes at least four or five minutes, if they were really serious about the people's business they would not have asked for divisions. The minute they saw that it was our intention to postpone consideration of all the clauses, and they wanted to do their work as they try to pretend because they are built on pretence - instead of pretending.....

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. To say that an hon. member is built on pretence is unparliamentary. I submit that it means that he does not honestly believe in the matter that he is talking about, and that he is putting forward things tendentiously. I submit that that is unparliamentary. Are we to say of the hon. member that he is a man when he is not a man? I will give you an example of it. 4.40 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. member is taking exception to the word "pretence", and I rule that it is unparliamentary because hon. members could not be in here under pretence. The people have elected us, and I ask you to withdraw that.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Chairman, although I feel very strongly that what I said is true, I will withdraw it.

Mr. FORDE:

That is not a proper withdrawal, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

He has withdrawn it.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

The point is, Mr. Chairman, that they come in here; they know that they have the people's business to do; they say that they are lawyers and they know all the laws in this country or all the law in the world; they come in here and criticise all of the lawyers on this side and so on. As for me, I am incompetent to deal with anything other than agriculture. (Mr. ADAMS The Prime Minister said that; not us.)

Mr. Chairman, the hon. members on that side knew that, according to Standing Orders 35(2) and 47, they could have moved a motion that "Your Honour do now report progress." They did not do that. How can one view this matter other than as a matter of insincerity, a matter of pretence or something of the sort, or a matter of being unwilling to do the people's work for 11/2 hours? They sat down there, and, instead of moving that Your Honour do now report progress, they moved Clause after Clause knowing that the Clauses were not going to be dealt with. When the vote was taken they asked for a division on every possible one and that took up five additional minutes. There were 9 Clauses, so 9 by 5 would give you 45 minutes wasted.

The hon. member who introduced the Bill as well as the Clauses knew that he was wasting time when he got up talking and expanding things. Mr. Chairman, all of us have copies of the Bill and the hon. member thinks that we cannot read. In order to show you the time-wasting factor, the hon. member took the Bill and read certain Clauses word for word and then commented on them when he knew that he was wasting time. The time was wasted by members on the other side.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I read Clause 1 of the Bill because it was obvious to me that hardly any hon. member had it. I also read Clause 2 and a very small portion, about two lines, of Clause 4. I cannot say that the hon. member is lying, but I just have to say that he has a poor recollection. I, deliberately, as a courtesy to hon. members, read out Clause 1 because I could see that nobody had it before him, and for my courtesy I am abused and reviled in here.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Chairman, he was courteous enough to read a Clause. I left in here, went outside and spoke to at least two people, and came back in here to hear the hon. member speaking on Clause 3 or 4. When he got up on a point of order, he did not say that he read Clause 4. I am saying that he wasted time on Clause 4, and he knows that, too. With regard to the question of courtesy, the point is that they were not prepared to deal with anything else on the Order Paper, and they tried to waste as much time as they possibly could. That is my submission to you, Sir.

The question that the Schedule be postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative the Committee

dividing as follows:-

AYES:
Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Mr. SPRINGER; Mrs. EASTMOND; Mr. HOPPIN; Mr. MORRISON, and Hon. R. St.C. WEEKES - 10.

NOES:
Mr. ADAMS, Mr. CRAIG; Mr. HINDS and Mr. FORDE - 4.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
This is now the end of Private Members' Business for this sitting. 4.50 p.m.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER:
Let me say this. When the suspension was taken at 2 o'clock, the House was dealing with the Airports Act, 1970. The hon. member for Christ Church West was on his feet, and it is to that we will now revert.

Mr. ADAMS:
Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave of the House to move that Private Members' Business be further taken until 5.15 p.m. We have had a contretemps in Committee as no doubt the Chairman of Committees has reported to you, I am very anxious to start Order No. 1, I do not need a motion to start it, and all that we need for Order No. 1 which is the No Confidence motion is the time to start it. The Leader of the House has accused me of not wishing to go on with it, and I am asking leave to move that Private Members' Business be taken until 5.15 p.m. to deal with Order No. 1 under Private Members' Business.

Mr. SPEAKER:
That particular Standing Order has not been suspended.

Mr. ADAMS:

If I may with respect say so, does not the Rule say that you dp not need to give notice of a motion the effect of which is to suspend the Standing Orders, that you only need Your Honour's leave, and that Your Honour's leave to present such a motion has to be given with regard to the rights of the minority? This is the minority putting it forward...

Mr. SPEAKER:

What you are in fact doing is asking for a suspension of the Standing Orders in respect of this.

Mr. ADAMS:

By necessary implication.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The point is made. Is there a seconder?

Mr. FORDE:

I beg to second that.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, speaking on this motion for further extension, the position is simply this we took particular pains to see that the Standing Orders were not suspended in order to enable the Opposition to deal with Private Members' Business and for any Private Member on this side to do so also. They had a full opportunity to proceed with any matter which they considered most urgent and important and of public interest. This No Confidence motion has been on the Order Paper for four or five weeks. I think it was introduced when I went to St. Croix on 3rd July. The fact is that they have had it there for over a month, and if it is such a burning question, one would have thought that as we implored and told the Leader of the Opposition that we were not ready to deal with Item 2 on the Order Paper, he would have taken the opportunity to move on to Item 1. I am afraid we cannot go along with them. I am surprised to see the Leader of the Opposition wasting such time.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The question is that Private Members' Business be extended until 5.15 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:
Mr. Speaker, the motion which was moved is that Standing Orders be suspended.

Mr. SPEAKER:
Not at all. By implication this is what the hon. member is asking for, that Standing Order No. 20 be suspended.

Mr. ADAMS:
Can I with respect on a point of order.....

Mr. SPEAKER:
The matter is quite dear.

Mr. ADAMS:
Perhaps the- words "notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order No. 20" would make the motion perfect,

The question that Private Members' Business time be extended until 5.15 p.m. was put and resolved in the negative the House dividing as follows:

NOES:
Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Mr. MORRISON; Mr. HOPPIN; Mrs. EASTMOND; Mr. SPRINGER; Hon. R. St.C. WEEKES and Mr. LOWE -11.

AYES:
Mr. ADAMS; Mr. CRAIG; Mr HINDS and Mr. FORDE -4.

THE AIRPORTS (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1973

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Speaker, before the suspension I was making the point that where we are conferring on persons the power of arrest of a citizen, we should make sure that person knows how to exercise his duties properly. I would like to make the further point that where we are conferring such powers of arrest, we should make sure that the section dealing with the matter is absolutely clear. Although I do not pretend, Mr. Speaker, to be any brilliant lawyer it does seem to me that there has been a difficulty in drafting this section because the section is conferring on an authorised officer all of the powers of arrest conferred on a member of the Police Force under Section 21 of the Police Act, 1961.

Under Section 21 of the Police Act, 1961, a Police Constable may arrest any person whom he finds in any highway, yard or other, place between the hours of eight o'clock in the evening and five o'clock in the morning and whom he suspects upon reasonable grounds of having committed or being about to commit a felony. He can also arrest any person for whom he has reasonable cause to believe a warrant of arrest has been issued, or any person found between the hours of eight o' clock in the evening and five o'clock in the morning having in his possession without lawful excuse any implement of house-breaking.

Now it seems to me that it is unnecessary to confer this power on authorised officers and that it would have been better drafting and indeed tighter security for the private citizen if the section of the Act had spelt out in relation to the Airport compound the necessary powers which Parliament wishes to confer on authorised officers. This may be a shortened way of looking at the matter, but I can see great doubt being cast in future on the implications of this section, and that is why when Parliament is extending powers of arrest to certain people we should be careful to have clarity of language and clarity of thought. It seems to me here that the drafting is not very appropriate in the context of this Act, unless the Minister can asure me that he is not conferring a power at large on an authorised officer merely because an offence has been committted at the Airport and giving him extremely wide powers which are unnecessary.

I would respectfully suggest to the Government to take the view of their legal draughtsman on the Act and see whether it would not be better to set out clause by clause and verbatim in subsections the actual powers which are necessary. I am not one for the modern shortened drafting which creates, if I may put it this way, a battle filed for litigation particularly where private citizens may be inconvenienced, and I draw this to the attention of the Leader of the House and hope he can in his reply clarify the position, and certainly if there is any doubt on the matter it should be referred to the appropriate legal draughtsman for his attention. 5.00 p.m.

I should like again to emphasise that I think it is important that Security Officers at the Airport should be taught of the legal powers they have. Once before when there were Special Constables, courses were ran for Special Constables. I am not sure if they will run in relation to Security Officers themselves; but it seems to me that if they are not, then we should have these courses properly organised because they are being given necessary powers in some respects. Mr. Speaker, do not misunderstand me. Some of these powers are very necessary that the officer should have, but because they are necessary, it is also incumbent on us to make sure that they are exercised properly rather than that the Government be exposed to action and people inconvenienced by an arrest that may be unlawful or unwarranted by the circumstances. I would like to say again that legislating by implication in this instance seems to me not the most appropriate way of dealing with the problem.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The question is that the Bill be read a second time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, just before you put the question, Sir, as I explained in introducing this Bill, at present the Airport Manager is finding it very difficult to maintain order and to control the Airport generally especially in relation to the private vehicles and taxis, and this power of arrest is to enable him to pass it on to his agents - Security Officers, and Security Guards - and to have greater control over the Airport,

I do not see that it is taking away the rights of anybody. Nowadays you have hijacking, you have hippies, all types of misbehaviour, not only the ones of 18, you have older people too, all sorts of drug trafficking and all sorts of rackets. You need greater power vested in the Manager of the Airport and Security Guards. It is what you find all over the world. We are just trying to update our Airport. At our Airport everybody can do as they like at present and this is the first step in a series of steps in order to tighten the security of the airport and put things in a better order.

This is not the only one that will be coming. Probably another Act will be coming which will be more comprehensive and will tighten up the powers more rigidly. I am afraid that although the hon. and learned member for Christ Church West is an eminent lawyer - there is no pretence in that - the fact is that I cannot go along with his suggestions after this matter has been examined carefully by our legal department; and I am not in position now on my feet to make any amendments, and it is something which we regard as being very urgent.

If there are any flaws any mistakes, well it can be done in the Other Place. I will draw the points which the hon. member has made to the attention of Cabinet and if there are any real amendments which are desirable, probably the Other Place can make them and we can then concur in them down here.

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

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. LOWE in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 inclusive of the Bill were called and passed

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

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, the Bill was read a third time and passed. Its title was agreed to.

THE DEVELOPMENT (CANADIAN LOAN)

(AMENDMENT) BILL, 1973

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the next Item on the Order Paper, Sir, is Item No. 6 standing in the name of the Hon. Minister for Agriculture, Science and Technology. It is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Development (Canadian Loan) Act, 1967.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, in 1967 the Development (Canadian Loan) Act was passed. At the time the Canadian Government were kind enough to make a loan to Barbados of $250,000 (Can.) for the development of the Dairy Industry. From this money we could purchase from Canada cows and equipment.

The Canadian Government on representation being made by the Barbados Government, has again agreed to make a further loan, as they have noted that the $250,000 which was made available to us in 1967 was put to good advantage. They have agreed to lend an additional $56,000 (Can.) to Barbados for the further development of the livestock industry, and I say livestock industry advisedly.

It is primarily to purchase dairy cattle, but you will remember, Sir, that the Canadian Government made available to us the cane consultants who carried out experiments in the use of comfith with the steer from the Dairy Industry for the production of prime beef in Barbados. Now, this further loan would increase the number of cows producing milk for the Dairy Industry. It would set us very far on our way to being self-sufficient in milk and it would give us enough milk not only to supply the local fresh milk consumer market, but to put some of the locally produced milk into the manufacturing of evaporated milk, and therefore it would reduce the amount of evaporated milk which is brought into the country in cans.

I may state at this point that every time a consumer in this country punches a can of evaporated milk he throws away 10 cents because that is the cost of the can. At the Pine Hill Dairy we are producing evaporated milk in bottles. There is a deposit of 5 cents on a bottle and each time that you return and you go to buy another bottle of milk you return a bottle and you are not throwing away anything. 5.10 p.m.

It is better for us to be in a position to produce more milk to put into the manufacturing of Evaporated Milk. You will agree, Sir, that, if you can put more fresh milk into the production of sweetened Condensed Milk and Evaporated Milk, you will get a better quality milk. Along with this project we propose to establish two units: one at Greenland to produce beef on a feed lot, and one using comfith with the dairy cattle. When you produce bulls fed on comfith, you will find that you have produced prime beef which is used in the hotels in place of imported, expensive beef. I think that hotels are now importing beef to the tune of $800,000 per annum.

We propose that, as soon as we get the comfith project in top gear, we will be able to supply all the hotels with all the prime beef which they need. We must have more dairy cattle producing milk. Normally you have a 50:50 ratio of heifers to bulls in the dairy industry. We have approximately 6,000 milch cows in the country. If, from this loan, we can bring in another 2,000, it means that our steer production in the country can be increased by 1,000 in the first year, and then you have the multiplying

factor. We will soon be able to produce all the prime beef from the comfith project that this country needs, and at the same time we will be increasing the milk production. We will be having from this loan things like tractors, grass cutters, rakes, milking machines, and so on. In other words, it is a comprehensive scheme to boost the dairy industry in this country.

Sir, the loan is an interest-free loan. We do not have to repay any of this money until 1982, and at that time we will begin to repay the loan in two 6-monthly instalments of $7,000 (Canadian) per month. It is interest free. You and I may not be here when the money is repaid around 2032. (Asides) I hope that I will be here. The hon. member for St. Michael West is hoping that he will be here. I do not know how many of us will be here, but I do not think we could expect anything better.

I must say that the Canadian Government have been very helpful to us in the livestock development of this country. When we had our problems with Swine Fever they came to our rescue by sending us four Veterinarians: when we wanted to build up the dairy industry they gave us loans, they are now giving us additional loans, and we have also approached them in respect of assistance as far as the beef industry per se is concerned. Dr. Berry, who is attached to my Ministry, is a Technical Officer from Canada and he is an expert in the livestock industry. He has gone to Canada; he has approached the Canadian Authorities, and they are willing to make a long-term soft loan to us in respect of the development of the beef industry in this country.

Now, this matter is noncontroversial, Sir. Anybody who votes against it will be voting against the future economic development of Barbados. I am satisfied that I do not have to convince even the hon. member for Christ Church West that this is important. (Asides) He says that today is agricultural day, and I am sure he will support this Bill.

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

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

Mr. HINDS:
Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that anybody is going to vote against the Government getting any assistance whatsoever from the Government of Canada to improve our dairy industry. What we are going to address our minds to is that we have heard the Minister say that, with this loan coming forward

and the possibility of having more milch cows as well as a greater supply of fresh milk, there will be the possibility of our canning Evaporated Milk.

Hon.. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I did use the word "canning". I referred to the question of putting more fresh milk into manufactured milk. I am against canning because I have pointed out that, whenever the consumer punches a can, he throws away 10 cents, as against using a bottle.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is a point of elucidation.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, we will leave the word "canning" behind our backs. We will be putting more fresh milk into the Evaporated Milk that would be available to us for consumption locally. I wonder if the Minister has in mind the services of the Pine Hill Dairy for such an operation with respect to the production of this Evaporated Milk? That is the first thing that has come to my mind. We know that the Pine Hill Dairy was established to produce Evaporated as well as Condensed Milk. We have established an industry that has found it more convenient and profitable to import Evaporated Milk, and the Minister has intimated that each consumer who buys one tin of Evaporated Milk is automatically losing 10 cents the moment he punches that tin. We now find that the Government were content for all of these years to allow a Barbadian, whenever he buys a tin of Evaporated Milk, to lose 10 cents when he has no means whatsoever of recovering it.

Mr. Speaker, you will see that our first concern must be whether it is the intention of the Government, with this new flow of fresh milk that will be available to us, to use the Pine Hill Dairy to bring the processed form of the Evaporated Milk to the mouths of the consuming public. 5.20 p.m

We understand from what the Minister has had to say that there will be milking equipment, there will be tractors and cutting machines, and that it is a comprehensive scheme that is being embarked upon as far as the loan from the Canadian Government is concerned. This is not the first loan, but on previous occasions the loans referred specifically to cattle or animals being made available. All of this, Mr. Speaker, is something which is to our credit and we feel somewhat elated at hearing that the way how the scheme has been going in the past, the Canadian Government is so impressed that they are now willing to make this additional loan for the benefit of the taxpayers of this country; but we want to know with some degree of certainty that it is not a case where somebody is now going to get swollen headed, and with this loan coming to us, with all the fresh milk flowing, yet no benefit whatsoever is accruing to

the consuming public, that the price of milk will remain as high and mounting higher and we will be told again that it is a question of inflation we are importing when we could have had a Canadian gift, because the loan is interest free for quite a number of years. We do not want to hear any of this.

There is the question, Mr. Speaker, as to whether or not the setting up of this unit at Greenland for beef production is really and truly going to turn out to be something of benefit to us and relieve us of having to import $800,000 of beef only for the hotels and the like. It is all right for the Minister to get all these figures before him to come here and impress us that this is a mountain we now have to climb or fly over and try to lure us on this side of the House into supporting this measure. We are prepared to give our wholehearted support in any such scheme if it is for the benefit of the masses of people, but we would like to know that the Minister has had some research work done. Has he made it possible to find out whether the estates in the Greenland and Haggatts group are going to be able to produce the type of fodder and at what cost for the feeding of these animals? The Minister knows what difficulty he has been experiencing in the past with the feeding of the few animals down there, and exactly what has been taking place we have not seen, and we are not satisfied that all that has gone on in the Haggatts group owned by the Government has been carried cm to the benefit of the Government and people of this country. We have seen that a few people have benefited more than others, and when the time really came for action to be taken to let us see that justice was meted out, that was not the case; but we say no more at this stage except that to merely, make mention of what I have said at this point should be sufficient to alert the Minister to the fact that we will be keeping our eyes wide open to see how high the scheme will go.

Mr. Speaker, we are particulary interested in seeing and finding out what will be done in respect of this matter of the Pine Hill Dairy. We hope that we will not see in any operation at the Pine Hill Dairy, as we have seen in the past, that they are going to manufacture milk for sale to consumers without a single sample being taken during the period of one year. No Minister can get up and deny that it is not a fact that the same brooms that they have been cleaning the lavatories with at the Pine (Hill Dairy are not the same brooms that they have been cleaning the vats with and then processing milk in these vats and offering it for sale to the general public of Barbados. These are things the Minister must investigate and not be fooled by people who because they are in business do not want the dirty end of their business to be brought out. We are quite prepared not to bring this out if they will keep their business clean. I need say no more on this score.

Hon. A. DaC, EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, let me reply to the hon. member by catergorically denying the statement which he has made last - the question of the same brooms being used in the lavatories and so on being used in the vats. This is not a true allegation or accusation against the Pine Hill Dairy. The Pine Hill Dairy is one of the few industries in this country that has a high standard of public health.

On the question of samples not being taken, I think I did answer a question on this matter raised by the hon. member already. There was some confusion as to who should take the samples, whether it should be the Health Department at Enmore or some other department. However that hurdle has been got over, and I can assure the hon. member that samples of the milk produced by the Pine Hill Dairy wore taken by the Ministry of Agriculture and analysed in the laboratory at the Ministry of Agriculture.

As far as the services of the Pine Hill Dairy are concerned in respect of the production of evaporated milk, let us get the facts straight. The Pine Hill Dairy had its teething problems and the hon. member came in here and said that they were selling stinking milk. The Pine Hill Dairy had a boiler problem and the milk was not lasting as well as it should; it was having lumps. The heating was bad, the canning was bad. Since then, Mr. Speaker, the Dairy has spent $1 million in improving not only the boiler by putting in a new one, but in making additional space for storage of its products. The Pine Hill Dairy has gone further since it found that the canning process was a more expensive one and secondly that the cans which they were getting from Trinidad were not as good for evaporated milk as they would want them to be - they were all right for the sweetened condensed milk but not for evaporated milk - they have tried another approach to the problem and they are today producing evaporated milk in sixteen once bottles. When you buy a bottle of evaporated milk you get milk of as high a quality and in some cases of higher quality than the milk imported in cans. The quality of the milk imported in cans depends to a large extent on the country of origin, and we have carried out tests in our laboratory in the Ministry and found that there has been differentials in the amount of total fat in the evaporated milk varying from country to country of origin. 5.30 p.m.

There is one standard set for the milk produced by the Pine Hill Dairy, and I can invite the member or the general public without notice - do not tell the Pine Hill Dairy that they are coming - go there without notice, Mr. Barry-Smith, when I discussed this matter with him on the question of brooms, pointed out that he was willing to allow any member of Parliament or any other person to go and inspect the Pine Hill Dairy without giving them even an hour's notice, and then the hon. member could see the standard of public health.

Mr. HINDS:

I take it that the Minister means that he is willing to do this since my questions have been tabled.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Since the questions were tabled; but the questions were tabled without any foundation of fact.

Mr. SPEAKER:
The hon. member is dilating very much on this question of milk.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:
Right.

Mr. SPEAKER:
We are dealing with a Canadian loan.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:
Which has to do with the development of the dairy industry in this country; and the processing is important, with all due respect to you, Sir. The whole point, Mr. Speaker, is that the hon. member asked about the reduction of the importation of evaporated milk, and that is what we are gearing ourselves to. I can assure the hon. member how that the Pine Hill Dairy has got an order of a quarter million bottles to put evaporated milk in, in order to reduce the import of evaporated milk.

Mind you, Sir, they are doing the same thing with the milk in bottles as they were doing for the imported evaporated milk; but whereas you were only getting about 131/4 fluid ounces of evaporated milk in each can of milk, you are getting 16 full fluid ounces in a bottle of milk; but what has happened is that the Barbadian consumer feels that unless something comes from outside it is no use. They prefer to pay for something brought from New Zealand, Australia or Denmark or Austria or some other place than to buy locally produced milk.

The sooner, Sir, that we can get around to using what is locally produced, the better it is for us. Now we are hoping - I am giving him the assurance of the Pine Hill Dairy that by the end of October they will be in a position to produce something like half of the amount of evaporated milk for the country in bottles. At the beginning of January they will be in a position to produce about three quarters of the amount of evaporated milk consumed in the country and in another six months they will be able to produce all of the milk to be consumed in the country, and we will be in a position to have to import no more evaporated milk.

This has been my latest information from the Managing Director of the Pine Hill Dairy. The hon. member raised the question of the price of milk, and says that he hopes that the price of milk will remain the same. I cannot give him that assurance. I would not be a fool to give him that assurance because the

hon. member heard us debate here today that the cost of animal feed is increasing. We have just heard that soya bean meal is increasing from $100 a ton to $186 a ton or something like that. There has been an increase of about 60 per cent in the cost of soya bean meal. The price of corn has increased considerably.

All of these are inputs into the dairy industry. The industry does not only depend on having a cow, it depends on feeding that cow and feeding that cow the right way, if it is to produce milk. Therefore I cannot give the hon. member any assurance that the price of milk will not increase. If you have got to put increased input into production you will expect the end product to cost more; but what I am saying is that it is better to pay more for a local commodity than to pay more for an imported commodity or even to subsidise an imported commodity; and this, Mr. Speaker, is my reply to him

Now, Sir, he also raised the question of the feed production unit at Greenland, how helpful it will be to us and so on. I want to let the hon. member know this: we are not operating in a vacuum. We are going into this matter with our eyes fully open. The first report given to me by the Canadian Cane Consultants at the Hilton Hotel almost a year ago I critised because I did not see anything in it for the small man.

They came to me with a project talking about a three-acre plot feed lot in sugar. I could not accept that because I want to hear in any experiment carried on in the Ministry of Agriculture or any innovation how can you help the small man. They had to come back and give me a report which would now involve the small man. Well they have now come with another report, and contrary to the understanding of the hon. member, I would like to point out here that the feed lot at Greenland is not dependent on the grass at Greenland.

When I talk about comfith, I am talking about the conversion of sugar cane into animal feed. You use the separator plant and you take off the rind, and you use the comfith as the energy base of the feed. You put vitamins and minerals in it, and that gives you animal feed. So it is not a question of grass.

Hon. members are aware of the fact that in the Scotland District it has been very difficult to get the canes reaped in four months to send to the factory. In the Scotland District, from Newcastle back down to Boscobelle, we have thought that the canes in that area should be used to provide the protein diet to the country.

That area is one seventh of the land mass of this country, and it could be put to better use. What,

however, will happen is that certain lands where it is difficult to harvest the cane or to get to the cane we are saying that what we will do is to supplement the cane production for the comfith project by Pangola grass, or Elephant grass or some other grass to assist the farmers where there is a shortage of comfith and where you cannot get to the canes to get them out of the slopes in the Scotland District.

But Sir, I can assure the hon. member that I did not go into this blindly. They had to present me with a feasibility study to see how feasible the project would be, and I am satisfied that the project is feasible. An order has been made for the first separation plant, and we hope to have it rolling from early next year. We hope to have another one in the Scotland District on the hill so that we can have what we term a multiplier unit that is fed on comfith and so on, where we can produce animals. You breed the animals and you can make maximum use of what you have.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that from my explanation, the hon. member - I know that he is not an agriculturalist, that he is only sitting in for the Shadow Minister of Agriculture and that he would not be as au fait with agriculture as his colleague. I sympathise with him for his ignorance as to what is going on in the field of agriculture and of the real facts about the Pine Hill Dairy. I hope that my explanation will be of some benefit to him. 5.40 p.m.

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that you do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:
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. LOWE in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:
Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Hon. R. St.C. WEEKES:
I beg to second that.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

1973-74 No. 15

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Speaker, we will now revert to Item 1, which is a Resolution to grant the sum of $202,700 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1973-74, Part 1 - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1973-74, No. 15, which form the Schedule to the Resolution. I am asking for leave to take charge of this Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER:
Leave is granted.

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

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

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

A Resolution in the sum of $202,700 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Chairman, PART I - CURRENT - HEAD 6 - MINISTRY OF LEGAL AFFAIRS - Item 17 - Entertainment Allowance. This is merely to provide an Entertainment Allowance for the Chief Parliamentary Counsel. The other members of the legal profession, for example, the Solicitor General and the Director of Public Prosecutions, have already received their Entertainment Allowance and their Entertainment Allowance has been increased to $1,200 and $1,400 per annum respectively with effect from the 1st April, 1973. The Chief Parliamentary Counsel has just been brought into line and is being given an Entertainment Allowance.

I beg to move that Head 6 stand part.

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

Mr. FORDE:
Mr. Chairman, there are a few points I should like to draw to the Minister's attention in relation to the drafting section of the Department of the Attorney General. Despite the increase in staff, it is still a fact that the Department is finding itself hard pressed for time in order to get through the work which is being placed upon it. I believe there is one Chief Parliamentary Counsel; a Deputy Chief Parliamentary Counsel, a Parliamentary Counsel, and an Assistant Parliamentary Counsel, and the four members at present constitute the Department. The Chief Parliamentary Counsel, during the last few months, has had to spend a considerable length of time working on matters affecting the Caribbean Common Market and, indeed, rendering assistance to the Caribbean Community Secretariat in drafting of the relevant

documents. This is commendable so far as regional integration is concerned, but it creates some problems in relation to legislation that need immediate attention.

Now, I can think, if I look back at the Speech from the Throne, of many areas of legislation which should be brought into this House speedily. I can think of legislation dealing with the right to associate; legislation dealing with collective bargaining, which we had been promised in order to implement the provisions of the I.L.O. Convention; I can think of the Children's legislation; I can think of course, of legislation dealing with minors. All of these are urgent matters, and it seems to me that the Government might be well advised again, bearing in mind the necessity, to increase the staff of this Department a bit further.

% I should like to say also that, in the realm

of law reform, we are suffering from a lack of Parliamentary Counsel. We have Mr. Wilfred Fergusson, a very distinguished Legal Draftsman; in fact, one of the best which we have produced in the Caribbean. I know that his services were readily available, and unfortunately, I do not think that they have been fully utilised although he is now helping us in producing our laws. Perhaps the Government should give some consideration to making use of part-time services in helping in the drafting of, particularly, noncontentious legislation. There is a lot of legislation that is suffering because it is not of immediate political significance, but, so far as up-dating the laws is concerned, such legislation is of urgent significance.

I am not saying that this Department is not producing. On the contrary, it is producing, but it suffers from a lack of man power. Legal Draftsmen take a long time to be trained. There is really no special credit when they are trained because it is not an easy job. Sometimes it might be a boring job, unless you really like this sort of work. I can say to the Government that we have now produced five scholars at the University of the West Indies' regional examination, LL.B. Five Barbadians have qualified: One, happily, is a member of the Police Force; one is a member of the Civil Service attached to the Registry, and I should hope that the Government would give consideration to enabling them to go to Trinidad to do their Certificate of Legal Education and using them for specialised fields. I should like to see the Government attaching specialised Legal Draftsmen to the Income Tax Department, the Port Department, the Social Welfare Department and so on. I am wondering whether it would not be a good opportunity to adopt these five to see their other two years through so that they could come back and make their services available in the Legal Affairs Department.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, when I look over the gamut of things to see the neglect which Parliament has been experiencing from time to time, and to see that it is somewhat related to the Parliamentary Counsels whether it is the Chief Parliamentary Counsel or otherwise, I cannot see how we can so cheerfully meet here this afternoon to vote money to provide an Entertainment Allowance for these Officers. We heard here this afternoon from the Leader of the House that, when there is anything bad in drafting and there is need for an amendment, the Other Place would look at it. There could be no sadder reflection upon the ability of this Honourable House to discharge its function. 5.50 p.m

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, I hate to interrupt the hon. member, but I mentioned nothing about bad drafting. It is just a point which the hon. member for Christ Church was attempting to introduce to have the Bill updated and improved on. I did not say it was bad drafting. I merely said if there were amendments which were valid they could be put in by the Other Place and sent back here.

Mr. HINDS:

I take it that the Minister would accept that it is a case of drafting not being up to standard and might require amendment from time to time, - I believe he would fall for that - that it could be done in the Other Place. I appreciate the fact that there are some of these officers who must put in some considerable amount of work, but as the hon. member for Christ Church West has said, you cannot put your hand on a good Parliamentary Draftsman overnight. It takes a period of time for him to be trained in this specialist field, and no one really knows exactly what is being done in this particular field.

One thing comes to my mind, Sir, when I see this vote for $1,320 being asked for here. When will the Government come with a Resolution for money to re-employ those vast numbers of people who have been kid of£ for months? There are hundreds of families without bread tonight. It is a serious situation in the Ministry of Communications and Works and the Waterworks Department. I believe there is need for putting matters such as this right, but there are other very pressing matters which I am sure the Government is neglecting, matters that concern the people. We are here providing $1,320 Entertainment Allowance for the Chief Parliamentary Counsel. I do not say that he does not deserve it, but look at the thousands of people who have not had a job for nearly four months, and there is no hope in the very near future because the Government cannot find money to employ these people. This is no joke. What is being done to relieve these people of their plight? If we take it for granted that one worker has two or three mouths dependent on him when he earns a week's pay, what is the position with them? Some as we know have more than three mouths to feed; so that is the situation that confronts us. We are not going to oppose the voting of this $1,320, but we are asking the Government to address its mind to the things that really matter in a situation such as this.

The question that Head 6 - Ministry of Legal Affairs - stand part, was put and resolved in the

affirmative without division.

Head 8 - Crown Solicitor's Office - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of Head 8 for the sum of $1,300, I think the note is fairly accurate. The position is that approval has been given by the Minister responsible for establishments for the payment of entertainment allowance at the rate of $1,200 per annum with effect from 1st April, 1973. This is a new item and the sum of $1,300 is required for the financial year. Again this is bringing the Crown Solicitor in line with other senior officers in similar posts.

I beg to move that Head 8 - Crown Solicitor's Office - stand part.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I wonder when the Chief Fire Officer will be brought in line for house and entertainment allowances. What is really wrong with such an officer? I definitely have the feeling that if Major Bradford was still head of that Department that he would have been given a house allowance and all sorts of allowances and brought in line with all these other officers.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I think the appropriate Head for that is Head 28.

Mr. HINDS:

No. Sir. I am dealing with it under this Head. What I am dealing with is Item 7A (New) Entertainment Allowance. We are not trying to deny the Crown Solicitor of this entertainment allowance, but I feel it is time the Government give a .general look and if they are handing out this entertainment allowance, we know it is not everybody who entertains that is being considered for entertainment allowance, and when I say entertainment I mean every person whose office requires that at some time or other they must entertain people. Some people have to entertain out of their paltry salary and it is not fair to give some

people and not others. I am not saying that the Crown Solicitor does not deserve it.

The question that Head 8 - Crown Solicitor's Office - stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 16 - Cabinet Office - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, in moving Head 16, Item 4 - Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister, for the sum of $4,920, the note again is fairly complete but it may be that I should give further explanation. The sum of $11,520 was provided in the Estimates 1973-74 to meet the salary of the Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister, but due to the revision of the rate of salary from $11,520 to $16,440 per annum it will be necessary to supplement this item by the sum of $4,920. This is just to bring the salary of the Personal Assistant in line pro rata to the revision of salaries given to all other officers in the Government Service.

In so far as Item 11 - Secretary for Personal Assistant and Parliamentary Secretary, is concerned, this again is bringing her salary in line and giving the appropriate increase as Private Secretary which entitles her to travelling at the usual rate.

I beg to move that Head 16 - Cabinet Office - stand part.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, we see quite rightly that an adjustment is being made here with respect to the salary etc. of the Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister and the Executive Secretary. We have nothing against this because it results from the salaries revision, but I am sure that in this Chamber - and I do not want to say that the Leader of the House has given any undertaking - there yet remains some matters which should be engaging the attention of the Leader of the House and Cabinet as well with respect to some hon. members in this House when it is borne in mind that their salaries do not measure up in any respect or bears any relation to what has been set as the top salary being paid to some Parliamentarians. I

am sure that the Leader of the House would like to address his mind to this and have the matter set right as soon as humanly possible. I am sure he would not like to have this matter hanging fire for too long. It has been pointed out where the Temporary Clerks at the Table are paid a better salary than back benchers and the like. Nobody is saying that they are getting too much money, but we would like to know that these matters are attended to by the Cabinet through the Leader of the House taking the necessary steps.

The question that Head 16 - Cabinet Office - stand part) was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 6.00 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of Head 21, Item 28, $6,000, this is necessary consequent upon the assumption by this division of responsibility for the Government Headquarters building. The vote under this Item was reduced by some $4,000 instead of $10,000 from the Ministry of Home Affairs, in the last financial year, $6,000 in this year's Estimates.

However, this division also assumes responsibility for the Organisation and Management Division and after three months of operation the sum of $5,027 of the provision under this Item has been spent or committed leaving a balance of $962.14.

I beg to move that Head 21 Item 28 stand part.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

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

Head 26 - Mnistry of Home Affairs - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of the sum of $2,769 under this Head, the position is simply that this amount is needed to supplement the amount already provided under Head 26. The sum of $1,442 was provided under Item 27 and lapsed on the 31st March, 1973 because a Rollindex filing cabinet and two small index filing cabinets ordered during the month of December, 1972 were not delivered by that date. The Rollindex filing cabinet was delivered in May, 1973 and the tendered bill was $1,178. The other cabinets had not been delivered up to the time of drafting this statement but are estimated to be about $172. Then there is a typist's chair at $75 leaving $1,225 out of the sum. The amount of $1,242.12 is therefore required.

I beg to move that Head 26 stand part.

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

Mr. HINDS:
Mr. Chairman, I am only enquiring from the Hon. Minister why he has not told us about the air conditioning units. I am sure that he has them in his file there. As far as each of these units is concerned, one in particular has just gone over its guaranteed period. The Minister cannot feel justified in coming to this House and asking for a replacement, and I believe that is the reason why he has not said anything in this Chamber about the air conditioning units.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Chairman, so far as the air conditioning units are concerned they have been replaced. It is cheaper and more beneficial to replace them than to repair them. They are unserviceable.

The question that Head 26 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 28 - Fire Service - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
In moving the passing of Head 28, the sums of $3,046, $3,642 and $82,287 appearing in these Items are revotes. Take for instance Item 23 - Fire Appliances. The sum of $120,000 provided in the 1972-73

Estimates lapsed on the 31st March, 1973. Two Fire Appliances have been received and two more are expected shortly. The exact cost of these appliances could not be ascertained at this stage but the Ministry envisage that the full lapsed amount should be revoted.

I beg to move that Head 28 stand part.

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

Mr. HINDS:
Mr. Chairman, this Head, Fire Service is one which if it were to be discussed fully would be very painful indeed. The Minister has just told us that two units have just been received. It will be recalled that not so long ago I found it necessary to table questions in this Hon. House with regard to the state of equipment of the Fire Service. Replies have been laid in this Honourable House.

The Government, Sir, is entitled to lay its replies, but I am maintaining here and now that up to this present moment the Fire Service is not sufficiently equipped to cope with any serious outbreak of fire in this Island. Definitely not equipped. 6.10 p.m.

As for me, with only 100 men, some men are still working 96 hours a week, but the Government say that 100 men are enough to do the work. The Minister has just told us that two of the vehicles they had ordered had been received. I take it that he is speaking in respect of the vehicles which have been ordered from Britain. Now, two vehicles have been received, and two more are expected shortly. The Minister has not touched on the 8 vehicles that have been ordered from Canada, because the most dishonest note that could ever be put before this Honourable House is this one which tells us that it is new equipment being ordered from Canada. It is not so. I challenge the Minister to deny that the vehicles we are trying to replace here are vehicles which have been in use since 1958. There are 1958 vehicles which have been found to be unserviceable and we are now trying to get rid of them, but the Government are buying from Canada 1957 vehicles. All of these vehicles are second-hand vehicles.

Now Mr. Jerry Bull and Mr. Carlton Brathwaite have an organisation in Canada and they are the people who are refitting the engines. Mr. Sherman Alleyne of Fire Service was sent to Canada twice to inspect these vehicles instead of the Officer at Fire Services who normally works on the vehicles there and keeps them going. He was specially requested to make two trips to Canada to inspect these 1957

vehicles. We are getting rid of the 1958 vehicles. The Government are buying second-hand 1957 vehicles from Canada, and two people are having them refitted with engines to be sent down here to work at Sea-well Airport.

Mr. Chairman, I am saying that this is nothing but a scandal. It is not every Minister on that side of the House who can say that he does not have some knowledge of what is going on in this particular racket. When a note is put before us telling us anything about new vehicles coming from Canada, I am saying that it is misleading. It is a total disregard of the taxpayers of this country, and they have no respect or no thought of the Opposition in this Honourable House. Our function here is to protect the taxpayers' money. This is nothing but a scandal; it is a small Watergate, but we are not going to have the type of investigation that would bring all of this before the public.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister is telling us that they do not yet know the price of the vehicles coming from England. I am telling the Minister now that, if he searches his files, he will see that the price is $150,000. I am willing now to confront the Minister with misleading this Honourable House.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I am not misleading the House. I go by what is written in a Cabinet Paper. I want the hon. member to withdraw that remark. I read from a Cabinet Paper which I did not prepare; I am not the appropriate Minister, and I am merely holding on for the Minister. The note was prepared by Government Servants and not by me. The hon. member can get in here and shout and think that he is impressing somebody, but I am not involved in any scheme or anything of that sort. Thank God I have a fairly good record, and that is why I have remained in this House so long. I doubt whether you will remain that long.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, if the Minister is saying that he is not in any scheme.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I am asking the hon. member to withdraw the remarks. It is not the first time he has insulted me. He has done it about fifty times.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I am asking the hon. member to withdraw the remarks.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, if I said that the Minister is misleading the House and he is objecting to it, I will withdraw it. It might be that he has it in his Cabinet Paper and he might have misread it. He might not have misled the House, and I am sorry I said that he misled the House.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, Sir. I will read the whole thing. Item 23 - Fire Equipment. I said that $82,286.25 of the sum of $120,000 provided in 1972-73 lapsed on the 31st March, 1973. Two Fire Appliances have since been received and two more are expected shortly. The exact cost of these Appliances cannot be ascertained at this stage, but the appropriate Minister proposes that this full lapsed amount of $82,287 be revoted.

As far as Item 19 is concerned, $4,641.44 of the $13,127 provided lapsed on the 31st March, 1973. Equipment ordered through the Crown Agents in June, 1973, has not been received so far and no bills have been received. Crown Agents charges for inspection and post charges are difficult to estimate, but in order to save over-commitment of funds the Minister proposes that a revote of the full lapsed amount of $3,642 be sought.

I am merely going by what the Cabinet Paper says. It has been prepared by the officials in the Ministry in the normal way, and it has been approved by the Cabinet. I am merely holding on for the appropriate Minister.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, whether the Minister has it in his files or not, or whether he has brought it out.....(Asides.) The Minister says that no bills have been received. I am saying that no bills have been received, but they have spent $120,000 up to yesterday. These people are making sport.

Mr. Chairman, you will understand that when the Government are taking the taxpayers' money to buy these 1957 vehicles from Canada - vehicles for which no new parts are now being manufactured - and placing them at Seawell Airport, in a very short space of time we will find that the taxpayers of this country will be called upon again to provide replacements. 6.20 p.m.

We will find that everybody will have forgotten all of this because they are going to be repainted and brought down here according to the Replies that Government laid on the Table of this House as eight new appliances that, have been ordered from Canada. Now I do not know if anybody was misleading the House when they laid these replies. I do not think they intended to mislead the House; at least they could not mislead me, but we know that whoever laid them ought to have known that there were gross mis-statements of fact. The Minister should be called upon to tender any such matter to this Chamber unless the Minister is in a position to back this up, and he should not be expected to back this up because in truth and in fact they are not eight new vehicles as such that are being imported from Canada.

This brings us, Mr. Chairman, to the whole disgraceful state of affairs with respect to the Fire Services, because you will find that we have been told that as soon as these eight arrive we will be having five appliances which are now in use available for general distribution. Now if you have 100 men with the present appliances and they now work 96 hours a week, and you are going to have five additional appliances after you get these eight to distribute further, do you mean that these appliances are going to work themselves? The Minister cannot deny that application has been made for an increase in the strength of the Fire Service because the men are crying out. They undergo too much strain under the present circumstances; so what are they doing? They are not prepared to do anything to relieve the situation, but they come here, and I do not want to say fool anybody because that is not a proper term and try to tell us things which we are sure they really could hardly expect us to take seriously when they are talking about them.

You will find, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister ought to know that with respect to the north of this Island, Fire Service has got to rely in very great measure upon the Naval Facility at St. Lucy in the case of any serious outbreak. How long can we go on like that? Is that something that the Government can in truth and in fact rely upon? The Government should set about to equip its own stations, and in a place like St. James they have been carrying on with one appliance which could not carry a gill of water. All they had was a lot of empty hoses and it has been like this for months. It is only God's mercy that we have not had any serious outbreak up north or in any part of the Island to really and truly test the strength of Fire Services, We are glad for all this, but we are asking the Government not to continue in this vein. This is not the right attitude to adopt in a service like this because it belongs to the whole community. It is something we have to set right once and for all, but how is Government going to cope with the situation when they come with eight second hand tenders to service Seawell Airport?

Mr. Chairman, we are expanding our services at Seawell Airport. When the break-downs begin, what is going to happen? I do not intend saying anything further on this. I believe I have said enough to let the Government understand that we know what really is taking place where the spending of taxpayers' money in this matter is concerned. We are satisfied that under the circumstances it is not a case where the Government is looking out to see that the taxpayers get the best deal. Government is definitely not looking out to see that the taxpayers get the best for their money. Who is getting the deal is left to be

seen, and we are asking that Government in future conduct its business in such a way that it can be held above suspicion, because when people can be suspicious of Government's association with this or that individual in a particular matter, it is a reflection right down through society. The public servants and other people through whom the documents have to pass must know. That is why the Government does not let us have those documents laid on the Table of this House because they spend money for these eight Canadian vehicles. Let us see from whom the documents are coming. I am asking hon. members to do something like this and let everybody be convinced that our Government is above board in all its dealings. I am sure nobody would say I am saying anything that Government should not try to do.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure the Government wants to be free from any association with anything called a deal whether it be on secondhand vehicles from Canada or elsewhere. I am sure the Government would want its name to be disassociated from any such thing, and we invite them to act in such a manner that we cm this side can at least tell the people it is not true that Government associates itself in any respect with anything like this.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the public would care if the hon. member for St. Peter told them that somebody was ever in a deal. He is the last person to go telling people about deals and talking about rats. How can the hon. member with his record begin to look at the Prime Minister who is Minister of Finance and challenge a man of unimpeachable character as compared with himself who cannot.....

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I am objecting to that loud mouth, big mouth and want him to withdraw what he said about my character in here. If he wants to say it, let us go outside and kick each other down the chairs.

Mr. WALCOTT:

I know that the Chairman would see that the hon. member got up.....

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I have taken objection to what the hon. member is saying about me.

Mr. WALCOTT:

I had the deal in here last time. I know the Chairman did not make you withdraw the words that you used when you accused the Minister of running a racket and the Minister asked you to withdraw the

words.

Mr. HINDS:
Mr. Chairman, I have taken objection.

Mr. WALCOTT:
Objection to what? He does not know the words I have said. He does not know the meaning of the words I have used. He cannot repeat them. He had better ask the hon. member on his left.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
What are the remarks complained of?

Mr. HINDS:
The hon. member said I am not a man of unimpeachable character. That is what the hon. member is imputing. He said how can you look at me with a record like mine as against the Prime Minister with an unimpeachable character. 6.30 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
Is the hon. member addressing the Chair?

Mr. HINDS:
I am addressing the Chair, Sir. I have addressed the Chair. (Mr. WALCOTT You cannot address any Chair.) I cannot address a chair home at you. I can address a chair home at me. You cannot even address one home at you. Your trouble is that you had the Union money and nobody jailed you for it. That is your trouble. You borrowed the money and built a house and put it in your wife's name.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
I ask both members to take their seats. I am asking the hon. member to state the remarks complained of.

Mr. HINDS:
I will do so. (ASIDES). Can I address the Chair?

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
That is why I want both hon. members to withdraw their remarks.

Mr. WALCOTT:
I said that the Hon. Prime Minister is a man of unimpeachable character. I am not going to withdraw the remarks that the Prime Minister is a man of unimpeachable character. I am not withdrawing them.

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

Mr. WALCOTT:
I am not withdrawing them.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
I call upon you to withdraw them.

Mr. WALCOTT:
I am not withdrawing them. No matter who calls upon me to withdraw them, I am not withdrawing them. If Jesus calls, if God calls or anybody calls upon me, I am not withdrawing them

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
I am asking the hon. member to withdraw his remarks that the Prime Minister is unimpeachable. I am asking the hon. member for St. Peter relative to the remarks complained of to withdraw those remarks. I will ask all hon. members of this Chamber to understand - I am going to make it quite clear here and now that I do not care which hon. member gets up and shouts as loud as he likes at the Chair. When I rule, I will deal with the relative Standing Order. I will deal with this matter. Do not think that I am standing here and do not know what I am about. What are the remarks that the hon. member has complained about?

Mr. HINDS:

That the member has said that a man with a record like mine - imagine a man with a record like mine can be compared with the Prime Minister, with a man of unimpeachable character like the Prime Minister, thereby imputing that I am not a man with unimpeachable character in here.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Under Standing Order No. 28(7), no member may impute improper motives to another member. Under Standing Order 28(5) it shall be out of order to use offensive and insulting language about Members of the House. Now I am going to ask both Members to withdraw insulting remarks which were offensive to both. Loud mouth rat? We do not have them inside here, it is against the Standing Orders to use offensive and insulting language about members. Therefore if the character of a member inside here is impeachable it should always be stated by giving motives. According to these Standing Orders that member would be brought up. I will ask both members to withdraw those statements and also that the statements be expunged from the record.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the remarks.

Mr. WALCOTT:

I have no intention of withdrawing the statement that the Prime Minister is a man of impeachable character. I will leave this Chamber before I withdraw that. If the Chairman does not understand what the word means it is not my fault.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I will ask the hon. member now to leave this Chamber for the remainder of today's sitting.

Mr. WALCOTT left the Chamber.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Chairman, I arrived in this Chamber when consideration of this Resolution had begun, and from what I have heard it appears to me that criticism was leveled at certain Heads. I think it is important that this Chamber should be reminded, because it has been told from time to time, that for equipment and

supplies and by supplies I don't mean money, we have a chief supply department. I am sure that hon. members sitting here must have heard time and time again how this country imports the things which are required and for which this House votes. 6.40 p.m.

When this House votes that a Fire Tender, a motor vehicle, or anything that we do not produce in this country, is required, the matter goes back to the civil servants. The Minister's functions end here in Parliament. You are very close to the Government, Mr. Chairman, and you know that not even the brand name is permitted to be put in the Estimates. Even if we are importing a vehicle, we cannot even say an "Austin" vehicle for fear that there may be accusations, from time to time, that we are preferring one vehicle to another. If Government want a vehicle, the Officer concerned shops around for the best value for money. He asks for quotations; he looks at the performance of the vehicle; he looks at the past history of the vehicle in this country, and then orders the vehicle. The Minister does not know when these things are being done.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister's functions end in the House at Estimates time when the money is voted. Everything then goes back to the Cabinet Secretary, and all of the files are sent back to their respective Departments. The people in the respective Departments will then take the necessary action. Time and time again we sit here and vote money because the vehicles we have ordered have not arrived by the end of the financial year. Under the Rules, as you know, Sir, the funds will lapse and we will have to re-vote those funds.

Now, I sat here and heard it said that Mr. Sherman Alleyne of the Fire Department had been sent abroad to look at Fire Tenders. I would ask the question: What better Officer in the Fire Department could be sent to examine. Fire Tenders than Sherman Alleyne? The same Sherman Alleyne built two Fire Tenders in Barbados and saved thousands of dollars that the Government had already voted. He has a special knowledge, it appears, to manufacture and produce these things. In the light of this, Mr. Chairman, what better Fire Officer could be sent abroad to examine the Fire Tenders that we are ordering? It is all well and good to sit here and level accusations.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of elucidation, Sir. I am not criticising Mr. Alleyne's going. I criticise the method of selection, and I am saying now that the Prime Minister made a specific request that Mr. Alleyne be sent to Canada.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Chairman, that is no point of elucidation.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
No point of elucidation whatsoever!

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:
Mr. Chairman, what is wrong with that? He is the person who has the knowledge. It is easy to sit and level accusations because Barbadians are susceptible to accusations; they feed on accusations, and as long as people are willing to feed them with such things they will accept them. This, Mr. Chairman, is what we are experiencing here this afternoon.

The question that Head 28 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 29 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 29 - Town and Country Planning - $5,846 - stand part.

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

Mr. FORDE:
Mr. Chairman, I think it is about time that this House has some substantive debate on the functions of the Town and Country Planning Department and the nonfunctioning of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1965, and this is about as good a time as possible to start on this subject. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that I am over-stating the case when I say that the Town and Country Planning Act, 1965, although it has been proclaimed, has not been operated in accordance with the legislation, and that the Government, for whatever reason they know best, have seen it fit not to carry out the provisions of the Act.

Under the Act, for instance, it is provided that an Advisory Council should be established to advise the

Minister. This has not taken place, despite the fact that the Act has been in operation now for something like five or Six years. Under the Act it is provided that the Minister should approve a Development Plan for the development of the whole of the Island; that he should publish in the Official Gazette notice of the Development Plan when it is submitted to him, and if there are objections there should be a Public Inquiry. That after he has had the benefit of the Inquiry, he should approve the Plan, if he so feels, subject to modifications, if he so feels, and that the Plan should be brought before Parliament for Parliament's approval.

The Chief Town Planner has submitted, for several years now, a Development Plan to the Minister. The Inquiry on that Plan has taken place before Mr. Justice Williams as special Commissioner. This House has voted money for payment of the Chief Commissioner; the Chief Commissioner's Report has been before the Minister for over eighteen months now, and this House has not yet had the benefit of the Development Plan being brought before it for its approval. What is the effect of this? The effect is that instead of having comprehensive planning for Barbados as a whole, we are having adhoc decisions being taken by a Committee of Ministers, in my submission, quite unlawfully under this Act, instead of decisions being taken as the Act provides.

Now, it is necessary to have a Development Plan so that planning could function properly in these respects: In the first place, the Island as a whole would know what areas are zoned and for what particular purposes, so that certain people cannot get an undue advantage over other persons by buying land which may be passed for certain specific development purposes and then making a quick capital gain at the expense of other persons who have their lands. 6.50 p.m.

I am saying as a fact that some of the decisions that have been taken by the Committee of three Ministers on the development of land in Barbados has not been in the best interest of this Island. I am not going to put it any higher, and I am saying that they are not applying proper planning methods or decisions to this, and it is unfair to say the least that we should have ad hoc decisions being taken when we should have a proper system of planning. I am asking the Government if this legislation is irrelevant to repeal the Act, but if you have legislation which you recommended to this House in 1965 as being very relevant legislation, as being in the interest of the Island, it is surprising that in 1973, despite the proclamation of the Act in 1968, you cannot come before the House with the Development Plan. I sympathise with the Minister of Agriculture. For the benefit of the hon. member for St. Michael North West I am saying that five years after the Act has been proclaimed we still have not had the Development Plan brought before the House. I am not saying that the Act was proclaimed five years after it had been passed in this House. Indeed the Act has been amended in the light of various experiences.

Mr. Chairman, I sympathise with the Minister of Agriculture having to come at this late stage and tell

us that he cannot afford to have any more land moved out of agriculture; but it is too late because some of the choicest agricultural spots have already moved out of agriculture. I can hardly believe that golf is agriculture, although some people tell me that you need three quarters for golfers in order to get the green as pretty as possible. Durants is one of the few areas in Barbados where we have an abundance of sheet water for vegetable growing, but that has been passed. I am not going to go on. In the rich St. George Valley we have had agricultural land taken out of agriculture; it is some of the best soil formation you have in Barbados, and I think it is wrong. The Minister is now saying that he is going to insist that people with four acre lots of land on which they have built one house should be forced to build on 10,800 square feet and put the balance in agriculture, and he is going to legislate if necessary for this. He does not need any specific legislation. The legislation was there for the Government to use and the necessary conditions should have been laid down at the planning stage; but failure to operate this Act properly is what has brought us to the position we are in today.

I am very grieved by the Government's failure to recognise that planning cannot be a secret within the bosoms of three Ministers as a Committee. Why three Ministers? Was not the one Minister who should review decisions adequate? There is another criticism of the Act that I think is justified. To me I think it is unfair that there are planning applications which have been made and asked for review for several months, and in some cases several years, that are still in the Ministry without the citizen being given an opportunity to have his case presented and an impartial review taking place. The Act is not made to function and the Government cannot say that it is the fault of the Civil Servants only in this respect. I think it is the policy decisions being taken by the Government which are wrong, and any recognised and unbiased planner any part of the world will tell you that the smaller the country the more necessary it is to have a published Development Plan, because people will feel they are having as fair a chance as anybody else. For instance, if the Prime Minister applies for a change of land use in respect of any of the acres he owns, he would want to know it is not being passed on by a Committee of three Ministers, his own colleagues, if he wants to see that everything is done fairly. He would want the Chief Town Planner to go through the motions and that he is treated like any other citizen and there is no undue advantage appearing to be granted to him. That is why I am asking the Government to say what are the areas that are allowed for tourism, which for agriculture and which for commercial development, because there is no doubt that already in this country the speculators have moved in and have already got an undue advantage. Why I view this seriously is that we have no capital gains tax in Barbados.

Mr. Chairman, I have known people from overseas to come down here and pay down 10%, something like $8,000 on a bit of land and have left Barbados without completing their deal in their own name and have made capital gains of tremendous amounts, sometimes $50,000 or $60,000. I know of one particular person who in the Christ Church area made a capital gain of $300,000 merely being a fly by night operator who borrowed his deposit from the bank. That cannot be fair to Barbadians. None of that territory should have gone with him to Canada. He came down here and made his money in a short space of time. I will gjve the Minister the name. I am not one of those people who like to call names on the Floor of the House, but I will make the information available to him. I am not talking about legitimate persons in Barbados who conduct their business and go and see a proper deal, pay income tax and live here and have resident status here; I am talking about fly by night people who are coming into

this country and bleeding it so that there is very little deal left in it either for those who live here or those who care to put down their bucket in this place.

I seriously appeal to the Government to make the Town and Country Planning Act function properly. Pay some respect to the experts in the field. It saddens me to see young officers having to resign from that Department through frustration. It saddens me to see that a body like the Town and Country Planning Society which gives proper advice has its comments ignored. It saddens me to see that we are not in a position to use the Town and Country Planning Act to preserve some of our national heritage, and I wonder whether the Government is concerned about this. I would not want them to vote only for this today; I would want to vote for an improvement in the functioning of the Act and of the Department. It is said that many of the senior officers in the department are frustrated. The technical people feel like leaving because they feel they are not allowed to work as professionals properly. If this is so, and the Government must know if it is so, then the Government should take note of these allegations, investigate them and find out whether the fault is because of the commission of something within the department, or the omission on the part of the Government to do various things, and if it is, I ask them to take steps to improve the situation.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Chairman, I do not rise to take issue with much of what the hon. member for Christ Church West has said because a lot of what he has said I am sure is correct. I merely want probably in one or two instances to correct what I would consider to be a mis-statement of fact. I hope he does not rise to object to that. There is no Cabinet Committee of three members looking after any town planning matters as the hon. member has said. The position is this A considerable backlog of applications and appeals particularly appeals, built up in the Town Planning Department. Now if one understands how the appeals are done, one would understand why this Committee of Cabinet Ministers was brought into play. First of all you have your Reporters under the Act and there is a Chairman. Time and time again it was impossible to get persons to hear town planning appeals as required by the Act in spite of the fact that the panel was increased considerably, and even when the appeals were heard it took a considerably long time to get from these persons the results of their hearings. 7.OO p.m.

Hon. members here have complained about appeals to the Town Planning Department. The public at large have been complaining about the build up of work at the Town Planning Department, and it was because of this, in order to alleviate some of the hardship, that the Prime Minister appointed - Mr. Chairman, I would like at this stage to move that you report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, we are asking leave to continue with this debate for another four or five minutes or so in order to conclude the business. We are nearing completion. I think it is the wish of members on both sides of the House especially in view of the fact that dinner has not been ordered. I ask Your Honour to exercise your discretion. I will move that the necessary Standing Orders be suspended. I beg to move that Standing Order 6(3) be suspended.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS:

Can the Standing Orders be suspended after seven o'clock, Sir? The Caterer just borrowed my station wagon in order to collect something for hon. members to eat. I can assure the House that any such motion will be controversial.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER:

It being now 7 p.m. the sitting will be suspended until 8 p.m.

The sitting was accordingly suspended until 8 p.m.

On Resumption:

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER:
When the sitting was suspended the House was in Committee of Supply, and to that it now reverts.

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

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:
Mr. Chairman, at the suspension I was trying to explain the position of the Committee of Ministers, as reference was made to that by the hon. member for Christ Church West. Now, the Minister of Home Affairs has statutory functions under the Act, and he can, if he wants to, ask for applications to be sent to him by the Chief Town Planner.

I have explained to this Chamber the difficulties in the hearing of appeals, and I have explained that the Committee of Cabinet Ministers was born - indeed the Prime Minister has spoken on this in this Chamber before - out of the problem that people were experiencing in having matters heard and determined by the Chief Town Planner.

Now this may or may not sometimes have a bearing on the publication or lack of publication of the Physical Development Plan. I think that all of us agree that it is desirable to have this Physical Development Plan published so that it can be used as a guide line for the development control of the country; and I think that it was in 1970 that the Plan was published, and there was a hearing on the Plan, and persons came and made representation.

I cannot now remember what stage this plan is at. I have the feeling that a decision has been taken to lay the Plan as amended since publication in Parliament. Of course, I am speaking under correction; but I think that is the case. I merely want to put the record straight as regards the Committee to which the member for Christ Church West made reference. He said that the Committee has acted illegally. In fact the Committee is being assisted in the hearing of a number of outstanding applications under the Act.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, before you put the question I wonder if the Minister would tell us the age of each of these applications which are still lying in the Town Planning Department. If the Minister would be so good as to give us a little bit of information as to how long these applications have been lying about in the Town Planning office without being dealt with, we should be grateful.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I may mention that the Government on; investigation found out that there were certain applications pending, that is the reason why we set up our appointed reporters, or machinery to deal with these appeals. There were several of these Committees which have been examining the situation and making recommendations to Cabinet.

It is through the adoption of such measures that we have been able to clear up many of these appeals to the advantage of the appellants. This has been going on for some time, and the Hon. Minister of Lands who was then Minister of Home Affairs has just explained how the Appeals Committee was set up, so that regardless of how many appeals are pending, and the period for which they have been pending, I am afraid that I am not in a position to answer this, but it can probably be a matter for a substantive question. 8.05 p.m.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, it is not so much the appeals that I am worried about, but it is a question of applications which have been submitted and the Town Planning Department has not made a decision on them. There are rumours that there are applications in the Department as old as five years and no decisions have ever been made on them. There are also rumours of files being misplaced. You are told that files cannot be found and so on. These are the things that really matter.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I have been instructed, Sir, that some have been as long outstanding as 1969, but they have been processed and reprocessed in consultation with the applicants although the applications are still in the original. There are others which have been processed well within the 2-year period. There are justifiable complaints in that many of those applications, as have been drawn to the attention of this Committee, have been pending for a very long time. I will promise the hon. member to draw this matter to the attention of the appropriate Hon. Minister and the Cabinet and see that something is done in this connection. We all feel very strongly about this matter.

The question that Head 29 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 30 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, in moving that Head 30 - Prisons - stand part, there are several items which are to be considered. In so far as the main item in the sum of $40,262 is concerned, the position is that on the current provision of $55,000 there is an increase of $12,500 over the 1972-73 provisions. The 1972-73 provisions proved to be $40,262 too small, but $13,571.60 was paid from the provision in respect of 1971-72 commitment. Now $13,050 incurred in 1970-71 had to be met from the 1971-72 provision, and similar situations for similar amounts arose in 1970-71 and in 1969-70.

The position is that the population at the Prison has increased. The Prison population is now 220 as compared with 180 or therebout a year or two years ago. The cost of food has increased, as we all know and it is costing Government at present an average of $5 a day to feed the average prisoner. That gives you an idea as to why this large amount is needed to supplement this item.

As far as clothing is concerned, this item is increased by $1,600 on the Current Estimates to $5,600. The increase is due to the inclusion of $1,614 for prisoners' clothing under this item, instead of placing it with the provision for bedding and linen for prisoners. If there are any other questions, I will try to answer them. The amounts needed for Furniture and Equipment, Office Expenses and Utilities are also mentioned here.

I beg to move that Head 30 stand part. Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

I beg to second that.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, I notice that there is a considerable amount which is being asked for to meet the cost of foodstuffs. In this day and age when the cost of foodstuff is rising, I wonder if the authorities have not considered a better method, in keeping with the times, of utilising prison service rather than sweeping the gates at Government House and so on. There are several Agricultural Stations which are doing nothing. The Prison has land in the compound, and I should very much like to see that a term of imprisonment is used as a method of rehabilitation and training, and that prisoners be put to do some sort of gardening so that they can grow their own foodstuffs to supply the Prison. The system of taking a lorry load of prisoners to sweep the gates at Government House on mornings should be changed.

I have heard the Democratic Labour Party talking about advancing into the 70'5, but rather than advancing into the 70's, you still have prisoners with grass brooms brushing around Government House. That sort of thing was being done from the 1920's. There are machines which could sweep an area bigger than Government House in a short space of time. I fed that prisoners should be given some sort of instruction which would help them later in life.

Now, the Minister of Agriculture talks about an agrarian policy; he talks about training the 4-Hers, but I am sure that the prisoners could be trained to grow vegetables and proper crops. When they leave prison they should be equipped to make a livelihood. They should not be seen in Bridgetown begging, and it is not an easy thing for a man who has been released from prison to get a job. Instead of coming to Parliament to ask for $40,262, I would have liked to hear that the sum required is $40,262, but it is estimated that crops grown by prisoners would amount to $10,000. Some of the prisoners get some sort of pay and, in my opinion, this would be a better method of utilising the services of these people by training them for a worthwhile occupation and a better form of rehabilitation than to send them out without being fit to do anything.

The Minister talks about an agrarian policy, but it will be necessary to have people who are devoted to the soil and are trained in doing what you expect them to do. You cannot take a man from Bridgetown, send him in the country to buy a 2-acre lot, and expect him to work the land at the back of his house after he has worked all day in Bridgetown. He cannot work in Bridgetown and then go home and work in his garden.

If these prisoners have nothing to do when they leave prison and they live on a Government Housing Scheme, they should be able to have two or three beds where they can grow lettuce or cabbage and utilise the training given to them when they were paying their debt to society rather than walking about telling people that they have just been released from prison and asking them for a job or something to go by. It is not easy to get a job after you have been sent to prison. 8.15 p.m.

As I have said before, we get very little information when it comes to things dealing with the Estimates or Supplementary Estimates, and when one looks at the Addendum or the notes set out, they do not tell you exactly what the furniture and equipment will be. I would very much like to see this because I remember that in 1967-68 the Prison used to have a first class compliment of workmen who used to produce high quality mahogany desks, office chairs, dining room tables and so on. I would hate to think that we are now buying steel desks, chairs and these various things if there are people still in the prison, because you are voting money for the prison workshop. Either you are training these people to do these things or you are not, and that is why I would like to know what the office equipment, furniture

and equipment will be- I wonder if the Leader of the House has this information available and can tell us. (ASIDES) Should I ask a question to get a reply like the one you gave to Parliamentary Question No. 95?

Mr. Chairman, I heard an aside.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
I have not. You are addressing the Chair.

Mr. BOLDEN:
I will ask the Leader of the House if he can explain to us what this furniture and equipment is that they are buying for the prison with this money?

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

Mr. BOLDEN:
Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Leader of the House said if there are any questions to be asked he would gladly supply the answer. I have asked a question and you have to give him time to peruse his papers and give me the answer.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would give way, this is another item affected by the population increase in the prison. With $1,178 from this year's vote satisfying last year's commitments, and with the need for more cots, beds and things like that, we need this additional sum.

Mr. BOLDEN:
You see, Mr. Chairman, it boils down to what I have been saying. Once before the cots used to be made at the prison by the prisoners for the prisoners. They also used to supply the Mental Hospital.

Hon. P. M, GREAVES:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to know on what the hon. member has risen. He has already made his speech in Committee. It appears to me that he is making another speech. He has not said he has risen on a point of order or elucidation.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

The Hon. Minister rose and asked if the hon. member would give way.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member had taken his seat and sat for a long time when you were going to put the question, and it is only at that point that he said the Minister had said he would answer any questions. But he had taken his seat for a good few minutes.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, there was a time when the prisoners Used to make cots for themselves and for the Mental Hospital.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, under the Standing Orders of this Chamber, I am submitting that the hon. member is breaking the Rules.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, is the hon. member challenging your ruling?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

I am making a submission and I am on a point of order.

The question that Head 30 - Prisons - stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 36 - Ministry of Education (7) Hotel School - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 36 - Ministry of Education (7) Hotel School - stand part.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:
I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:
Mr. Chairman, we believe that the decision to have a separate Head for the Hotel School as distinct from the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic was perhaps a good thing, but I do not belive that the correct nomenclature has been give the senior officer of an institution such a the Hotel School is expected to be. We axe of the opinion that the importance that the Hotel School is expected to play in the role of our development in a day such as this is that it should be represented as an imposing sort of institution that can throw upon the industry people processing the type of training that can enhance the industry in more aspects than we have been able to see during the past. There has been, Mr. Chairman, complaints that training at this institution in the past was not spread out over a broad enough area, and this is in respect to personnel. You find that there were some Barbadians who were given initial courses before they went on to Canada, and complaints have been made that the treatment that was meted out to those people as against treatment that was meted out to people because of the colour of their skin is something that needs to be investigated, because however one may look at it, the hotel industry in this Island is still dangling before the tourists a certain image, and even this Parliament of ours lends itself to doing this. 8.25 p.m.

I am sorry that the Minister of Tourism is not now in his place. I believe that one of the biggest insults being offered to our industry is the present Minister of Tourism looking at him as a person. I am very sorry that he is not in his place.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:
On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that I have heard correctly. If what I have heard is correct it would be a breach of Standing Orders. It would be a breach of Standing Oder 28(5).

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
The Hon. Minister is taking objection to the remarks and I ask that they be withdrawn.

Mr. HINDS:
If you call on me to withdraw them I shall withdraw them. I have no hesitation about that at all.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:
I think that they are so offensive but the matter lies with you, Mr. Chairman. I think that these remarks should be taken off the record. It lies with you to say that the remarks should be taken off the record.

Mr. HINDS rose.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
Are you addressing the Chair?

Mr. HINDS:
I am addressing the Chair and I have gone on addressing the Chair, Sir. The Hon. Minister can rise on a point of order on anything that he likes.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
Has the hon. member completed his address?

Mr. HINDS:
When an hon. member completes his address he takes his seat. You know that when it comes to talking you do not hive to tell me to complete my address. That is what I am here for. What I am saying is that I believe that the Government could have done the industry much better than putting the present Minister in the position in which he finds himself as Minister of Tourism.

Now, what you will find is this: I have taken opportunity in the past to draw to the attention of the Government the fact that the Hotel School is a cell for dope pushing. I say this, and I do not want to be annoyed by any member of the Police Force coming to ask me to assist them in locating where or how people go about this business. It is for them to do their job. I do enough when I come here; but what I

am saying is this what I say here can be checked on. The police are in possession of evidence that a member of staff of the Hotel School was involved when a hotelier was arrested on the St. Lawrence coast. They are in possession of that information. They know the part that was played by the person who is now on the staff of the Hotel School. They know this. Much of what has been going on here today in the discussion about Seawell Airport needs to be brought into this because I am sure that despite the fact that people will be armed with authority to arrest, there are certain people who can trespass at Seawell Airport, go any part of Seawell Airport and they are known to be more than suspected of carrying dope at the time.

Their suspicious moments have attracted the attention of members of the Force at Seawell Airport, but no arrests are made because those people hob nob with certain members whom I am sure the hon. member who was not long ago on his feet would rise to object to again if you said that they are in association with friends of the same Minister.

That is the trouble with us here, so that when you give people at the Airport authority to do this and to do that, let them go down to the Hotel School. Yes, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Let us keep just to the Hotel School and not to Seawell.

Mr. HINDS:

No, Sir. I am discussing dope at Seawell and I am going to prove to you my point because the Instructor from the Hotel School has been known to go to Seawell and receive it at Seawell. This has been seen by members of the Force but they can do nothing about it because they are friends of certain people. I am not worthy of having those friends.

That is our trouble, but you will find, Mr. Chairman, that there are people now who go to the same Hotel School and who are doing a thriving business. They can come out from the Hotel School and do a thriving business at their respective hotels when they return there after receiving instructions plus dope.

That is the kind of situation with which we are faced. What I am saying seems to be providing a certain measure of amusement for the Hon. Minister - the Acting Attorney General as I think he now is known. I think that we should take note of the fact that it has been said that there is now a necessity to appoint a counterpart to the Senior Instructor at the Hotel School. If this is the case, I think that it should

bear out the point that I have made. If you are having another Senior Instructor, you do not want to have two and call both of them Senior Instructors. You should look for an appropriate title for one. In other words, one should be more senior than the other, and you should try to give the staff the sort of structuring that bears the same relation to institutions of this kind. You should relate it title-wise to similar institutions that are to be found in other parts of the world.

I believe, Sir, that much could be derived from a properly run Hotel School in this country, 8.35 p.m.

We are satisfied that some of the students who go there have certainly benefited from the instructions they have received. If it were a case that their training could be on a continuous basis, I believe that some of them who show merit would go much further than they are allowed to go at present. I would urge upon the Government to give consideration to this matter, and we would find, eventually, that we would not be turning out the vast number of high-falutin domestics as in the past, but we would be turning out people who could reach a higher status in the structure of things. I should like the Government to give consideration to that aspect of the matter.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Mr. Chairman, this particular supplementary provision has been made necessary because the Canadian International Development Agency is phasing out its assistance to the Barbados Hotel School, and hence provision of the Senior Instructor and the two Instructors. Provision must be made in the Estimates for these posts. In particular we are in search of Barbadians to assume these positions of leadership in the Hotel School and, secondly, the posts of Assistant Accountant, Storekeeper, and Clerk/Typist have become necessary because we have set up the Hotel School as a separate institution from the beginning of this financial year.

We need not be told, Mr. Chairman, that the Hotel School should be turning out persons who are more than high-falutin cooks. The courses offered at the Hotel School embrace both the craft level and the middle management level. There are courses in Reception, in basic Cooking and Advanced Cooking. There are courses for waiters, waitresses, and for those who attend in the bar and in the dining room. Those are courses at the craft level. Above that we have courses at the middle management level for those assuming supervisory positions in the different departments and sub-departments. We need not be told that this is what the Hotel School should be doing. It has already put on a course at middle management level, and I believe another one will be coming shortly.

I should merely like to make it clear that I have no evidence about any dope pushing, or dope peddling, or other breaches of the law, going on at the Hotel School. Certainly, if I had that type of

information, I would place it before the Police which is the competent body in this country to deal with those matters. If, as the hon. member claims, the Police are in possession of such information and have done nothing about the matter, I assume that they do not have enough evidence. I cannot speak on these matters because, unlike the hon. member, that type of information does not come to me.

The question that Head 36(7) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 36(15) was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 36 - Ministry of Education (15) Community Development - Item 32 - in the sum of $8,716 stand part.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, this item for $8,716 is a re-vote. The note says that due to an oversight, the final instalment was not paid to the Museum and Historical Society during the financial year 1972-73. An oversight on whose part, Sir? I believe that the time has come when Government should be giving more consideration to the Barbados Museum and Historical Society and seeing whether modern ideas or thinking could be dribbled into the heads of members of the Committee in some respect.

I believe that all hon. members should agree that it is time the Barbados Museum and Historical Society should be putting on an exhibition which should reflect in some way the political history of this country up to the present. It is known that when this Parliament was 300 years old, there was a very large picture of our House of Assembly. I do not think that there is any respectable looking picture of Parliament, or of the picture commemorating the 300-year anniversary of Parliament, to be found at the Barbados Museum and Historical Society. I also believe that it is a very serious omission.

I feel that the Government should endeavour to see that the Curator and the Committee get down to modernising their thinking as to what the Museum should portray from time to time so that it will be

kept as up to date as possible in having something to offer us. One cannot deny that history is made in this country each day, and it is the duty of the Museum wherever possible, to assist researchers and others in having something tangible before them. 8.45 p.m.

There are some very old pictures to be found in the Museum and I am sure there are some others in this Parliament, in our banquet hall, that the museum should be in possession of, or if not, replicas of some of then.. All of this is history to our lasting benefit and I would wish that Government would give this matter the consideration that it deserves.

The question that Head 36- Ministry of Education (15) Community Development - stand partt was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Resolution for the sum of $202,700 do now pass.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:
I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1973-74 No. 14

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Chairman, the Addendum sets out this matter very clearly. It is for the institution of a training programme for fishermen using one of the UNDP Project Vessels. The Addendum goes on to explain it very thoroughly. In the past, trainees have been paid an allowance of $50 per month and at the same time while on board, received free board at a cost of $3.00 per day, but due to the increased cost of living etc. the rate is $5.00 per day. On the basis of these estimates five trainees will cost approximately $7,200 for six months' training, and then there are other local costs which amount to $3,940, making a total of $13,100. There are maids who are employed for 52 weeks at $42 per week, watchmen $56 per week and so on, making a total of $8,944, less the amount which was voted of $5,000, leaving a balance

of roughly $4,000. This is for instituting a new trainee scheme in order to carry on and to benefit as a result of the project which we had here.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:
I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:
Mr. Chairman, undoubtedly any scheme for the training of fishermen or any group of persons in this country so that they can acquire any sort of skill to help them is something to be appreciated. We must look at this, Mr. Chairman, in this light. What evidence does the Minister have to advance to bear out that our fishermen have in truth and in fact benefited to any considerable extent by any training that has been given under this scheme in the past? When I ask that, I am not asking the Minister to tell us how many men have learned to splice rope and the like. What we are trying to get from the Minister is an explanation as to what has been the capacity to earn by those who were trained when related to those who have had to go on their own.

You have people in the garment industry here whom you say you are training to take up positions to bring about certain standards of production, but then there is no guarantee as to what these people's pay is going to be like. You train them and let them loose, I cannot say for the villains in the industry, and allow them to be taken advantage of. The Minister should be telling us of Government's plans to launch a giant cooperative with deep sea fishing on a large scale with trawlers bringing fish to our shores in the process of time. What studies have been carried out in this respect and what are your requirements with respect to training? How far is Government advanced along this line? What is being done for these men? It is all right for us to say that the extension of the period during which the Headquarters for the Caribbean Fisheries Training and Development Centre will remain in Barbados, and that establishment of this Centre, which will be located in Trinidad as the successor to the UNDP/FAO Fisheries Development Project has been delayed for a period of about six months. We understand this, but that in itself is not enough. During the six months how many people are you going to train? After they are trained what are they going to do? In other words, we do not want to hear that we vote money to assist these men in training, and you find that in the shrimp industry that has had the support of this Honourable House for its launching, Barbadian shrimpers are denied the opportunity to man the boats, and people from St. Vincent and other places are given first preference as captains, and the St. Vincent captains are recruiting St. Vincent crews and the Barbadians are left here on the rocks. We are hearing all this. They are bringing in people from Trinidad and elsewhere and paying them a lot of money per week as standbys until boats come, and Barbadians who have captained shrimp boats are down here doing absolutely nothing and have their families to feed and can find no employment. Some of them fly

from here to Trinidad in search of a shrimp boat and you are bringing in shrimp boat captains from Trinidad and elsewhere to man boats that should come to Barbados, and nobody seems to be taking any stock of that kind of situation. 8.55 p.m.

So we are asking that if you are going to be training men, training people, that some sort of consideration should be given to those people who have training so that they can take their rightful place in the order of things according to their ability or whatever it is; but really and truly, from what we can gather from the information that has been reaching us, and the efforts that I have made personally to contact some of the people who are employing these people in the shrimp industry, I am not satisfied that it is going as we have been led to believe in this Honourable House that it would be going when it got launched.

I am urging on the Government to examine all these things. If we are going to train these people, if we are going to see to them, see that we fit them out in truth and in fact as trawler crews; but for heaven's sake, do not train them and leave them to be roaming about the streets with no trawlers to go on. Do not leave them to suffer worse than they have been suffering in the past.

I would hope that by the time they have finished their training that they will be able to join some trawler with people who have had some experience so that they will be able to further their experience as they go along and will be able to earn a dollar to help themselves and their families.

I hope that a giant trawler fishing cooperative will be formed in the not too distant future and that the entire Caribbean will benefit and not Barbados alone.

The question that the Resolution for $13,100 do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. P. M GREAVES, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of two Resolutipjns in Committee of Supply, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly,

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. P. M GREAVES, the Resolutions

were read a first and second time and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Speaker, this now concludes Government Business for today's sitting. I beg to move that the House do mow adjourn until Tuesday, 16th October this year, at 12 o'clock noon.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:
I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly. 9.00p.m.