
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 30th January, 1962

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12 o'clock (noon) today.

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., (*Speaker*)
Mr. F. E. MILLER; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. J. W. CORBIN;
Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (*Minister of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism*); Mr. R. ST.C. WEEKES;
Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. L. A. LYNCH; Mr. G. V. BATSON, (*Chairman of Committees*); Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD and
Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (*Minister of Social Services*).

Prayers were read.

Mr. COWARD entered the House and took his seat.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the meeting of this Assembly held on the 23rd January, 1962, have been printed and circulated amongst hon. members, and unless there be any objection, those Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed (*PAUSE*) Apparently there is no objection, and those Minutes are now taken as read and confirmed.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD entered the House and took his seat.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I beg to lay the Fire Service (Duty Allowance) Regulations, 1961.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of \$524 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1961-62 Part I - Current, as shown in the supplementary Estimate 1961-62, No. 40 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I beg to give notice of a Bill entitled The Pensions (Amendment) Bill, 1962.

Mr. HOLDER entered the House and took his seat.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to consider the Money Resolution of which notice has just been given.

Mr. WALCOTT entered the House and took his seat.

QUESTION

Mr. G. V. BATSON: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Is the Minister aware of the expense that several householders in the parish of St. Thomas have undergone in wiring their homes with the expectation of getting Electricity therein?

2. If the answer is "yes", will Government consider implementing immediately a scheme to cause Electricity to be placed at the disposal of residents in the parish of St. Thomas?

Mr. SMITH entered the House and took his seat.

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill entitled the Pensions (Amendment) Bill, 1962, be now read a first time.

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House:- To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the island.

On the motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. BATSON being in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1961-62 No. 38

ELECTRICAL INSPECTION - TRAVELLING EXPENSES

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is a Resolution for the sum of \$300. This supplementary provision is required for the payment of travelling allowances. This request is made through the increased demand by other Government Departments for services and by the public for inspection. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

12.15 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1961-62 No. 39

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, this is a Supplementary Resolution for the sum of \$120,589 to be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1961-62, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1961-62, No. 39 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

The Addendum sets out in detail, Mr. Chairman, the various purposes of this Resolution. I think it is quite clear and I am asking the Committee to agree to this Resolution. I would just like to point out that in five of the Items, Nos. 12, 91, 94, 96 and 107, it is stated that the proposal for these grants was not granted in 1960-61. I would like to make it clear too, lest it be misunderstood, that in truth and in fact the proposal for Supplementary Estimates was submitted by the General Hospital late in the financial year; as a matter of fact, too late for the various explanations to be gone into, and therefore there was not time enough to deal with the provisions in that year. A vast amount of these Estimates, therefore, results from the fact that there was not time enough to ask for it in the financial year, 1960-61, and therefore the Hospital Administration was asked to let it go over into the following year's Estimates, 1961-62.

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

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, this is a considerable amount of money which is being passed for the General Hospital, and during the interim between the general election and this Sitting of the House, a Report, a very serious indictment on the Hospital Administration, was made, and I consider it appropriate that at this stage we cannot wait too long before we discuss this public document. It is true that any hon. member can bring in a Resolution to discuss it, but I think it is incumbent on the Government to lay it on the Table and have a discussion on it. A lot of what we are proposing to do in passing this Resolution forms part of the criticisms which have been made in this Report, and if I may say so, I have not in my life since I have been a member of this Chamber, seen a public document like that. It is no wonder that the past Government did not release it because it is the most scathing indictment of any public administration short of an indictment which accuses people of corruption. This has not accused the Government of corruption, but of a positive lack in its administrative ability and I would say that the present Government now has a responsibility to the community to say what they intend to do with this Report.

I am going to take this opportunity of saying that the Minister should say here and now in getting this \$120,000 what is the Government's intention about the Report which has been made, to what extent they have met and agreed on it, and to what extent they are going to carry out any measures to implement the recommendations of that Report, and on the other hand, whether the Government intends to have a debate on it. It is not a Report that they have asked for. I should like to know whether they intend to have a debate on the Report or if it is the intention of the Government to lay a Paper, whether they call a White Paper, Resolution or Statement - but I prefer to say a White Paper - so that we can begin to discuss this document which was laid.

I have this Report before me, Mr. Chairman, and in fairness to the public I would say that the Government owes the community the responsibility to let us know since this has been published what the Government proposes to do about the Report. I would like to hear from the Minister what are the proposals, because when I look here and see that we are supplementing to the amount of \$120,000, that is not an inconsiderable amount. Eight times this amount would be \$1 million; and \$1/8th million, in a community where the national income is only \$90 million and where the revenue is \$22 million, cannot be looked upon as something which you are spending lightly. Within the context of your revenue, it represents a substantial amount to be a sup-

plementary estimate. The past Government, Mr. Chairman, did not take heed of supplementary estimates, but in a country which is budgeting for \$20 million, a supplementary provision of \$120,000 at any time would always form a considerable portion of its revenue and budget, and I do hope that the Minister of Finance will institute some other method than the present *ad hoc* arrangement which is carried on here in Government where you can budget for \$20 million this morning and come back in April and say you want \$150,000 which somebody had forgotten to put in the budget, thus making budgeting a bogus scheme and your surpluses and your requirements not meaningful. For that reason I hope that this Government will undertake a method that is not a legacy of the past where we come in from week to week and discuss Resolutions.

I would like to say, too, that I hope this Government will undertake a commonsense approach to these meetings and not bring us here week after week to discuss a few nonsensical money Resolutions that are administrative arrangements because you are not requiring the staff to do the work they should do, and are taking busy men away; and instead of dealing with legislation at a period, you come in to pass Resolutions and say that the Addendum speaks for itself. I do not want any longer in my life to come to this Chamber and hear that Addenda speak for themselves and be called upon to do that type of legislation. I think our time could be more usefully spent in doing other public duties. For that reason I am hoping that the Government will undertake to let us know what is their position with the Hospital Report, because I think it is time that the air should be cleared on this matter, and see to what extent these recommendations can be met.

12.25 p.m.

I think it is essential that we should hear these things and I was hoping that the Hon. Minister would have taken this opportunity to let us know that. If it has slipped him, let us know now.

Mr. MILLER: As was said by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, I hope that the Hon. Minister will reply now. There are many things which I would like to say on this Resolution but I would like to hear first of all if the Minister will give this Committee something on the matter.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I cannot hear what the hon. member is saying.

Mr. MILLER: I was just saying that I would like to say a few things on the Resolution but just as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said, I thought that the Hon. Minister was going to make some statement on this matter. (A VOICE: Go ahead.)

Well, Sir, if the Hon. Minister is not ready to reply, there are just a few things which I would like to say. First of all, I am quite familiar with the intent of the Resolution. This is quite a considerable sum of money coming down as a supplementary, and the Hon. Minister when addressing the Chamber as regards the reasons why this Resolution was not brought in before was quite correct. However, the Hon. Minister should have spoken more in detail. It is a fact that when this Resolution reached the former Cabinet, it came too late for the Estimates. I am familiar with all that is stated here. I think the hon. senior member for St. Peter and even some other hon. members would appreciate the changes which were made in the General Hospital within the short space of five years. As hon. members can see, under the Item, Drugs and Dressings, we voted during the last estimates \$185,000 and now you have to come back for \$78,000. There is no where on earth that you can estimate for that with any degree of accuracy.

In connection with the post of Bacteriologist, we were advertising for two years for such a doctor and it was not until some time last year that we were able to get one. That is the reason why a supplementary request for that Department has come to this House.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if the Government has taken over the bad habits of the last Government and if they are doing likewise, let me get it quite

clear. This Resolution is for the sum of \$120,000. A Report on the General Hospital was released recently and was laid on the Table of the House, and, therefore a reply is something which is required from the Minister when a question is being asked.

I want to make my position clear. I do not think Ministers of the Government should regard their public duty in such a way that when you ask questions on something, they should think you are asking them about their personal affairs or something which is in their backyard. Their personal business is something unto themselves, but every document which is laid in this Chamber is a public document; therefore, if any hon. member requires a debate on it or puts a question to a Minister concerning it, he deserves an answer. If that were not so, then, what was the intention of the Government when they laid the Report on the General Hospital?

Sir, I want to say that the reason why I am asking questions on these things is because they examined the existing structure at the General Hospital under the following heads: Medical, Nursing, Clerical and Administration. Now, you bring in a document which involves three aspects of that Report, and that Report has made a sort of indictment about the way in which we were dealing with these things. That Report said that there are certain simple things which you cannot get done in the Hospital. Because of all that, I am asking the Hon. Minister of Health if he does not know anything concerning these matters, well, do not speak on them. Just say that he does not know; but I do not want these important matters to be lost sight of.

Sir, I will go to a further document. The Government in power issued a manifesto which spoke against the present method of financing the Government. I agree with what they said in that document. Let me remind the Ministers that if they start with this old method of doing things and they are not prepared to answer questions, they will find me extremely difficult.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I am not yet finished. I want to make it quite clear that any question I ask in relation to this matter, a statement can be made by the Minister.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of explanation. The hon. senior member for St. Peter is implying that I had no intention of replying to his question but I was waiting to see if other hon. members in this Chamber wanted to speak before I made a reply.

Mr. WALCOTT: I thank you; but I would like the hon. member to know that there are rules and procedure of this House. If the Chairman puts a question, no member can jump up after he has put it. I rose, Mr. Chairman, because you said "question" and when you put the question that this Resolution do now pass, not even the Hon. Leader of the House can clarify any of these matters. Therefore, I do not think I misunderstood the Minister. I quite understood the Minister. I say again: do not copy the habits of the last Government because their bad habits have caused them to be sitting on this side of the House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I for one do not think that the Hon. Minister of Health or any of the other Ministers would attempt to copy the bad habits of the last Government in power, knowing them as I do. However, they should not expect that this Resolution will be passed by this Committee without hon. members generating some debate on it. I have a few questions to ask the Hon. Minister and I say at once to him that if he cannot answer them today, he should investigate them, because if I do not get the answers from him, there is another way of my getting them.

I am going to deal with Item 90 - Substitute for Officers and Servants on leave. I want the Hon. Minister to tell this Committee for the benefit of the public what is his practice as regards officers on leave. How long must a medical officer or any other officer at the Hospital work in order to get study leave, or any other leave, for that matter? Another

question is this. Have you at the Hospital any officer who has gone on leave and is still drawing full salary? I am not a schoolmaster and if I am not perfectly clear, I am willing to ask the question again. I repeat, how long has an officer to work at the General Hospital in order to get study leave or any other leave whether he is appointed or not? Has there been any officer granted leave who is still drawing money from the Hospital which comes out of Government's funds?

I warn the Hon. Minister that if he cannot answer the questions, do not get into the habit of defending any officer in here. We will be quite satisfied if the Minister will say: "I do not know, but I am perfectly willing to give an answer later".

Now, Sir, I am dealing with Item 12 - House Officers. In the explanatory note to the item, it is stated:- "The provision under this item is \$6,720 to pay salaries of two house officers. This vote was exceeded by \$280 in 1860-61 as an application for this supplementary amount in that financial year was not granted."

That implies to me that that sum was asked for and refused. Am I right in saying so?

12.35 p.m.

I understand that this refers to the last Government. Something could not be granted unless it had been asked for. This is a very serious matter and it goes right through the explanatory notes on this Hospital Resolution. I want to know if these things have been asked for and they have not been granted. I appreciate what has been set out here in the note, that authority has previously been given for the payment of honoraria to certain members of the Medical Staff from lapsing salaries of these posts when either of them is vacant, and so on. While I am on my feet, I also want to know this; I will ask about this as long as I am in this House. Can the Hon. Minister tell me if any attempt has been made or what the Government has found since they have gone into office, or if they intend to have another Radiologist trained at the Hospital or are they going along with what some of the Doctors tell them at the Hospital, that is to say, that there is no need for any other Radiologist? I should like to know if any attempt has been made to offer any scholarships to the young practitioners from the U.C.W.I. or any other University to train another Radiologist. I should like the Minister to be able to tell me that. I do not think that we can pursue this policy year after year of having one Radiologist at a Hospital which has to cater to 200,000 people. The provision of one Radiologist for the Hospital is absolutely inadequate.

I have been asking that question for the last 15 years and I am also saying that there is the necessity for having another permanent Surgeon Specialist on the Staff of the General Hospital, although my friends do not want to agree with me. However, in respect of the Radiologist, I want the Hon. Minister to tell us if they have found any recommendations for the appointment of another Radiologist and what they propose to do. The Note says that extraordinary expenditure from the vote in 1960-61 was incurred in respect of, among other payments, the payment of salaries of temporary Radiologists recruited from the United States of America during the months of May to September, 1960 while the Specialist Radiologist was on leave. If this were the only means of getting Radiologists, I would commend the person who attempted to do this, but I want to know what steps are being taken to remedy this situation.

The Note to Item 91 - Drugs and Dressings - states that it is estimated that the vote will be exceeded by \$78,000, for the following reasons: (a) application for a supplementary amount of \$38,000 in 1960-61 was not granted. This is a serious matter. I cannot conceive, at any Hospital in the world, of a Minister refusing an application. This is not a question of asking for money for the purpose of painting or washing any building; this is something for a substantial amount of money and the vote was overspent. The Auditor General's Department is a very important Department and if anyone attempted to spend money in the wrong way he would be castigated. It would be a very serious thing for anybody to refuse a grant in respect of the Hospital. The

reasons are given here and one is that the number of admissions has increased. Well, we accept that; in all countries of the world people have always appreciated the attention which is due to public health and, consequently, there would be more admissions to the Hospital.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot help reminding the ex-Minister of Social Services of what he said, that is, that there was not one single person on the waiting list for operations in this colony. I am sure that every member of the House at that time will remember that. The hon. member said that we could well afford to train all the young people who were qualified. I would like to ask the Minister if it is true that the Government advertised for a young doctor to go on a post-graduate course in pathology, there was an application from a Gold Medallist and up to now the Government have not replied saying "yes" or "no". I am referring to Dr. Eugene Ward who read such a brilliant address before the medical men from England and of whom every Barbadian should be proud and whom Jamaica snapped up. Barbados did not see fit to reply to the letter and this is not creating any good feeling among the ambitious students of this country. If you find that information lying down in the file then bring it out because we want to hear about that. Do not pursue the habit of thinking that when we ask these things we are asking you about your private business. This is the people's business and we will ask about that on the floor of this House. The Note further sets out that consequent on these increases as have been set out, there has been an increase of the consumption of drugs, dressings, sutures etc. and it goes on to state that issues from the dispensary (drugs and dressings only) have increased; and the numbers are given. The ex-Minister will remember that on one occasion I said that the Hospital had issued a book which is issued in England forbidding medical men from giving drugs other than those which have been prescribed in the book and I was told by the then Premier that I did not know what I was talking about, that I could not appreciate what it all meant and so forth. However, there is one thing which I appreciated and it is that I am a human being; I suffered like anybody else and I had to attend Doctors. 12.45 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, the note says that it is estimated that the vote will be exceeded by \$78,000, and one of the reasons is that application for an amount of \$38,000 in 1960-61 was not granted, meaning as I said, that it was asked for and refused, and included in the reasons also was the question of medicines and so on. The Minister will have to get up and tell me this. Are you suggesting that \$38,000 was refused when the then Minister of Social Services at the Hospital knew that these things were short? Since you have taken over the Government in the last two months and you have stated in black and white that \$38,000 was refused for the General Hospital when a tremendous lot of people were suffering, it is the duty of the Minister to give it the lie, because if it is true it is absolutely scandalous to say that \$38,000 were refused for people who wanted medicine, people who wanted dressings, and above all, people who wanted drugs. I could never know that somebody belonging to me wanted two shillings unless I was asked for it.

If what is written is wrong, Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry and the ex-Minister who was a member of the last Government should get it and deny it. It looks to me, Mr. Chairman, that it is something worse than scandalous for this Government to have to come here today and say that \$38,000 was asked for and refused. I believe the hon. junior member for St. George is the luckiest man that ran for the House of Assembly in the last elections, because he said there were no people on the Waiting List for operations. He said that and it came out publicly in Barbados; but now we are told that \$38,000 were refused for drugs and dressings. You would not have refused \$38,000 for a doctor to go on a spree or for leave passage, but you have refused \$38,000 for drugs and dressings. Not one of the members around this Table from the last Government would like to know that anybody belonging to him was refused medicine or dressing, but the last Government refused \$38,000 which were asked for by those persons who, I presume, knew what they were talking about.

You will remember, Mr. Chairman, that I came in here and talked about not pinning doctors down to using certain drugs. I want to say that Specialists are Specialists in their own rights; a Radiologist is a Radiologist in his own right; a Physician Specialist is a Physician Specialist in his own right; and a Surgeon Specialist is a Surgeon Specialist in his own right and I do not care if what I say today makes enemies or not, but not one Specialist has a right to tell another Specialist that he must stick to a particular drug when he is dealing with a patient. No Surgeon Specialist has a right to tell a Physician Specialist what drug he should use because the Hospital Board says he must use it, because he knows the reaction of the patient he is attending. This kind of thing which is going on at the Hospital will not do, and I throw it out to the Minister of Social Services that he must put his foot down on that. I do not think I have to stress that so far as his Government is concerned, but I think it is something which should be drawn to his attention.

On the question of linen, clothing and uniform, these are things which must be given.

Mr. Chairman, I know it is difficult to get the best doctors with the comparable salaries paid in other territories, especially sprawling Jamaica, but I cannot help thinking when examiners in England who do not know anything about a boy go through his papers and say he is a Gold Medallist in a particular line, how absurd it is for the Barbados Government, after he applied for leave to pursue a course in something in which he specialised and which he was willing and ready to do and come back and give his services to Barbados, after being given a scholarship by the people of Barbados and being among those who said he would come back and give of his best with all the necessary qualifications, not even to reply to him. Why? I should like to know the answer to that question when I finally sit down.

On the question of House Officers, Substitutes for Officers and servants on leave - I think that means Medical Officers - I want to know what is your policy of giving leave for study. Have you been differentiating between doctor and doctors? I cannot get it straight. There is a whispering going around via the grape-vine that you are differentiating between doctor and doctor. If one doctor can get leave and remain on the staff and draw his full salary, and other doctors because of political persuasion though with the necessary ability and desire to specialise are not given the same opportunity, those are things you have to answer on the floor of this House. That is not your personal business; that is our business; and if these things are true, we think the Government which did it should be condemned publicly. (Mr. WALCOTT: They have been condemned already.)

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the question posed by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, I must state that this Resolution has no immediate bearing on the Gillette Report. We have been considering and scrutinizing the Report very carefully, and in the not too distant future a statement of what we propose to do about the Gillette Report will be brought before this Chamber. I would like to inform this Honourable House here and now that certain proposals are presently before the Establishment to make right some of the infelicities at the General Hospital. I am sure that the hon. senior member for St. Peter knows quite well that we on this side of the House would not allow that Report to go unheeded. 12.55 p.m.

I am sure hon. members will agree with me that it takes time to go through these things. However, in due course whatever we are doing about it will be done. I am sure that something is done at present.

As regards the question of Medical Officers going on leave, I would like to say that I will answer the question put by the hon. senior member for the City at some subsequent date. As far as the explanation given in the Addendum to that item, what I have gathered from it, according to the explanation which I was given, is that the proposals for the supplementary estimates were sent to the Ministry too late

to be gone through and to get to the House to be dealt with before the last Session ended. This Resolution for supplementary estimates is one which I found when I assumed this Ministry. I would like it to be clearly understood that this Resolution which is before the House is one which I found in my Ministry. I made certain enquiries and I was given certain explanations which I have given to the House. I thought it was necessary to bring this Resolution before the House and I expedited its coming here.

On the question of the honoraria, I was informed that there were certain doctors employed at the Hospital who performed extra duties and the granting of an honorarium was a sort of remuneration for what is termed in other departments as overtime work.

On the question of having a properly trained Radiologist, we have been considering this quite seriously and an announcement will be made on that score in the not too distant future.

When it comes to the question of Surgeon-Specialist, the policy on that will be dealt with in a few weeks from now after taking into consideration the necessary proposals occasioned by the Gillette Report which was brought before this House. I will promise the hon. senior member for the City to make the necessary investigations as regards applications coming from doctors for scholarships. The hon. member also referred to certain jobs and restrictions which are placed on practitioners giving various prescriptions. What I was told by the administration of the General Hospital is that the demand for a greater sum of money towards the item, drugs, is because private medical practitioners who are presently employed at the General Hospital do not prescribe the drugs which they are told to prescribe but prescribe proprietary drugs which they feel would be more effective in the interest of the people.

Sir, I wonder if what I have said has satisfied both the hon. senior member for the City and the hon. senior member for St. Peter. If there is anything more, I am quite willing to answer.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, before we go further, lest it be thought that this Government is rather indifferent about this matter, I want to make it perfectly clear that nobody on that side of the House could be more horrified than we were when the request was made to us for this Resolution of \$120,000 to supplement the estimates at the Hospital which we were supposed to find from God knows where with a Treasury as bare as Mother Hubbard's cupboard.

The hon. junior member for St. George has said that these things came before the Cabinet in December, a little before the General Elections, and therefore this Resolution could not be considered before the elections. The hon. junior member for St. George who is the former Minister of Social Services has come in here just trying to fool us. Some of these things date back from 1959 and he is now attempting to excuse the last Government by claiming that they had no time to consider these matters. They stand indicted for crass ignorance and crass indifference to suffering humanity. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, if you were to check back this Resolution, you will see some of the things for which they stand indicted. Take Item 93 - Drugs and Dressings. We are asking that the sum of \$78,000 be voted.

1.05 p.m.
The information we have is that this money, or rather some of it, was asked for from 1959-60. The entire year 1960-61 passed and the last Government did nothing about it. This is now 1962 and we are asked to provide money from 1961 arising out of expenditure from 1959-60. The same thing applies to Item 94 "Instruments and Equipment". The first application which the last Government had was in 1960; then you have Item 96 "linen, clothing and uniforms" and Item 107 "Incidentals". Every single one of these Items - as a matter of fact, some of the amounts asked for go back from 1959-60. We found this backlog over two years old, in many cases, and the most unjust system of administration; apparently, the authorities were told that they could overspend

in one year and without getting a supplementary Resolution, take the expenditure out of another year's vote. Every year you carry forward a debit and the public is not given any adequate account of the running of the Hospital.

Hon. members have had a chance of reading the Hospital Report and they have found that the Director of Medical Services in no uncertain terms has condemned these malpractices and all that was going on at the Hospital; therefore the former Minister of Social Services has no excuse at all for attempting to becloud the issue by saying that in December they got this request. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, if I were in his place I would be absent from the House today. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Whom are you talking about?) I am talking about the hon. junior member for St. George. This reflects the most adverse criticism of the administration of his Ministry and exposes the corrupt indifference of the Government under which he has served.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order. It is like the hon. member to apply corruption to the former Government. I am anxious to reply to a number of things which he has said, but the hon. member must withdraw that.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I said that it was a corrupt Government.

Mr. MILLER: I must insist, Mr. Chairman, that you rule on this occasion. The hon. member has said that the former Minister should be ashamed and that the past Government of which I was a member was corrupt. He must withdraw that.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I am not withdrawing anything.

Mr. MILLER: Then the hon. member cannot continue the debate.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Minister did not say that the ex-Minister was corrupt but that the Government under which he served was corrupt.

Mr. MILLER: Your duty, Mr. Chairman is to conduct the debates of this House. It is not your duty to say that; I must insist that the hon. member withdraw the untrue statement.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, no member of this House has any right to tell the Speaker or the Chairman that he has no right to do this or that. Every single member of this House heard what the hon. senior member for St. Philip said. The hon. member said what you, Mr. Chairman, rightly interpreted when he rightly disclosed the corruption of the Government under which the hon. junior member for St. George served. You are to make a ruling; if the hon. member withdrew that statement he would have to leave the Party to which I belong or I will have to leave it. If he wants to withdraw a statement like that which the whole of Barbados knows to be correct, it is a matter for him.

Mr. MILLER: It is unfortunate, Mr. Chairman that we should hear the crack of the whip of the Premier, the Leader of that Party. He threatened his colleague and says that he must leave the Party if he withdrew that statement; but is this not destroying the elementary rights of manhood? You hear the shrill crack of the Party whip, but certainly I have the right to ask that that statement be withdrawn. If you want to say that what I said is not true you can check it with the debate; but when a Minister is Deputy Premier and Leader of the House and he has to go under the crack of the whip of the Premier, that is not usual. When these things are said they go down in the debates for ever; when the hon. member says that the last Government was corrupt, that is unkind and untrue. I would not like to place you, Mr. Chairman, in a position where I have to ask you - I take it that you must have been reading May's, but I may have to request that you read the debate to make sure of the statement which has been made.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: When the hon. member thinks he is talking about the Party in which there was.....

Mr. MILLER: The hon. member cannot continue his speech.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Minister is developing his point.

Mr. MILLER: He cannot develop his point. I think you should ask the Clerk to advise you.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. This whole thing is now out of order. If the hon. junior member for St. George wanted to press his point he should have objected when the hon. Premier attempted to speak. The hon. member is out of order now. The Chairman having ruled, the hon. member should not have allowed the Hon. Premier to make his speech. I see that the ex-Speaker of the House has walked out rather than give any assistance in this matter.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order. I told the Chairman long before, when the Leader of the House was up on the second occasion, that I requested the hon. member to withdraw the statement, and the ruling was that the hon. member should not be allowed to speak until he had withdrawn his remarks. Mr. Chairman, will you rule on this occasion?

1.15 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like the hon. member to understand that I have made a ruling already.

Mr. MILLER: I do not know that this Committee understands that you have made a ruling.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I made a ruling when I said that the Hon. Minister was not referring to the hon. junior member for St. George at the time when he made the statement. He was referring to the late Government.

Mr. MILLER: But I am a member of the last Government and he said it was corrupt. What am I to understand by this ruling of the Chair?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Order!

Mr. MILLER: How long have you known about order? You cannot tell me, Sir, that that is your ruling. I think you understand my attitude in matters Parliamentary. My respect in unswerving and will remain forever, and I think you will understand.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, am I to understand that the hon. member.....

Mr. MILLER: I want to hear the ruling now. I am on a point of order, and I want to hear your ruling.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will listen to the hon. junior member for St. George.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of privilege.....

Mr. MILLER: The hon. member cannot get up on a point of privilege. My point of order must be heard. You cannot interrupt a point of order in here and tell me about a point of privilege. The member must sit down.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: If the hon. member is not going to take his seat, I will have him named.

Mr. MILLER: It does not matter. You know I will bounce back here.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order.....

Mr. MILLER: I am on a point of order and I have a right. Those are the rules of this House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Three hon. members cannot stand at the same time.

Mr. MILLER: It is for you to rule, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I rose on a point of privilege to point out that the hon. junior member for St. George is questioning your ruling.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I cannot see, Sir,.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like this House to understand that I have so ruled and that ends that.

Mr. MILLER: Would you repeat that for me, Sir?

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

Mr. MILLER: No, Mr. Chairman. Call the Speaker.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You cannot call the Speaker at this stage.

Mr. MILLER: What is your ruling, Sir? Are you going to rule against the point or order?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like the hon. junior member for St. George to understand that my ruling is that the Hon. Minister did not make an insinuation to him; he was speaking of the late Government, and I have ruled that there was no personal reference to the hon. junior member for St. George.

Mr. MILLER: I am on a point of order. Am I to be heard or not?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I too have said that the Government was corrupt.

Mr. MILLER: He said the member ought to be ashamed, and I want your ruling.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I understand that a statement was made on a point of privilege which supersedes any other procedural point, and the hon. member got up and objected. Since he has objected, five or six different speeches have been made. Quite apart from that you made a clear, unequivocal and unambiguous ruling that you did not consider any personal reference had been made to the hon. junior member for St. George. When the hon. member gets up and says you cannot do this and you cannot do that and re-opens the debate, he is challenging the ruling of the Chair, and I merely get up to warn the hon. member that we will have no hesitation on this side of the House to ask that the hon. member be named if he cannot observe the rules of the House. It is most indecent and unbecoming behaviour on the part of the hon. member, and I implore the hon. member not to challenge the ruling of the Chair. If he thinks the Chair is not impartial and is not competent, he can move a substantive Resolution against Your Honour and have you removed from the Chair. It is a matter for him and I am asking him to let us proceed with the debate.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The position is this, Mr. Chairman: the hon. junior member for St. George is taking umbrage over my remarks about his Party. He has gone further and suggested something about the crack of a whip and members not possessing the necessary ability and what not. I want to make him understand clearly, Mr. Chairman, that that is not his Party in which the big Lieutenant in Trinidad pulls the strings and they dance like marionettes. In our Party the position of the Premier is *primus inter pares*; he is first amongst equals, and he does not dictate to anybody or attempt to put any whip to anybody.

When I said the Government was corrupt, Mr. Chairman, what I meant was this: in this particular Institution the former Government themselves were minded to question some of the money asked for for some of these items, and they were told that the system of accounting and checking and administration of the Hospital in some respects left a lot to be desired. The Director of Medical Services himself pointed out that he could not give any accurate statement one way or another, whether for instance, in the case of drugs and dressings they were used at the Hospital or not. They had a clear, unequivocal statement from the Director of Medical Services that everything was not going right. They themselves have no excuse for not realising what they were told and acting upon it. They did nothing.....

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, we got no statement from any Director of Medical Services that things were not going right.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Just let me read one note, Sir, sent on to them when they queried increases asked for. "It is hoped that the information given will be considered sufficient to justify the increase, as, in the absence of a proper medical store and the necessary storekeeping and accounting staff, it is not possible to obtain information which would enable me to explain this increase with absolute accuracy." This is from the Director of Medical Services to them. (Mr. MOTTLEY: When?) In 1960.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, after all, the hon. senior member for the City cannot reduce up here to the City Council, and I object to this sort of thing going on. He is taking advantage of you. If the hon. member were there in the Chair, he was not going to allow it. Let us get down to business and not waste time. The hon. member is asking questions when it is his business to listen to the debate. I heard what the hon. member said and I do not like this ragged-trousers way of conducting business in the House of Assembly; it is poor reflection of our ability to discuss things properly. I object to the hon. member subjecting all of us to this sort of stupidity.
1.25 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not know what the hon. member means. What I would like to do is to raise the standard of the House to that of the City Council. Tell me what is wrong with my asking "what date". I am entitled to ask "what date". I am not trying to take advantage of the Chair. The hon. member knows that well enough.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member has a right to ask any question but he cannot sit down on this far side of the House and shout across the Table "what date". We are not in Broad Street stopping a bus; therefore I object to him shouting across the Table "what date". It is improper to do it, especially to do it so loudly. We can ask in a *sotto voce* manner something but we should not be shouting across the Table. After all, we are in the General Assembly of this Island.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am so glad to see this metamorphosis which has come about in this Honourable Assembly. At times, you could stand in the lobby and hear the hon. senior member for St. Peter's voice when he became indignant with the last Government or when he wanted to get something out of the last Government.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, let me finalise this part of the argument. This is just a slight quotation from the Gillette Report which has been mentioned so many times today. "There can be no doubt that the present administrative structure of the Hospital is unsound, and that there is urgent need for radical changes and improvement. The Hospital functions in a manner befitting a long past epoch of life and no understanding and imagination has been displayed by Government in recognising the urgent needs of the Hospital now what is required in a modern hospital."

The hon. junior member for St. George when he was Minister of Health was so horrified at this statement that he did not allow the Report to see the light of day. As a matter of fact, he said that it was a personal and a private Report; so possibly the Hospital is his private property too. He knows as well as the world.....

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I think the Hon. Leader of the House is aware that I am very eager to introduce a debate on this Report, but we are not at this moment discussing the Report. I want a full dress debate on the Report. The Hon. Minister of Social Services talked about certain monies and has said that he is presenting a statement.

Mr. Chairman, I want to know if you are permitting a debate on the report now.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No; I am not permitting a debate on the Report now. The Hon. Minister is making a statement.

Mr. MILLER: What is happening?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Minister is quite in order to make an explanation.

Mr. MILLER: He cannot quote in making a statement. You allowed him to read from the Report and you now tell me that you are not allowing him to debate it.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, you are too near to the hon. senior member for the City or he is too near you. I stood here and heard him tell you to say "no". Any member can get up here on this Resolution and quote from that Report and that is the reason why I asked the Minister at the beginning if he had a statement to make on it. Any member is entitled to read any part of the Report that is laid in here.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is exactly what I said to my colleague on my left *sotto voce*. The hon. member seems to have been listening a lot to what I was saying. I know my way about in here. I will never try to put the Chairman wrong. I said to my colleague what I thought was wrong. Every member, even the hon. junior member for St. George, should know too, that what I said was that it is a matter entirely for the Chairman. I cannot see the Chairman preventing anybody from citing the Report.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: That is not a point of order; that is another speech. Every member in this Chamber knows, except the hon. junior member for St. George, that we are not debating it. All that I have said is this. We do not want to waste any more time on this issue; the time will come for a full-dress debate on the Report. We are concerned over the fact that the hon. junior member for St. George when he was Minister of Health and in Office refused to publish the Report, and now says he wants to debate this Report. We believe that there are more important things to do now; therefore, it is no use crying over spilt milk. We now have to look for \$120,000 as asked for in this Resolution to provide essential services for this Department and I merely entered the debate, before the question was put, to correct a lapse of memory on the part of the hon. junior member for St. George when he said that this request for this supplementary amount of money came before them too near to the election, when in truth and in fact some of that expenditure date back to 1959 and 1960.

We did not expect to find ourselves with this backlog of money to be expended when we would have been only too delighted to vote this money for other purposes. We did not expect to be asking this House to grant \$120,000 towards the end of the financial year when we are concerned with laying the Estimates for next year, and finding enormous sums of money for the programmes which we have to put into effect. But we had no other choice; therefore, none of us on this side of the Chamber views with any sort of equanimity the inference in the debate by the former Minister of Social Services, especially bearing in mind the comment which he made.

Speaking in a general way, I want to say that this Government itself is completely hostile to the Hospital or any other department of the Government presenting us any time of the year with supplementary requests, because it puts the entire financial position of the country out of focus. We have, since we came into office, impressed upon department heads that they must attempt to be more precise in their requirements for the ensuing financial year and I hope that we would not have to return to the House with a thing of this sort during our tenure of office. It is not our policy. I say that in answer to the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I want him to be assured that we have no intention whatsoever to continue with the policy of coming to the House week after week, month after month, with supplementary resolutions and we have made it clear to department heads.

Finally, on the institution of our Public Accounts system, it is more or less quite clear that this sort of incidence will be reduced to a minimum if not completely obliterated.
1.35 p.m.

Mr. MILLER: I should say that I am rather sorry for the Minister to lay a statement rather than have a free, open

debate on this Report in connection with the Hospital. There are a number of questions asked by the hon. senior member for the City in connection with these items as set out here. I think it is correct to say that the Minister of Social Services did point out on two or more occasions that it is a question of time. You do not have to be advised; only you did not take time to read the file. I want to say this; last Tuesday, the Minister of Education fell out of the debate on education and today there is a row between the Minister of Social Services, in attempting to prosecute the case before the Chairman of Committees, and the Leader of the House who took over the debate. What is happening? He twisted the debate to the extent that what the Minister himself said.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. I believe that the Minister knows what is meant by the word "twist".

Mr. MILLER: If the hon. member objects to that, I will explain. I must say that from this side I can still see, from the crack of the whip, that the hon. member would have to leave the Party if he withdrew his statement.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. I said from the beginning that I would not withdraw the statement.

Mr. MILLER: The whole story was related by the Hon. Minister of Social Services and he was honest in what he said. It was in December that this estimate was sent in. It was not clear and it had to be referred to the Superintendent of the Hospital. When the information was sent to the Ministry, the Estimates were already in the hands of the printers. That has happened about 100 times. If you were to examine the position, if you have a copy of the Estimates.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: What Estimates is the hon. member talking about? Does he mean last year's Estimates?

Mr. MILLER: Is the hon. member on a point of order or is that a second speech? A few minutes ago I said that I would accept the ruling of the Chair, Mr. Chairman, whether you rule rightly or wrongly, I will accept it. What is the position? Ask the Clerk to advise you what to do.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member made a statement in connection with the Estimates and the Minister is asking to what Estimates is he referring.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The Estimates for last year cannot enter this debate at this point at all. I only rose after the Minister had spoken because the hon. junior member for St. George had said at first that the ex-Government could not supply this money because the request came in near to the Elections.

Mr. MILLER: I did not say that. That is the type of fabrication we have here. I said that when the request reached the Ministry the Estimates were already in the hands of the Printers and it was too late. The Minister said that on two or more occasions.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, I would ask to have the Reporter read back what the hon. member said at the beginning of the debate. He said that the Government could not have supplied this money because the request came in December near the Elections and they did not have time to consider it. That is what the hon. member said and that is what made me answer him in the way I did.

Mr. MILLER: That is not true. The hon. member knows that he cannot ask you to have the debates read back. He knows, Mr. Chairman, that you do not have any power to do that. The Minister knows that I did not say that. The Elections had nothing to do with the matter.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I quoted the hon. junior member for St. George on that point. I began by saying that the ex-Minister said that the request came near the Elections and that is why I intervened in the debate.

Mr. MILLER: Look at the blatant dishonesty although I would decline to say that! How could I refer to the Elec-

tions when the request was from 1960-61 and the Elections were in December 1961? Can we not understand the difference between the Elections and a debate in this House? This matter was before the Ministry in December during the 1960-61 Estimates and the Elections were in December, 1961. I wonder if the hon. member would withdraw that statement now.

Mr. CORBIN: On a point of explanation.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot listen to two hon. members who are now on their feet. The hon. senior member for St. Andrew has risen on a point of order, but I am still listening to the hon. junior member for St. George.

Mr. MILLER: The Hon. Leader of the House said that he joined in the debate because I said that the request from this Department came in too close.... (ASIDES).....

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

Mr. MILLER: I want to address the Chamber. Can you ask for order? The Hon. Leader of the House has said that he joined in the debate because I said that this request was made from the Institution when it was too close to the Elections.

1.45 p.m.

The election was in December, 1961, and the request was made in December, 1960; so I could not have said that. It is therefore not a whole year. Mr. Chairman, the hon. senior member for St. Peter was at pains a couple of moments ago.....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, I did not enter the debate, but I was listening to the hon. member and he said that it came in December. He is now saying he did not mean December 1961, but December 1960. That is worse, because he had a whole year and did nothing about it; so whichever December he means, it is worse, unless he means December 1962.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.....

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, tell me what to do. I will accept the ruling of the Chair whether it is right or wrong.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: This is the position, Mr. Chairman. The hon. junior member for St. George rose to explain why his Party could not have furnished this money before. He said that the request came in December and it was too late. Well, now, we assumed he meant December 1961 at election time. If he himself gets up and says today that he means December 1960, he is an utter idiot because they had a whole year.

Mr. MILLER: Is that a point of order, Sir?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: What I would like to call him is unparliamentary. If they had a whole year why did they do nothing about it?

Mr. MILLER: Imagine the hon. member calling me an idiot! He is seeing the reflection of the dark shades on his face because he could not be more than a full-grown waxed ass. I withdraw that, Sir. I did not bring in the Resolution here which says that they asked for \$38,000 in December, 1960. The Minister was honest in making a true statement when he said that. If a request is made during the Estimates, you do not come after the Estimates with a supplementary. Imagine the folly! You talked about having a whole year. We declined the request because it was too late and the Estimates were already in the hands of the printers; so we could not come immediately after in April with a supplementary under the Heads referred to. You are dealing with an Institution where I have been increasing and bursting the old buildings at its seams, taking it in five years from 4,500 people in the Outpatients Department to nearly 14,000. No doctor, Superintendent or any man alive could estimate what would be required when thinking in terms of dressings and drugs. If you want to see the change, this is

what has happened in the Estimates and I suppose you accept this as being correct: In 1959-1960 we spent \$162,000, and in 1958-59 we spent \$145,000, and by the time you reach the Estimates of 1961-62 it was increased by \$25,000 to \$185,000 - one item. He is telling us about having a whole year. Let him get a copy of the Estimates and stop all this nonsensical debate in here, thinking that he can twist the truth. We jumped from \$145,000 in four years to \$185,000 for one item, and the Minister knows that we did not have space in that institution to stop the supplies.

Mr. Chairman, I was the one who gave a directive in the Institution that as far as possible Crown Agents should supply the requirements of that Institution, because on examination, a number of the items bought here in this town was as much as 1,000% higher than the items bought through the Crown Agents. There is no place to store a year's supply and they come forward with four shipments. I understand that the Minister does not know anything about all this.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I should like the hon. junior member for St. George to know that the present Minister of Social Services is not a nit-wit like some of the others who have gone out.

Mr. MILLER: I do not know what the hon. member means when he says he is not a nit-wit. Is that intended to be a little bit bumptious? If so, you are making sport and I will make it rough for you. Tell me what you mean by "nit-wit".

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like the hon. member to address the Chair.

Mr. MILLER: I am looking at your face and addressing the Chair, and I accept your ruling even if it is wrong.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am on a point of order, sit down! It is unbecoming of the hon. member to say that. There is no hon. member in this House past or present who has had more rows with the Chairman than I. The hon. member for St. Joseph can say that; so you cannot tell the Chairman that you accept his ruling whether it is right or wrong. The hon. member can very well do better than that. The Chairman is a new member and he tries to be impartial.

Mr. MILLER: Why does the hon. member interrupt the debate? I understand procedure in this Chamber, and like the hon. member I think I know my way around and I am saying that I accept the ruling of the Chair whether it is right or wrong.

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

Mr. MILLER: I do not know what the Minister of Social Services meant by "nit-wit", but I suppose it is the beginning of learning his way around in here. I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman. Now you have not got to be a nit-wit, and even if you are a nit-wit you would understand what \$98,000 in drugs and dressing look like. Can you think of \$98,000 in cotton-wool? This House could not hold it.

Mr. Chairman, we have not got the debates but for the sake of the record, I would like to put them in order. We were told by the member for the City that Mr. Ward did apply for leave.....

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, to which member for the City is the hon. member referring? I am very much exercised in my mind as to how I might be protected from these loud asides coming from either side. There was an oblique reference to the proceedings of the City Council to which I took objection but I did not get up just now. I would like the hon. member who has objected to visit us where he would see that our deliberations are carried out with dignity, decorum and despatch.
1.55 p.m.

Mr. MILLER: It was unkind of him to say that the request was made by Dr. Ward in that we did not even write a letter in reply to him. I had a number of discussions in the

Ministry with Dr. Ward. Dr. Ward is one of the bright sons of Barbados and I will go as far as to say that he has done a wonderful job. However, his request was for training and to be a specialist in that field. When we examined the matter, we found that it would cost over \$24,000. Under the circumstances, it was not a question of whether he deserved that money being spent on him, but it was a question of whether we could afford to spend \$24,000 on a four-year course of training as a doctor, knowing the other commitments we had to carry out in another section. That is the only reason that we could not carry it out. It was too costly. There is a limit to what we can do. You can say whatever you like on it, but you must say whether or not you can use \$24,000 to give training to one man. That is really too much unless you can subject that officer to an agreement to work with you for a number of years after. I hope the Hon. Minister will pay some attention to that. Hon. members ought to know that in the last couple of years we have not been able to keep medical officers at the Hospital for more than two years. As a matter of fact, some have spent only six months. You do not know how long they will remain with you; therefore, to spend \$24,000 on the training of an officer when there is so much to be done in other matters would not be fair.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 2.00 p.m., this Sitting stands suspended until 2.30 p.m. o'clock of this day.

On reassembling,

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I observe that there is no quorum and I ask that the Bell be rung.

The bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask hon. members to be less tardy in resuming their seats after the luncheon interval.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: There are no answers to Questions; therefore we proceed to Private Members' Business.

RESOLUTION re AWARD OF CONTRACTS FOR STONES

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order is to resume debate on a Resolution re award of contracts for supply of stones for use for the repairs and/or construction of roads by the Department of Highways and Transport.

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph was speaking when Private Members' Business came to an end. He may resume if he so cares.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday, when I was trying to explain to the House that it was not a question of the quality of stone being used or the contract for it; it was a question of awarding of the contract to three contractors for the entire Island. I do not want that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member sit while I ask hon. members not to tarry in the corridors? (A Pause) The hon. member may resume.

Mr. SMITH: It is simply that at present one who lives in a particular parish does not have the opportunity to tender for a contract for the supply of stones to the Highways and Transport Department when that Department has work to do in the particular parish. It is a question of one contractor being awarded the tender when there are in the particular parish people who have lorries and who want something for their lorries and their lorry-hands to do. We must not encourage more unemployment than we have at present. It would be better to have a contract that an individual or individuals can tender for one parish because it will tend to operate in such a way that rather than your giving it to one contractor to supply the whole area, you can give it to as many as possible, so long as they can carry out the contract and do the job. It will not prevent the present contractors from tendering for the supply of stones to all of

the parishes as usual and, perhaps, they may be lucky enough to get the contract for all because it is still the job of the Tenders Committee to award the contract to whom they think fit. However, the man with one lorry will have the opportunity to tender for a contract for the supply of stones in his parish. The ones who do not want to take the trouble of tendering for three or four parishes, but who feel to tender for one parish or the particular parish in which they are living can submit a tender; and that is all I am asking the House to consider and to vote favour of.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before I put the question, it must be remembered that there are two motions before the House. There is the substantive motion by the mover of the Resolution who has just made his reply and there is another motion that further consideration of the Resolution be postponed.

2.35 p.m.

That motion stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, seconded by the hon. senior member for the City. The question is that the further consideration of this Resolution be postponed. Hon. members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

A division was taken as follows:—

AYES: Mr. BATSON, Hon. E. W. BARROW, Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD; Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Messrs. WEEKES, LOWE; YEARWOOD; BOXILL; WALCOTT; SEALY and LYNCH — 13.

NOES: Messrs. SMITH and MILLER — 2.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been resolved in the affirmative, thirteen hon. members voting "Aye" and two hon. members voting "no". The further consideration of this Resolution is now postponed.

RESOLUTION re PAYMENT OF OLD AGE PENSIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Philip:— To move the passing of a Resolution re the setting up of a Committee to investigate the matter of the payment of Old Age Pensions.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, I am willing to give way with the understanding that this Resolution be dealt with....

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member not in a position to proceed with his motion today?

Mr. WEEKES: Not at this stage.

REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day under this Head stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Peter:— To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Representation of the People Act, 1957.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill which seeks to amend the Representation of the People Act, 1957, I can say that those of us who share the view that this Act should be amended, cannot feel but very gratified indeed that this is an issue which the Party which is now in power made one of its planks in its Manifesto for the Elections. That is set out on page 16 of the Manifesto where it says that the Party favours the reduction of the voting age from 21 years to 18 years. If anybody has any doubt as to an issue such as this becoming a Mandate and you have the people's decision on it, one can truthfully say that this is an issue which has been put foursquare before the people of Barbados. All of us in this Chamber who hold this view will regard ourselves as meeting the challenge — and we live in an age of challenge — I would say that the members of the Government have the capacity for meeting the challenge of change and this is one in which we can accept that a reduction of the voting age from 21 years to 18 years means a lot to this community. This is a young community generally speaking, and I feel that if the youth of any community is brought

within the ambit of these constitutional changes, it imposes a responsibility on the representatives so that they have to cast their nets wider and look into a wider field in order to perform their duties to include people who come within the ambit of this voting power.

Putting it in the narrowest way, when you put the voting age at 18 years, you do not deprive those who are above the age of 21 years from the right to vote, but it would demand of the representatives a positive programme and policy which will include youth. I am satisfied in my mind that, with more young people coming within the voting age, it will impose on any Government or country the necessity for providing programmes for youth. I find in Barbados that there is still lacking a positive programme for youth, and we have in this country a hiatus between the ages of 15 years and 18 years. When you reduce the voting age to 18 years, you will impose on all of us the necessity of accepting the challenge which the youth in our community require, and not regard them as some people who can be employed until they reach the age of 21 years. Moreover, I do not think that there is any divine or intrinsic value in our saying that the age of voting should be 21 years, because that is the legal age for many other things. I believe that we should examine our own community and I may say that any careful examination and analysis of our community will reveal that Barbadians at the ages of 18, 19 and 20 years today have greater opportunities and facilities for developing the mind and they take a greater interest in political life and civic matters than those who are above those ages. For that reason, if one hundred years ago a man at 21 years was given the right to vote, I believe you will be able to come to the conclusion that anyone who has attained the age of 18 years today is not only more politically mature than his counter-part of 100 years ago, but he is actually taking a more active part in the life of the community. Boys and girls at the age of 18 years are held responsible for many other things; they have affected the wage economy and they make a very valuable contribution to our national life. In many instances we include them in the work programme, they enter the labour force and they become an asset in so far as the economy of the country is concerned. Therefore there can be no valid reasons for excluding them from these economic changes and for those reasons I have much pleasure in moving that this amendment be made to the Act. In other words, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

2.45 p.m.

I do not think it is necessary for me to plead with my colleagues on this, because I am sure that all the members of the Government share my views on this. Those of us who had the opportunity of sitting in this Chamber, when we had to defend this constitutional change against the powers that be, can say that we have liquidated them by our arguments and by our broad programme and policy; therefore we can say we have a mandate to produce this. I would ask the Hon. Premier and his colleagues not only to accept this amendment to the Representation of the People Act, but I think that he and his colleagues would have the responsibility to this community to let us remove the archaic system of still continuing with double-member constituencies; and if it is going to be a corollary to this, I would ask the Hon. Premier maybe to examine this in the light of such changes and perhaps before this Session gets midway we will find that Barbados is coming in line with modern trends on constitutional matters.

I feel sure that so far as the people of Barbados are concerned, we would be giving them the impetus that they should have in these constitutional matters; so this amendment may lead to consequential amendments by the Government, and I am sure that these consequential amendments would meet with the approbation of the community as a whole.

I therefore have great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in moving that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, in seconding the motion, I think you will agree that contemporary thought in a modern society, particularly in a community like ours emerging from economic strangulation after slavery is that we reach

the stage of maturity, probably because we are in the sun, in our youth much earlier than found in other countries. I am supporting this with a deep understanding and appreciation of the remarks made by the hon. member, and I do so for a number of reasons. I have been in trouble to a certain extent to understand why we have not had this for a long time. The youth of the Island contribute to the taxes, they are in the labour force, and it is true to say that a number of persons in the country question whether or not Barbados has to give the lead; but I share the sentiments and have always had that feeling myself, and whether or not it is going to be accepted on the outside — I am thinking of the area and probably of the ten units that once federated — I give my full support to the member's expressed sentiments on this particular matter.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Before the hon. member concludes.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. member finished his speech?

Mr. MILLER: Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has concluded. Is the Hon. Minister speaking in support of the Bill?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I wanted to ask him a question, that is all.

Mr. SPEAKER: There can be no question.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: What I really wanted to query was the expression by the hon. junior member for St. George that he always had that feeling.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member emphasised "feeling".

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: That is a remarkable confession on the part of the hon. member since he made no intimation of his feeling to this House when last year his Party utterly opposed a motion of this sort. If this feeling, of course, is of recent date, or if the election has something to do with his conversion, the hon. member has given no intimation one way or another; but I must say, Mr. Speaker, that in fairness to the House and the public the hon. member for St. George should have intimated at least the date of his conversion to this feeling. This sudden conversion of the agnostic, this sudden conversion of erstwhile unrepentant sinners to the true way fills us with a certain amount of astonishment.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, the Government, as you will recall, on the last occasion on which this matter was discussed expressed its complete endorsement of the views expressed by the hon. senior member for St. Peter and again today we make no hesitation in saying that we accept the principle contained in the motion and will in due course give legislative ratification to it. In the meantime, as the member for St. Peter has pointed out, there will be a number of other consequential amendments to this Act, and since the Government itself has certain proposals to make to the Act with regard to the introduction of single member constituencies and other important aspects of the representation of the people — including this of course — we are going to suggest to the hon. senior member for St. Peter that he accepts a motion for further consideration to be postponed, or rather, Sir, accept a motion for its being sent to Select Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: If this motion passes, that is automatic.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: In that case, Sir, with the definite understanding that the matter will be sent to a Select Committee, we have no other option than to support its passing at this stage.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member rising to elucidate something?

Mr. MILLER: On a point of explanation, I am rising to elucidate a point made by the last speaker on the question of astonishment and surprise at my attitude and feeling on this matter. I believe he has some understanding of Party discipline, and where the majority decides, whether or not you agree, you accept the decision. I am quite sure he is aware of that and we had a demonstration in this House not so long ago.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Am I to understand that the hon. member is still a member of the same Party, or has he changed his allegiance?

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The hon. member has said that I have some understanding of Party allegiance and Party discipline, a reference no doubt to his docile acquiescence on the last occasion when his Party opposed this motion. Now he is supporting it.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: It could be a point of explanation if Your Honour pleases.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not please. (*Laughter.*)

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: If Your Honour accepts, I am, however, trying.....

Mr. SPEAKER: An hon. member may only rise, as he knows so well, on a point of order, and under the Rules, Standing Order No. 28 which the hon. member, I know, knows by heart in respect of "interruptions", one member may only interrupt another member by rising on a point of order to elucidate some matter. I thought the hon. junior member for St. George really was going to elucidate some matter, and he will only so elucidate if the member speaking is willing to give way and resume his seat. 2.55 p.m.

Mr. MILLER: I thought that was the understanding and again I was interrupted on a point of order. The Hon. Minister is probably in trouble and would like an explanation. I have always and have only belonged to the Barbados Labour Party and forever I will be a member of that Party. On the other hand.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has already spoken. The hon. member has made his speech and he has elucidated on a matter which was causing us all grave concern.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, like the hon. senior member for St. Peter we were a bit surprised at the alacrity with which the hon. junior member for St. George rose to his feet to support a measure which was introduced first in this Chamber early in 1961 — I think the date was the 24th January of that year. When the Bill came on for debate in May 1961, the then Government of this country rejected the proposal made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter and the hon. junior member for St. George felt so strongly about the reduction of the voting age that he never said a mumbling word.

It is established parliamentary practice that there is collective responsibility of the Cabinet under a parliamentary system of Government; yet when a member feels so strongly on a measure that with a change of Government he is so anxious not only to support it, but to go down on the records to second the motion for the second reading. I think if the hon. junior member for St. George was not concerned about preserving his place in this Chamber and in the Government and safeguarding his salary at any price that his conscience would have driven him into crossing the House at that time and stating his view without fear or favour. It is only another illustration of what the passage of time can do to change persuasions of some categories of political — I do not want to use the word which is at the tip of my tongue. (Mr. SPEAKER: Of course, you can use it as long as it is parliamentary.) Well, I will say political gymnasts.

Be that as it may, I want to draw the attention of the House to one or two matters about this Bill. The first thing is this. It has been declared as part and parcel of the policy of members of this Party, and we had a mandate from the people for the reduction of the voting age.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter dealt exhaustively and courageously with this Bill not only on this occasion, but in 1961 when the Government rejected the one which he introduced and it is not necessary for me to go over the ground which he so adequately covered both in that debate and in this one.

When Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies was in Barbados not so long ago — within the last three weeks — we pointed out to him that we had got the mandate of the people for the reduction of the voting age and we were committed to supporting a Bill on the floor of the House by an hon. member for that purpose. The Secretary of State for the Colonies intimated to us that it was entirely a domestic matter, and in view of the fact that it would not be necessary to change anything in the Letters Patent or in the instruments within which the Constitution of Barbados is written — such as the Executive Committee Act — it would be a matter for us to go ahead if we so cared.

When this matter was put before the Government, the then Solicitor General appeared to be of the opinion that the amendment would involve the preparation of three separate registers — a register for the Federal Government Elections, a register for Local Government Elections and a register for the General Assembly Elections. The law relating to the register for the Federal Government Elections — and I cannot see that it would be necessary in these present circumstances — is that the register for the Federal Government Elections should be the Local Government Register as existing in January, 1958. Therefore, if the Federal Government Elections were to be held any time within the next six months, or I would say within the next twelve months, which in my opinion appears now to be extremely unlikely, the position would be that even although we made the amendment to the Representation of the Peoples Act in respect of this, it would not entitle those of the age of 18 years to 21 years to vote in the Federal Government Elections. However, I do not think that that election is one which should cause any concern because, as I have said before, it is extremely unlikely that such an election will take place. This, of course, is just a personal assessment of the situation according to the way things are shaping at the present moment.

When we come to the question of the Local Government Elections, we have just passed through the Local Government Elections and we are not due to hold another election for Local Government Councils until the year 1964. That gives us adequate time to prepare a separate register or alternatively to amend the Local Government Act and perhaps any consequential amendments to other Acts. There again, I do not think that can be a valid objection to the passage of this Bill at this particular time.

However, it is obvious to anyone who has made a study of the Local Government Act that there are several provisions in that Act which are repugnant to our ideas of democratic government in Barbados — ideas of this Government and ideas which I am sure the hon. senior member for St. Peter will be quite willing to support. There are several provisions in that Act which tend to make it appear that Local Government Elections are more important than the elections to the General Assembly of this Island. There is such a thing as the qualifications which they have laid down for one to be a member and there are other things such as the method of taxation, the relief which is granted to owners of plantations and matters of that kind. It is therefore obvious that several major amendments in the light of the policy of the present Government would have to be made to the 1958 Local Government Act under which we are now suffering.

3.05 p.m.

The procedure when a Private Bill is introduced is that that Bill should be sent to a Select Committee; this Bill therefore has to go to a Select Committee. When the Hon. Leader of the House made the motion, it was an act of supereroga-

tion on his part and, as one of my friends on my right would say, it was done out of an abundance of caution. It was, in the light of the provision of our standards, not entirely necessary, but it was only emphasising to hon. members that we do not intend to stampede Private Members' Business until both the public and the members of this House have had full opportunity to debate, discuss, analyse, criticise and make recommendations on measures of this kind. I have already given instructions that all the consequential amendments attendant upon the passage of this Bill, without in any way anticipating the will of the House, should be prepared, so that when the Select Committee reports, we will be able to introduce within a very short time the legislative amendments which would make this provision for the reduction of the voting age to 18 years a practical proposition.

Mr. Speaker, I entirely agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter that if there is any political illiteracy in this island, if there is any political agnosticism or atheism, it is to be found in the age-group over 50 to 80 rather than in the 18 to 21 age-group. If there is any age group which has had the advantage of some kind of formal education to the extent of 100%, that age-group must certainly be the one from 18 years to 21 years. I agree that in our archaic system of the Mosaic Law, a man can suffer capital punishment at the age of 18 years; he can bear arms at the age of 18 years, he can marry at the age of 18 years, he is also subject to the payment of income tax, and if we follow the principle of no taxation without representation to its logical conclusion, it is clear that we cannot disenfranchise the people who are taxpayers of this colony. The average age of young people who are leaving school in Barbados is 14 years and in Secondary Schools it is about 17 1/2 to 18 years. We anticipate an economic condition in this country that young people will be absorbed in the avenue of gainful employment immediately on leaving the Secondary Schools and the Primary Schools of this island; if they are going to be absorbed in the avenues of employment, then they will become taxpayers and it is only logical that these young people should have some say in the running of the country in which they live. I therefore have great pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill which has been moved by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, and it is only an indication that this Government does not intend to fall into the thinking of the previous Government that whenever a private member introduces a Bill they should automatically oppose its passage. The past Government has gone to the extent that they, rather than support legislative matters on the Order Paper, have prorogued the House so that they could kill every possible item of Private Members' Business on the Order Paper. We do not intend to follow that practice. We now see that members of the erstwhile Government are going into the reverse now; they no longer have the power to advise the Officer administering the Government of the country as to the dissolution of the Legislative Session; so they climb on the vanguard of the "holier-than thou"-ers or the new frontier men and they even second the motions moved by private members.

It is true that they are lagging rather far behind but we welcome them to our ranks in the same way that we would welcome the 18 to 20 year olds into the ranks of the progressive way of the exercise of the franchise at the present time.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary for me to reply except to thank hon. members. This is a perfect indication of the unanimity in which this Bill has been held by the people, even by the erstwhile foes. They have come into line with this way of thinking, and as the Hon. Premier has said, there are new frontier men who can be relied on for doing something in the right way. I want to thank hon. members for supporting this Bill.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have selected the following hon. members to serve on the Select Committee in connection with this Bill:— The hon. mover of the Resolution, the hon. senior member for St. Peter, (Mr. Walcott); the hon. seconder, the hon. junior

member for St. George (Mr. F. E. Miller); the hon. junior member for St. Peter (Mr. K. N. R. Husbands); the hon. junior member for the City (Mr. L. A. Lynch); the hon. senior member for St. Thomas (Mr. G. V. Batson); and the hon. junior member for St. Lucy (Hon. J. C. Tudor).

RESOLUTION re PAYMENT OF OLD AGE PENSIONS

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to deal with Order No. 2 standing in my name under this Head at this stage.

Mr. SPEAKER: The action of the hon. member earlier this afternoon would cause the Order to go to the bottom of the Order Paper; on the other hand, he may ask leave of the hon. senior member for St. Peter, who is not now in his place, whose motion is Order No. 4 on the Order Paper, and of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, whose motion is Order No. 5, if the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has no objection. Does the hon. junior member for St. Joseph have any objection to the hon. member dealing with his Resolution at this stage?

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the hon. member proceeding with his motion, but it does seem to me as if he is making sport. Last Tuesday he asked that his Order be brought up from the bottom of the Order Paper to Order No. 2 and now today he has given way to the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

Mr. SPEAKER: Anyhow, I gather that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is willing to give way on this occasion to the hon. junior member for St. Philip. The hon. junior member for St. Philip may proceed.
3.15 p.m.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution reads as follows:-

WHEREAS Old Age Pensioners of this island suffer great inconvenience and hardship in travelling to the various venues provided for payment of their pensions;

AND WHEREAS accommodation at these venues is often unsuitable, having regard to their age and the long distances which they often have to travel to receive the same,

BE IT RESOLVED that steps be taken to appoint a Committee to deal with the whole matter, under the following terms of reference:-

- (a) To examine the present system of payment, and
- (b) To consider whether some method can be made with the possibility of payments at their homes.

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution was tabled for the specific purpose of doing something to alleviate the difficulties and hardship which the underprivileged of this island must face when they reach old age. It is one which is long overdue, Sir, and should be implemented as soon as possible. Considering that the old age pensioners contributed to the economy of this Island, it is my opinion and should be the opinion of any Democratic Government that something should be done to relieve them of this cumbersome burden. We, the members of the Government must realise that it is the working-class people in the lower brackets who have contributed to our success, and therefore it is our duty to place their interests on our priority list.

In the parish which I represent, there are approximately 900 pensioners. Some have to travel approximately three to four miles to receive their pensions. It is a fact, Sir, that some of them use the bus, but they have to pay bus-fares and having to do so reduces the amount which they get from the Post Office. Others have to walk and on many occasions they have to go through inclement weather. I have noticed on several occasions that some of them have taken ill on the road and others have taken ill at the Paying Centres, and it was the help of others which caused them to reach back to their homes. In many cases people have to give them first aid, and in some cases they have to pay for transportation to get back home. These things are not good enough in this age, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, I have also noticed that there is no proper accommodation at the various Post Offices to deal with the people, and in case of heavy rains they must get wet. Taking all these points into consideration, Sir, I feel that the time has come when this Government should do something to help these poor unfortunate people who did their utmost when they were young.

Now, Sir, the Resolution asks that a Committee be appointed to deal with the matter, but I still feel it is my duty to make certain suggestions. I feel, Sir, that the number of postmen at the various Post Offices could be increased and that the pensions could be sent by cheque or any other method which the Government sees fit. It is quite possible that you can use some kind of coupon system, and I am sure the shopkeepers would do their best to accept them on behalf of the pensioners. It is my opinion that by increasing the number of postmen the matter could be dealt with by sending these letters registered. Some people wonder how you are going to make sure that the pensioners receive the money. It is my way of thinking that if a postman is not capable of carrying a pension to a pensioner, he is not fit to be a postman, and any postman who is caught doing anything to prevent a pensioner from receiving the amount should be punished.

I realise, Sir, that it is going to take this Government some money, but I am sure that the amount will not be exorbitant if the method which I have suggested is implemented. It is my opinion that it can be done, and I am appealing to the members of the Government to try to solve this problem. It is not a colossal one and is one which I feel we can deal with.

I beg to move, Sir, that this Resolution do now pass.
(Cheers).
3.25 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I just point out to the hon. junior member for St. Philip that there are two slight clerical errors in the Address and before you finally sit down, you can ask that they be amended.

The second paragraph reads as follows:-

"AND WHEREAS accommodation at these venues is often unsuitable, having regard to their age and the long distance which they often have to travel to receive the same,"

Obviously, "the age of such pensioners" has been omitted from that paragraph.

In paragraph 3 (b) "to consider whether some method can be made with the possibility of payments at their homes", obviously, it should be "to consider whether some method can be devised." I suppose that those clerical errors can be amended.

Mr. WEEKES: Sir, I agree with you.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, in seconding this Resolution, I do so with great pleasure because something is really necessary to relieve the situation of these poor old people who are pensioners of the various districts. Sir, I know it would be a hard job of work for this Government to provide the postmen necessary if the system of payment were changed to the payment of old age pensions by cheque.

My suggestion to this problem is that the Government should provide the Postmasters and the Postmistresses and certain other officers in the various districts with a place in each district from which to pay pensions in order to relieve the people from walking up and down. You should also have certain paying days and then you could notify the people that they could receive their pensions at those offices on such days. I think that suggestion is a good one especially for those poor people who have to walk four or five miles to receive their pensions.

I have heard the hon. member for St. Philip saying that many old people fall in going to receive their pensions. Many of these poor old people have had to work very hard all through their life and it is very hard to see them totter-

ing about in the streets. I have heard their ankle bones crying out for lubrication while they were on their way to get their pension. Their ankle bones were ringing out like bells because of lack of lubrication. These poor people have worked very hard all through their life and it is double punishment to ask them to walk so far to receive their pensions. Some are hungry, some blind and some in a destitute condition; and to ask them to walk such distances, it means that after they have received their pensions, they will then have to go and pay a doctor.

The past Government should have taken up such a cause and should have looked after these poor people who have built up the economy of this Island, but very little interest has been taken in them. It shocks my modesty when I think of the old men and old women who receive a pension of just \$1.80 a week out of which they have to pay house rent and buy food and clothing. Along with that, they have to walk long distances to receive the pension or else they have to pay a bus fare of 20 cents going and coming out of that small pittance.

I agree wholeheartedly that some kind of consideration should be given to these poor people who have suffered so much.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think I should point out that the old age pensioners of the municipality do not have to pay doctors even when they fall.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. The hon. member can point that out when he is making a speech.

Mr. CORBIN: Sir, I am still glad for the suggestion which the hon. member has made. In the northern districts poor people even when they fall when going to receive their pensions, have to pay doctors. In Bridgetown or Christ Church it may be different but I am speaking of what I know. There are many people in St. Michael who are kings and queens to these poor ones in the other parishes. Some of these people receive \$3.00 a week as assistance plus other allowances; but the poor people in my district receive only the \$1.80 without any further consideration and they have to abide with that.

What I would like to see is the Government making a uniform rate of assistance to these poor old people throughout the whole Island; that is to say, whatever an old man or woman gets in St. Michael should be received by such a person in St. Lucy or any of the northern districts. I would like to see the poor old people in the northern parishes receiving the same thing as those in St. Michael.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The old age pension is one uniform rate throughout the whole island. I think the hon. member is speaking on the help which is being given by the Public Assistance Committee.

Mr. CORBIN: Sir, I am glad the hon. member mentioned it because every time they get up to interrupt me, they give me more ideas. I know Central Government gives all old age pensioners \$1.80, which is the last figure I know about. What I am saying is that poor people in the northern district only receive something like 25 cents, 50 cents or 75 cents a week as assistance. The highest they receive is 75 cents a week.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I repeat, what the hon. senior member for St. Andrew is continually speaking on is what they get from the Public Assistance Committee. But that has nothing to do with old age pensions.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I rise on the same point of order. It is obvious that the Resolution deals with old age pensions, not general public assistance; therefore, the hon. senior member for St. Andrew is out of order. There is no Speaker in the Chair who can think differently.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member is making a speech.

Mr. HUSBANDS: In stressing my point of order, I have to be emphatic. I have to be emphatic to convince the House and the hon. member as to the point.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, you have sat and listened to certain suggestions which I have made and I am willing to hear any more suggestions; but no hon. member has given me time to express my feelings. I am speaking as regards the old age pensioners. I know that some old age pensioners receive pensions from the Central Government and from the Public Assistance Committee too.

3.35 p.m.

I know that well. The point which I want to develop is what is causing the confusion. There are several days for the poor people to receive public assistance allowance and there are several days for them to receive old age pensions. The point I want to make is that the payment of both public assistance allowance and of old age pensions should be at one and the same time instead of asking people to walk two days a week in order to receive a small pittance.

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of explanation. The hon. member is suggesting to the House that the day or the time for the payment of old age pensions and the day or the time for the payment of public assistance should be one and the same. This Resolution seeks the approval of this House on a matter relating to Old Age Pensions, but it is beyond our powers to deal with a matter which comes within the province of Local Government. When it comes to the question of paying public assistance, that matter comes under the heading of Local Government. Is the hon. member asking us to assume to ourselves powers which are not ours?

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the hon. member is advocating that both public assistance and old age pensions should be paid out on the same day.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Is the hon. member aware that he is asking this House to do something which is beyond its powers? The hon. member must understand that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the hon. member is merely expressing his point of view *en passant*. The wording of this Resolution does not refer to the Old Age Pension Act of 1937; it merely refers to the old age pensioners of this island although we are inclined to include them in the Old Age Pension Act of 1937-13.

Mr. HUSBANDS: The hon. member has brought forward a Resolution dealing with the Old Age Pensioners of this Island and they include pensioners over whom this House has no control by legislation. What is the hon. member doing? Must he be led down the garden path?

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the hon. member has made his point.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I think that whenever an hon. member can be assisted, he should be assisted. When I see that an hon. member is actually straying from what is within the powers of this House and what is beyond it.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Assistance can always be given as long as it is within the province of this House to give it; but as far as interruptions are concerned, they are dealt with under the Standing Orders.

Mr. HUSBANDS: You joined me on this point of order and I replied to your interventions most properly and with decorum. I thought I was rendering my colleague a service; but if it is not appreciated then I sit.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, it seems that this debate has a little fire in it and I would really like to know whom it is burning. I hope that the time will come when this Government will take over the responsibility of the poor as a whole, and put aside all public assistance. We want to do away with all this 75¢ allowance and give the poor a decent pension. I hope that the Government will consider the people and give them the allowance as I have suggested. I know that my Government has it at heart to do the best it can for the poor people of this island. We intend to go throughout

the length and breadth of this island and see the needs of the poor people and assist them. We hope to spend the money in the best way to achieve results so that the whole island will be able to see them. I hope that by the passing of this Resolution the poor people will be able to go to their respective districts, receive their allowances and come back home and enjoy some of the substance which the island has provided for them. I hope that there will be no more crying and shedding of tears along the streets; I hope that these people will be able to sit down and eat and drink and give God the praise.

Mr. Speaker, I know what I am talking about because I have to deal with old people; all of us know the suffering of the old people and we are trying to eradicate their sufferings. We want to be able to supply the needs of these old people, and I hope that the Government will consider them and supply their needs according to what they have in hand. These people have built up the economy of this island and they should have some of the benefit which we have received today. I know that any man who is interested in the poor, God will be for him; and any man who is not interested in the poor will be forsaken. The former Government is out of existence today because it neglected the poor too much and saw to the big man. The cry of the poor has gone up and the former Government will be out of existence forever.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I did not want to speak on this Resolution. I am sure that no hon. member will vote against it and at the same time every hon. member will not speak on it. The need of the Old Age Pensioner, those who are qualified under the law to receive old age pensions - I am not confusing them with other pensioners who are old - is there. I should like to make that clear at the beginning. I must associate myself with this matter because I do not believe that it is more than a fortnight ago, when I asked the present Government a question about accommodating these old age pensioners. I feel that they should be paid earlier than Saturday morning. That question has not yet been answered by the Government; however, I have no doubt that it will be answered soon. There is no need to make any speeches on this question and I must say that I am not as exuberant as the hon. senior member for St. Andrew. That is his nature; it is not mine. This Resolution reads as follows:-

WHEREAS Old Age Pensioners of this Island suffer great inconvenience and hardship in travelling to the various venues provided for payment of their pensions;

AND WHEREAS accommodation at these venues is often unsuitable, having regard to their age and the long distances which they often have to travel to receive the same,

BE IT RESOLVED that steps be taken to appoint a Committee to deal with the whole matter, under the following terms of reference:-

- (a) To examine the present system of payment, and
- (b) To consider whether some method can be made with the possibility of payments at their homes.

3.45 p.m.

Well, Sir, it is this Government's responsibility to see how practical that end of it is. I do not believe it is insurmountable; it is quite possible that each pensioner may be further accommodated, because when you think of old people who have to walk, especially in the rural areas, reasonably long distances on Saturday mornings - and I repeat Saturday mornings because they are paid on Saturdays - to the Post Offices, it is not a good thing for the old to be subjected to such hard conditions. As a matter of fact, it has always been said that you can gauge the morale of a country by the way it treats its poor, and due consideration ought to be given to people who have already given of their best in labour; when they come to the evening of their days they should be better cared for and more highly appreciated. We cannot do too much for the old people. In Barbados there is no social security system. Already what they get which is miscalled a pension is very, very little, and I think the least we could do is to make it as bearable as possible in that they are

subjected to hard conditions and trials even in obtaining these pensions.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is the entire purport and intention of this Resolution, and as I have said, no member of the House would dare oppose it and I daresay no member would hold this up by making a long speech. As a matter of fact, I do not think any member can make a long speech on it. For the old and tired out who get little or nothing, we are asking that they should not be subjected to the hardest conditions in receiving it; and so I give this Resolution my blessing and I hope it will be found practical by Government to accommodate the terms of this Resolution.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in associating myself with this Resolution. I know that you, Sir, passing by the Black Rock Post Office have often been amazed to see these poor people lined up by the side of the road and having to wait in the sun, rain and wind. If that is so in the parish of St. Michael, Sir, you can just imagine the country districts where these people who are not able have to travel far distances to receive their pension. I am saying, Sir, that if it is not possible that these pensions could be sent to these people, you should pay them once per month instead of weekly so that it would help them to remove some of the inconvenience which they now suffer.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, the Resolution as it is worded and asking that an inquiry be made into the possibility of paying old age pensions in a manner other than now exists is quite desirable indeed. The appointment of a Commission of Enquiry is the correct thing to do because it would be fraught with difficulties. If, for instance, we had suggested that these old age pensions be paid by cheque or voucher, some of them would get it maybe two weeks late; so all this we cannot deal with today in the House and that needs investigation. Not today but for many years when we sat on the other side we asked the Government about the possibility of changing the method of payment to the old age pensioners, and in doing so we did not have in mind every old age pensioner; we were thinking of those who were unable to get to or found great difficulty in getting to the place where they receive their pensions, and who often had to send some relative or child to receive them, because very often as has been pointed out, they were paying a large sum of their pensions in bus fares in getting to and from the stations where they draw their pensions.

I commend this in its entirety, and I wonder if we could go a little further now that we are going to ask Government to set up a Commission of Enquiry to go into this matter and ask whether they could not also include Government pensioners. Instead of their having to come down here to the Treasury once a month, why could they not be sent a cheque? It is done in America like that. I know there are American pensioners in Barbados who receive a cheque every month, but they do not receive a second cheque until their endorsement on the first cheque is returned to America; so that one could only get away with a month's pension. I think we could go a little further and ask that the scope of this Commission of Enquiry be widened to include the possibility of paying Government pensioners generally in a way that would facilitate payment to them and not having them come to the Treasury every month.

I commend it and if it could be widened, I propose when the Government is setting up a Commission, and I am sure they will, investigating the possibility that exists for the improvement of the paying of all old age pensioners, that they could be included at the same time. I give it my blessing like all other members, and I am sure that some good can come out of this.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, as one not entirely unconnected with the affairs of the Municipality, I rise to give my support to this measure. I would like to say, however, that I am not in agreement with the idea of people being paid once a month. The poor are notoriously improvident; that is how they become poor in the first place, and many a man or woman if given a sum of money once a month, it would not last him or her four weeks. It is necessary to see that they receive these pensions on a weekly basis.

Mr. Speaker, the idea of a cheque is also somewhat repugnant - except, of course, the hon. introducer intends having little wayside Banks, one for every three or four houses, because they would still be faced with the problem of getting to one of the Commercial Banks, or what is more dangerous, sending some neighbour who might not return with the money after presenting the cheque.
3.55 p.m.

Therefore, I do think, Sir, that it would be a wise thing to turn this matter over to a Select Committee who might enquire into what is done in places like British Guiana where such things are involved and in Trinidad where other things are involved.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, no one is more concerned about the old age pensioners than I, myself. I have given this matter careful thought ever since I was a Minister and until this day we are still trying to devise ways and means to assist these pensioners. All that has been said here this afternoon we have discussed and there are the *pros* and *cons*. I, therefore, feel, while agreeing with this Resolution in principle, that it is going to take a considerable amount of thought before something tangible can be done and I agree that a Committee should be set up to go into this matter. I, therefore, take great pleasure in associating myself with the remarks which were made by the several speakers.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I merely wanted to say, as the Hon. Minister of Social Services has said, that the Government has accepted the principle that a national committee should be appointed to go into this matter and in the very near future such a committee would be set up under the Chairmanship of the Minister of Social Services to go into this matter and to report on the best means of putting the suggestions into operation.

Mr. SPEAKER: If no other hon. members want to contribute to this debate, then the hon. junior member for St. Philip, if he cares to say anything by way of finalising this discussion, may proceed.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to thank hon. members for the support which they have given and I do hope that the matter will be dealt with as soon as possible.

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

LEAVE TO PROCEED WITH ORDER No. 4

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I have communicated to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph my intention of dealing with Order No. 4 now and he is willing to allow me to deal with that item. I am, therefore, asking leave that Order No. 4 of Private Members' Business be the next Order of the Day.

There being no objection, leave was granted the hon. member.

THE TRADE UNION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1962

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Peter: Second reading of a Bill to amend the Trade Union Act, 1939.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, this amendment, as you are aware, has been before this Assembly in and out since 1949. In 1949, it was passed and then in going to the Other Place this Clause which I now propose to insert was deleted. This Clause brings the Act of Barbados in line with the English Act and I will say that the Hon. Premier who has a lot of experience in industrial law dealt with this matter extensively in another neighbouring territory and I think at that time - and I can say this without divulging any secret - one of the books which the Hon. Premier used was my property. If I am not mistaken, at one stage or the other, he had to make use of one of those documents of mine.

This is another matter which forms part of the Government's manifesto in the last elections and it comes under

page 14 of that booklet. I am sorry that the hon. senior member for the City is not in his place because I heard him make more than one pronouncement that there are two things which his Party is against. One is nationalisation. The present Mayor who is the junior member for the City thought that they are gradually moving to understand that this includes more things in public, and if that is so, then I cannot understand their policy on nationalisation. However, this Bill does not deal with nationalisation; it deals with an amendment to the Trade Union Act to provide for peaceful picketing at or near the residence of a person directly concerned with a trade dispute.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If the hon. member cannot understand nationalisation, I propose to lend him a book to show him that a system of Government in a corporation supports the question of nationalisation.

Mr. SPEAKER: That seems to me more a point of magnanimity or generosity than a point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, as the hon. member goes along, he will learn.

Mr. LYNCH: I will only just tell the hon. member that a bottle of three gills proportion would hold no more than is put into it after ten years or ten seconds.

Mr. WALCOTT: I will say that schoolmasters even learn when they come into this Chamber, if they are not above learning; and as soon as the hon. member is in here a little longer, he will come to understand.

Sir, in this Bill, we propose even when industrialists come here and settle that they would be better equipped.

The 1906 Trade Disputes Act makes it quite clear that it shall be lawful for one or more persons, acting on their own behalf or on the behalf of the Trade Union or of an individual employer or firm in contemplation or furtherance of a Trade Dispute, to attend at or near a house or place where a person resides or works or carries on business or happens to be, if they so attend merely for the purpose of peacefully obtaining or communicating information, or peacefully persuading any person to work or abstain from working.

Now, this amendment is a little different from the last Resolution. This is not a local political flogging horse like old age pensions; this is one of those bits of legislation that one philosophically must have something in mind about it and one's mind must be clearly emancipated from the days of slavery and thoroughly free to know that peaceful picketing does not mean that you are going into anybody's backyard or house, because it says 'at or near the place he resides'. It merely gives the right where a trade dispute exists that you can picket peacefully at or near the residence of the person directly concerned.

I can only draw to the attention of hon. members of this Chamber what some of the lawyers had to say about that. In a book written by Norman A. Citrine, called 'Trade Union Law' - and this is the Second Edition - on page 446, it says:-
4.05 p.m.

"It is however suggested that picketing confined to peaceful persuasion and argument is not, and never has been, criminal either at common law, under the Combination of Workmen Act, 1825, the Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1871, or under section 7 of the 1875 Act.

The case of *R. v. Selsby* was heard before the passing of the Molestation of Workmen Act, 1859, which expressly declared it to be legal peacefully to persuade others to cease or abstain from work, in order to obtain the rate of wages or the altered hours of labour agreed upon between them. In that case, Rolfe B., in addressing the jury said:

"It is doubtless lawful for people to agree among themselves not to work except upon certain terms; that

being so, I am not aware of any illegality in their peaceably trying to persuade others to adopt the same view.... My opinion is that if there was no other object than to persuade people that it was their interest not to work except for certain wages, and not to work under certain regulations complied with in a peaceable way, that it was not illegal."

Therefore the whole question of peaceful picketing at or near your home or place of business is to be understood in the context that you are talking about an industrial dispute. As to the amendment in our Act, if there is no dispute, then there is no question of peaceful picketing. If a strike is legal, as a corollary to a strike, peaceful picketing must take place in order to make the strike effective. Those of us who deal with these matters will know that you do not pass an Act like this with the intention that tomorrow morning the Trade Union will call a strike and will come to your backyard and say: "There is a strike on and we have come to let you know that the law as to peaceful picketing has been amended and you must comply with it." It is not done with that intention at all; it is done with the intention that when these major things take place, it gives the Trade Union the right to use all of its powers in the best way it can. There is the question that you cannot coerce or intimidate. I should like to say that peaceful picketing does not infringe on the right of the citizens; it gives the right that, in a dispute, a person can persuade his colleagues to realise that something has gone wrong. There is no difference between a strike or a fire or some other calamity in which you restrict the right of people not to go this way or that way. You restrict the rights of the citizens to pass along the normal road or route to go to their home; you tell them that they cannot go this way because you are using this way. We are not pressing this amendment because it has happened elsewhere, but we are dealing with something which is done so universally that it is unusual not to have it here. This legislation was passed 56 years ago in England; it is no wonder that the Conservative Government, led by the hon. senior member for the City in Barbados, wanted to take his party back into the days of 1927 in the United Kingdom. That shows that they are living.....

Mr. LYNCH: On a point of order. The hon. senior member for St. Peter seems to be anticipating when he talks about the Conservative Government led by the hon. senior member for the City.

Mr. WALCOTT: You can only deal with the leaders. All parties have chosen leaders and I give them the right designation. It may be that the others in the Party.....

Mr. LYNCH: On a point of order. This Party is not the Conservative Government; it is the Conservative Party, it is not yet the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps the hon. member had in mind the Government of the Municipality.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I was speaking about the Conservative Government in England. I do not think that the hon. member should worry. Everybody can aspire, but I believe that conservatism within the context of our local politics - I believe that they will be looking for something more than a metamorphosis if they believe that the Conservatives, by any appellation, will ever become the Government of the country in our age. I say that that is hopeful thinking, but you have wishful thinking all over the world. I was only making the analysis that the mentality of these Conservatives in Barbados is in tune with that of the Conservative Government in England in 1927. That was the Government which took out the 1906 amendment; but when the Labour Party came into power in 1945, they amended that and put the law back where it was in 1906. I know that this will not have much meaning to the hon. junior member for the City because socialism is anathema to the hon. member and to the members of his Party because they believe that that is the last stage of human existence.

This amendment is to give the right which the workers should have had many years ago and it was put into the Acts of this island. The Government of today and myself took it

upon ourselves to let the people know what peaceful picketing means. I heard even during the Election, one of those lame-duck explanations as to what peaceful picketing is. That same hon. member who made the explanation, was so soundly and convincingly defeated that you can say that it was a vote of confidence in the Government in proposing this matter. This matter has been put foursquare to the people of this country. This is something which the workers will plump for and something which the employers will understand; and gradually the employers have been showing some sense of reality and realism and are not like the ostrich, sinking their heads in the sand and leaving the greater part of their anatomy exposed. The Trade Union does not regard an employer as a foe, but it regards itself as having an integral part to play in this society of ours.

This is something which should be made law. Even here it will be more restrictive than it is in the United Kingdom because in the United Kingdom the Act says: "on behalf of the man or on behalf of somebody else;" but in Barbados it says "on behalf of a Trade Union". Anybody who acts in accordance with this, acts in accordance with the Trade Union and knows that a Trade Union exists.
4.15 p.m.

I do not speak to members on my left because they are converts to this; but to those members on my right who are not aware of it, I would say that this is not one of the things you can become aware of suddenly. It is something you have to understand and not get the idea as I have heard expressed by the hon. senior member for the City, that a man's home is his castle and therefore you have no right to go to a man's home. That is an anti-diluvian concept. When a man's home becomes his castle, he must so act and conduct himself industrially that none of his actions would cause him to be the subject of public notice. You cannot have workers at your home and tell them you dare them to come near where you live. What about domestic servants? Who would dare treat domestic servants badly and say they could not picket at his home? Why could there not be a demonstration to show that you have treated them badly? It would be a terrific revelation if I say to some of those people who treat their domestic help badly that if these people were organised they would see what it would be like.

Mr. Speaker, there are some people who live upstairs and carry on business downstairs. Are you going to say that that is their home and you could not picket there? People carry on business away from their homes and no demonstration can take place where that business is carried on. There was a classic example of a gentleman who owned a canefield in St. John and refused to pay a proper price and production bonus. Do you want people to go to the canefield and picket the canefield? All the plantation houses are situated at places where you can regard them as homes. Are you suggesting that we could not have a demonstration there to show that this is where the man lives who refuses to pay, but that he can go within the cloisters of his home after committing all the peculiar acts outside his home and tell you that is his preserve? The days for that type of thinking are over.

Mr. Speaker, it is not the Trade Union's business to go to a man's home for the sake of going to his home, because if a man runs a business in Bridgetown, the effectiveness of peaceful picketing is at the place in Bridgetown. We do not want to go in Belleville or the Pine where there are dogs for the sake of demonstrating to him that we want to picket at his house; but we will go to his house if that is the only means of bringing effectiveness to bear. As I mentioned already, there are private homes where people live, like the managers of plantations and factories, which are surrounded by their work-places. If you go to a place like Bulkeley, for example, the house is at the end of a long gap from the street. You cannot go to the house because you cannot trespass on a man's property, but the highway is there and it has always been used for peaceful picketing; but if a servant was treated badly in Dalkeith, what is wrong with picketing there to show that the servant was not treated right? Somebody has the idea that in peaceful picketing you are going behind Sarah Ann's paling and peeping until she comes out in the morning before she is properly clad when she could say she could not be private because she

saw somebody peeping through her paling. Or perhaps one might say they are peeping to see when somebody comes through the window or the back-door or comes out with a cup bigger than theirs.

Mr. Speaker, this is purely and simply an industrial bit of legislation that must find its way on the Statute Book of this Island. I do not think under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, that it is necessary for me to make a longer speech because I think all the members on the side of the Government agree with this. This is something which to my way of thinking the Government could have brought down, because I know they are in favour of it; but I had given notice of it in so many Sessions and I felt sure the Government would support it.

I would also like to say, Mr. Speaker, that we have reached the stage in which the Government's relationship with the Trade Union is different from what it was with the past Government. That does not mean that the Government has any control over the Trade Union, nor does it mean that the Trade Union wants the Government to do something for the Trade Union without taking the national interest into consideration. The Trade Union does not want that. It would be improper for that to be suggested. We feel that the Government has its functions to perform, because there may be instances in which the Trade Union and the Government may come into conflict; so I do not think one need worry over the fact that there is a good relationship between the Government and the Trade Union, because there is no suggestion one way or the other that the Government is to be pushed around by the Trade Union, or the Trade Union is to be pushed around by the Government. The Minister of Labour and all the members of Government can act freely, independently and in consultation with the Union, and for that reason the Trade Union would act as a Trade Union without being regarded as being under the thumb of Government or under any Minister. That shows that we can have collaboration and good relationship without there being any question of one or the other being controlled. For that reason, I feel sure that coming at this stage it augurs well for Barbados that the Trade Union has reached the maturity it has and the Government has seen that an Act like this can be put on the Statute Book without anybody losing any sense of their position in the community, but giving everybody an opportunity to look at the Trade Union in its true light.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore have the greatest pleasure in moving the passing of the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, on rising to second this motion, I must say something that has struck me again forcefully, and it is that a representative Government of the workers was in power for so long and never saw fit to implement this piece of necessary legislation. As the hon. senior member for St. Peter has pointed out, this Act does not entitle a person to go at somebody's place and knock him down or anything like that; it is for the sole purpose of protecting the workers. There are many employers who live away from where they have their source of employment. They go to their source of employment as gentlemen, but on the job they are nothing but scamps; so this piece of legislation will give us, the Trade Union, - when I say "us", I am speaking as a Trade Unionist - an opportunity to point out to the people in the community where this employer lives that he is not the gentleman he was trying to pretend that he was. It would also bring note to the people who live around him that they would not want to see this sort of thing, and they would pressurize him to come to an agreement, because in nine out of ten cases the Trade Union is not asking for something to do harm to these people. It is necessary at times for the Trade Union to revert to the act of striking; and it is the only weapon which the Trade Union has against an unscrupulous employer. You cannot go to beat him, and therefore you must hit him where it hurts most, that is in his paypacket, by refusing to work or picketing his place or office, whichever is suitable. He in turn would be losing as well as the members of the Trade Union, and as you know, capitalists never like to lose much, and that is where he would feel it most.

I have been all around as you know, Sir. I am not at sea any longer, I am ashore and I know what I am speaking

about; but when I go to sea I go ashore and I try to find out things for myself. Sir, it is remarkable how this piece of legislation was objected to by the former Government on some stupid pretext, when in places like England where a Conservative Government has been in power for so many years - I think this is the second or third term of office - they have not seen fit to change it, which means that it has served a useful purpose.

In seconding this motion I can do none other.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member ignore the asides.

Mr. BOXILL: I will, Sir. In seconding this motion, I can do no other than give it my whole-hearted support, and I do know that my colleagues will follow suit.

4.25 p.m.

Mr. CORBIN: In connection with this Bill, Mr. Speaker, we must say that peaceful picketing is necessary. I will tell you why I say it is necessary. I remember some years ago here in Barbados, I was in charge of rock blasters who worked for Mr. Farnum, and the rock blasters never got an increase of pay or back pay when from His Excellency the Governor at that time back down to the lowest paid Civil Servant had got an increase and back pay. I called upon my men and told them what was happening and I stopped every man from working. I then called on the authorities of Highways and Transport and on my representative of the parish at that time and they all came to Belle-plaine and saw that the men had stopped working. I had them all lined up and said to them that no man should speak but "Homie" Corbin. When the Engineer of the Highways and Transport asked why the men had stopped working, I said to him that my men had run out of oil and wanted lubrication. I told him that from His Excellency back down to the lowest paid Civil Servant had got an increase of pay and my poor men who were carrying the burden of the day have received no more money; therefore, they have come to a standstill.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS RESUMED

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now 4.30 o'clock p.m. and with great regret - because the hon. member was just in his stride - I have to say that Government Business is resumed.

When the House adjourned, it was in Committee of Supply.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY RESUMED

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the suspension, the hon. junior member for St. George was speaking.

Mr. MILLER: There is nothing more that I can add.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I must thank the Hon. Minister for the reply which he gave me on this matter and what he proposes to do with the Hospital Report because, as I have said, my query was to find out what was the Government's stand on the matter. I was a bit taken back when I heard the former Minister of Social Services making a statement to the effect that he wanted a full dress debate on the Report. If the hon. junior member for St. George would accept my little advice with good grace, I would say that it would be better for him not to persist in debating the Report on the Hospital because I do not believe that his persistence in debating it is going to be in favour of the Barbados Labour Party of which he is the Parliamentary Leader. Of course, some of us like to be members of something which does not exist or is dying; but I think it would be a good thing to let that Party die now and have a decent burial so that something appropriate would be said to its remembrance. For those reasons, I do hope that the hon. member would not persist in having the Hospital Report discussed. I hope, however, that we will discuss this matter: but when we do so I hope that the hon. junior member for St. George will not be in the Chamber because we will be able to debate it on what it stands for. If the hon. member is in the Chamber at the time he is likely to add fuel to fire. I thank the Hon. Minister for the explanation he has given. I did not intend to question the Resolution as such.

I also thank the Hon. Leader of the House for the information which he has given in relation to this matter. Finally, I would say that the hon. junior member for St. George should correct himself as to the proper dates. His December date seems too fluid. Maybe, there are more Decembers than one in his year. I was under the impression that he meant December, 1961, but he seems to mean December 1960. I know that the Barbados Labour Party year was 1937 and I hope he would not go back to 1937.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I have to reply to the last member who spoke. I was always a member of the Barbados Labour Party and will continue to be a member of that Party. I thank him for his advice but again I must tell him it is a matter for me as to what he has advised me to do. It would be no use for me to discuss it outside. It would be better that I discuss it on the floor of the House.

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

On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER the passing of two Resolutions in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.
4.35 p.m.

RESOLUTION re PARCEL POST SURFACE RATES TO CANADA

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism:- To move the passing of the following Resolution:- Resolution to approve that with effect from the first day of February, 1962, the postage on parcels to Canada as set out in the Schedule to Resolution 71/1960 shall be varied as shown in the Schedule hereto.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, it has become necessary to revise the parcel post rates to Canada, since the Canadian Postal Administration has made substantial increases in its terminal charges and the existing local rates have become uneconomic. This Resolution therefore makes provision for increases in the local surface postage rates on parcels to Canada. It also makes provision for a more expeditious postal service to Canada via Trinidad at the choice of the sender as an alternative to direct shipment.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

RESOLUTION re PARCEL POST AIR MAIL RATES TO CANADA

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism:- To move the passing of the following Resolution:- Resolution to approve that with effect from the first day of February, 1962, air mail postage on parcels to Canada as set out in the Schedule to the Resolution No. 72/1960 shall be varied as shown in the Schedule hereto.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, it has become necessary to revise the parcel post rates to Canada since the Canadian Postal Administration has made substantial increases in its terminal charges and the existing local rates have become uneconomic. This Resolution therefore makes provision for an increase in the local air mail postage rate on parcels to Canada.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

COUNTERFEIT CURRENCY (CONVENTION) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the second reading of a Bill to enable effect to be given to an International Currency for the suppression of Counterfeiting Currency, signed on behalf of His Majesty at Geneva on the twentieth day of April, nineteen hundred and twenty-nine, to apply to foreign coin certain enactments relating to British Coin, and to assimilate the penalties for importing counterfeit coin.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, there are in this island three laws dealing with currency offences. As you know, Sir, since we have moved from the age when mankind transacted business by means of barter, it has been necessary to place on the Statute Book certain laws for which the common law of the land did not make provision, dealing with counterfeiting and forgery offences, the assimilation of the currency of the realm by unqualified and unauthorised persons, the uttering of counterfeit coins and notes and the forging of promissory notes, bills of exchange and the other measures of exchanges which we use in our money economy today. In 1929 there was an International Convention to which the United Kingdom was a high contracting party, and it appears that the Government of Barbados in 1961 has now got around to rationalising and bringing to a certain level the international standards which were introduced by the Convention of 1929, the law relating to the forgery, uttering manufacturing and the counterfeiting of coins and the forgery of bills of exchange upon mankind.

The Bill which is now before us is a very simple one. It is merely, as hon. members will see in the explanation in the "Objects and Reasons", to give effect to the International Convention for the suppression of counterfeiting currency. While these international conventions are accepted by the high ranking countries, not even in those countries do they have the persuasive effect and the sanction of the law until they are enshrined on the Statute Books of the respective countries.
4.45 p.m.

Similarly, no Colonial territory is automatically bound by any convention which is signed by the United Kingdom Government, and neither is a place like Barbados for which legislation cannot be made by reference to the Imperial Parliament bound by even a statutory enactment of the United Kingdom Parliament except in so far as it may relate to constitutional matters. It is therefore necessary for us to bring the Statute Law of Barbados up to standard so that in these days when we have international trade, when the Swiss franc and the German mark may be as freely negotiable as the West Indian dollar in the business places of Bridgetown and when the Government itself has to seek other means of investment funds outside of the sterling market, it is very important that we should try to conform to these international conventions and standards.

The three Acts which are affected in Barbados are the Forgery Act, 1868, the Coinage (Offences) Act, 1868 and the Currency Act, 1959. In these three Acts some of the provisions of the conventions of 1929 are now part of the Statute Law of Barbados. The Bill which we have before us, however, Mr. Speaker, goes a little further. This is necessary for the purpose of bringing us in line with the international convention, but these are included for the purpose of assimilating the law relating to foreign and British currency and making it as close as possible to similar United Kingdom legislation.

If Your Honour would look at Clause 6 of the Bill, you will see a typical example of the provisions which are not necessarily part of the International Convention, but which we consider advisable to include now in this legislation rather than come piece-meal to make amendments to the three Acts which I have mentioned from time to time. In Clause 6 you will see that the provisions of the Coinage (Offences) Act of 1868 are now applied *mutatis mutandis* to foreign

coin as for British coin, and all these provisions were not necessarily contained in the 1929 Convention.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill intituled "The Counterfeit Currency (Convention) Act, 1962, be now read a second time.

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

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

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

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

AYES: Mr. BATSON; Hon. E. W. BARROW; Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Mr. CORBIN; Mr. WEEKES; Mr. LOWE; Mr. YEARWOOD; Mr. BOXILL; Mr. WALCOTT; Mr. COWARD; Mr. HOLDER; Mr. SEALY; Mr. LYNCH and Mr. GODDARD — 18.

NOES: NIL.

Mr. SPEAKER: I heard an hon. member vote very vehemently "no" when the question was put louder than the "Ayes". I will remind members of Standing Order No. 37 in respect of voting. "A member shall not answer in a manner inconsistent with any opinion which he may have expressed when the voices were taken collectively." Let hon. members bear that in mind.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee, Mr. BATSON being in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 7 inclusive were called and passed. 4.55 p.m.

The Schedule was called and passed.

On motion of Hon. E. W. BARROW, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. E. W. BARROW, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE LEASE TO MESSRS. TEXACO ANTILLES LTD.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism:—To move the passing of the following Resolution:

Resolution to approve the lease by the Executive Committee to Messrs. Texaco Antilles Limited of a parcel of land situated at Seawell in the parish of Christ Church and containing by admeasurement approximately 5,440 square feet, for the purpose of erecting a station thereon for the retail of gasoline and other petroleum products.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, as the Addendum sets out, this Resolution seeks, in accordance with the provisions of the Executive Committee (Amendment) Act, 1951, the approval by the Legislature of the lease of a parcel of land at Seawell, Christ Church, to Messrs. Texaco Antilles Limited for the purpose of erecting a station for the retail of gasoline and other petroleum products.

It is proposed to lease the parcel of land of approximately 5,440 square feet at the rate of \$35.00 a year and for a period of ten years with the option of renewal for a similar period.

The joint lease of two areas of 1 acre, 1 rood, 32 perches and 2,227 square feet to Messrs. Shell Antilles and Guianas Limited and Messrs. Texaco Antilles Limited was sanctioned by the House of Assembly on the 9th of December, 1960, and concurred in by the Legislative Council on the 13th of December, 1960. The smaller area was to be used in connection with the retail of gasoline, etc.

The two companies do not now wish to conclude the joint lease for this area but Messrs. Texaco Antilles Limited by themselves propose to erect an improved station on the 5,440 square feet of land.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: I would like to know if the Hon. Minister can tell us what is behind granting these people a lease of land at Seawell to retail gasoline. I do not regard it as a public service, though it is essential near to the Airport to have gasoline being sold. The reason why I say that is because these are rather rich oil companies to which you are extending a lease and if they wanted land up at Seawell for refuelling aircraft, by all means, you should lease them; but if they want land on which they can sell their gasoline, they should go out on the front road and buy it. I am not inclined to give any oil company any lease of land to sell gasoline. I do not know, but I may be wrong. I am not inclined to give any oil company any lease of land to sell gasoline at Seawell as distinct from selling it near St. Bartholomew. Of course, the selling of gasoline there is not an essential thing in helping one to get to the Airport because if you run out of gasoline before you get there you would not be able to get to the Airport. But if you run out of gasoline at the Airport, the selling of gas there would be a means of helping you to get back to town. However, there is no man who can pretend that he has run short of gasoline in getting there because there are gasoline stations all the way up to Airport. There is a gasoline station at Pegwell and a little higher up, there is one at Oldbury.

Sir, I would like to know what there is in it that we have to give these people a lease of land at Seawell at this sort of peppercorn rent. According to the Addendum, it is something like 5,440 square feet at the rate of \$35 a year. The reason why I am asking that question is because when Government has to buy land, Government has to pay a lot of money per square foot for it. Do you want Texaco Antilles Limited to sell gasoline up there? Has the Government requested them to do so?
5.05 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, the reason why I ask about Texaco Antilles Ltd. is not because I think anything valuable has been said for me to argue about. I see no reason why the Government should not rent Texaco a piece of land; it is only what the land is worth. Anything which will find employment for people I am in favour of. (ASIDES) Are you insinuating.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not insinuating anything.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Not you, Sir, you do not insinuate unless it is in the interest of the public. I am always in favour of anything which will create employment for people. I want to say that you cannot put up gasoline stations in sufficient numbers. I take it that these people are paying a reasonable price for this land. There are hon. members who have more than passing interest in having a gas station at Seawell. As I have said, I do not consider this price to be an unreasonable one.

The hon. member talks about a peddling shop and a what-else shop; I should like to say that the average man who goes to Seawell always makes sure that he has gas; unless you are getting away from somebody you will always provide. I do not think that this business is going to be as big as what some hon. members think. I have much pleasure in supporting the passing of this Resolution.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am not against the leasing of this land to this Company, but I am against the price to be paid for it. This amount of \$35.00 a year seems to be too small an amount for such an area of land in Christ Church. I am wondering if the Addendum to this Resolution has been wrongly worded; I am wondering if the price is not \$35.00 a week and not \$35.00 a year. I cannot vote for this Resolution under these conditions because this price is too small. I would be glad if the Hon. Minister would explain

to us whether this amount is \$35.00 per month or \$35.00 per week. Really, Sir, I am not in agreement with this price although I agree with the leasing of the land. I will await the reply of the Hon. Minister.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, before the Minister replies, I should like to say that I remember having had discussions on this matter and I did visit the site myself. In view of the moment, there is the need for providing a service in this area where it is a question of supplying gasoline. You want to provide a very essential facility, and I do not know that there is anything wrong about this matter at all. If you pay attention to what may develop at the Airport, you will really require this facility up there. That is what we were told. No one would go off the main road in order to go into Seawell for the purpose of buying gasoline. I would like to support the Minister in this matter; I repeat that there is a growing need for this facility in this area.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, in reply to hon. members I would like to say that if you were to look carefully at the Addendum to this Resolution you will see that this Agreement had been previously entered into with two joint firms for a greater amount of land. I enquired carefully into the question of the price and I was informed that this station would be more of a public utility at this time than it would be a paying concern because few cars go to the airport for gasoline. It would be just a matter that if a car at Seawell had run out of gasoline it would be a question of public convenience rather than a money-making concern at the present stage. That is why this lease is for a period of ten years with the option of renewal for another ten years. If things develop to a greater extent, a proper price would have to be paid. I myself considered that \$35 per year was rather cheap. Paragraph 3 of the Addendum to this Resolution shows that this contract was entered into before this Government took over; it was entered into on the 9th December, 1960.

Mr. Speaker, I have investigated the matter and I would say that the average car would not leave the highway to go into Seawell so as to be supplied with gasoline. It would be a question of a motor vehicle having run out of gasoline at Seawell; I repeat that it would be more a question of supplying a public utility at the Airport. I view the matter from the same angle as others.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker,.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid the Hon. Minister has already replied.

The question that this Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 5.15 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: That appears to conclude Government Business for this afternoon, and all business for this day's meeting.

CONGRATULATIONS TO HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, before we fix the Order Paper, I should like on behalf of this side of the House to extend our warmest felicitations to Your Honour on having obtained your twenty-fifth birthday as a member of this Chamber. *(Cheers.)* (Mr. WALCOTT: Let us have a \$20 plate.)

There could be no better indication of the respect and veneration in which Your Honour is held by the good people of the parish of St. Lucy, Sir, and I need hardly say that selecting you as one of their representatives for the last twenty-five years speaks very highly for their good sense and perspicacity, and demonstrates that St. Lucy has arrived at a political maturity not yet achieved by one or two other parishes in this Island. We, Sir, would like to wish you many happy returns of this political birthday, and express the hope that so long as Your Honour desires to remain as a representative of St. Lucy, the good people of this parish will be inclined to retain your services as one of their spokesmen in this Chamber.

I think it is a most appropriate coincidence that the advent of this birthday should have coincided with your election by the members of this House to the position you now occupy, because this in itself also demonstrates that not only your constituents in St. Lucy but your compeers in this Chamber have arrived at a measure of appreciation of your service and your reputation as a politician, and your judicious and impartial temperament in having selected you for this post. It is my hope and that of all of us on this side of the Chamber that so long as Your Honour wishes you may be permitted to adorn the seat that you now occupy.

Finally, Sir, in extending to you our most sincere hopes for a long and continued occupancy of the Chair, involving of course the continued occupancy of a seat in the Chamber, we express the hope that your health should be spared appropriately to carry on the duties which your office carries. I do not know whether or not this is appropriate, but we look forward to being invited by Your Honour at some appropriate time to celebrate more appropriately at another place the combination of your Parliamentary achievement and distinguished duration of your membership of this Chamber. *(Cheers.)*

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I too from this side of the Table would like to join with the Hon. Leader of the House in congratulating you in attaining a quarter of a century as a member of this House. I well remember, Sir, those very youthful days when you entered this Chamber, but none of us thought that we would have been spared to see you among the first bachelors to occupy this Chair. I am not going to say much, but I do join with the hon. member in hoping that at some future date we could join you in celebrating this very unique occasion, because it is indeed a privilege for one to be for twenty-five years elected continuously as a member of a Legislative body. It is one of the greatest honours which can be bestowed on any one by one's fellowmen; but I do hope that when we next come to congratulate you in this Chamber we will congratulate you on straying from the happy band of bachelors when you will no longer preside over this Chamber as a Bachelor Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that you will be able to continue to represent the electorate of St. Lucy, and while I do hope in the not too distant future that I may be able to wrestle your seat from you *(Laughter.)* I offer you my sincere congratulations on your twenty-fifth birthday as a member of this House and further as Speaker of this Chamber.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I must add my share of congratulations, and I think you will agree with me that twenty-five years is an indication of the regard in which you are held by the electorate in your constituency. I am thinking more of your contribution as a man, a politician and a statesman and what your life has meant Parliamentarily, and in more recent years particularly in this Session and now in your function as Speaker, and I think history will have quite a lot to say. I think you will agree with me that if we look back to the not too distant past, your first love for politics was applied in the Barbados Labour Party, I take a bow and I congratulate you again on behalf of that Party, and we look forward to the day in the changing scene of things when we will see you hanging from one of the stained-glass windows.....

Mr. SPEAKER: What does the hon. member mean by the word "hanging"?

Mr. MILLER: I mean that you will adorn this ancient Chamber. I have no doubt that it must mean something to you to hear the feelings of the members of this Chamber in their attempt to congratulate you after twenty-five years in Parliament, which is indeed a tremendous contribution, and I think I am correct in saying that people who know and think must feel as your colleagues and friends do, as we attempt to share with you the congratulations and feelings of the day. Thank you again on behalf of the Party to which you will forever belong. I say thanks with fondest congratulations.
5.25 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be improper of me if I did not join with the others in congratulating you on your presence in this Chamber for 25 consecutive years. A period of twenty-five years in any phase of human life is an extremely long one because it represents a very important slice of the life of a human being here on earth; and to be in Parliament for 25 years is an achievement because it represents a higher proportion of your mature years.

I, therefore, feel that your contribution for 25 years has marked you out to be in a distinctive position in our community in that it has demonstrated that as soon as you had reached maturity you entered the fray of political life and it was at a time when young men did not feel it incumbent upon them to do so. When we look back at what the position was 25 years ago, we can say that your contribution is a notable record because I do not think in this century there is another man of your philosophy who has put in so much service. You are the first member of our group, our thinking and our philosophy who has had 25 consecutive years in this Chamber and you have that unique and distinctive position. No other person holding your political sympathies has been in this Chamber for 25 years. The other oldest member is the Prime Minister of the West Indies who entered this Chamber in 1934 and left in 1958 to go to the Federal Parliament. That was a period of 24 years but you have served 25 years. When making a comparison of your service with that of the Prime Minister of the West Indies, it shows that you entered Parliament at an earlier age than he.

Sir, I think all of us will have to congratulate you on your long period of service. You have now reached the stage of being Speaker of this House of Assembly and in respect of that, I would say that you have the ideal temperament and knowledge for that high office. I hope that you will be spared for many years to preside over the debates of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I wish you all that is good, I wish you good health and hope that you will continue to render such good public service as you have rendered in the past. I do hope that at some proper time we would be able to shower congratulations on you in a more convivial atmosphere than in this parliamentary atmosphere.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I wish also to congratulate you for your good ability and conduct and for your good representation of the people of St. Lucy and the Island as a whole. I must say that you have put me in mind of kings who rise and fall because while kings have risen and fallen, you still continue. You have put me in mind of a good captain on the high seas passing through all the storms and still intent on sailing on. I assure you that I can vouch at all times to the people of St. Lucy your good representation in the House of Assembly. Sir, I look at your manner and conduct and see how you conduct yourself and it gives me great pleasure to associate myself with you at all times. I know that the people of St. Lucy are with you because you have not given them cause to lose confidence in you. I know that as long as you continue to represent the people in the right way, you will be always in their favour.

Sir, I wish you many years more service as Speaker of this House of Assembly and I hope that as the years go by you will go from strength to strength.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, before Your Honour replies to the encomiums which have been showered upon you by hon. members, I feel it falls upon me as your junior colleague to say a few words. Your Honour, I believe, has had four colleagues to share the representation of the constituency of St. Lucy with you. They were Mr. Henry Alleyne, Mr. E. Lisle Ward, Mr. Lorenzo Williams and the fourth, myself. I think what we have all discovered of you was that you are a master in political manoeuvre and that we have all learned from you in fullest measures all the splendours of political manoeuvre. To be associated with you is a good experience in that you teach your colleagues how to survive and that is no mean achievement.

I think, Sir, that there are two outstanding things in your career as a member of this House which I am certain will always reflect great credit on you. One is the absolute stand which you have always taken in racial matters. Everybody knows on which side of the fence you sit and that you would never concede an inch in any issues where decency, fairplay and justice are required. You have always stood firm on the way in which coloured people should be treated and insisted that one should treat them in the way we would like them to be treated. Your record in that is clear.

The second contribution which you have made, in my opinion, is that throughout your career as a member of this Assembly you have always taken an interest in the efficiency of the Public Service of this Island and you have never failed in your determination to urge that the fairest treatment be given to the lowest paid members. You have always when in the Opposition urged the Government to give more consideration to their own employees who were not as well off as others. If I may say this with the greatest respect to you, if there is anything which can be attached to your name, I think you well deserve to go down in Barbados political history with the epithet of Christmas Bonus Branker. That would be the most fitting epithet which from my point of view of your clamour for the lowest paid members of the Public Service can be applied to you.

5.35 p.m.

I have been your colleague for seven years; you have taught me all about politics — for which I am grateful, and I have had the pleasure of working with you in our constituency. I congratulate you very warmly on your 25th anniversary of the membership of this House. I have already spoken of your qualities as a Parliamentarian on the motion which I had the honour to make before you occupied the Chair of this House, and all of my colleagues would join me if they were here in the House. I wish to say how much we have enjoyed working with you and with Mr. Lorenzo Williams whom I know would be happy to be associated with any remarks I may make here this afternoon.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, kindly accept my sincerest congratulations on your 25 years of unbroken service which you have given to this country and not merely to St. Lucy. Sir, it is a pleasure to have the honour to address you in a manner such as this, and I am sure that as soon as the Electorate of St. Lucy read the congratulations which have been showered on you this afternoon they can only make up their minds to give you another 25 years. (Laughter.) I am sure that you will continue to do all that lies in your power to represent the people of St. Lucy and of Barbados as a whole. (ASIDES). The hon. senior member for the City will come in at some time and he sometimes supplies a treat. I am sure that you are the best judge of yourself and when hon. members try to catch you into the net of being away from a bachelor, I say that you are the best judge of yourself. I want to say that I congratulate you, as I have said, and I feel that you will be able to serve more fully and better if you were to remain single. Sir, my advice to you is to remain a bachelor because I know both sides of the position. I wish you all the best; I wish for you another 25 years in your capacity as Speaker of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am deeply grateful to hon. members from all sides of this House for this surprise this afternoon. I never thought that when I accepted the Chair that I would so soon find myself in a position that I would be allowing discussion on a subject which was not on the Order Paper by way of a motion for the adjournment and which was completely out of order. (Laughter.) However, I am deeply and profoundly grateful for everything which has been said, for all of the sentiments which have been expressed by so many hon. members and in such eloquent terms.

There is one hon. member, I think it was the Hon. Leader of the House, who spoke of my celebration, but as I promised the House when I took the Chair, I would always be guided by precedent. Up to now I can think — and I have been thinking as the hon. member spoke — of no precedent whereby a person has a party in his own honour or entertains himself or celebrates his own anniversary. (Laughter.) All he does when he takes the Chair of the House is to put

himself at the mercy of his colleagues for the tangible expression of the communication of what has been expressed when they speak so feelingly. I thank hon. members, each and everyone, for everything which they have said and while I do not look forward to another 25 years, perhaps a little longer than this quarter of a century.

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of the House I want to make an appeal to your colleague to permit you to retain your normal Christian name. We should hate in the normal evolution of things to have to refer to you as "Sir Christmas Bonus".

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the motion for the adjournment, there is a matter which I think Your Honour would like to examine before this House meets again and it is that on my behalf the Honourable Leader of the House has laid some Regulations. These Regulations were laid before I entered into this Chamber. I entertain some doubt that it is possible to make allowances to any employee in the Government Service by way of Regulations.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. Minister use another microphone? The one which he is using does not seem to be working.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I was saying that I am in some doubt as to whether it is the correct manner in which these allowances can be made merely by laying these Regulations. Somehow or other the Act does not mention this on behalf of allowances at all, and although the Regulations should be laid on the Table of the House for forty days during which time hon. members would have the opportunity of challenging the Regulations, I would like hon. members who are interested in Parliamentary practice to examine this matter and see whether this is the correct way in which this matter should be done. I apologize to hon. members for some inconvenience in this matter, but I do not approve of spending money by way of Regulations at all. I regret that these Regulations were laid before I had a proper legal opinion on the matter. When I scrutinized them I saw that they would involve the expenditure of public funds. I want to say that when documents are laid on the Table of the House we do not take any responsibility after 40 days have elapsed. The interval of time is for the specific purpose of giving members of the public and members of the House the opportunity to say whether the Regulations have been properly laid or not.

Mr. SPEAKER: There seems to be some doubt as to whether the adjournment of the House has been moved.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until this day week, Tuesday, 6th February, 1962, at 12 o'clock (Noon).

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the motion for the adjournment I would like to say a few words on what the Hon. Premier has had to say. For the past ten years I have always objected to the manner in which.....

Mr. SMITH: On what is the hon. member speaking? 5.45 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It will be a long time before any of you get a chance to take over the Chair and become Speaker of this House.

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order,.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: I will sit down now.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I take it that a motion has been made for the adjournment of this House, and if that is so, all discussion now must continue only on the adjournment of this House. If you check the Rules, you will see that I am correct.

Mr. SPEAKER: What the hon. member may do is speak on the motion for the adjournment just mentioning en passant

that he agrees with what was said, and let us close on the note on which we were five minutes ago.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order,.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: What is the member rising on?

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows what is a point of order. I do not think he could think I am rising on a "pint" of rum. I take it that although the hon. member said it will be long enough before any of us become Speaker of this House, I have lived long without becoming Speaker and I will live just as long again; but the only thing you should entertain is if the hon. member is speaking on whether the hour next Tuesday should be 1 o'clock, 2 o'clock or any other time. The Hon. Leader of the House moved the adjournment of the House, and the only thing that the hon. member can speak on is that and nothing else. There can be no new matter, and this will be a new matter he is coming with.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not know what is the new matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let me refresh hon. members' minds of Standing Order No. 15 - Adjournment of the House - which will be found on page 15 of the Standing Orders of this Chamber.

"Upon a motion for the adjournment moved under the provisions of this Order, a debate may take place in which any matter for which a Minister is responsible may be raised by any member who has obtained the right to raise a matter on a motion for the adjournment of the House that day. If time permits, the Speaker may allow any other member, who has given him prior notice of his wish so to do to speak on the subject raised, and the Minister who is responsible for the matter raised shall reply. Thereafter, if time permits, any other member who has obtained the right may similarly raise a matter subject to the same conditions. In any such debate any Minister may speak more than once in reply to members raising matters.

Any member who wishes to raise a matter under the provisions of paragraph 2 of this Order at a particular sitting shall give notice of the matter in writing to the Speaker not less than three days before the sitting concerned. Subject to the giving of such notice, the right to raise a matter shall be allotted for each sitting through such arrangements as the Speaker may make."

And Standing Order No. 16 in respect of the adjournment reads as follows:-

"Any member other than a Minister may at the time appointed under Standing Order No. 8 (Order of Business) rise in his place and ask for leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance."

And finally, I will point out to all hon. members Standing Order No. 16 (4) which reads as follows:-

"At 8.30 p.m. or upon the earlier conclusion of the debate on the motion for the adjournment, the business which was postponed at 6.15 shall be resumed, and any proceedings thereon and any other business standing on the Order Paper for the day's sitting, may be continued after 8.30 p.m. for a period of time equal to the duration of the proceedings upon the adjournment motion under this Order, and thereafter the House shall stand adjourned without question put."

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am just saying, Sir,.....

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member is just making a remark,.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is what I am doing. I am quite aware that if I wanted to adjourn this House on any specific matter of any importance I would have to give Your Honour notice and I would have done that; but I was just making a remark in reply to what the Hon. Premier said about the Regulations. For the past ten years I have in this House always objected to the manner in which these Regulations

were laid, and more so when on one occasion I was instrumental in holding some Regulations in this House, a definite promise was made to this House at the time by the now Prime Minister of the West Indies that although we have no right to amend Regulations here he would get the Act amended. That is, if this Legislature passes an Act giving the Government power to make Regulations, then we have no power to amend those Regulations; we either accept those Regulations *en bloc* or throw them out.

My remarks in this respect to the Hon. Premier now is that the public would never have a chance to know of the Regulations of which he is speaking under the present laws of this country. They cannot be amended as long as they are laid on the Table of this House; they must either be accepted or thrown out. I do not think the hon. member was here at

the time, but the then Premier made a definite promise that he would see to it that the Act was so amended to give this Legislature an opportunity that if they passed laws giving the Governor-in-Executive Committee power to make Regulations, if there were one or two sections of those Regulations of which they did not approve, they could amend those Regulations without throwing the whole thing out.

I wanted to draw to the Hon. Premier's attention in dealing with this matter that he should look into it and give us an opportunity to amend Regulations when we do not agree with all the Sections.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 6th February, 1962 at 12 noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
5.55 p.m.