THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 6th August, 1963.

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

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., *(Speaker);* Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., Mr. E. ST.A. HOLDER, J.P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, *(Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries);* Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., *(Minister of Education);* Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, *(Minister of Communications, Works and Housing);* Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. G. V. BATSON, *(Chairman of Committees);* and Mr. J.B. YEARWOOD.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the Meeting of the 30th July, 1963, have been circulated and unless hon. members object, they will be confirmed. *(A Pause).*

Hearing no objection, I declare the Minutes of that meeting duly confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I beg to lay: Statement of Revenue and Expenditure of the Barbados Savings Bank for the half-year ended 31st December, 1962.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following: The Seventh Annual Report of the Transport Board for the period 1st October, 1961 to 30th September, 1962.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Govemment Notices were given as follows:-

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Resolution to place the sum of $550 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1963-64, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1963-64, No. 13, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Resolution to place the sum of $500 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1963-64, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1963-64, No. 14, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

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 deal with these Resolutions of which I have given notice.

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 102/1962 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas on the 5th February, 1963, is now ready.

Mr. SEALEY GRANTED TWO MONTHS' LEAVE

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am asking that leave of absence for two months be granted to the hon. senior member for St. Michael as from today.

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

Mr. CARMICHAEL INDISPOSED

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Speaker, I have been asked to state that the hon. senior member for St. James will be absent today due to indisposition.

RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY TO Mr. J. A. HAYNES' RELATIVES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise to move the following Resolution:

BE IT RESOLVED that this House place on record its sympathy with the passing of Mr. Joseph Alleyne Haynes, former member of this House for the parish of St. Andrew and that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to his widow.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the hon. member would like to proceed with this before the business of the House begins.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes, Sir. I am sure that hon. members would have heard with profound sorrow of the sudden passing of Mr. "Josh" Haynes. He was, Your Honour will recall, a member of this Honourable House for over a period of some eleven years having served from 1942 to 1948 inclusive, and then again from 1951 to 1956 inclusive.

Members who knew him and had the privilege of sitting in this House with him, can bear full testimony of his work and example as a man and as a politician. As a person, he was completely unassuming — the sort of person, Mr. Speaker, whom you did not get to know very quickly, but when you got to know him you were convinced beyond a shadow of doubt of his sterling qualities. The late Mr. "Josh" Haynes would have been the first to admit that he was not a very eloquent speaker, and consequently, the reports of the debates of this House though they will bear full tribute and full record of the many contributions which

he made, will possibly not bear frequent record: but each of the contributions which he made to the debates of this House from the time he was here was full of wisdom and hard, sound commonsense.
12.25 p.m.

The House will recall that he was, among other things, of course, an expert in the sugar industry which was his nearest and dearest interest, but he maintained an equal interest in other aspects and spheres in this island; he gave proof of that not only by way of the interest which he showed therein, but in the contribution which he made to the well-being of the community in those spheres. After he retired from active politics he still maintained his interest in education, for one thing. He retained uninterruptedly his connection with the Alleyne School, the Governing Body of which he was Chairman for several years. I myself have a warm recollection of the last occasion on which he showed his interest in that School in educational matters generally. Some weeks ago when we instituted the Industrial Arts Programme at the Alleyne School he presided over the function as Chairman, and gave his blessing to that new attempt in the educational expansion of this island.

Mr. "Josh" Haynes will be remembered by those who have sat in this House firstly for the contribution which he made to the debates of this House and, secondly, for his unswerving interest in Church affairs. He was a man of a very quiet but nevertheless passionate faith, a sober Christian, if one may put it in that way, and he maintained an interest in the affairs of the Established Church. He was one of his generation and of his station in life who saw quite clearly that some separation between the Church and State was necessary in this Island in the interest of both Church and State, although he was always careful to point out that if such separation did take place, it was not to be to the harm of the Church.

Mr. Haynes was also far ahead of contemporary thinking in that not so long ago, he made it quite clear in this House that it was a conviction of his that there should be electoral reform in this island, and he came out quite boldly on that occasion in favour of having single member constituencies. He was a Liberal of the old school, and that term combined, in so far as it applied to him, a sort of sober conservatism with radicalism and it could be quite clearly seen that the departure from the old ways was in the interest of the community. He was by no means a reactionary. This House will remember that although it was difficult sometimes to get him to come down on the side of really radical reform, he was, at the same time, fair-minded in his criticisms and would always let it be known that he would not stand in the way of progress. There will be deep sorrow at his passing not only among the members of his family and those who know him best in business and socially, but also among a wide range of people, members of this House and of the community generally. I am sure that this House would wish to associate itself with all those expressions of sympathy which, for the last two or three days, have been going to his family and especially to his wife and his son; I am sure that this House sympathises with them in their bereavement and would like to send to them its deep expression of sympathy and its condolence at the passing of a very distinguished Barbadian gentleman.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to second the motion for the passing of the Resolution which has been moved by the Hon. Minister of Education relative to the passing of Mr. Joseph Alleyne Haynes. The Hon. Minister has aptly described Mr. Haynes and has told of his qualities, and therefore there is hardly much point in painting the lily because hon. members of this Chamber will appreciate the fact that, as a member of my Party, he could truly be described as a progressive Conservative and as a man who spoke his mind as a man. We have lost in Barbados a real Barbadian in the sense that we have lost a Barbadian who was, if I might so describe him, a scholar, soldier, planter and politician. Indeed he sprang from an old family who settled here many, many years ago and he was of the last brigade which really had an interest in Barbados and in things Barbadian.

My knowledge of Mr. Haynes goes back further than his being a member of this House, speaking of my association with him politically. The little parish of St. Andrew which the Hon. Minister of Social Services now has the honour to represent, was looked upon as a backward parish but it was ever near and dear to Mr. "Josh" Haynes. As has been said, Mr. Haynes, like many distinguished Barbadians attended Codrington College in this country where he qualified for his Bachelor of Arts degree, and during the years when it was very difficult to get people out, he gave of his best and of his services in assisting the classical tuition at this very great institution in the days when it was associated with Durham University.
12.35 p.m.

He then found that there was the call to serve his King and country, and as a young man he offered his services; but the glitter and the bright lights of the city did not prevent Mr. Haynes from coming back to Barbados after the cessation of hostilities and settling back down in little far St. Andrew where he was near and dear to the people and they were near and dear to his heart.

As a politician, Sir, and as a member of my Party, we had several differences, because I believe we were both of a similar nature in that he held his views upon something and I held mine. We differed; but I learnt one thing from him, that though men may differ, they need not fall out. As a politician, he gave yeoman service not so much as a member of this Chamber, but in the old system of Local Government in the parish of St. Andrew in which he served on every Board and gave, as you know, Sir, in those days his time, energy and experience free, gratis and for nothing. Although he could truly be described as a progressive Conservative — and no one would deny he was a Conservative, as changes came about he was ever willing to accede to changes though he was not, like most Conservatives, willing to give way to radical changes.

The Island is poorer for his passing, because indeed those of us who wanted to know something of this Island would always sit and talk with Mr. Josh, as he was familiarly known to the youngsters. He lived through the age when he saw changes upon changes; he lived through the age when he realised, and so often he has said it to me, that the prejudices which existed in this country must go if we in Barbados must live in harmony, and not only did he say it, but set it as an example, because, looking back on his background, we say that he realised that he could not keep aloof as his ancestors did from the mass of people, and therefore he shew, no matter what the colour of a man might be, that he appreciated education, and therefore he could always be associated with people of learning and education.

It was indeed a shock to me and the members of my Party when we heard the sad news that he had passed into the Great Beyond. I know, Sir, that his widow and his son must have suffered a severe shock at his sudden passing, but as I have so often said, they can take solace in the words of Holy Writ — "These things which have been done now will best be known hereafter and not now."

I have much pleasure, although it is a sad pleasure, in associating myself with the remarks of the Hon. Minister that we do pass this Resolution of sympathy, and, Sir, I think it asks that this Resolution be sent to the widow and relatives of Mr. Josh Haynes.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Leader of the Opposition seconding the motion for the passing of the Resolution?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I said that in my opening remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my Party and myself, I rise to associate myself with the remarks which have just been made by the Hon. Introducer and Seconder of a Resolution re the passing of Mr J. A. Haynes. Sir it is with a very sad and heavy heart that I have to say a few words relative to the passing of Mr. J. A. Haynes. Sir, if there is

one member in this Assembly who can speak about the actions, activities and the life of Mr. Haynes, it is your humble servant. Mr. Haynes was one of those rich men who never cherished the thought that certain things were made for a certain class. He always showed by his actions that everything was made for everybody; he always looked upon the character of a person and his ability. He always took those two things into consideration, and would go completely out of his way to help the person who was in receipt of those two things — ability and character. Regardless of who you are, if you were honest and showed Mr. Haynes your ability to do the things he expected you to do, you had no difficulty in getting financial help from him. He never had any love for carelessness or slackness, and if you were that type he had no uses for you; but if you were honest, you could, as some of us would say, put something on him. He always looked out to help the one who showed the ability to help himself. He was not a snob at any time, and colour meant nothing to him. He would always render to Caesar the things that were Caesar's and to God the things that were God's. He never took your right and added it to my wrong, or my wrong to your right. He always looked into the case for himself and did justice to everyone. He might have been at the time a Conservative in outlook or by conserving his wealth, but he never tried to prevent one from trying to rise also, as there are a lot of us today who would do everything to keep a certain class down and help another class. Mr. Haynes was always willing and ready to help all classes.
12.45 p.m.

Politically, Sir, I can say — it may sound a little bit foolish on my part, but I will be honest — that he was responsible for your humble servant being in politics today because at the time, when he called upon me and said: "Smith, you will have to run for the Vestry of St. Joseph", I believe my heart must have missed a beat because I never expected that a servant would have heard such remarks coming from his master, particularly in those days when politics were as they were. When I say that my heart must have missed a beat, I felt that if I had entered the Vestry of St. Joseph with him, it may have been responsible for spoiling the friendship between Mr. Haynes and myself, and knowing him as I did, he may have wanted me to do something which I may not have wanted to do and to be saying "yes" when it was "no", and "no" when it was "yes". It might have caused the friendship between us to break, but it did not for one moment. We seldom disagreed; and if we did disagree he would always end up by saying: "Smith, I am sorry that you cannot see it as I see it, but you must have your say."

Sir, at that time I was in his hands. He could say: "Die financially" and Smith would have to die financially. I am sure it never happened and what I can assure you also is that some of his colleagues — some of his white colleagues - had very little uses for him owing to the way how he took to your humble servant. That is a fact. They could not find out why it was that a man of Mr. Haynes' position should try to take the time from someone that is from nowhere; but the late Mr. "Josh' Haynes could see honesty and integrity of purpose, and that is what caused him to go so far and so long with your humble servant.

Sir, when the time came for me to enter general politics and to offer myself as a candidate for the Barbados House of Assembly, I am not ashamed to say that before I decided to do so, I asked him because I felt that it may have caused the friendship between us to break and his first reply to me was: "Smith, you could not be doing a better thing; you have my support." Therefore, Mr. Speaker, when you meet someone like that, you cannot but say that Mr. Haynes was a big man with a big spirit. He always had the people at heart, and if he did not, do you think that he would have tried to strengthen the chain of progress by adding another link to the Barbados Labour Party? It must be remembered that at that time I was not offering myself as a candidate for the Conservative Party; I was offering myself as a candidate for the Barbados Labour Party which was fighting the cause of the downtrodden; and when he gave me that O.K. and promised me his support, one can only say that he was not 100 per cent Conservative. I can tell you that some of my people were against me for running on the side of the Barbados Labour Party, but at the time, he promised me help and gave me help.

Therefore, Sir, it is with a very heavy heart that I have to say these things. I must be honest to him although it can be said that I need not because he cannot know what I have said. Sir, I do owe it to him as a man for my position today financially, politically and otherwise. I sincerely hope that he may rest in peace.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I can say that I have had the distinction of serving in this Chamber along with the late Mr. Joseph Alleyne Haynes, and as you will very well remember, eighteen years ago was a different thing to what it is today. Eighteen years ago, this Chamber was dominated by members like the late Mr. "Josh" Haynes, but in him I found a man of charm and a man without malice.

I very well remember that we clashed in debates — and I may say at times we clashed very deeply: but I can never remember him, during the time and all during the years which I have known him when there was any clash in a debate in this Chamber that it would cause him to regard that as a personal matter and caused him not to meet you in a very friendly way, and with that warm friendship which he always met me with whether in the Chamber or outside. That is a quality which we need something of in these days.

Sir, I am very happy to know that I have had the honour and distinction of serving with a member of those qualities. You learn from people like that because people like Mr. Haynes teach one that you can differ, but you need not have a dislike. The late Mr. Haynes impressed me as a man without the slightest modicum of malice. He was always willing to express his views. I have met him on Boards outside of this Chamber over which he was a Director, and I have found him as a man in business not unwilling to accept change although he was born and reared in a generation which was not easy to accept change.

Mr. Speaker, the late Mr. Haynes' contribution to public life and industrial life is one that his successors can do well to copy. I regard it as a privilege and an honour to have known him, and I feel sure, in this community of ours, people of that vintage and outlook are not succeeding as fast as we would like; therefore, when one like that has passed from our scene, it is a cause for deep regret. The personality of the late Mr. J. A. Haynes has been accepted, and I am very pleased to say that his immediate family has made a contribution in their own way and I feel sure all of us in this Honourable Chamber would like to express our deep sympathy also to his family.

Sir, I am sorry to say that there are not many "Josh" Haynes in this community and, as the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has said, he was one of those personalities which were very rare to find. As the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has said, he was a man who was a rich man by any standards you would like to say, and it is very rare that you can look upon a man like that when you are passing and address him as "Josh" and he would meet you with a smile. It was the sort of smile, fatherly and friendly, and which was without any of the haughtiness — something which you would not expect from one with riches.
12.55 p.m.

It was a most unassuming and unostentatious personality which made you feel friendly in his company. I join with all of those hon. members in expressing my sincere condolence to the relatives on the passing of one of our personalities in public life.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to associate myself with the remarks of other speakers in connection with the passing of Mr. Joseph Alleyne Haynes. There are two things for which the people of St. Andrew will have to remember Mr. Haynes throughout their lifetime. The first thing is that the parish of St. Andrew was in such a difficult financial position that it could not maintain the roads in proper repair. Sometimes you went to sleep at night, and when you have a heavy rainfall during the night, on the next day you

could not find your way to the main street because of the washing away of the bridges. Mr. Haynes joined with others and proposed to the Government that they take over the roads of St. Andrew because the parish could not cope with the repairs. As I say, the people of St. Andrew will have to remember Mr. Haynes because of the great move which he made in getting the Government to take over the roads, and I am sure that the main roads of St. Andrew are better than some parts of Broad Street especially with the new construction which is in force today.

The second thing for which we have to remember Mr. Haynes is in connection with the Alleyne School. The appropriate authorities wanted to abolish the Alleyne School which, at that time, could only accommodate about twenty to twenty-four pupils and Mr. Haynes, who was the Chairman of the Governing Body, resisted them and said that the School will have to continue even if it continued with six pupils. I can assure you that today the School is entertaining around 280 pupils and that is because of the efforts which Mr. Haynes made that the School should not be abolished. Because of that, the people of St. Andrew have much for which to remember Mr. Haynes today. Mr. Haynes was a man without any partiality; his dignity was great. He would not allow anybody to move him from his attitude. If he saw that something was wrong he would say that it was wrong; and, on the other hand, if he saw that a thing was right he would say that it was right. Mr. Speaker, to lose a man of that type is regrettable, but we cannot do any better.

With those few remarks which I have made on behalf of the people of St. Andrew and on my own behalf, I associate myself with this Resolution which I believe will be unanimously passed. I trust that a letter will be drafted and sent to the members of Mr. Haynes' family conveying the expressions of sympathy of this House

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, the passing of Mr. "Josh" Haynes is a blow to the people of Barbados. Mr. Haynes was a great friend of mine. The first time that I got to know Mr. Haynes was through politics and he was a member of this party. What brought him close to me was the by-election which took place in St. Andrew when he fought it and I campaigned on his behalf. It was then that I got to know him. In my campaigning I realised the amount of good social work which Mr. Haynes had done in the parish of St. Andrew. He was not one who would tell you what he had done, but when you moved around the people many of them would point to their houses and would say: "That roof over me and my family has been put there because of Mr. "Josh" Haynes." I think that Mr. Haynes' greatest public work was done in the parochial field; as a Vestryman in the parish of St. Andrew and also of the parish of St. Joseph, his work brought him closest to the people.

Mr. Speaker, another remarkable feature of Mr. "Josh" Haynes was that he knew what was going on in Barbados. He would stay in St. Peter or at "Parks", twelve miles out of Bridgetown, and be able to come in here and tell us for the first time what was happening in Bridgetown. He had a source of information which only he knew. He was such a person that if he had decided that a thing should be done in one way, it was of no use trying to influence him against his will. He had the courage of his convictions to say "Yes" or "No" whether it pleased his family or his friends or not. I know that when the Blue Waters property was for sale, he felt that the Government should not have bought it because it would be a loss. I considered that Mr. Haynes was my friend, but that did not prevent him from coming in here and speaking his mind and that was an example as to how he carried himself.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Haynes was an ardent supporter of the construction of the East Coast Road. I believe that he was the person who brought the first Resolution relative to the construction of the East Coast Road before this House. He had land down there and he offered to give to the Government the difference in the valuation as the result of the enhanced value of his land following upon the construction of that road. That goes back for about fifteen years and we are now doing what Mr. Haynes was advocating then. Mr. Haynes was a Barbadian to the core. He visited the United Kingdom occasionally, but his heart was here in Barbados. I know that his investments have remained in Barbados and he has been an active shareholder who took an interest in the businesses in which he held shares — and they were many. I think that there is hardly any public company in Barbados in which he did not have a financial interest. He wanted to know what was being done and you could not accuse him of throwing away money. He did help the people, and the greatest feature of it was that if he did help a person he saw to it that that person made good. Here was a person who would not tell you that he had helped anybody, but he did help very many people.
1.05 p.m.

He helped many small businessmen whether through the purchase of a lorry or the first stock in a shop; but there were very many indeed, and St. Andrew will be poorer for his passing. It was a shock to me to learn of his passing. I had seen him just a week before and we had a chat, as always along the same line, on what was happening in politics. He had a keen interest in the people of Barbados and kept it up until the very end.

I support the Resolution and I am very sad at his passing.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is a matter of deep grief so far as I am concerned that this event has taken place. It was of course inevitable, but one did not think that the late "Josh" Haynes would have departed just yet. I had the pleasure of being in the House for some years before Mr. Haynes first became a member. He left it temporarily and he returned again as a member for the parish of St. Andrew, and one was bound to observe the independent attitude which he took whether it was because of his independent means or of his independent nature and disposition or a combination of both.

The late Joseph Alleyne Haynes was a member of this House who made a sound and useful contribution — not a frequently vocal contribution, but whenever he rose he had something worthwhile to say, and one had to appreciate that whether one disagreed or agreed with him. It was also a privilege of mine to be associated with him on the Transport Board — that is, the first Transport Board — and he was a member for St. Andrew and I was a member for St. Lucy, and the tug-of-war was who was to get something done first for his particular parish.

I offer my sympathy to all of those who were closely associated with him; and it is a source of great satisfaction to me, as it is, I know, to other hon. members of this House that we were afforded the opportunity — those members who knew of the sad event and who were able to arrive at St. John's Parish Church — to be privileged to bear him, as he had to be borne, from the Church to his last resting place. As a token of our unanimity in this matter and our respect of the deceased, I am asking hon. members to rise and stand for two minutes during which period this Resolution will be deemed to have been passed.

Hon. members stood for two minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER: This Resolution has been passed and it will be acted upon in accordance with its terms.

The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House, the hon. senior member for St. Philip: to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Island.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I would be very grateful if in future we asked for competent, technical assistance for the acoustics of the House.

Before we proceed with the first Order of the Day, may I have the leave of the House to make a statement on the principle of equal pay for men and women in the Public Service of this Island?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. and Learned Premier has asked leave of the House to make a Statement in connection

with the matter which he has mentioned, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the Statement reads as follows:

STATEMENT BY HONOURABLE PREMIER ON EQUAL PAY FOR MEN AND WOMEN

It has been the practice in the past to differentiate between the remuneration given to men and women in the same categories of employment in the public service of the Island. To adhere any longer to this practice would be to ignore the great strides made by women towards obtaining universal recognition of their full personality, through the enjoyment of civil rights, and, in most enlightened countries, the application of the principle of equal pay for equal work regardless of sex.

This Government therefore has decided to eliminate the disadvantages imposed on its female employees. Implementation of the equal pay principle involved an expenditure of $240,000 per annum, and must therefore be related to the Island's ability to meet the additional financial burden.

On grounds of finance therefore, Government has decided that the principle will be effected gradually by granting women, every year for five years, "equal pay increments" equivalent to 1/5 of the difference between the salaries of men and women in the same categories of employment.

In this respect it is interesting to note that when the Government of the United Kingdom implemented this principle in that country, it did so in seven stages. This "equal pay increment" will be in addition to normal annual increments.

Persons joining the service after commencement of the Equalisation Plan, will receive the appropriate equal pay increment, i.e. a new entrant who joins the Service in the 4th year after commencement of the plan will be entitled to the initial salary of the women's scale plus 4/5 of the difference between men and women scales. And so at the end of the five year period the "equal pay" principle will be fully implemented.

It is proposed to make provision in the 1964-65 Estimates for the payment of the first instalment of the Equalisation Plan to take effect from 1st April, 1964.

The cost of implementation will be as follows:-

1st year	$40,000
2nd year	$84,000
3rd year	$132,000
4th year	$179,000
5th year	$240,000

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Hon. Leader of the House now proceed with the matter standing in his name, Order No. 1?

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

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

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

1.15 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1963,64, No. 12
ERADICATION OF YELLOW FEVER MOSQUITO

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, in 1954, a programme was begun for the complete eradication of the Yellow Fever Mosquito. It has now been going on for eight years and the mosquito has not yet been eradicated from the Island. I will not say that the efforts were entirely fruitless because they have got the Yellow Fever Mosquito under control. During that period of eight years, several of our parishes were declared negative, but Barbados is too small a place for one to think that if one parish is negative and the mosquito is rampant in other parishes, that parish would remain negative for any time.

The answer to this is complete eradication and, therefore, on the advice of the World Health Organisation, the Government has taken the decision to increase the number of people employed in this campaign by 50%. The 36 Inspectors would be therefore increased by 18 to make them 54, and it is hoped that within a short time, the mosquito would be eradicated.

Sir, this is not a task too arduous to be borne by Barbadians because it has happened in other places. St. Lucia has eradicated the Yellow Fever Mosquito and several other Caribbean Islands have eradicated it. It is felt that Barbados should not lag behind the others in this drive. The presence of the Yellow Fever Mosquito in Barbados is not only a danger where health is concerned; it is not only responsible for yellow fever, but there are other things like Dengue Fever, for which it is responsible. We have had no case of yellow fever within recent years, so it may be felt that we are wasting time trying to eradicate this mosquito; but there have been several cases of Dengue Fever and Dermatonosis for which this mosquito is responsible.

In order to have a complete eradication of this mosquito, the entire community must co-operate. The efforts of the Inspectors would be fruitless if they do not have the co-operation of householders. It has been the practice of householders to empty the vessels within the houses as soon as they are sprayed by these Inspectors, and we hope that we will have greater co-operation in this drive and the community as a whole will hold itself responsible for the complete eradication of this mosquito and will not only leave it to the 54 Inspectors.

If the mosquito remains rampant in Barbados, it would not only be a danger where the health of the community is concerned, but it would also be a danger to the economy of the Island. Barbados has got to depend to a large extent on the Tourist Industry. In the U.S.A., large sums of money are spent in their drive to eradicate the mosquito from their area. When the mosquito is eradicated from the U.S.A., it means that if Barbados still has the mosquito, the tourists who come here from the U.S.A. would prefer to go to any other place than Barbados because Americans would not want to have a case of yellow fever there again. It means, therefore, that quite a considerable amount of the revenue of Barbados would be lost if this yellow fever mosquito continues to remain in Barbados and if we do not try and make a genuine effort to get rid of it.

With the former staff which we had, a cycle was supposed to be made in three months; but because of the shortage of the staff, we were only able to complete a cycle in a matter of eight months. With this increased staff, we will be able to complete a cycle in three months and in the case of the parish of St. Michael or where the breeding of the mosquito is the highest, we will be able to carry out cycles even more frequently.

Mr. Chairman, I hardly think that any hon. member would object to this additional expenditure which is asked for in order to secure better health in our community, and to retain and to even improve the economy of the Island where the Tourist Industry is concerned.

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

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this Resolution but I do not like Resolutions coming in this form. The Addendum says:

"In order that Barbados should not lag behind other territories in its efforts towards the eradication of the yellow fever mosquito it has been decided to intensify the eradication programme. The sum requested is to meet the increased expenditure resulting from the intensification of the programme for the remainder of the current financial year."

What I want to know from the hon. member — and I am sure he has the figures — is, if you are voting $37,000, what this money has to be spent on. Is this to be spent on the insecticide or on the staff? I would just like you to understand that you must break down this amount for this House to understand. Is this to be spent on the 18 more Inspectors, buying insecticides, spray guns or what? Surely, the hon. member can tell us, and not one of us would object to this Resolution because this is something for the benefit not only of the health of the community but the economy of the Island. I do not think the Hon. Minister can find any difficulty in giving us a true and full information. I would only ask the Hon. Minister to see to it in future that his Secretaries give us a breakdown in the Addendum and do not just bring in an Addendum like this.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, there is something which I would like to say on this matter. I do not think anyone would object to spending this money with the hope of having a complete eradication of this mosquito.

Sir, I have had a lot to do with this matter myself, and I say with some satisfaction that we have had not one single case of yellow fever within recent times in spite of the fact that we have the carrier with us. If you look at the copies of the files in the Ministry, you will see that in 1887, we had the last case of yellow fever in this Island. 1.25 p.m.

I do not know that at the moment we need have any special fear. I can understand and appreciate the efforts of the World Health Organisation in their endeavours completely to eradicate this mosquito. It is true to say that all that has been done in the last year is to bring this mosquito under control. Up to the time when I left the Ministry there were two hard spots in connection with the location of this mosquito and I kept in close touch with the Department. There was one spot in St. James and one in Oistins; there was one at the Garrison which was uncontrollable because of the roofs of the barracks up there. We know the danger of this mosquito; this mosquito is a carrier of disease. When you come to the yellow fever Campaign, when you come to this mosquito, no matter how great the efforts of the authorities are, the spread of this ungodly disease will be rapid.

We know from history that the cattle are also carriers of this disease, and it would be a dangerous thing if we had one case coming to the Island. We are spending a considerable sum of money in the eradication of this yellow fever mosquito; we are spending $37,000 on it but we could be spending $57,000; it is not just the spending of the money. You take the Malaria Campaign in British Guiana; there was a herculean task before it could be completed. But it is a question of the man who is at the head of this type of programme.

It is unfortunate for this country that it should be left without the services of a man like Dr. Byer; it is indeed a gloomy future for us, if we are losing the services of this man. It is unfortunate, Mr. Chairman, that the Government is going to lose or has lost his services. I do not know that there is a man in living memory who is more dedicated to public health than Dr. Byer. He has done quite a number of things for his country, and I can say that everyone who has had to do with Dr. Byer will support what I am saying most strongly. Do not let us fool ourselves that we will completely carry out the eradication of this yellow fever mosquito in any six or eight months. I think that you are aware that this cannot be expected of the curative type of doctor. This campaign must take a man whose life has been bound up in public health; he must be a man who is interested in it and he must have a love for people. Dr. Byer is a man whose life has been dedicated to the welfare of the people, and probably you could not get any Director of Medical Services in another two hundred years other than a public health man who would give his services in public health to this country in order that we could free ourselves of this mosquito. We must respect the World Health Organisation. We have not had one case of yellow fever in this Island for very many years, and we therefore want to turn our attention to things about which we should worry. For instance, there has been a gradual increase in the number of cases of tuberculosis, but nobody seems to worry about that. Again, you have Dr. Cochrane and I must say that people will continue to die unless we have men like Dr. Byer and Dr. Cochrane.

As I say, you can spend $57,000 on the eradication of the yellow fever mosquito, but we want to appreciate that the man who is at the head of this project of programme is the one which wins every time without exception. It is true that Dr. Byer has reached his 55th year, and is therefore on leave and he has gone to give his services to Jamaica when we need him here. I believe it is common history that Dr. Byer rid this country of the disease of yaws which crippled the children of this country. Dr. Byer has done a good job in this country and I do not see why his services should not be completed here in this programme. I know that he was exposed to all sorts of criticisms during the Polio epidemic. There was nothing wrong with what he said in connection with Polio. There was nothing wrong when he said that there should not be any panic; he was right, but people became apprehensive because he said that. The last case of Polio took place in June and now we are worrying about Polio when we have cases of tuberculosis. Now that the scare of polio has died down, you are losing the services of a man which you can ill afford to lose.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, is the hon. member trying to insinuate that the Government is calling upon Dr. Byer to resign? That is the only impression which one could get from the hon. member's speech. Dr. Byer is resigning at his own sweet will.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I in any way insinuated that the Government has called upon Dr. Byer to resign. What I did was to ask the Government to see if they could retain the services of Dr. Byer. What is happening with the hon. member's thinking? This is nothing about which you can pitch marbles or anything of that sort; you have a big responsibility for the health of the country. It means twenty-four hours a day.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. member will appreciate the fact that I have given him an excess amount of latitude. We are now dealing with the eradication of the yellow fever mosquito and I would appreciate if the hon. member would stick to the Resolution.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I know my responsibility to the Chair and it does not matter who is in the Chair. There is no reason why you should want to direct me as to what I should say. I am a free soul and I do not want to be rude to you; but surely you must not tell me what I must say and what I must not say. We are discussing the eradication of the yellow fever mosquito, and that is something which is in connection with a doctor and it is under the direction of the Director of Medical Services. 1.35 p.m.

He is still in the Island.....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I think somebody should rise to your assistance. The hon. member is raising a matter which, so far as this Chamber is concerned, has absolutely nothing to do with this Resolution. We passed an Act saying that any officer can go on leave. The gentleman is on pre-retirement leave and that has absolutely nothing to do with this House; but if the hon. member wants a Resolution like that, let him bring a Resolution. You may be innocent of this, Mr. Chairman, but introducing that into this debate is not only unfair to the House, but is reducing the time of the House. A doctor going on pre-retirement leave is solely his own prerogative which no Minister can stop.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to address the Chair, and if I am to be told that there are two Chairmen, or a dictator Chairman and another Chairman, I have to understand that. No one wastes more time in this House than the hon. senior member for St. Peter who gets up when he likes and talks feathers and fuzz which I do not think anybody appreciates. He must have reasons for interrupting this debate. I have a right to address the House. You must have sat in this House and listened to more folly from the hon. member than you have heard before. Who discusses more foolishness than the hon. member?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. junior member for St. George get on with the Resolution?

Mr. MILLER: If you say that I can, and make sure that other members permit me to speak. You have a positive full-grown fool that talks when he likes and nobody interrupts him. I am saying, Sir, that in this campaign the Minister spoke of a cycle of three months, but it would be probably six and possibly eight months, and I believe that deep down in his heart he knows that $37,000 for any campaign in any three or six months cannot eradicate this mosquito, and therefore he should not attempt innocently to mislead the House no matter how strong his intentions are to rid this country of this mosquito.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I did not say that the campaign would be of three to six months' duration. If the hon. members does not understand what is meant by a cycle, ask him to ask me to explain it to him, and I would be willing to explain it and he can get it free, gratis and for nothing.

Mr. MILLER: I do not think there is anything on earth that the Hon. Minister can explain to me. He is discussing something which was put in his hands by his Permanent Secretary. I do not believe he can draw on paper the mosquito he is talking about. What makes him think he can explain something to me? What makes him think that anybody in the country feels that he has any knowledge of what he is talking about in the Ministry of Health? What makes him feel, other than being a big square peg in a round hole, that he can explain something to me?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not like the remarks expressed by the hon. junior member for St. George. I do not see in this Resolution any holes.

Mr. MILLER: But I take it by interrupting, you are punching holes in it, because you can save the debate by keeping quiet.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not intend to keep quiet. I intend to listen to you on the Resolution.

Mr. MILLER: To listen to me you would have to be quiet. What I want to say to the Minister is this: we have quite a lot of people with flower pots all over the house, who for a number of reasons object to spraying by the Inspectors in the various districts. We were told enough about that; and if he is going to make a bold bid of this, he would need a little legislation in order that the Inspectors can get into the houses where this mosquito had been developing and growing. You may have for sentimental reasons an individual refusing an Inspector, and these are things the Minister must have been told; they are written all over the files. For innocent reasons and for religious reasons you have people objecting to the Inspectors coming to the place and spraying the mosquitoes, when right in that vase with probably a little bit of water the mosquito continues to multiply. If you are going to run a campaign with the idea of breaking this finally, it is all right to appeal to the country, but you cannot appeal to an individual who is afraid for the sprayer to come into his building. I want to suggest to him, if he considers it necessary, to bring down some legislation and fix a period so that if the Inspector calls and says "yellow fever", he would be admitted or there would be some sort of prosecution. There is no use fighting an area for months then to find that in two or three houses we are up against it because the mosquito is being hatched in those houses in water pots, and because an innocent person resists the help of the Inspectors. What I want to ask the Minister to do is to bring down legislation, and make it as temporary as he likes, probably six months and renew it if possible, in order to assist these Health Inspectors who can be refused at any door. These are the things we need to tell and we must give you some reason. We must have had some trouble and experience, and if you can benefit from them for nothing, by all means, use them.

I must repeat, Mr. Chairman, what is indeed a great loss to this country. It is not going to be an easy job and it will go on with Sundays and Christmas Day included, and in order to destroy this mosquito you require a delegation within the very individuals who are expected to make sense of this. I have had enough to do with the mosquito, and I have had enough heart-breaks that you can write on four sides of a foolscap sheet, and when you were sure that you had covered an area and it was free and there was no posibility of finding it. I believe my friend, the hon. senior member for the City, will agree with this project for a full eradication of the mosquito and I know that there is pressure from the World Health Organisation, and therefore you should bring down legislation to help those men who are expected to go to houses and eliminate the mosquito from the country. I do not see what Government is talking about pre-retirement leave when the newspaper indicated the very hospital he is going to work at in Jamaica, but we know all the reasons, and probably there will be another opportunity to deal with it when I will say why this man was driven from this country. We do not expect him to bleed his soul upon the mosquito, but it is the hard-working Public Health men. Probably Dr. Byer can put up a shingle and take four times as much as he has taken from the country and with more time at his leisure, but it is because of his belief that he wanted to give this. Go and see in St. Lucia the little centres that house four people. See Vieux Fort where the man plodded and fought night and day until he eliminated it. Whom are you expecting to get? There is not another officer in this Island who would really know and assist the Minister in opening that new Hospital. There is not another man who knows every crack, and we spent three years on it. It is all right to have an officer in charge of the Casualty and a Medical Specialist, but the only man who understands every screw and every bolt and how it is going to function and operate when you are ready to open...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. junior member for St. George is again straying from the Resolution.

Mr. MILLER: But the mosquito must make a case to be sent to the hospital. What is happening to the Chairman today? He must be sick today.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think your straying from the Resolution is causing some uneasiness.

Mr. MILLER: If you are talking about a mosquito and if you do not eradicate it, you would have to send cases to the hospital. How can you really separate it? There is no point in stressing this, but it worries you because you are conscious and interested in these things. You cannot sit down and say that they do not exist. We know what it would mean to the country if one case of yellow fever is discovered in this Island; the tourist trade would die overnight. If there is one case, all the American and Canadian tourists would cease to come from that hour.
1.45 p.m.

I am sorry you are losing the type of man who can handle and master this campaign out of his love for it. You know what can happen to the country's economy as a result of it. All these things we are aware of. When the Minister asks for this $37,000, there must be a man who is not concerned about cases in the Hospital to do this.

Sir, I want to support this Resolution because I cannot do otherwise, but there are other things which should be said. You should bring in some legislation to compel people to open their houses to Inspectors. You should bring in something to compel Inspectors to go on the roofs of houses where there are gutters holding water and spray them.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I hate to interrupt the hon. member but I only rise to say this because of my experience in the matter. I am sure the Hon. Minister might not know, but speaking on the particular point in question, there is some existing legislation on that matter which the hon. member is talking about. The hon. junior member for St. George may have forgotten. (A VOICE: He never knew.) That exists in legislation today and it came down during the time that the hon. member's Government was in power. I just want to remind the hon. junior member for St. George that he may have forgotten that legislation came down with respect to that matter immediately as the campaign against this mosquito was started. What you found out was that there was not sufficient co-operation among the people, but legislation is there for that purpose. It exists for the average Inspectors who must go in and inspect vases and so on. As a matter of fact, the people can be prosecuted if they do not co-operate. I am mindful of that because I told my wife that when an Inspector comes home to spray for this mosquito, if he wants to go in her drawing room to spray, she must allow him to do so; she must not say that she does not want him to come in. There is legislation which says that they must have the right to enter. There is no such legislation for yard Inspectors, but an Inspector for this purpose has the right to go into your house. In short, he has the right to enter.

Quite recently, we had cases of people refusing to let these Inspectors come in their houses and we actually threatened to prosecute them. As a result, we got more co-operation, so much so that because one person was abusive, the landlord of that person resented it so much that he gave that person notice to quit immediately. The legislation goes so far as to state what time these Inspectors must come, and all they have to do is to show their credentials that they are Inspectors.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The hon. junior member for St. George pointed out that I was a square peg in a round hole and no legislation was brought at the time when he was a member of the Government Party which made it imperative for householders to open their houses to Inspectors. There is legislation that if an Inspector went to a householder previously and that householder did not allow him to come in, and he went the second time and she was not there, he can get a policeman and go and open the house. The hon. junior member for St. George should know that. Who is the square peg in the round hole? He is so ignorant of anything that happened in his Ministry, that he does not know that this legislation was brought in during his time. Who is the square peg in the round hole?

Mr. MILLER: The legislation which the hon. senior member for the City talked about is that which I brought to the House myself. It was copied from similar legislation in Jamaica. The hon. senior member for the City said that he threatened somebody to prosecute. That is what I am asking the present Government to get corrected. We want to be in a position to change the legislation to a point where we do not want to prosecute, but we want to go into the house as soon as we go to inspect.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The law actually exists: but what can you do with a person who departs from it? Are you going to cut off their heads? We actually prosecuted and lodged a case. When the case was lodged, the person became penitent and the owner of the house said to the person who was renting it that he was wrong and if he came before Mr. Perry if he knew what he would be up against. The landlord apologised to us and said that the Inspectors could go into the house at any time they wanted to and, far from that, he told the tenant of the house that he must quit immediately because he would not have a tenant not co-operating. You must be able to prosecute if you are in a position to prosecute; but when persons come and say that they are sorry this thing has happened, what would you do? Would you prosecute if they gave satisfaction? I am only saying that I know from experience that the law is there and that law was brought in during the time of the last Government.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I tried to explain without success. I said that this law was copied from similar legislation in Jamaica, lock, stock and barrel, without realising how it would apply to our own private domestic affairs. If an Inspector is unhappy about his returning to a district — let us say that he has covered nine of the ten houses and he has reason to suspect that this mosquito is breeding in house No. 10 and he goes to that house and the person objects, all that Inspector can do at present is to say that he would have to take the matter to the Board and that a prosecution would take place. But by the time the prosecution takes place, the twenty houses in that district — not only the ten — would be saturated with this mosquito. He is fighting an area with ten houses. He is able to cover and spray nine out of the ten, but it would take two weeks for prosecution to take place for him to cover the tenth. It would mean that the nine houses would be saturated before you are able to eliminate the mosquito from the tenth house. 1.55 p.m.

He has been able to clear nine out of ten houses, and any delay means that the nine houses will be restarted again before you have an opportunity of eliminating the last house. Mr. Chairman, all I am asking him is this: that when the Inspector goes to the door, do not tell him about any policeman. You will return to find that the person is not at home. *(ASIDES).* Are you an Inspector of Police? That is a stupid argument. We want to be able to tell a person: "Your house is a hazard." It is of no use threatening a person and then waiting for four or five weeks for an order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is saying that I do not understand this matter, but it will take a Solomon to understand the hon. member.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, will you tell the foolish fellow not to dabble with this?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. member is losing control of himself.

Mr. MILLER: I am not losing any control. Do you think that anybody on this side of the House understands that the present Minister of Social Services understands health matters? Do you believe that anybody on earth thinks so? I am simply saying this: we got this legislation from Jamaica feeling that the country had a good deal of experience with such legislation and we had information only to find that there was a fault with this legislation. It was only in recent years that we have been studying this matter; it was a matter of four months prior to the election and all of these things take time for a person to understand. It is all very well for you to threaten somebody with prosecution, and I must say that the hon. member could have saved all of this.

Mr. Chairman, you know that what I am saying is correct. All I am saying is that the hon. member should amend this legislation and give the Inspectors the right to say: "We are satisfied that ten houses are clear and there is one house which is not clear; give me permission to work on it now." Do not tell me that you want to bring a policeman asking the landlord to put a person off the land; what is wrong with the suggestion that we tighten up the legislation?

At this stage, it now being 2.00 p.m., of the clock, Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 2.00 p.m., of the clock, this sitting stands suspended until 2.30 p.m., of the clock.

The sitting now stands suspended.
2.05 p.m.

On re-assembling,

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time. The Reply has been laid to Question No. 102 which is found on page six on the right hand side, of the Order Paper. That Question stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas.

PROVISION FOR POST BOXES IN ST. THOMAS

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

Is Government aware that the people of the parish of St. Thomas are subjected to much inconvenience in posting their mail?

2. Will Government immediately make provision for the placing of at least three Post Boxes in the following Districts in St. Thomas:

Welchman Hall, Prout and Hillaby?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, the Reply to the hon. member's Question is as follows:-

1. The Government is aware that there is need for an additional Posting Box in Prout Village in the parish of St. Thomas.

2. A survey has been carried out into the need for additional posting boxes throughout the island and it has been ascertained that there is the need for seventeen additional boxes including one for Prout Village. The other two areas mentioned in the Question are already adequately served by existing boxes in these areas.

3. The Legislature is being asked to provide additional funds to provide the cost of the installation of additional posting boxes.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is another Question to which the answer is laid and that Question stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Peter, who is not instantly in his place. For the second and last time, I will allow that Reply to remain on the Table.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: There are no other Questions ready to be dealt with.
2.35 p.m.

Accordingly the House will now revert to Private Members' Business, and the first Order under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas; to resume debate on the passing of a Resolution relating to the laying-off without proper notice of field workers. On the last occasion, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was speaking when Private Members' Business expired.

I observe the absence of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition at present. Is there any member who has not spoken who seeks to contribute to this discussion?

Does the hon. senior member for St. Thomas care to avail himself of the right of final reply?

Mr. BATSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I noticed on the last occasion when I introduced this Resolution, Mr. Speaker, that many members spoke, and the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was very vociferous in his remarks in that he gave a personal biological sketch of me, and even went to the extreme of making a comparision. I am proud of the remarks made by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph in that he has reminded me of something I did not know anything about, and I am happy to acknowledge the contribution which he made. I must say, Sir, the amendment moved by the hon. senior member for St. James meets with my approval. I think that at the time when the Resolution was drafted, I really was thinking in terms of Government employees, and I think that the wording which he has subscribed in his amendment is very much to the point. I should like to inform the House that I am accepting that amendment. The Resolution will now read as follows:-

WHEREAS much dissatisfaction exists amongst Central and Local Government casual workers in consequence of the fact that they are often laid off without proper notice being given them;

AND WHEREAS the said workers have families to support;

BE IT RESOLVED that Government take the necessary steps to ensure that wherever possible appropriate notice be given to the worker of the pending cessation of his employment."

I think, Mr. Speaker, that that comes to the point which prompted me to introduce this Resolution, and I need not go further on what I said on my opening remarks with regard to these casual employees who were laid off without proper notice given. Hon. members spoke in glowing terms, and some suggested that this operation would be very technical. I cannot see anything technical in it, because I feel that one would know the amount of money that is allotted to a particular scheme, the amount of personnel that will be engaged in this operation and also the period over which this money should last, and therefore they should not wait until almost all the money is exhausted then suddenly to inform those workers that they will be laid off. I feel it is not too difficult for a week's notice to be given these men, and that would be in keeping with self-respect for these workers. For a worker to be told on Friday when he receives his pay packet or even on the Monday when he goes to work that there is no work for him, is something very harsh, especially when these workers have families to support, and most of them are in the low income bracket. I feel, Sir, that Government will no doubt in future pay more attention to this type of worker, because unlike other workers these men have a different classification in so far as the type of work in which they are engaged is concerned, and some notice should be given to them before the cessation of their employment. I think I have made my point, Mr. Speaker, and without any more ado, I am informing this House that I accept the amendment moved by the hon. senior member for St. James.

Mr. SPEAKER: Now the hon. junior member for St. Thomas seconded the original motion of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, which latter hon. member has now accepted the amendment of the hon. and learned member for St. James. Does the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, like the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, accept the amendment of the hon. senior member for St. James?

Mr. BOXILL: I do, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry, but I hope I am in order now to speak on the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: At this stage, no, because I looked around and no one showed any inclination or any disposition to speak and then I called on the hon. senior member for St. Thomas. There is no doubt about it that any hon. member who spoke before the amendment was made would have had an opportunity to speak after the amendment, but as no one showed any inclination or disposition to speak, I called on the hon. senior member for St. Thomas to wind up, and in so doing he mentioned that he accepted the amendment of the hon. and learned member for St. James; therefore no one at this stage is eligible to speak. Only a Minister may reply after the mover of a Resolution has exercised the final right of reply if the motion is critical of the Government. That does not arise in this case; so I am afraid no hon. member may now speak after the hon. senior member for St. Thomas.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to argue, and I am quite willing to obey the Chair, but I was waiting to see whether the hon. member would accept the amendment, and I took it that after the acceptance I would have been able to speak. If he did not accept it, I feel I would not have been able to speak, but in this case I do not know who is right from who is wrong.

Mr. SPEAKER: As I am at present advised by myself, I am correct that no member can speak now. I must say this: the hon. senior member for St. Thomas very shrewdly included in his final speech in reply the fact that he accepted the amendment. I know there is precedence for movers of motions accepting amendments by jumping up and accept-

ing, and later on having the right of final reply. That is what would normally have happened in this case; but I must say that the hon. senior member for St. Thomas was very alert on this occasion — not that I suggest he is not alert on other occasions — when he in the course of his final speech said he had accepted the amendment, and it was a final speech.

Mr. SMITH: It may have been the way you put it, because I was expecting you to ask the hon. member whether he had accepted it, to which he would have said "yes" or "no", and then you would have allowed other members to speak. He, however, accepted it and began to speak the same time. The motion would not have been in order if it was not accepted by the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: I intended asking the hon. senior member for St. Thomas if he accepted either of the amendments, but he proceeded after everyone else had shown no intention, as I understood the climate of the House at that time. I then called on him to exercise his right of final reply. He need not have accepted the amendment at all, but in the course of his speech he accepted it and made it his final speech.
2.45 p.m.

I am sorry that some misunderstanding has arisen, but I do not think I can do otherwise than what my understanding of the Standing Orders is: and that is that no other hon. member may speak, not even one of Her Majesty's Ministers. Therefore, the question is that this Resolution as amended do now pass. It has to be borne in mind that there was an amendment which was not accepted by the Hon. Introducer of the motion. That is an amendment by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, seconded by the hon. junior member for the City of Bridgetown. I will put that first. It reads:

"WHEREAS much dissatisfaction exists where casual workers are concerned with the system of laying off without prior notice being given to them;"

"BE IT RESOLVED that the Government notify the appropriate departments not to lay off any worker without prior notice."

The question that the Resolution as amended was put and resolved in the negative, on the declaration of Mr. SPEAKER that "the Noes have it".

Mr. SPEAKER then put the second amendment to the Resolution which reads as follows:-

"WHEREAS much dissatisfaction exists amongst Central and Local Government casual workers in consequence of the fact that they are often laid off without proper notice being given to them;"

"AND WHEREAS the said workers have families to support;"

"BE IT RESOLVED that Government take the necessary steps to ensure that, wherever possible, appropriate notice be given to the worker of the pending cessation of his employment."

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

RESOLUTION *re* NAVAL SHIPS VISITING ISLAND

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas: To move the passing of a Resolution *re* making representation to the American and Canadian Governments with a view to more Naval Ships visiting the Island.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the Resolution reads as follows:-

"WHEREAS the Government is called upon to subsidise the tourist industry to the sum of $500,000 for the benefit of the Island;"

This Resolution must have an amendment just along here.

Mr. SPEAKER: Per haps the hon. member should read the Resolution as it stands and then say where he proposes making an amendment.

Mr. BOXILL: The Resolution goes on to read:

"AND WHEREAS the proposed entry of Britain into the European Common Market will have some effect on the economy of the Island;"

"BE IT RESOLVED that this Government make representation to the American and Canadian Governments with a view of asking them to allow more of their Naval ships to visit this Island in order that the many crews may spend their shore leave in the Island."

Mr. Speaker, since I wrote this Resolution, you would know that Britain's entry into the Common Market is something of the past, something which I think we all are relieved of. All of us in this Honourable Chamber, I assume, probably, know or have heard of the gentleman from Genoa by the name of Christopher Columbus who set out some years ago to go to India, but decided to sail West instead of sailing East and accidentally ran into some of these West Indian Islands. Then we have heard of some legendary figures such as Captain Blood, Captain Kidd, Long John Silver and last but not least, Captain Bligh. Those were the good old days when we had wooden ships and iron men. However, since then, we have gone a long way, a way in which we all can be proud.

Sir, I remember some time in 1929 a fleet came to Barbados, both American and English sailors, and as a result of that, the people were warned not to carry any stock on the Garrison Savannah. You had to be careful how you handled these naval men at that time. Today, we all can be proud because today many a nobleman's son and many a reverend gentleman's son can be found in the Navy. So those who had their faces turned up at everything that a mariner did, I think that you can eradicate that feeling now. You now have the leading nations and the secondary nations demanding that as soon as a youngster reaches the age of 18 years, he must do some military service for his country.
2.55 p.m.

Therefore you will get a real cross-section of the community, the good, bad and the indifferent; but it is the good with whom we are dealing more so than the bad and the indifferent. This Government subsidizes — and I guess all other Governments subsidize — the tourist industry; but if you get these people spending their shore leave here, I believe that it would reflect more on the economy of the Island than if you get two cruise ships of the tourist line visiting the Island per month. When a tourist ship comes in with 200 or 300 passengers occasionally, we do not see the spending of the money down to the man in the street. It is true that the tourists do spend money, but we have to remember that the money might reach the taxi driver, but it might never reach the man in the street. On the other hand, if the American or Canadian seamen were allowed to spend their shore leave in the Island, you will be able to see the reflection on the community. You will be able to see that especially in Bridgetown; every juke box will be playing until 11 o'clock at night and you can really see life. You will have taxi men plying for the American dollar.

There is a complete difference when you see a cruise ship come here now. It is true that the taxi drivers may get work, but some of them have to park their cars down there on the night before the ship arrives, and they really do not get a chance unless they break the line. Whereas if the fleet is in, you will get people spending their shore leave here and you will see them all the time. The entire crew will want to see some place or places in the island, they will

want to have a drink and they will want to mix with the people in the community. Mr. Speaker, that in itself is a boost to the community. Some of these people come from the remotest places in the United States of America. I remember that some time ago I was in Texas and a man asked me whence I had come. I said that I was from Barbados and the man looked at me as if he thought I was from Mars. I had difficulty in explaining to him where Barbados was. I said that it was 200 miles northeast of Trinidad but I did not know if the man knows any geography. However, what I am proposing here means that when a man gets back to his home he will be able to tell his family and his friends how amicable the inhabitants of Barbados are; he will have memories to tell and pictures to show of some of the places he had visited here. He will be able to tell his family and friends that the people in Barbados speak the English Language and that visitors to this Island will not have any problem. Again, we have as good accommodation here as you will find in Florida. We have places where we can entertain the Americans and Canadians; but I am stressing the visits of the Americans more than the Canadians, because the value of the Canadian dollar has dropped a little from the American dollar. It is a question of $1.69 for the American dollar as compared with $1.50 or a little over for the Canadian dollar. *(Pause).*

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member addressing the Leader of the Minority Party in the Opposition or is he addressing the Chair?

Mr. BOXILL: I am addressing the Chair, Mr. Speaker, but I thought that the hon. member was feeding me with something. When I brought forward this Resolution I was serious, and I am still serious as to the help which will be afforded the island if the terms of this Resolution were put into effect. It is difficult in our position to get any lend lease from America as we are now; but if they were to send their naval ships here so that the men would have shore leave. that would be another way of alleviating some of the strain which is now being experienced in Barbados. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that when pay-day comes these people do not hesitate in spending their money. They do not have to worry about what will happen tomorrow because food and shelter are provided, the necessary amount of money will be sent back home and what is left to a man he could afford to spend here freely.

In the island of Puerto Rico where these people go now, that island is making something like $60 million out of the tourist industry, and if the American Government were to send their ships here for bunkering purposes and allow those ships to remain here for a week or so, that would not take away anything from Puerto Rico; on the contrary, it would certainly add quite a lot to Barbados. President Kennedy has suggested to Congress that they have another look at the Walter Mc. Carran Act so as to allow more West Indians to enter the United States of America. That is an Act which was strictly against West Indians and Asiatics.
3.05 p.m.

If we can get quite a number of these youngsters coming here, who knows when one of them might become President of the United States? If we get these people coming here and show them some of our hospitality, it would give them a different heart. It would also make them realise that if one Barbadian happens to get the opportunity to go to the United States as the Jamaicans and the Trinidadians are about to get, we would be going to the United States not as parasites, but as responsible people in a community who have something to offer to that community. It would get them to know us better, and it would get us to know them better. That is why I am serious about this, and I want it to be given full and top-rate priority when next the Premier and members of the Cabinet go to the United States. I am sure that with the way things are going today, the Americans may be only too glad to accommodate us, especially when we stress the need and show them the feasibility and where they would be getting back something for their dollar, and we also would be getting back something for our hospitality.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the leaders, Mr. Mc. Namara along with the President and other top brass would be only too willing to allow these ships to come to Barbados so that their many crew members can enjoy some of the good things which we have to offer.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, I rise to second the passing of the Resolution. In doing so, I must commend the hon. member who has just sat down for bringing this type of Resolution to the Chamber. It is a Resolution which, in my opinion, is long overdue, in that there are many beneficial aspects to be derived from it. As the last speaker said, the Government expends much money in the tourist industry, and I feel that if representation is made to the Canadian Government to allow more of their ships to visit these shores, much of the unemployment which now exists would be relieved somewhat in that people would be able to sell their curios along the highway, and money would be brought to the Island. I feel very strongly, therefore, that Government should explore the possibility of making representation in order that this Resolution may become practicable. This Resolution would not only bring in revenue as I said, but business places would do more business. I remember as a boy in the Boy Scouts Movement seeing several of these ships come to the Island, and the Scoutmaster made representation whereby the Scouts could go on board, and in that avenue much education was developed. I feel that those men who are engaged on these ships would benefit tremendously by coming to these shores more often, and it is said that the people of Barbados are more hospitable than those of the other islands to which these ships go, I am sure that if many more of these ships come to these shores, not only would the personnel on the ships derive pleasure by visiting here, but we in Barbados would be able to get, as the last speaker said, some of the Canadian and American dollars. As the hon. member said, the Canadian dollar speaks a good language.

I feel, Sir, that there would be no hon. member in this Chamber who would oppose a Resolution of this nature, and I highly commend the mover, hoping that Government will in the not too distant future make the necessary contact in order to bring this Resolution to fruition. With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in seconding the Resolution.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, ...

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member replying?

I understand that the hon. junior member for St. Thomas had intended in his speech, in moving the passing of the Resolution, asking leave to withdraw a certain paragraph.

Mr. BOXILL: Yes, Sir, paragraph 2.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is now asking leave of the House so to do which would not affect this right, if the leave is granted, of final reply.

The hon. junior member for St. Thomas is asking leave of the House to propose an amendment to the original Resolution which inadvertently he failed to do in his speech, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted.

There being apparently no objection, leave is granted for the hon. junior member for St. Thomas to do that, and that alone now, without forfeiting his right of final reply.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I am asking the leave of the House to withdraw paragraph 2 of this Resolution. May I read it, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may read.

Mr. BOXILL: It reads as follows:-

"AND WHEREAS the proposed entry of Britain into the European Common Market will have some effect on the economy of the Island."

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Thomas has asked leave to withdraw that paragraph. If there is no objection, leave will be granted.

There being apparently no objection, that paragraph is deemed to have been omitted.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the opening paragraph accurately expresses what is the position with regard to public funds on the tourist industry. The hon. member says in the Address "WHEREAS the Government is called upon to subsidise the tourist industry to the sum of $500,000 for the benefit of the Island." I do not think it is accurate to say that the Government subsidises the tourist industry. The Government, it is true to say, expends certain funds on the promotion of the tourist industry; it is not actually a subsidy, because a subsidy is an entirely different thing, and therefore I would suggest to the hon. member that he might, if he so desires, amend the opening paragraph to express more appropriately the position with regard to the expenditure of public funds, or rather to suggest more appropriately the relationship of Government expenditure to the tourist industry

Mr. SPEAKER: I wonder if the Hon. Leader of the House would care to suggest an amendment which possibly the hon. junior member for St. Thomas would probably accept; and I know the Hon. Leader of the House is an adept mover of amendments whilst on his feet.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I am flattered, Sir. The hon. member says that the Government spends $500,000, but I am not sure what the amount is. If it reads "WHEREAS the Government expends annually appreciable sums in the promotion of the tourist industry," I think that ought to cover it, Sir. The Resolution might therefore read as follows:-

WHEREAS the Government expends annually appreciable sums in the promotion of the tourist industry;

BE IT RESOLVED that this Government make representation to the American and Canadian Governments with a view to asking them to allow more of their Naval Ships to visit the Island in order that the many crews may spend their shore leave in the Island."
3.15 p.m.

Sir, we have no resistance to offer to the Resolution. If the hon. member would accept those amendments, I would pleased to vote for it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Would the hon. junior member for St. Thomas intimate whether he would accept the amendments by the Hon. Minister of Trade?

Mr. BOXILL: Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. junior member for St. Thomas sees fit to exercise his right of a final reply, he may do so now.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, what surprised me most about this Resolution is that it is not a parish pump Resolution that everybody can get in a word, but is the type of Resolution which I would say is not only national, but international, because it is the sort of Resolution which this Government is calling on other Governments to do something in order to alleviate the position in which this Government finds itself.

Everybody knows that Barbados needs tourist dollars. What surprises me is that more hon. members have not taken the opportunity to get into this debate; probably they are not feeling in the mood of talking today.

Mr. SPEAKER: They may feel that the hon. junior member for St. Thomas has said everything that possibly can be said and do not want to be repetitive.

Mr. BOXILL: I thank Your Honour for saying that, though I am appalled at the inertia which they have shown on a Resolution like this. However, Sir, there is not much more I can say on this Resolution other than hope it gets the blessing of the entire community, and I also hope that everyone of us would live long enough to see the benefits which might accrue from such a Resolution.

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

ORDER NO. 3 DEFERRED

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the Hon. senior member for St. Thomas: To move the passing of a Resolution *re* the setting up of a Rent Restriction Board.

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, I do not think I can proceed with that today, and I am asking leave to defer it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Would you like this Order to be put at the bottom of the Order Paper?

Mr. BATSON: Not to the bottom, but at such a position as to allow other hon. members the opportunity to deal with other measures standing under their names.

RESOLUTION *re* REFUSE AND DEAD ANIMALS

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Resolution stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas: To move the passing of a Resolution relative to the health of people in the parish of St. Thomas being endangered due to refuse and dead animals being allowed to remain in front of houses for several weeks.

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, the Resolution reads as follows:-

"WHEREAS the general health of the people in the parish of St. Thomas is very much endangered due to the refuse and dead animals that are allowed to remain in front of their homes for several weeks before removal:"

"BE IT RESOLVED that Government set about investigating the said matter with a view to remedying the unpleasant state of affairs before an epidemic breaks out."

Mr. Speaker, since this Resolution was introduced, an improvement has been made in the situation, but the improvement which has been made is not yet to my satisfaction. However, I must say that Barbadians on the whole should accept their responsibility in trying to maintain the health of the community and should not be throwing their garbage and refuse along the highway. It is very noticeable in the country districts where the health of these smallholders are very much endangered as a result, and I feel that the help of the Northern District Council should be approached on this matter in order that they may be able to remedy this unpleasant state of affairs which has been allowed to exist for very long periods.

Sir, no doubt in your journeying through the northern parishes, this type of situation is very noticeable to you. I feel the people in the northern parishes should be told that whenever animals die, due to no fault of their own, such as sometimes vehicles pass on the road and kill them, the people should take up these animals from off the streets, dig a hole and burn them first before burying them. These dead animals and refuse should be taken to the back of their premises and should be burnt, and as a result the work of the health authorities of the particular parish would be reduced somewhat and this unnecessary situation would cease to exist. People should be told that it is their responsibility to assist those in authority with this type of situation.

I know that hon. members would know about the position which prompted me to introduce this Resolution. I also believe and feel that the health authorities of the Northern District parishes would effect a remedy in the not too distant future in this matter so that the many people who now complain about their plight when dead animals are allowed to remain on be street for so long would be relieved and they would not feel that they are a forgotten group. I say that because when hon. members are travelling along the

northern parishes, they would be surprised to see the amount of refuse which is collected and which remains on the street for so many weeks.
3.25 p.m.

Quite recently I have been told that the District Council had made representation for the purchase of another refuse truck. I believe that the situation might be relieved somewhat as the result of the purchase of this additional refuse truck. I cannot see why the garbage in this district cannot be taken up as readily as it is taken up in Bridgetown. I have heard the campaign about keeping the City clean and that slogan should also apply to the Northern parishes. If we had that slogan "Keep the parishes clean", people would serioulsy realise their position and they would not depend solely upon the health authorities to relieve them of such an inconvenience. I know that there are some hon. members of this Chamber who represent Northern parishes or a Northern parish such as I represent and they will associate themselves with me in my remarks. However, this is the responsibility of the Northern District Council: and therefore all that the Government could do, in my opinion, would be to make some sort of representation to the Northern District Council informing them of this situation and no doubt it can be easily remedied. Mr. Speaker, with those remarks, I now formally ask leave of this Chamber to withdraw this Resolution. I am doing so as a result of a full assurance that a remedy will be effected, and therefore it will not be becessary for hon. members to make any further contribution to this matter. I have the full assurance that the situation will be remedied and I may say that, to a certain extent, it has been remedied. On that ground, I am therefore asking leave of the House to withdraw this Resolution.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker,....

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member seconding the motion for the passing of this Resolution? *(After a pause).* The Clerk has pointed out to me that the passing of the Resolution has not been moved but that the hon. member is asking leave to withdraw the Resolution. Since the hon. member has not moved the passing of the Resolution, there cannot be any seconder and there cannot be any objection to leave being granted for the withdrawal of the Resolution because no motion has been made for its passing. No hon. member can second the motion for the passing of the Resolution when the hon. member has not moved its passing. I must say that the situation is unique in my experience.

The position is this: the Resolution in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas and the hon. member has spoken on it without moving its passing and then he has asked leave to withdraw it. I will now put that question and hon. members may or may not object to leave being granted the hon. member to withdraw the Resolution. The hon. member is asking leave to withdraw this Resolution which stands in his name and if there is no objection, leave will be granted.

Mr. SMITH: I am objecting, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member is objecting to leave being granted for the withdrawal of this Resolution, he may show cause why he is objecting to it.

Mr. SMITH: Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: But the hon. member may not speak on the Resolution.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, this is a Resolution which was before this Chamber for a very long time. As far as I remember, it was away down the Order Paper and the hon. member saw fit to draw it up in front of other Resolutions for the purpose of having it debated before the other Resolutions. That was agreed to; now the hon. member has made all of his points and he is asking that this Resolution be withdrawn. I am saying that that is not fair to hon. members; it was not fair to other hon. members for the hon. member to ask that this Resolution be drawn up on the Order Paper and now that the hon. member has spoken, he has said all that he wanted to say, and he is now asking hon. members to refrain from speaking on the Resolution. The hon. member refers to the fact that there are other hon. members on the Northern District Council....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the hon. junior member for St. Joseph heard precisely what the hon. senior member for St. Thomas has said. However, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has said that the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, after having had his Resolution removed from away down on the Order Paper to its present position and having made his speech on it, he is now asking leave to withdraw the Resolution. Well, Sir, if the hon. member has asked leave to withdraw the Resolution, then there is nothing before the House.

The next point is this. The hon. senior member for St. Thomas has said that subsequent to his taking this action in placing this Resolution on the Order Paper and even in speaking on it, certain information of a collective nature has been drawn to his attention....

Mr. SPEAKER: Certain action.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Yes, Sir. The hon. senior member for St. Thomas has said that certain action of a corrective nature has been drawn to his attention, and since that corrective action has been taken, the necessity for debating the Resolution in the House no longer exists; and therefore he is asking leave to withdraw the Resolution.
3. 35 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Anyhow, the hon. member has made his point of order, but the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was explaining why he was objecting to leave being granted, which he might be quite entitled to do, although as I said, this is a most unique situation which has never arisen befor in my period of membership in this House.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: If I may go on respectfully to suggest why he is objecting to leave being granted for withdrawal, the hon. member is not entitled to debate the Order under reference.

Mr. SPEAKER: No more as the hon. member is entitled to debate the motion in his point of order.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, it is all well and good for the Leader of the House to get below there and encourage things of this sort.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I object most strenuously.

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps the hon. junior member for St. Joseph would continue with any other reasons that he proposes to state why he is objecting to this leave being granted.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, if it is the intention of any member to withdraw a Resolution or anything that is before the House, his duty would be to get up in the first instance and say that he is going to withdraw it and give his reasons for withdrawing it; but for a member to get up and make a complete speech on a Resolution and then say he is going to withdraw it, is not fair to hon. members of this House. If he wanted it withdrawn, no sooner had you called it, he would have got up and asked leave to withdraw and give his reasons, which might be that since he had introduced it he had got certain information and he was no longer going on with it. The hon. member got up and accused the Northern District Council for having dirty districts and things in front of people's doors for several weeks and then said he was going to withdraw it, without giving any other hon. member or a Councillor an opportunity to get up and defend the Council. He is not a member of the Council, but he has said in his remarks that the Council is responsible for dirty yards and for dead animals remaining in front of people's houses. A member should therefore have a chance now to reply and state whether the hon. member is right or wrong. It is not fair to deprive hon. members of making a reply af-

ter the hon. member has made his speech. This is the second time for the day that the hon. member, as Chairman of Committees, has made these blundering mistakes. I do not believe he is doing it ignorantly, because as Chairman of Committees in this Honourable House, he has the same authority and power as you, the Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Up to a certain point.

Mr. SMITH: In other words he should know the Rules of this House. As soon as a member makes a speech, it is open for discussion and he really and truly should not ask leave to withdraw this from the Order Paper after he has made his speech. I have Resolutions here and I will get up and make my speech and then ask for the withdrawal.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well, now! What I have decided to do, as the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was speaking, is this: in every case in which an hon. member begins to speak, I will ask if he is moving the passing of the Resolution; so this cannot happen again. This question cannot recur so long as I am in the Chair. The hon. junior member for St. Thomas never moved the passing of this Resolution therefore it cannot be seconded, and the motion for the passing cannot be made by any other member except the hon. member who made the speech, but did not at some stage, in his speech, either beginning, middle or end, move formally the passing of this Resolution; so in future I will ask hon. members as they rise, including that hon. member, to indicate if he is moving the passing of the Resolution on which he is speaking, and it will save an action like this, quite unprecedented in my twenty-six years, from ever occurring again.

Mr. SMITH: With all due deference to the Chair, you know I am not going to argue, but we cannot always let these things slip us. The hon. member knew what he intended doing, and I am sure it would be seconded.....

Mr. SPEAKER: It could not be seconded because the passing has not been moved.

Mr. SMITH: It is a reflection of hon. members to be doing something of that sort as Chairman of Committees. You will pardon me using this remark, but this certainly is a trick.

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps the hon. member would use another word which is not so close to the border.

Mr. SMITH: I will say then, Sir, that this is a fast one.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, it is not merely, with due deference to Your Honour, a question of asking the hon. member only to use another word. The word "trick" in reference to hon. members in a debate is unparliamentary and he must withdraw it.

Mr. SPEAKER: When I asked the hon. member to use another word, I meant in place of and in substitution for.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the word "trick", and will say that this is a fast one. Let the hon. member get up now and object. I feel the Hon. Minister of Education reads his Bible, because one afternoon I attended a service of his, and I mistook him for the Bishop. I hope he will remember about Eli and his sons.

Mr. SPEAKER: Who lied? The Bishop?

Mr. SMITH: I said I hoped the Hon. Minister of Education will remember what happened to Eli. I did not say he lied.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member does not remember, he can just refer to the hon. senior member for St. Andrew on his immediate right.

Mr. SMITH: He tried every time to defend a wrong. I do not mean the Minister this time; I mean Eli, whose sons could never do wrong, and caused him his life. Sir, I wanted to put this thing in the true perspective, and it is for you to rule in this case, because as you have said, a thing like this never happened since there was a House of Assembly.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not go back so far. I can only go back twenty-six years.

Mr. SMITH: It has never happened during my seventeen or eighteen years as a member where a member got up and made a speech on a Resolution and then asked for it to be withdrawn. When Resolutions are brought here, the entire House gets a chance to debate it, and then the mover of the Resolution may ask for it to be withdrawn, and that is what you call democracy. In this case today, Sir,.....

Mr. BATSON: On a point of elucidation, Mr. Speaker, I do not think the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was attending to me when I made certain remarks about the Resolution. I was trying to enlighten the House on what prompted me to bring the Resolution, and then I said that owing to certain representations made subsequent to the bringing of this Resolution to the Chamber, there was no need to carry on with the Resolution. You will notice, Sir, that this Resolution was introduced on 21st May and this is now August; so you will very well understand that if these dead animals and refuse were yet there, the position of this parish would be very serious. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph seems not to realise that since 21st May much water has flowed under the bridge, and therefore it is my duty not to flog dead animals or to make any criticism against the Northern District Council, because you will have noticed that in my remarks I said some sort of satisfaction had been made, and therefore I was complimenting the Council and not flogging dead horses anymore; but the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The point of eludication has been made that these dead animals have now been buried even though the identity of the undertaker is unknown.

Mr. BATSON: I was only showing the cause for introducing the Resolution and the reason for its withdrawal.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am still giving reasons for my objection regardless of what the hon. member may say; but he has made it worse.
3.45 p.m.

The hon. member said that since he introduced this resolution on the 21st May, 1963, these dead animals were removed. Well then, since then, he could have had this Resolution withdrawn. At the time when he moved that it be pitchforked, that was the time for him to have it removed from the Order Paper. He has accused me as a member of the Northern District Council for allowing dead dogs to remain in front of people's homes, and now he does not want me to explain the situation or to defend myself and the Northern District Council. Can that be fair? Sir, I will have to bow to your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: It may be that since this Resolution was promoted to its present position on the Order Paper that the services of the undertaker were brought into play and the animals were buried. It is a question as regards date.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member rising to object to this Resolution being withdrawn?

Mr. CORBIN: Yes, Sir, I am. I am supposed to be Chairman of the Public Health Committee of the Northern District Council, and I have come in here this afternoon and have seen you allow the hon. senior member for St. Thomas to get up and speak on the whole nature of this Resolution and then ask to withdraw it. What he said was very insulting to the Public Health Inspectors of the Northern District Council, especially those who work in the parish of St. Thomas.

Sir, I can assure you that if I were in the place of the Hon. Mover of this Resolution, I would have arisen and

said: "Well, Sir, the remedy has been made towards the offence which the Resolution complains of; therefore, I am going to remove the Resolution from the Order Paper." You should not have allowed him to get up and speak so hard Inspectors of the Northern District Council. He has spoken hard against the public Health Inspectors of the parish of St. Thomas and I want it to go down in history. He also spoke of the negligence of the people of that parish.

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution has no sense. If the hon. senior member for St. Thomas had any sense, seeing the evil that existed, he would have written the Northern District Council stating the offence which he had seen and asked the Council to have it remedied, removed or buried.

Mr. BATSON: In order to enlighten the hon. member.....

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the hon. member speaking on?

Mr. BATSON: I am speaking on a point of elucidation?

Mr. SMITH: What point of elucidation is that?

Mr. BATSON: If the hon. junior member for St. Joseph fails to understand.... .

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member make his point of elucidation.

Mr. BATSON: The hon. junior member for St. Joseph said that he felt that I have not seen these animals, but I actually saw them in Arch Hall and there were people who made certain approaches to me and I have to accommodate them. Some hon. members fail to realise that this Resolution was introduced on the 21st May, 1963, and that is why I asked that this Resolution be pushed higher on the Order Paper in order that we would be able to debate the matter and get some kind of settlement.

Mr. SPEAKER: Your point of elucidation has been made.

Mr. CORBIN: The hon. member said that he saw them in Arch Hall himself. I thought the hon. senior member for St. Thomas would have had as much courtesy as to write the Northern District Council and tell us of this evil existing.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that you or anyone, if you had seen a dead animal around the district, would have written us and asked that we instruct an Inspector to remove it. I am certain that we never got a report of such dead animals remaining on the streets, as the hon. member has put it. I cannot vote for leave being given the hon. member to withdraw the Resolution now.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Thomas is entitled to leave being given.

Mr. CORBIN: After hearing the hon. senior member for St. Thomas who has revealed the whole nature of this Resolution, it has moved me not to agree with him because he has severely criticised the members of the Northern District Council. I hope when they read his Resolution, that they will see his action. It is very bad that he should speak in such a fashion of members of the Northern District Council. The hon. member sees me every Tuesday, and probably he has a telephone on his premises and he knows where the Clerk of the Northern District Council lives, so that he could telephone him about the matter. But it seems to me that the hon. member has been forced to do things beyond his mind.

Sir, I would not agree for anyone to speak of the whole nature of a Resolution and then ask to withdraw it without other hon. members particularly those who belong to the Northern District Council which he has criticised, speaking and defending themselves. I am the Chairman of the Public Health Committee of the Northern District Council and I can say that such a matter never came before me.

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member said that I criticised the Northern District Council. For the information of this Honourable Chamber, I just want to say that information was given to me in this connection by one of the members of the Northern District Council.

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

Mr. CORBIN: The hon. member cannot shelter himself from this at all because he has criticised the Northern District Council and all that he can say now cannot remedy that. This should be published so that anybody can see. This is what we are here for; but the hon. member should not bring an accusation against the Northern District Council and expect that he alone should speak and believe that other hon. members are mummies. We are all men and we are privileged in here to speak and defend ourselves, and those outside too. One member cannot be allowed to speak as he likes and after he has spoken be allowed to withdraw the Resolution. I am objecting against the withdrawal of this Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Thomas is asking leave to withdraw the Resolution, but the Resolution has not been seconded; therefore, I now declare that we proceed to the next Order under Private Members' Business. 3.55 p.m.

RESOLUTION *re* CESSATION OF DOMESTIC SCIENCE CLASS AT ST. JOHN'S MIXED SCHOOL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is a Resolution the passing of which has already been formally moved. This Order is to resume debate on the passing of a Resolution in connection with the Domestic Science Class at St. John's Mixed School. The passing of this Resolution was moved by the hon. junior member for St. John and it was duly seconded by the hon. senior member for St. George. The Hon. Minister of Education was speaking at 4.30 o'clock p.m., when Government Business was resumed on the last occasion. Perhaps the Hon. Minister would now care to resume his speech.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, when we last debated this Resolution I had only just begun to reply when Private Members' Business, or at least the time alloted to Private Members' Business, came to an end. Perhaps it would not be a bad thing if I were to start from the beginning and refresh the minds of hon. members on this issue. I said that I was very grateful to the hon. junior member for St. John for having raised the issue of the provision and continuation of the Domestic Science Classes at St. John's Mixed School. There was something which I had to say in connection with that and on the whole problem of these classes generally. The hon. member was quite right in drawing the attention of the House to the problem because, although it may appear on the surface that it was a matter which concerned the parish of St. John, yet it had more significance than that it was confined to that parish itself because it raises the whole issue of the training of young women in this respect.

In the first place, Mr. Speaker, let us deal with the particular issue. Some time before this Government came into power there had been dissatisfaction expressed by some of the young women in St. John who had been attending the classes at this Centre. So far as I can gather, their grievance was that having attended the classes, having written the examinations, having satisfied the examiners in some cases and having passed the examination with the highest grades, they were not fortunate enough to be selected for subsequent employment as domestics on the quota to Canada. So great was this grievance for these women that it was not only in 1961 that they expressed their dissatisfaction, but they had been doing it in the year or two years before. The point which I want to establish is this: the closing down of the Centre was not an action of the Ministry of Education under my control and influence, but it was a situation which I inherited and which I have subsequently done my best to remedy. In other words, the grievance existed before I was able either to attend to the matter or even to make the new policy known. I go further and say that both my attempts last year to reopen the Centre have not met with any success, not because the facilities which would be offered were in any way less or more restricted

than those which obtained before, but because by the time I was able to give instructions for classes to be held again, it was evident that public confidence, in so far as the young women of St. John were concerned, had already been lost in this particular activity in that parish. I realised immediately that it would have taken some time for that confidence in that branch of the Housecraft Centre in St. John to be restored.

I would like to set it on record, however, that twice since I have assumed responsibility for the Ministry of Education, I have caused an advertisement to be inserted in the Press inviting young women again to attend the classes at this Centre, and on both occasions the response to the advertisement has been nil. I am not, however, dogged by those two previous experiences, and I have already given instructions that persons should again be invited to register for classes to be started either in September or October. The policy which the Ministry of Education follows under my direction is that, wherever we can, we will open up new facilities. Under no circumstances should the facilities be shut off or closed down if there is the slightest chance of anybody being able to make use of them. Therefore, when we advertise again, if twelve people apply for these facilities, we shall hold the classes for them; and if ten people apply, we shall hold classes for them. As a matter of fact, whatever be the number of people applying, the facilities will be there for them — and that applies not only to the parish of St. John, but it is the general policy over the whole island.

That being so, I wish to assure the hon. member that the Ministry does not, I repeat, object emphatically to the re-opening of that Centre, but, on the contrary, the Ministry would be willing to see it re-opened within the shortest possible time and would be as willing to see it put to the fullest possible use. While on this point, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that we should like to see the fullest possible use made of this Centre because it costs a considerable amount of money to keep a Housecraft Centre going anywhere; but at any of these classes, there is a terrific amount of overhead expenditure to be met for the payment of instructors and for the amount of material which is used. If you have small classes in different subjects, you need the same number of instructors as if the classes had been the maximum number. For the purpose of demonstration you need the same type and quality of material for a large number as you will need for a small number. Therefore, if the overhead expenditure which the Ministry incurs in these lectures is to be justified at all, it is when the best possible and the fullest possible use is made of these Centres.

4.05 p.m.

In other words, we would rather see an evening class bursting at the seams or full to capacity or overflowing, than we would see it half empty or below what the numbers should be; so that in speaking particularly on this issue, I am inviting not only those from St. John who are willing to attend these classes to do so in as large as possible numbers; my remarks must by the same token be applicable to all the others all over the Island who attend these centres whether here in town, in St. Philip, in Christ Church, in St. George, in St. Peter or wherever it has relation to St. John.

The second point I would like to make is this: while it is true that the immediate interest of most of these girls and young women in these Domestic Science classes has been due to the possibility of their being qualified for the Canadian emigration under the Domestic Servants' Scheme, it ought also to be emphasised that apart from its immediate utility, the training at these centres is good in itself, and the Ministry of Education would like to see it expanded. There has been quite a lot done by the Government towards the establishment of a hotel school, and when final plans for that are ready, the appropriate Ministry in conjunction with my own Ministry will make these plans known. But what we envisage among other things is this: that there should be some sensible connection between this prior effort of training in housecraft which is now going on, and that more important effort of training for catering generally. In other words, what we want to do is to find some activity which could link all of these together, and we therefore want people to feel that this training which they do in these centres, even if it does not immediately so far as individuals are concerned fructify in their selection for employment in Canada, is still useful for another reason — that as the tourist trade expands here, the domestic requirements for trained caterers will not grow less, but will grow more. That is why I think there is great need to emphasise that this training can well be taken, whether or not the successful people go to Canada. As a matter of fact, this Government, while it obviously will do all it can to encourage the few people who have an opportunity to go to Canada as domestic servants and will continue to play its part in that respect, does not at the same time regard that as the sole justification for the money it expends in training young people in these Domestic Science classes.

The Ministry of Education has in recent months given quite a lot of thought not only at that level to the Housecraft Centre, but even on the school curriculum itself to this whole question of training in Housecraft, and hon. members will know that, in quite a number of our Secondary schools, Housecraft or Domestic Science is an examination subject, and quite a number of girls at the Secondary Grammar schools offer that subject for the G.C.E. and other examinations, and do quite well in it. In the new Secondary Modern school which is in the process of construction on Government House lands, and in the new Secondary school which will soon be in the course of construction, and wherever girls are going to be included on the roll, there will certainly be expanded Domestic Science teaching. As a matter of fact, in that Secondary school at Government Hill, there are going to be no less than three Domestic Science rooms. That of course is going to be a school for girls exclusively, and therefore Domestic Science will have to be part of their curriculum, and a major part indeed.

I just want the House to understand that while we are pressing on with expanding these centres where girls and young women can be trained in the evening, reopening them where they have been closed, and making more available where none existed, we are going even lower down and making sure that the subject itself is offered with due attention at the school level, as it does attract a considerable proportion of the pupils in the girls' schools, and those who teach it remark with considerable fervour that it is a subject not only learnt because of its practical applicability, but because it enables pupils in these schools to acquire a good all-round, general education.

As far as this motion is concerned, Mr. Speaker, I would like once again to assure the hon. member that he has performed a public service by bringing it to our attention. But although the Resolution has made specific reference to a situation existing in St. John in 1961, yet it is of tremendous importance and significance from the point of view of our policy and to the Island as a whole and I have given instruction for that particular centre to be reopened and for invitations to be issued to residents of St. John to attend it, and also that everything must be done to attract the largest number of would-be schools and pupils to these classes, because we save if the classes are overcrowded, and we lose heavily when they are not.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I really missed a good deal of the Minister's address on this matter, and for the sake of clarification, I am hoping that the hon. junior member for St. John will enlighten me on all this. The Minister in his remarks said that he had advertised on two occasions and the response was nil. I take it that "nil" means "nought", and in spite of the fact that this training is a vehicle for emigration to Canada, there was no response at all. To read the Resolution leaves me somewhat confused, and I must appeal to the hon. junior member for St. John for clarification. The Resolution says:

"WHEREAS the Domestic Science Class at St. John's Mixed School has been closed;

AND WHEREAS because....."

That is confusing to me. The Minister was at pains to explain, but somehow he did not cover this particular point. Anyhow, to go on reading:

"AND WHEREAS because of the cessation of such classes young women in the parish of St. John have no opportunity to avail themselves of the training necessary to qualify for the scheme of emigration as domestics to Canada sponsored by the Government through the agency of the Labour Department;"

Now the member who is really responsible for the Resolution is saying "because of the cessation of the classes", and the Minister in reply said he had advertised on two occasions and the response was nil; that is, not one single girl in the parish of St. John was willing to make use of these classes in spite of the fact that they are still regarded as a vehicle for emigrating to Canada, and I think that is one of the ambitions of, I believe, almost every girl — to have an opportunity in Canada or the United States of America. There could be a number of reasons why girls in St. John are failing to respond to these classes. I would hate to express my own reasons or opinions on this, but I am honestly confused because this could be regarded as a charge, and I think that the Minister of Education has accepted as such that because of the cessation of such classes, young women in the parish of St. John have no opportunity to avail themselves of the classes. I take that to mean that because the Ministry or the Government has closed these classes, the member for St. John is anxious to have them reopened, I suppose, with the general spirit of helping his constituents.
4.15 p.m.

You will agree that it is very confusing for me to speak when the hon. junior member for St. John is utterly unaware of what is going on in his parish. My confusion leads me to think that the hon. member does not know anything. I do not know if he is aware of where the St. John Mixed School is situated. It is not a question of cessation by the previous Government, but a question of the policy under the leadership of the present Government.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I did point out that the girls had stopped attending the classes before I assumed the role of Minister of Education, and that last year we issued notices for the centre to be opened but the response was not as we wanted. However, the point was that they stopped coming long before I had a hand in it.

Mr. MILLER: When did they stop?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: They stopped in 1961 before my Party came into the Government.

Mr. MILLER: What I am at a great loss to understand and what disturbs me is what has happened to the hon. member who lives and works in the parish, for him to tell me that this Centre was there and he is completely unaware of what is happening. That is very confusing. I can quite understand why the girls of that particular parish are not particularly eager to go to the classes. Those things are understandable; but my personal and private conclusion is, at the moment, that the hon. member who is responsible for that constituency is utterly unaware of the cessation caused by the Government. I will sit, and my special pathetic plea to him is to make it clear in order that members of the House would understand his lack of knowledge of what has happened in the parish or what has caused him to bring in this Resolution. Since we are not in Committee, even the point of order which has been made by the Minister of Education is not clear and he is not in the position where he can reply.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are other Ministers in the Chamber.

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Speaker, after hearing the Hon. Minister of Education I hardly thought that I would have had to wind up the debate on this Resolution because what he said was quite satisfactory to me. However, after hearing the hon. junior member for St. George, I will have to reply because he is assuming that I am unaware of what is really going on or even unaware of where the school is situated. If I had to say that of the hon. junior member of St. George in connection with the schools in St. George, I think that I would be in place because he has no time for St. George.

Nevertheless, I can assure the hon. member and this Honourable House that I live just a few yards from the St. John's Mixed School and it is true to say that I must know of what is going on in the parish. I mince no bones about that.

It is very fortunate that this Government has had to inherit all these sins of the last Government because the St. John's Mixed School was closed during the time of the last Government. It was not closed during the term of this Government and I can give one or two reasons why it has been closed. There are about 20 pupils who really qualified for domestic status at that school every three months, and this is one of the reasons why I believe that the girls in that parish got careless in going to those classes. Year after year, three months after three months, those girls have had to walk to the school, take their lessons, pass their examinations, and none of them — and when I say none, just one girl from St. John who attended the classes in St. John was able to go to Canada. There was a lot of foul play, and that was the trouble. I can tell you that in the last Government's time, the Labour Department was definitely responsible for the lack of interest which the girls took in those classes. I am speaking about the last Government's time because that is the time when the classes at that school were closed down. The hon. junior member for St. George is unaware of all of that.

Mr. MILLER: Will the hon. member give way? I am speaking on a point of order, Sir. For his further enlightenment, there are only 40 places for domestics in Canada annually and something like 1,200 girls who have been placed there when the last Government was in power.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a very doubtful point of order.

Mr. YEARWOOD: Sir, at least the hon. junior member for St. George was in Parliament for a few years and he really should know what is meant by a point of order.

The position is this. The hon. member said that there are 42 places a year for domestics in Barbados. I think the last time there were 46; but if the St. John's Mixed School trains about 80 pupils a year and there are 1,200 that have gone during the last few years, it would mean that there were about 240 pupils qualified from St. John's Mixed School during that time. Is the hon. junior member for St. George suggesting that you could not find even two places out of the 240 pupils who qualified at the St. John's Mixed School? Is he really serious? I would like to ask the hon. junior member for St. George as to how many girls went from St. George and the reason why they are always going from St. George.
4.25 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. George cannot answer in here because he has already spoken.

Mr. YEARWOOD: We know the reasons why the girls have gone and that is the reason why I have brought forward this Resolution. I do not believe that after girls go night after night and qualify themselves for something, they should be pushed around, and then other girls who have not been attending these classes and have not qualified themselves, have had the opportunity to go to Canada. That is the point which I am trying to make. The hon. junior member for St. George knows that; he knows that only too well. I had the honour to represent one of the constituents of the hon. junior member for St. George who had passed the test at St. John's Mixed School, and the Labour Department at that time turned her around until they made her close down her shop in the belief that she was going to Canada; now she has not gone one foot out of Barbados after having gained a First-Class Certificate. That person lived in St. George, but she could not get the hon. junior member for St. George to represent her case; she could not get the hon. member to represent her.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, the Resolution simply states that "Because of the cessation of

such classes, young women in the parish of St. John have no opportunity to avail themselves of the training necessary to qualify for the scheme of emigration as domestics to Canada sponsored by the Government through the agency of the Labour Department." There are "A" and "B" certificates and it does not mean that all the young women in the parish will go there. The hon. member talks about the cessation of the classes and he is talking about the question of the activities. The Labour Department would give preference to the "A" groups and, of course, you would expect that the majority of these groups would come from the parish of St. George.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point of order has been duly made.

At this stage, it now being 4.30 p.m. of the clock,

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now 4.30 p.m., of the clock the time when the consideration of Private Members' Business automatically expires, and we revert to the consideration of Government Business.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1963-64 NO. 12 ERADICATION OF YELLOW FEVER MOSQUITO

Mr. SPEAKER: Immediately before the suspension of the sitting for lunch, the House was in Committee of Supply.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the House was in Committee of Supply before the suspension of the sitting for lunch, we were considering a Resolution for the sum of $37,000 to be provided in connection with the eradication of the Yellow Fever Mosquito. The hon. junior member for St. George was speaking.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I need repeat anything which I said before. I was suggesting that with a major project like this, you want a leader, and that leader must be dedicated to the particular subject, and I lamented the loss of the only man whom we had in this field. I was suggesting that we would authorise the Inspectors to get rid of the mosquito in spite of the number of objections which would come from the householders. At this point I will conclude my remarks.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister of Social Services is unavoidably absent, but I am quite sure that if he were here he would have to reply to one or two of the comments which were made earlier today by the hon. junior member for St. George. The hon. member attempted to make it appear that the campaign for the eradication of the Yellow Fever Mosquito had not been carried out effectively by the present Minister, and that the Minister's incompetence in the matter was a matter for adverse comment. The position is that we have been informed by specialists in this field that in the past, although the work had been organized basically along the correct lines, yet the effort made had been insufficient and it was too limited in scope in order to eradicate this mosquito. That being so, and merely for the purposes of the record, I would like to say at this stage that the Minister, whose activities in this matter have now got it to the present stage, has been highly commended by the Pan American Health Organization for the interest which he is taking in this matter. That is in absolute contradistinction to the lethargy and indifference of the past Minister of Social Services in relations to this matter. In this connection, there is a letter dated 26th June, 1963, from the Pan American Health Organization addressed to the Hon. Minister of Social Services. The letter refers to a conversation between a representative of the Pan American Health Organization and the Hon. Minister in relation to the campaign for the eradication of the Yellow fever Mosquito with the co-operation of the World Health Organization. This is what it says: "We are very pleased to see the keen interest being taken in intensifying the present efforts in order to obtain the eradication of the *Aedes Egypti* mosquito in a shorter period and in applying the recommended methods to supersede the technical and administrative obstacles found at present."

The letter goes on to state that the efforts of the Government in this matter are highly to be commended and he thanks the Minister of Social Services for his courtesy and co-operation in this matter.
4.35 p.m.

The Minister who is not here to defend himself, even if he were here, need not do it against the irresponsible and ill-informed attacks levelled against him this morning by the hon. junior member for St. George, for the simple reason that the world's best authority on this matter, the World Health Organization, had gone on record in a letter to the Minister as expressing their profound appreciation and congratulating him in no uncertain manner on his efforts to intensify the campaign, to remove the existing obstacles and to proceed with his campaign along lines which are bound to produce the required results.

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

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

On the separate motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded in each case by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Education to resume debate on what is called the Federation Resolution.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 5 be the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order accordingly stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Premier: to move the passing of a Resolution to approve "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 8) Order, 1963."

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of the Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is craving its indulgence to take charge of the Resolution standing in the name of the Hon. and Learned Premier, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted.

No objection being audible. leave is granted.

Let the Hon. Leader of the House proceed.

THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (NO.8) ORDER, 1963

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is for the purpose of making certain adjustments in the Civil Establishment as outlined in the Addendum to the Resolution. You will see that the Order provides for adjustments in the Department of Inland Revenue to the following order: (i) the abolition of one of the present posts of Senior Clerks; and (ii) the provision of the following additional permanent staff — one Accountant at the salary rate of $4,128 to $5,136; two Tax Officers at $2,472 to $4,464; one Accounts Clerk from $2,472 to $3,384; five Clerical Assistants beginning at $1,128 to $1,896; one Senior Valuation Officer whose remuneration will be $4,632 to $5,136; and two Long Grade clerks at salaries ranging from $1,200 to $2,832.

The underlying purpose in increasing the staff of the Inland Revenue Department is as is now well known, in order to provide more clerical assistance for the collection

of some of the outstanding accounts now due the Inland Revenue Department. It is felt, Sir, that the additional work which the additional staff would be able to perform will more than justify the increased expenditure on the Department. It is regarded that the coping appropriately with the efforts involved in the collection of outstanding accounts necessitates more staff, and that unless this Government provides it, the Department will not be able to function as efficiently as it should with the additional obligation involved in trying to bring in outstanding debts.

Then there is the provision of certain posts in the Ministry of Education. At Erdiston College we will abolish the post of Senior Tutor and also the post of Lecturer in Agriculture, and provide the following permanent posts: one Deputy Principal at $7,080; two Tutors at a salary range from $3,960 to $6,600, and a Bursar whose emoluments would begin at $3,096 and go to $3,960. It is estimated that the additional staff will cost $29,820 at a minimum level, and $46,188 when the maximum of the salary scales has been attained. I am sure that if there is more information wanted on this matter, the Minister of Education will be only too pleased t give it.

The Addendum sets out clearly in addition that in so far as the Income Tax Department is concerned and the proposed adjustments, often it has been necessary from time to time to engage temporary staff in order to bring important work up to date, and therefore one additional reason for providing extra staff is to obviate the necessity for engaging temporary staff. It is pointed out that the cost of appointing this staff will be a saving, for not only will the collection of the arrears be ensured, but additonal revenue should be collected in the future as well.

With regard to Erdiston, additional explanation is that less than 40% of the teachers in the Government Primary and Secondary Modern Schools are trained. The Government therefore proposes to raise the number of places for students at Erdiston to 120, that is, 24 above the present level which is 96, and in order to provide adequate tutorial staff for the increased numbers, these adjustments in the Establishment to which I have made reference earlier are being proposed. It is felt that the post of Bursar, which is among the new proposals, will enable the Principal to be relieved of certain time-consuming routine duties in connection with accounts, inventories, supplies, supervision of domestic staff; therefore he would be able to devote himself more fully to the tasks which really should fall on the shoulders of the Principal.
4.45 p.m.

The full time lecturer in Agriculture whose salary scale was from $3,756 - 4,740 is no longer required and from the 14th October, 1963, the date on which the present holder is due to retire, we are going to abolish the post.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, there is one aspect of this Order which I want to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister of Education, and I hope he will be able to deal with it although it may be said that it is not his portfolio. It is with respect to the section of this Resolution and Order which deals with the Department of Inland Revenue. Mr. Speaker, you are aware that I have been a very strong critic of the outstanding arrears in the Inland Revenue and Income Tax Department. I speak with authority on that because I am a taxpayer, and I believe that if everybody paid their taxes as I do, there would be nothing owed to that Department. I have never owed the Government any money for income tax although I consider myself to be highly taxed for a person whose income is known. I pay nearly 15% of my total income in taxes, and when it comes to my taxable income, I am placed in a worse position than some companies because we have recently passed legislation to enable certain companies to pay just 12 1/2% of their profits in income tax. These things are secret; therefore, I cannot divulge the amount which I pay, but I say that to show that this is something to which I have paid much attention.

What I would like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister of Education is something relating to these new posts. I would like to draw an analysis and ask that the Government rectify it. I agree that you need more staff in the Income Tax Department and I am not in any way protesting against this additional staff.....

Mr. Speaker, just in passing, I would say that it is all very nice for us to pay for having our voices carried over this amplifying equipment, but I do not know how hon. members feel when they see the people who are there to work it fast asleep. That is a shocking diagrace. For that reason, I think we should dispense with these things and save the money which we spend on them. It seems as if the operators operate in a different line. The debates of the House may be very contrary to what they should be because the operators go asleep.

Mr. SPEAKER: Unfortunately, everything seems to be out of order because even our bells are not working.

Mr. WALCOTT: So everything is alseep? Even all that we have said cannot even remotely arouse this operator from his slumber. If he were a Trade Unionist, I could not see in what way I could even defend him.

However, Sir, I think the Hon. Minister can hear me. The Hon. Minister is seeking to establish additional posts in the Income Tax and Inland Revenue Department, one of which is Senior Valuation Officer, at a salary of $4,632 - 5,136. What I would like to draw to the Hon. Minister's attention, is that this new post which you are creating is one in a department in which you already have a post of Chief Valuation Officer. Since the Government took over the Valuation Officers of Local Government authorities for income tax purposes, there is no longer now the need for parochial assessors in the sense that the parochial authorities dealt with this. The Chief Valuation Officer and the other Valuation Officers have to perform a task which is just as important.

I would just like to draw to the Hon. Minister's attention that there should be no differential between these officers. I do know that it is a little bit technical, but the Chief Valuation Officer in the Income Tax Department is one of that Department's officers. I do not want this to be associated with any parochial government because these officers are members of the Central Government, and the task of the Valuation Officers is no less exacting than the comparable officers of the Department of Inland Revenue.

The Chief Valuation Officer is second in that Department, or, if it is put in another way, the only two officers who are above him in that Department are the Commissioner of Inland Revenue and the Assistant Commissioner.

The Chief Valuation Officer gets a salary of $5,904 which is in the scale G2 and it ranges from $5,904 - $6,228 per annum. In that Department you also have a Senior Inspector whose salary which is in G3 ranges from $5,000 - 6,228. That officer's starting point is lower than the Chief Valuation Officer and the maximum is the same.

Now, you are going to appoint a Senior Valuation Officer that comes midway between a Senior Inspector and he is starting above the point of entry of Inspector, but finishing below an Inspector. I do not know what are the good reasons for this. The Chief Valuation Officer is comparable to the Senior Inspector, but has a higher starting point although he goes to the same maximum. What I do not understand is that this new post which we are creating which is next to the Chief Valuation Officer and which is comparable to the Senior Inspector is one which has a starting point of $4,632 and finishes at $5,136 as against an Inspector which is in the scale of G5 to G3 which starts at $4,128 which is a point just below what this new post starts at but which finishes at $5,712.
4.55 p.m.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not understand what is the justification for this differential. What strikes me as very strange, and it would look to me as being unfair, is that a

Valuation Officer — I understand that the duties of a Valuation Officer are to go all over the country valuing property and making assessments for income tax purposes. That in itself is a specialised job for which people have had training and experience. I do not understand why is it that you have the Valuation Officers who are no less important for our purposes from the Income Tax revenue point of view than other officers — on this basis. I feel that what is unfair is that their salary begins at $2,472 and goes up to $4,464. Then you have an officer whose salary starts at $2,472 and goes up to $3,384; something is wrong there. You have your Valuation Officers.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. Is the hon. member saying that the salary of the Valuation Officers begins at $2,472 and goes up to $4,464? That is the scale for Tax Officers, not Valuation Officers.

Mr. WALCOTT: What I am pointing out is that you are not providing for Valuation Officers. You have in the Establishment now four Valuation Officers. I am not dealing with this Resolution because in this Resolution you do not have Valuation Officers. What I am pointing out to the Hon. Minister is that you are only making provision for a Senior Valuation Officer, but you already have four Valuation Officers on the Establishment and those four Valuation Officers range in their salaries from G5 to G4 and that salary point begins at $2,472 and goes up to a maximum of $4,464.

Mr. Speaker, if you were to look at the back of the Estimates on page 5 of the Appendix you will find the point which I am raising about these officers. Appendix "B" gives the salaries. I feel that the Government should investigate this matter and the Minister should issue some directive. You have four Valuation Officers. You are now creating the post for a Senior Valuation Officer; you are not abolishing any of these posts. These officers are so important to this Income Tax Department that you cannot abolish them. You are now adding a Senior Valuation Officer. This is a representation which has been made on behalf of these people, and when you examine it you will find that they have a case; but the present salary of a Valuation Officer has close relationship with an Inspector in that Department from the duties which these people have to perform. Valuation Officers are very important people; they are not people in the office who are making calculations; these are men who have to go throughout the whole of Barbados and value property. What used to be done by Local Government Authorities is no longer done by them, and these officers are under the Chief Valuation Officer; they are making all the valuation and assessment of properties and hereditaments throughout the island.

I do not know what kind of valuation has been given to them but, on the face of it, it seems to me that these people are comparable to the Inspectors in this Department. You have a considerable drop in salary; you have an Inspector getting between $4,000 to $5,000 and a Valuation Officer is in the scale of $2,472 to $4,464. In assessing these things sometimes people say: "These people have been working with the Local Government Authorities and therefore they keep them in a different way from people who have been working in the Central Government as such". These Valuation Officers came from the Local Government authorities. As regards the Inspector, the Senior Inspector and the Valuation Officer, the position is that these men should have some sort of parity. You are now creating a new post and you can put this man where you like. If you look at the Estimates you will find that you have four Valuation Officers and I am pleading that they are not being treated properly, judging from the duties which they have to perform.

Mr. Speaker, on page 27 of the Estimates and at Item 12 you will find about what I am talking. I am sorry that the Hon. Premier is not here but I hope that the Hon. Minister will pay proper attention to what I am saying. I am also sorry that the hon. senior member for the City is not here because he has quite a lot to do with the City of Bridgetown.
5.05 p.m.

The Local Government Councils no longer have any assessors. These people are doing the work which the Local Government used to do, but for the Central Government at the Income Tax Department. I would say therefore that their tasks cannot be other than the tasks of Inspectors who have to go around to these properties all over the Island — plantations and other properties — and I feel that this salary scale of $2,472 to $4,464 in relation to the other officers in the same Department under the same coverage, and making this differential, is not fair to these officers. I feel that these officers have a case for re-adjustment, as too much onerous work is placed on their shoulders for them not to be properly remunerated for it. The salary scale for these officers is shockingly low. You can put anybody at a point in a scale to which you appoint them, but let us be quite sane about it. You have these people as Valuation Officers, but what you require is to remedy the outstanding arrears of $2 million; so that you know what you are doing. A salary of $206 a month going to a maximum of $372 is not an adequate salary for that kind of work, and I feel that the salary of these Valuation Officers should be re-adjusted to come more in line with the salaries of Inspectors, because the task which they have to perform is no less onerous than that of the Inspectors in the Income Tax Department. The Inspectors in the Income Tax Department on one side deal with personal and Companies' incomes, while the Valuation Officers on the other side deal with property assessment, and they in their position are as important as Inspectors.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what case has been made out for them in the Government or Whitley Council, but I am drawing to the attention of the Minister, now that it has come before this House, that the Valuation Officers of the Government should be in a better position than what I now regard as a lowly position for a very important Department, and dealing with a very important item in the taxation of this Island on which the Government has to depend. I hope by the analogy I have given to the Hon. Minister that he will see there is no objection on my part to the Resolution as it is, but it is a question of a re-valuation of the Valuation Officers, because I believe he would see that we are forced in this instance to make some go-between, thus making this Senior Valuation Officer begin higher than the Inspector and end lower than the Inspector. I know these are difficult things to ask the Minister, but I would ask why it is that they have put the Senior Valuation Officer at this point in relation to the position of the Inspector. The Inspector starts at $4,128 and your new post starts at $4,632. The Inspector ends at $5,712 and this man ends at $5,136; so even on that it seems to me somewhat of a contradiction that you are creating a new post which has a starting point higher than a post you already have as Inspector, but you are giving him a lower maximum. That is to say, the net and total value of this post which begins higher is not as worthwhile as a man that starts above; and unless you are doing this for a serving Officer, where you are putting him at a point above what somebody else is getting in order to start him off above, there seems little justification in creating a new post in a Department with this big anomaly. For example, you have a Chief Valuation Officer who starts at a higher point than the Senior Inspector, but ends at the same point. You have the Chief Valuation Officer starting at $5,904 and ending at $6,288. Well that is even more understandable in that he is not below, but the other one who starts below ends at the same point. You have this paradox that you are starting the Senior Valuation Officer above the Inspector and cutting him off below the Inspector which gives him an aggregate of income over the years which is less than what this man would get, because when he gets to the maximum, he would be frozen at a lower point, and as I said, it seems to me that the Valuation Officers need a complete re-adjustment in order to give them a better boosting.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if you can have the Inspectors working for approximately $1,300 per annum more at the finishing point and at the beginning they are working for nearly $1,700 per annum more than the Valuation Officers, you are not giving enough weight to these people. You will see that one begins roughly at $300 a month and the other at $200 a month, and the disparity of nearly 50% degrees in salary is something you should look at. I feel that the Valuation Officers are very important to Barbados, and they should not be looked at now in the light

that their job was formerly done by parochial authorities who had no particular structure. Now that these people have been roped into the Income Tax Department, parity should be one of the guiding principles, and I feel that some adjustment should be made in a Department like that, because from time to time in dealing with officers, no matter who they are, and in an Inland Revenue Department like this, you have to move around your staff in a Specialist Department around people who are acquainted with that work, and it is not easy to bring in people from the outside to do this work. It would be extremely difficult for the Government to find a raw man, unacquainted with valuations and unacquainted with this work to put in the Inland Revenue Department, and ask him to go out and do assessments by looking in somebody's book and seeing what he charged for land. It is not a job he can pick up like that, and I feel these Valuation Officers need better treatment; so I hope what I have said will show to the Minister and to the Government the relative position.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I cannot represent them any further than here and I do not know what representation they have made on their own behalf; but it seems to me crystal clear that the sum difficulty is denying these Valuation Officers better treatment in the light that the Minister has brought down a Resolution which treats the Senior Valuation Officer even a little worse than the Inspector, but much better than the Valuation Officers are treated at the same time. In the light of this situation, there is room for these Valuation Officers to be put at a better point and treated better than they are at present treated.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there any other hon. member who wants to contribute to this debate before the Hon. Leader of the House replies? Let the hon. member proceed.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member is aware, the question of matters of Establishment does not come within my portfolio, and therefore I am not prepared to be able to speak to him in any precise terms why there should have been this differential in the salary structure of the Valuation Officer on the one hand and the Inspectors on the other, or the Senior Valuation Officer and the Senior Inspector. The hon. member has made out a very strong case for revaluation of the Valuation Officers. 5.15 p.m.

There is no gainsaying of the fact that they do make an important contribution. It may well be the fact that originally these Valuation Officers were the Assessors from the old Vestries, and when they were fixing the salaries scales for their point of entry in the Public Service that they paid very much attention to the salary to which they were accustomed when they were parochial employees. I am not prepared to say whether this is so or not. However, I do agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter that the nature of their contribution is not to be underestimated because on their work more or less devolves the amounts which we eventually collect from this particular Department of the Inland Revenue Department. I do not know, Sir, why the new scale of entry for this Valuation Officer should have been at a point more than that of the Inspector. The Inspector starts at a salary of $4,128, whereas the Senior Valuation Officer is going to start at $4,632 and as the hon. senior member for St. Peter pointed out, whereas the new Valuation Officer would stop at a point of $5,136 an Inspector goes on to $5,712.

Well now, as the hon. member is aware, these scales presumably are fixed after maximum consideration of all the aspects involved. They are not done on an *ad hoc* basis. I presume that due consideration was given by the Public Service Commission which is responsible for Establishment matters and the salaries structure of every single person in the Public Service, and when structures are increased or when new structures are created at specified points, there must be adequate reason for it. Not having before me what is the reason for it, I am not in a position precisely to say why there should be these points of difference and why the differential, as noted by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, should exist. I do agree that no depreciation of the value of their work should spring from their previous association as employees of a department which traditionally paid their employees at a lower level than people who are paid for similar work in the Central Government. The beginning scale of $2,472 for the four Valuation Officers must have been fixed by people who knew what they were doing.

I can assure the hon. member that appropriate attention has been paid in the proper quarters to the work which they are doing. The idea was that a new valuation list should have been completed in the fourth year after the introduction of the Local Government system. The first valuation list was heavily criticised and then the Valuation Officers began preparing a new list. My estimation is that they actually did a tremendous lot of work under high pressure in order to complete this revised list in the three years which they did before the expiry date, but they did it at such physical strain that one or two of them have taken ill and I have heard that one has actually gone on long leave. That is as a result of the extra pressure of work. I may say now that the hon. senior member for St. Peter has added his weight of his proper representation to the claim for revision of their salaries that if the appropriate organisation to which they belong submits representation for them in the proper quarters, I am sure his very actions today must bear fruit in the near future. That is all I think I can say at this stage.

If the hon. member would like any further explanation of the matter, something more precise as to why the point of entry is comparitively lower for the Senior Valuation Officer in relation to the Inspectors, I shall make every effort to find that out for him. My own conception, without decrying the enormous task of the Public Service Commission, is that those people must have been aware of what they were doing, and as in the case of the four Valuation Officers, so now in the case of this new post of Senior Valuation Officer, the scale has been fixed in accordance with the consideration which applies to a post of this position and that all the relevant factors must have been taken into account. It may appear not only to the hon. member but to the others as a whole that the Senior Valuation Officer has not been given proper reward when the importance of his services is taken into account, but there it seems to be. If the Valuation Officers have a case and appropriate representation is made, I have no doubt that these representations are bound sooner or later to be effective.

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

LEAVE TO DEAL WITH RESOLUTION

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, of the two Resolutions which I gave notice today, to be dealt with in Committee of Supply at our next meeting, one of them has been circulated — the Resolution for $550 — and I am asking for leave now to deal with that Resolution in all its stages. Copies of it have been circulated amongst hon. members. It is a matter of some urgency and I therefore would appreciate if the House would grant the permission for disposal of it now.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is asking leave to proceed with this Resolution in all its stages today and he has assured the House that it is of an urgent nature. If there is no objection, leave will be granted the Hon. Minister. *(A Pause).*

Hearing no objection, leave is granted the Hon. Minister to proceed now with this Resolution which I declare to be the next Order of the Day.
5.25 p.m.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, MR. BATSON in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1963-63 — No. 13
VISIT OF ORTHOPAEDIC SURGEON

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, this is a Resolution for the sum of $550 in connection with the visit of an Orthopaedic Surgeon. As the Addendum to the Resolution sets out, this $550 is to cover the expenses of the visit of an Orthopaedic Surgeon from the University Hospital of the West Indies. It is proposed that this Surgeon should pay a visit to this Island for a period of about five days in order to make an assessment of the needs of those persons who have suffered from Poliomyelitis during the recent outbreak of that disease in this Island and to advise on a scheme for the rehabilitation of those persons.

I presume that hon. members will be fully willing to support a Resolution of this nature, as an expert of this calibre is urgently needed to go into this question which has been engaging the attention of the entire Island for the past few months. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

The question that this Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative with division.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to move, Mr Chairman, that you do now report the passing of one Resolution in Committee.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

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

The CHAIRMAN reported and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD in each case, the Resolution passed in Committee was read a first and second time and agreed to.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS CONCLUDED

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr Speaker, the consideration of that Resolution concludes Government Business for the day.

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, there is only one small matter with which we have to deal at the next meeting and the other outstanding matter is the Federation debate. I am wondering if we could meet on Friday of this week and dispose of those two matters after which we might be able to take a longer adjournment. I am wondering if hon. members would be willing to come here on Friday at 4.00 o'clock in the afternoon in order to deal with the Federation debate. (A MEMBER: We could do that on Tuesday too.) There is only one member who has to speak on Federation now.

Mr. SPEAKER: Several hon. members have not spoken in the Federation debate because an amendment to the Resolution was made and those hon. members are entitled to speak on that amendment. As a matter of fact, there are as many as fifteen hon. members who may speak now if they want to do so.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I am going to move, and I hope hon. members will agree, that we meet on Friday, 9th August, 1963, at 4.00 o'clock in the afternoon for the purpose of dealing only with the Federation debate. We will be meeting in Private Members' Time if we meet at 4.00 o'clock and we have to suspend the Standing Orders when we start; but I want to make it perfectly clear that we propose to do that and dispose of this matter so that it will go to the Other Place. I therefore beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Friday, 9th August, 1963 at 4 00 o'clock in the afternoon.

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

5.35 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do I understand the Hon. Leader of the House to give the assurance that he proposes as from the commencement to resume the debate on Federation?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: We have got a Resolution in Committee of Supply, so far as I know, of which notice was given today. We should like to dispose of that, and, if any urgent matter crops up to enable us to make a longer adjournment, we will deal with it. So we will have Committee of Supply first, any urgent matter which crops up which enables us to take a longer adjournment, and then the Federation debate.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I am asking permission of the House to have Question No. 129 standing in my name withdrawn from the Order Paper.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Thomas is asking that there be removed from the Order Paper Question No. 129 standing in his name. If there is no objection, leave will be granted.

There is no objection to that removal, and I declare it to be removed from the Order Paper.

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. senior member for St. Andrew, I should like Order No. 7 to be order No. 1.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if I am in order; I was not here, but I understand that Replies to Questions asked by me were ready, and I do not know if Your Honour would permit the Minister to reply to these questions now as there is no more business to be dealt with.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question Time has passed, but on the previous occasion I instructed, as the hon. senior member for St. Peter was not in his place, that that Question be deferred until today. Similarly I said, let today be the last time on which it will be deferred until the next meeting.

Mr. WALCOTT: I was not informed, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: It would seem to me that the appropriate Standing Order would have to be suspended for Question Time now to be allowed to take place.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: We have no desire to resist the hon. member's proposal. We are prepared to suspend the Standing Orders.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, I would like to request that Order No. 19 standing in my name be moved to No. 3.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion for the Adjournment which takes precedence over every other motion has already been moved by the Leader of the House. I do not know if it was seconded. In view of the fact that the Minister is not here, we will let that matter stand over until the next meeting of this House.

The requests are therefore as follows: the hon. senior member for St. Thomas on behalf and at the request of the hon. senior member for St. Andrew that Order No. 7 be Order No. 1. The matter which we were discussing under Private Members' Business when the time expired was No. 5 standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. John... ...

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave that Order No. 3 standing in my name be placed at the bottom.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking that Order No. 3 be placed at the bottom of the Order Paper, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted.

Hearing no objection leave granted.

So Order No. 7 will be Order No. 1; Order No. 5 will be Order No. 2 and Order No. 19 will be Order No. 3. In as much as there will only be half an hour at the most for Private Members' Business, if we do it at all, I do not see we can get through more than three.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Friday, 9th August, 1963, at 4.00 o'clock p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

5. 45 p.m