

X

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1961-66

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 18th August, 1964.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 2.30 o'clock p.m. today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., (*Speaker*); Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, (*Minister of Development, Trade Labour and Social Security*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Communications and Works*); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, (*Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries*); Mr. W. R. COWARD; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. G. V. BATSON and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (*Minister of Health, Housing, Local Government and Community Development*).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the Meetings of the 4th and 11th August, 1964, respectively, have been printed and circulated amongst hon. members, and if there is no objection, those Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed. (*After a pause*) There being no objection, I now declare the Minutes of those two Meetings to be duly read and confirmed

Messrs. BOXILL, BATSON and MOTTLEY entered the House and took their seats.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. W.A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for the four months ended 31st July, 1964.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 9) Order, 1964.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 10) Order, 1964.

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

Statement showing the sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of Money Orders, the amounts repaid to the Accountant General, and the amounts due by the various Post Offices to 31st May, 1964.

The Report of the Committee appointed by the Government on March 12th, 1963, to inquire into the public transport services of the Island and to make recommendations.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I beg to give notice of the following Resolutions:-

Resolution to place the sum of \$5,828 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1964-65 Part 1 Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1964-65 No. 25 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to place the sum of \$103,800 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1964-65 Part 1 Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1964-65 No. 26 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 9) Order, 1964.

Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 10) Order, 1964.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolutions:-

Resolution to place the sum of \$3,526 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1964-65 Part 11 - Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1964-65 No. 24 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to approve under Section 10 of the Barbados Harbours Act, 1960, the sum of \$7,200 to supplement the Estimates of the Port Department for the year 1964-65 as shown in the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Education, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of \$34,053 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1964-65 Part II - Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1964-65 No. 27 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 the money Resolutions of which notice was given today.

REPLY TO QUESTION

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I also beg to give notice of the fact that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 6/1964 asked by the hon. junior member for St. John, is now ready.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S NOTICE

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

WHEREAS a vast number of parents with children attending school have become very neglectful with regard to their responsibilities,

AND WHEREAS teachers do experience much difficulty in teaching such children,

BE IT RESOLVED that Government issue a directive to all Heads of schools requesting the establishment of parent-teachers associations in an effort to enlighten the said parents with respect to their duties.
2.55 p.m.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I do not know how hon. members feel about it, but this is now formally Question Time and we proceed from there to Private Members' Business. If hon. members have no objection, at least those who have business standing in their names, the hon. senior member for Bridgetown, the hon. senior member for St. Michael and the hon. junior member for Christ Church, I will move the suspension of the Standing Orders to do the four Resolutions standing under Government Business, and then we can adjourn. These will not take too much time. The Government contemplates a short recess, perhaps after next Tuesday, for the summer, and if hon. members are inclined to facilitate an early adjournment, I should like to move the suspension of the Standing Orders, if they want it, because I do not want it to be said that we are taking away their time. (Mr. SMITH: You can adjourn now).

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16, 18, 40 and 45 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting.

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

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

QUESTION TIME

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Question Time be now taken.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: This is now Question Time and the only Reply ready is to Parliamentary Question No. 6 standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. John.

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the Question reads as follows:-

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware that the cost of obtaining a good and marketable title to land in this Island is well nigh prohibitive, especially to owners of land not exceeding in value the sum of £500?

2. Will Government ensure, by legislation or otherwise, that a graded scale of fees and expenses with respect thereto, be drawn up so as to alleviate this hardship?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows:-

"No Sir, but the Government is aware that since the abolition of the Assistant Court of Appeal the cost of obtaining title to land has increased; and where the value does not exceed \$2,400 the increase is approximately 100%.

The cost of obtaining title to land is mainly fixed by the Rules of the Supreme Court, 1958. Part of the increase is due to the fact that whereas in an action in the Assistant Court of Appeal advertisements could appear in any newspaper, under the Rules of the Supreme Court, 1958, advertisements must appear in a daily newspaper and in an issue of the Official Gazette.

The question of the increase in cost of obtaining title to land is engaging the attention of the Judicial Advisory Council, which is the body responsible for making the Rules of the Supreme Court.

A new system of Registration of title which should reduce the cost of acquisition and of transfer of title is part of the Government's programme."

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day is to resume Committee on the Bill to amend the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank Act, 1943.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 2 be the first Order of the Day.

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

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

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.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1964-65 No. 23

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, the gaining of independence by Jamaica and Trinidad resulted in these two territories withdrawing their contribution to the Pan American Health Organisation, and has resulted in an increase in the contribution made by Barbados to P.A.H.O. This increase is equivalent to 31.6 per cent of the original contribution which had been made. There has been provision for the contribution to the Pan American Health Organisation of \$4,463 in the Estimates, and the increased provision which is sought is 31.6 per cent of the \$4,463 which amounts to \$1,373.
3.05 p.m.

Now, the fact cannot be gainsaid that there is assistance given by relative organisations to Barbados. We have been given assistance in the B.C.G. campaign, the Aedes Aegypti Eradication campaign, the establishment of the Environmental Sanitation campaign, the establishment of the Public Health Laboratory Service, the Post of Graduate Training of Public Health Staff, the Refuge Disposal and sewerage problems in connection with the Caricianna, Hilton and other projects. I do not think it is necessary for me to try to convince this House to make this contribution and I, therefore, beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON in each case, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL
ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL)
(AMENDMENT) (No. 7)
ORDER, 1964

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to take charge of the next Resolution which stands in the name of the Hon. Premier.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. John, and the hon. senior member for St. Andrew is seeking the leave of the House to take charge of it.

If there is no objection, leave will be granted the Hon. Minister. *(A Pause).*

There being no objection, leave is granted the Hon. Minister.

This Order is: To move the passing of the following Resolution: A Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 7) Order, 1964.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, now that the new Hospital has come into being, it has become necessary to make the necessary provision for adequate staff so that the services may be improved and it will develop to expectations of a leading Hospital as this Hospital is expected to do.

We have spent several weeks going into the details of our staffing problems. We have had consultants from the World Health Organisation, from the University of the West Indies and we have had experts in Hospital Administration who came down to advise us over the past few months in respect of staffing.

The Resolution before us takes care of the minimum requirements for staffing the Hospital so that it may be efficiently run. It is to be noted that the post of Medical Superintendent will be abolished and the actual administration of the Hospital will be done by a qualified Hospital Administrator. *(Hear! Hear!)* Representation has already been made to the United Nations Technical Corporation and the World Health Organisation for assistance in personnel for two years while we send one of our officers for training in Hospital Administration.

Now, Sir, it is to be remembered that when these consultants visited Barbados and the new General Hospital, their recommendations were that the post of Administrator of the Hospital should be a full-time post for a Hospital of that size, but that is not to say that the present holder of the post, or the person who is presently responsible for the administration of the Hospital, was in any way inefficient. When it is considered that two jobs were performed by one man, it must be said that the present holder of the office has done the job admirably and all praise is due to him. The time has come when with a Hospital the size of the new one, when aspirations are to reach the highest standard, it is inevitable that we must have a full time Administrator. 3.15 p.m.

On the other hand, the present holder of the post who is responsible for administration, is very well qualified as a Physician Specialist, and it is felt that he could do this community a greater service if he employs himself with more practice. Therefore, it is to be noted that the post of Chief

Physician Specialist will be created. That is one of the Specialist posts, and this post is created with the salary of the post which is now being abolished. It carries the same salary as that of the Medical Superintendent, that is to say, a salary of \$9,240 per annum. It is also to be noted that there will be increases in the Medical Staff from 28 to 49. At present there are 11 Specialists on the Staff of the Hospital and this number will be increased to 16. There are four Registrars and that number will be increased to 13. There are 9 regular Officers and that number will be increased to 14. There are four interneers, which number was increased to six last week, so that the total Medical Staff at the Hospital will now be 49 as against 28.

Hon. members will be interested in noting how the Specialists will be spread out. There is one post of Chief Physician Specialist and there will also be an additional post of Physician Specialist. There will be a Specialist Paediatrician. Hon. members will have heard of, or when they have visited the Hospital they will be shown, the Paediatric Department and for the first time there will be a Paediatrician. At the present time, the attention which should be paid to children at the Hospital is not considered to be satisfactory, because this attention is being paid by a Physician who is doing general practice. There is no bearing of any great emphasis on Paediatrics, and therefore with the establishment of a Paediatric Department, we will have people who have spent years in gaining knowledge of dealing with children. It may be said that this is a small Department, a matter of eighty beds, but it is also to be appreciated that a sick child demands even greater attention than a sick adult. Hence the justification for the establishment of this Paediatric Department.

Mr. Speaker, I know that there are certain of my hon. friends who will be pleased to hear that the post of Visiting E.N.T. Surgeon will be abolished. That is a part-time post, and a full-time post will be established. There is also the post of Assistant E.N.T. Surgeon at present and this post will be abolished. Therefore we will have the abolition of the post of Assistant Surgeon and we will have the establishment of the post of Paediatric Surgeon and Visiting Surgeon. This is necessary because at the present time there are about two thousand people who are on the waiting list for E.N.T. Treatment and we hope that with the establishment of this post to a full-time post this waiting list will be considerably reduced. *(Cheers!)* There will also be another post of Surgeon Specialist, and this post will have its emphasis on the Casualty and Out-patients Department. At the present time, the services rendered at the Casualty and Out-patient Department are considered to be unsatisfactory and great consideration has been given to that, resulting in the establishment of a surgeon in that Department. The Additional Surgeon Specialist will be primarily responsible for the Out-patients and Casualty Department. He will have a Registrar, and he will have his Medical Officers, and they will be directly responsible for the running of this Department. I hope that my honourable friend will no longer find it necessary to complain about the inefficiency of the Casualty and Out-patients Department.

Next we come to the Dispensary. There have been many complaints made about the Dispensary. Some people have stated that they have to wait for two or three days before they can get their prescriptions filled. May I explain, Sir, that because of the inadequacy of space at the old Hospital, although we were willing to establish more posts of Dispenser, there was no space for them to work! Because of that fact we have had to put up with the inadequate service. I may point out here that in 1961 the average number of monthly prescriptions filled was 8,373 and by October, 1963, that number had risen to above 10,000 per month. Hence hon. members will agree with me that, with this small staff, nothing more could have been done. 3.25 p.m.

Now, with improved facilities and with more space and more staff at the new Hospital, we will be able to offset those criticisms which were levelled at the Dispenser. It is to be noted that there were five posts plus one temporary post of Dispenser, and these include the Chief Dispenser in this Department, and these six posts will be increased by 50 per cent to nine posts.

Recently there has been great demand on the Hospital for a Physiotherapist, and this Establishment Order provides for one. If you were to look at the X-Ray Department, it is to be noted that there will be an increase from eight Radiographers to fourteen in this Department, and the emphasis here is placed on the diagnostic part of the Department because this is where most of the work is done as against work done in the therapy department. Now in the Pathologist and Bacteriologist's Department, the technicians will be increased from ten to seventeen. The Laboratory Assistants will be increased from two to three, and there will be two Departmental Aids.

I should like to say something on the question of Departmental Aids. Hon. members may wonder what we mean by Departmental Aids. At present there are several attendants who work in the Laboratory and the Operating Theatres and who assist the surgeons and other specialists ably in the provision of the cleaning of the equipment. The skill which these people have acquired over the past years is considered semi-technical, and because of that, there has been the establishment of a new grade of this type of worker that is considered as a semi-technician, and they call these Departmental Aids. Now I may say that the increase in the number of technicians in the Department of Pathology and Bacteriology is absolutely necessary if the Hospital is to be run as a teaching hospital. Very strong representation was made by the University of the West Indies for a well equipped laboratory, and Rockefeller Foundation is even considering giving assistance in the training of these Pathological Officers at the University of the West Indies so that our Hospital in these parts may be adequately supplied. It was only yesterday that three representatives were here.

On the question of nurses, at present the amount of staff nurses including from Staff Nurse to Matron Grade at the hospital is 144. This is to be increased to 228. There are thirty Ward Assistants and these will be increased to 60. The present number of 157 student nurses will be increased to 240. If hon. members would check the Order, they will see that consideration has also been given to the upgrading of the post of Matron and Assistant Matron, and also the post of Principal Tutor. These posts will be upgraded in keeping with the responsibilities of these officers. Some hon. members may wonder whether these nurses will be adequate to man the hospital, and I may point out here that a member of Faculty of Medicine at the University of the West Indies has expressed his views on it and has stated that this number of nurses is quite satisfactory for the time being.

Let us go to the Records Department. It is to be noted that the number of officers in this Department will be increased from twelve to nineteen. At present there are twelve officers in this Department and assistance is given by two Orderlies. Of course, hon. members will agree with me that this is unsatisfactory. An Orderly should perform the duties of an Orderly and not of a Records Officer, and therefore the posts will be increased to nineteen together with two Records Assistants. Now these Records Assistants are in the same grade as Clerical Assistants, and they will do the work which is presently done by the Orderlies.

Now we come to the Medical Supplies Department. There is a post of Hospital Supplies Officer and there is an additional post now of Assistant Hospital Supplies Officer. There are, of course, medical supplies, and have nothing to do with food. The Steward and his assistant are responsible for the food section, whilst the Hospital Supplies Officer is responsible for the medical section of the stores.

There is a new post created in the Linen Department, that of Sewing Mistress. The post of Linen Keeper in this Department is to be abolished, and the post goes on to the Laundry section. There is a post of Linen Keeper for the Laundry, but the post of Linen Keeper in the Sewing Department is abolished, and the person in charge of that Department will be the Sewing Mistress. The post of Assistant Seamstress will now become Seamstress, and the post of Seamstress will become Senior Seamstress. The establishment in this section has been increased from 18 to 24. Next we come to the Laundry. The present establishment is 34

and it is being increased to 38, which includes the establishment of the Linen Keeper, 3.35 p.m.

The three additional posts are three additional posts of operators. There have been additional machines set up in this Department and the three additional operators are established to look after these machines.

It is to be noted that in the present establishment there are three posts of Works Manager, Foreman and Assistant Foreman that seem to be connected to the laundry. Well, they are not included in the laundry and these posts will be abolished. Hon. members will remember that only a few weeks ago we dealt with the maintenance staff for the Hospital. The work done at the old Hospital by those persons are taken care of by the maintenance staff of the new Hospital. The only thing which is not taken care of is the work done by the carpenters, and in this Resolution there will be established the post of Works Foreman and this Works Foreman is the head of the carpenters' section of the Hospital.

On the food side, there is the creation of the post of Dietician. Formerly, there was the post of Dietician-Housekeeper. It is not considered in keeping with the present Hospital requirements that there should be the post of Dietician-Housekeeper and, accordingly, that post is abolished and the post of Dietician is created.

There is the post of Catering Officer which is proposed to be established which carries the same salary as the former post of Dietician-Housekeeper. There will be also an Assistant Catering Officer established and this post takes the place of Assistant Dietician-Housekeeper.

The nine posts of Kitchen Supervisor will be replaced by twelve posts of Catering Supervisor and the sixteen cooks will be increased to 25 cooks. The twenty posts of Kitchen Maid will be increased to twenty-three. Then the five posts of Sharer will be abolished. The reason why these posts are abolished is because there will be no sharing done in the kitchen. Provision is made to send the food to the wards in trolleys and the sharing will be taken care of in the wards.

The post of Housekeeper will be abolished and the 38 Ward Maids will be increased to 54.

Now, the post of Manageress, Nurses' Home is to be abolished and the post of Sister in charge of the Nurses' Home is to be created. It is felt that there should be a trained nurse in charge of the Nurses' Home of a Sister's grade in preference to a mere manageress of the Home.

The fifteen posts of Attendant are increased to 29 posts, and then there will be 28 posts of Departmental Aide created. I have already referred to these. Nineteen of these will be in charge of the work in the Supply Department.

There are seven posts of Gate Keeper and these will be increased to fifteen. Hon. members may want to know the reason why. There are more gates at the New Hospital and these people will have to be responsible for keeping out undesirables.

Now, Sir, the next thing is under General Administration in the Office Staff. I should like to inform hon. members that the Hospital will be run by a Board and in a few weeks time legislation will be introduced for the creation of a Board to be in charge of the Hospital. (Cheers!)

As I have said already, there is provision in this Establishment Order for the post of Administrator, and in the getting of this person, we are given assistance by the W.H.O. The post of Hospital Secretary would be abolished and the post of Chief Executive Officer will be established. The Chief Executive Officer will be responsible for the general administration, personnel and establishment matters, and along with the post of Chief Executive Officer there will be post of Senior Accountant who will be directly responsible to the Hospital Administrator for the accounts, which includes paying and receiving.

Then there will be the post of Almoner. This post is a sort of Hospital social worker, and his job will be to follow up cases for the medical staff. We are looking forward to the time when we may have to establish more of these posts when the cases of people who experience difficulty in paying debts will be gone into to find out whether they are able to pay or not.

There is an increase in the clerical staff to cope with the additional work. There are at present five clerks, and these will be increased to eight, two Secretaries increased to four, two additional Copy Typists and the one post of Clerical Assistant increased to nine.

There will be five Telephone Operators. I think they will be using the P.B.X. System and these five operators will work on a shift system so that there will be a twenty-four-hour a day coverage. The doctors will have a call system so that if they are at home at Enmore and they are needed at the Hospital, there will be no telephone message sent to them; they will be buzzed by a buzzing device system.

Now, Sir, over and above the \$590,000 which we are asking here for is the sum of \$40,000 for the unestablished staff, \$144 for the Supervisor of Gardens and consideration has to be given to the provision of food and uniform for the resident staff.
3.45 p.m.

This will approximate to \$120,000 and the revenue gained from that will be about \$20,000. With this establishment it will be approximately \$1 3/4 million which will be spent in staffing the new Hospital. With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL
ESTABLISHMENT (PART-TIME)
(AMENDMENT) ORDER 1964

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the Hon. Premier. Will the Hon. Minister of Social Service seek the leave of the House to take charge of this Resolution?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Health is asking leave of the House to take charge of this Order which stands in the name of the Hon. Premier, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted. (*Pause*). There being no objection, leave is granted and the Hon. Minister may proceed. This Order is to move the passing of the following Resolution:

A Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Part-Time Officers) (Amendment) Order, 1964.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, in my introduction of the former Resolution, I mentioned that there were certain changes or amendments made at the Hospital. I referred to the Assistant E.N.T. Surgeon, the Visiting Surgeon, but there is one thing which I omitted to mention and that was the question of the transfer of the work which is now being done by the present Maternity Hospital to the Obstetric Department of the new Hospital. This will result in the abolition of some of the part-time posts. At present, there is a full-time Obstetrician at the Hospital, and it will not therefore be necessary to have the post of Obstetrician at the Maternity Hospital, as is now the practice. All this Resolution seeks to do, therefore, is to get the record straight with these Part-time Officers, which I have already explained when I was dealing with the former Resolution. I therefore beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I hope that the hon. member does not think that he was allowed to slip away with anything when he was dealing with the first Resolution. Quite honestly, Sir, although it is his duty to defend, when he thinks there is something to be defended, when he cannot defend anything he honestly tells you what the position is. I admire that. I believe that with the changes which are being made at the Hospital, there is really no room for criticism. That is one of the reasons why I was not vociferous or I did not make any comments on the last Resolution. However, Sir, when it comes to this Resolution which is now before us, I would like to have just a few questions answered. As I understand it, Sir, the Maternity Hospital at Bank Hall will be abolished and everything will be conducted at the General Hospital. The Addendum to this Resolution sets out that there is to be the creation of a post of Visiting Obstetrician at a salary of \$1,200 per annum. The Addendum states as follows:-

- (c) the creation of a post of Visiting Obstetrician \$1,200 p.a.

It is proposed to incorporate in the General Hospital the services now offered by the Maternity Hospital and abolish the post of Visiting Obstetrician, Maternity Hospital. A post of Visiting Obstetrician, equal in status to the posts of Visiting Surgeon, should therefore be provided for the General Hospital.

- (d) the regrading of the post of Dental Surgeon from \$960 to \$1,920 per annum.

I should like to ask what is going to happen. Are we to understand that the entire system of Visiting Surgeons will be abolished or not? The Hon. Minister was rather lengthy in his introduction of the first Resolution, and he tried to explain matters as clearly as he possibly could.

We do not want to waste time with this matter, but in any system which seems to be better after a change, I think it is better to allow some time before any criticism is levelled. Although we must provide things by statute, I would enquire whether you will allow Ministers of any Denomination to go into the Hospital. It seems to me, Sir, that as soon as you put some people in authority, they seem to feel that there is one God here and another God there or that they know the only God. In the United States Navy, you have about 2,000 men and you have a Jewish Chaplain, a Roman Catholic Chaplain, and so on. I do not think it is necessary to have all of these, but I would feel quite happy, if I were confined to a bed in the Hospital, to be ministered to by the Chaplain which I think the Government would be appointing. Surely, you will want to have the Chaplain of your religious faith to minister to you. Will the Hon. Minister tell us what is going to be the position in respect of this matter?

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to mention this. The Hon. Minister has said that they were going to appoint a Board to administer the Hospital. That is something which the general public will appreciate very much, and therefore I was not singing any solo in that. Hon. members will await the efficiency of the running of the Hospital by a Board. As far as the few questions which I have asked are concerned, I know that the Hon. Minister in his usual style will be courteous enough to give us the answers to those questions. Otherwise, he has my unanimous support of this Resolution.
3.55 p.m.

Mr. MILLER: My point is similar to that of the last Speaker on the Visiting Surgeons at the Hospital who have rendered yeoman service over the years. We observe from the remarks of the Minister that this post and that of Gynaecologist will be abolished, and a post of Visiting Surgeon will be provided.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I should like the hon. member to speak into the microphone so that I can hear what he is saying. I would like to reply to him and not appear to be unmannerly.

Mr. MILLER: We were in trouble on this side when we were concentrating on the Hospital. However, if the hon. member can confirm what the hon. senior member for Bridgetown said, I may probably have nothing to say. If it is true that you are not going to abolish the post of Visiting Surgeon in this Institution, I would have nothing to say.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. junior member for St. George concluded or is giving way to the Hon. Minister of Health?

Mr. MILLER: I think it would curtail a lot of debate if the Hon. Minister would repeat what I should have heard but did not hear when he was speaking. I know I cannot sit down when the Speaker is in the Chair because I would forfeit my right to speak again, but I should like to get some indication without going directly through the Speaker who is so graciously occupying the Chair. I want to be sure whether the posts will be abolished, because there was a recommendation in the Gillette Report that the posts should be abolished. This I do not agree with, and I was hoping that the Minister would repeat what he said. Am I correct in hearing that the Minister did say that the posts will not be abolished? It is very difficult for me to say anything on this matter until I know whether or not they will be retained. Indications are that we have a second Surgeon Specialist in the major Departments, and I know that we have appointed an Obstetrician and a Gynaecologist.

However, Sir, I gather from an aside that the Minister is not going to abolish the post of Visiting Surgeon as hinted at in a number of Reports, especially the Gillette Report, and I need not hold the House up unnecessarily.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there any other hon. member seeking to contribute to this debate? Let the hon. junior member for St. Andrew avail himself of the right of final reply.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member seems to be worried about the abolition of the post of Visiting Surgeon and so on, but if hon. members were to read the notes carefully, they will see that the post of Assistant Visiting Surgeon will be abolished, but on page 108 of the Estimates for 1964-65 we are still creating three posts of Visiting Surgeon. There will be the employment of additional full-time Surgeons who will look after fractures, with emphasis on the Casualty and Outpatients' Department, and the appointment of a Registrar together with five additional Medical Officers. We are appreciative of the work done by the Visiting Surgeons and the Assistant Visiting Surgeons, and we can only thank them for the services they have rendered. We are not getting rid of the Visiting people, but to have a more efficient and up-to-date service, we consider it necessary and more in the interest of the community to have full-time established posts rather than having part-time Assistant Visiting Surgeons coming into the Hospital; but we are still keeping the Visiting Surgeons.

Hon. members will also note, Mr. Speaker, that although we have abolished the post of Assistant Visiting Surgeon or Assistant Part-time Surgeon in the E.N.T. Department, we have still created that post. There is a difference between the E.N.T. Surgeon Part-time and the Visiting E.N.T. Surgeon. My friend, the hon. senior member for Bridgetown, will understand me. The hon. senior member for Bridgetown referred to the question of Officers of Religion, and wondered whether one sector of the religious community will be allowed to visit the Hospital and not another sector. This will not be so. All members of the various religious denominations will be granted the necessary permission to go into the Hospital at a specific time to administer the sacrament to members of their religious sect, regardless of class or creed. I may point out here that presently the Hospital regulations are being revised, and hon. members will be acquainted with the revision of these regulations in a few weeks from now.

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

RESOLUTION TO INCREASE NUMBER OF UNESTABLISHED POSTS AT GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned senior member for St. John: to move the passing of a Resolution to increase the number of unestablished posts at the General Hospital as set out in the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, again I must refer to my introductory remarks in dealing with the established posts in the Civil Establishment Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is Order No. 5.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I should like to ask the leave of the House to deal with this Resolution standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. John.
4.05 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Andrew is asking leave to deal with this Resolution which stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Premier. This Resolution deals with matters of health and if there is no objection, leave will be granted the Hon. Minister. *(A Pause).*

There being no objection, leave is granted the Hon. Minister.

This Resolution is: To move the passing of the following Resolution: A Resolution to increase the number of non-established posts at the General Hospital as set out in the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, hon. members will remember that I referred to the number of student nurses at present on the non-established posts at the Hospital, and I said that the number was 157. This number will be increased to 240. In the same grade of Student Nurse is the question of Ward Nurse. Hon. members may wonder what we mean when we refer to Ward Nurse. A student nurse who has completed her four years of training is no longer a student but, at the same time, she may pass her examination and there may not be vacancies on the established posts of Staff Nurse at the Hospital. Meanwhile, it will not be profitable to our community to turn off this trained person; therefore, she continues to work in the grade of Ward Nurse until such time as the post of Staff Nurse becomes available and she is recommended for the post. These two posts, therefore, are added together to give a grand total of 240 instead of 157. This is what I explained when I introduced the last Resolution.

Last week, we dealt with the question of pre-registration officers, and the Resolution making provision for funds for that purpose was passed; therefore, it is not necessary for me to elaborate on that now.

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

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (NO. 8) ORDER, 1964

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order also stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned senior member for St. John, and it is to move the passing of the following Resolution: A Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 8) Order, 1964.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking for leave to take charge of this Resolution standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. John.

There being no objection, leave was granted the Hon. Minister.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution deals with the re-organisation of the staff of the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries. You will note that on integrating the Divisions of Agriculture and Fisheries in the Ministry, the functions of the office of Superintendent of Markets have been considerably reduced and no longer require an officer with qualifications in Veterinary Science. These functions are now limited largely to inspecting markets, issuing licences, allocating stalls to applicants, liaison with the Police in regard to the administration of markets legislation.

It is no longer the necessity for a qualified scientific officer, and the day to day routine in which the officer is concerned no longer merits the salary scale attached to the post. This Resolution is therefore abolishing that post of Superintendent of Markets and creating the post of Chief Supervisor, and it re-fixes the salary scale on a lower level.

Inasmuch as there is the abolition of this post of Superintendent of Markets, the post of Clerk to the Superintendent becomes a misnomer and since the holder of this post is primarily responsible for the accounts of the Department, it is therefore proposed to change the name of the post to Accounts Clerk.

The salary scale of the Chief Supervisor which replaces the post of Superintendent of Markets is at the rate of \$4,128 — 5,136. That when compared with the salary for the Superintendent which is \$6,600 — 7,080, is a marked reduction. In other words, the reduction is something like \$1,850 below the original post.

I do not think there is anything more which needs to be said on this. The Resolution is just to abolish one post and create another at a lower salary level and then to change the title of the Assistant to the Superintendent of Markets to Accounts Clerk.

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

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have nothing against the Resolution except for the purpose of quoting what was said at the time when the post of Superintendent of Markets was established. The Hon. Minister at that time argued that it was necessary to have a man trained in Veterinary Science, and we protested and said that one properly trained in the inspection of meat and food should be able to do this job. I remember that well.

I will just ask the Hon. Minister one question. I quite agree with the Government in making this reduction. Actually, it was necessary. It is stated here that the func-

tions of this officer are now limited largely to inspecting markets, issuing licences, allocating stalls to applicants, and liaison with the Police in regard to the administration of markets legislation.

The inspection of meat comes under the Ministry of Agriculture in the slaughterhouse. I have always argued that such men trained in the inspection of meat, that is to say, a well qualified inspector trained in Veterinary Science could do this job.

4.15 p.m.

I wonder if the Hon. Minister would say what is to be done now with the inspection of meat. This is a very important matter. The whole idea is to rope in as many as you can in order to make sure that you have the scientific inspection which is necessary; but you need not have a Veterinary Inspector to do this work as time goes on. If you have these functions as set out here (a) inspecting markets; (b) issuing licences; (c) allocating stalls to applicants and (d) liaison with the Police in regard to the administration of markets legislation, that leads hon. members to wonder what is to be done. This is the work of the Superintendent of the Market. If people are offered courses in Jamaica, they are qualified for detecting various diseases in these animals. I would like the Hon. Minister to enlighten us on this matter; otherwise I wholeheartedly support the Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: As it appears that no other hon. member wants to speak on this Resolution, the Hon. Minister may exercise his right of final reply.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, my information is that the responsibility for meat inspection has been transferred to the Veterinary division of the Ministry which is under the control and supervision of Dr. Proverbs. I am sure that the hon. member will be quite satisfied that the work of meat inspection is in capable hands.

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

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, that is the final matter which remained for consideration by this Chamber at today's sitting. I therefore beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 25th August, 1964, at 2.30 o'clock p.m.

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

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 25th August, 1964, at 2.30 o'clock p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

4.20 p.m.



THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1961-66

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 25th August, 1964.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 2.30 p.m. o'clock today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, O.C., (*Speaker*); Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, (*Minister of Development, Trade, Labour and Social Security*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Mr. E. St. A. HOLDER, J.P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Communications and Works*); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Mr. S. E. SEALEY; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (*Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries*); Mr. W. R. COWARD; Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. G. V. BATSON, (*Chairman of Committees*); Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (*Minister of Health, Housing, Local Government and Community Development*).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret to have to inform the House that the Minutes of the previous two meetings are not yet ready. I am advised that they may be ready and available this afternoon.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Statement in regard to the expenditure of the grant made to the Barbados General Agricultural Society under Head 47 -- Item 1.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of "Fairy Valley Plantation".

Also on behalf of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to approve the guarantee by the Government of payment of principal and interest on authorised borrowings of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation not exceeding in the aggregate \$510,000.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to approve the expenditure of \$2,400 to supplement the Estimates of the Port Department for the year 1964-65.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to approve that the sum of \$23,550 provided in the Estimates 1964-65, Part II -- Capital under Head 5 Item 7 be now granted for providing -- (a) toilet facilities at the Government Tennis Courts at the Garrison and -- (b) construction of three hard courts at University Row.

Resolution to place the sum of \$1,050 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1964-65 Part I -- Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1964-65 No. 28 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to place the sum of \$6,203 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates Part I -- Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1964-65, No. 29 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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 to deal with the money Resolutions of which notice was given today.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank the Report and Accounts to 30th June, 1964.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, in view of the decision to afford hon. members a summer vacation after today's sitting, I am going to ask for leave to deal with a number of the Resolutions of which notice was given today. We will circulate the appropriate papers concerning those which we will seek the approval of the House to deal with today in due course.
2.55 p.m.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, We have a fairly lengthy Order Paper today and I am going to suggest, if hon. members so desire, that they give up the time allocated to them for Private Members' Business to do Government Business with the possible exception of their dealing with the item standing in the name of the hon. junior member for Christ Church which is Order No. 3 under Private Members' Business.

If that is accepted by hon. members on the opposite side, I now beg to move the suspension of Standing Orders

Nos. 5, 14, 16, 18, 40 and 45 for the remainder of today's Session.

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

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Speaker, I would really like to ask permission of the Hon. Leader of the House to deal with Item No. 4 under Private Members' Business standing in my name.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member opposing the motion that these Standing Orders be suspended, or is it that he is seeking a favourable opportunity to deal with Order No. 4 which stands in his name under Private Members' Business?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, my only reason for not including the hon. member's item is because he did not intimate to me his desire of dealing with it.

The question that Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16, 18, 40 and 45 be suspended for the remainder of today's Session, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY re
PASSING OF Mr. F. B. ASHBY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, before we go on to Private Members' Business, perhaps it would be well that we deal with firstly two Resolutions of Sympathy and I may say that with respect to one, it should have been dealt with already.

One is with respect to the passing of a former member of the House of Assembly and, as I have said, I am sure that we would want to apologise for the late dealing with this matter. I refer to the passing of the late Mr. Frederick Bertram Ashby, who was a member of this House of Assembly during 1937-38. The late Mr. Ashby died a few weeks ago and we want to apologise for not having paid this tribute before.

The late Mr. Ashby was a member of the Vestry of Christ Church for a number of years, and I believe he was one of the most outstanding members. At a very young age, in 1937, he was elected to this honourable Chamber, and hon. members are aware that in those days the life of Parliament was only for one year. I am sure Your Honour will recall Mr. Ashby's election to this Chamber for one year. It was the only term which he served in the General Assembly.

However, Sir, both in the Vestry and in this honourable Assembly, the late Mr. F. B. Ashby gave indication that he was a young man of promise in the political well-being of the people of this country; but after his year of office in this Assembly, it was not his personal desire to be very active in the politics of this House of Assembly; else, from indications, he might have made a more remarkable contribution with the passing of time.

Sir, he was very progressive in outlook and hon. members, I am sure, would regret his passing at a fairly young age. I am sure that they would like to go on record in expressing their deep sympathy to his relatives and I, therefore, beg to move the passing of the following Resolution:-

RESOLVED that the House of Assembly place on record its profound sorrow at the passing of Frederick Bertram Ashby, former member of the House of Assembly for the parish of Christ Church, 1937-1938.

AND BE IT RESOLVED that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to his relatives.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I rise to second this Resolution of Sympathy. My first meeting with the late Mr. Frederick Bertram Ashby, who was generally referred to as Mr. "Jack" Ashby, was in 1948 when I stood for election to this Chamber and he supported me. He was always in-

terested in politics and, as was stated, he served the General Assembly for one year and after that, he was made a Justice of the Peace. And it was through that means that he got in touch with the political life of this Island. You could drop in his office at any time and address him on any matter of the moment. After the Vestries went out of existence and Local Government came into being, the late Mr. "Jack" Ashby stood for election to the Southern District Council and was returned. I believe he was very happy during the period that he served. Soon after he was elected his health declined and he became worse; therefore, he sought medical attention in the U.S.A. He returned here feeling not too well.

The late Mr. Ashby was a very outspoken man, and for a politician he often said things which he often regretted; but he was very sincere. We, on this side, support the passing of this Resolution to his relatives.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, unlike the hon. junior member for Christ Church, I did not know the late Mr. Ashby for a very long time; it is only for a short time that I knew him. But during that time, I had conversations with him now and again and I could clearly see that the late Mr. Ashby was very outspoken, as the hon. junior member for Christ Church said. He was very nearly too outspoken to be a politician because he never minced any matters.
3.05 p.m.

He would tell you straight what you had to depend upon, whether you cared to believe him or not. Mr. Ashby was a young man; I met him, it must be, about four years for the first time, and I think it was around the Local Government Election time. I can say that Mr. Ashby, as I had to tell him one day, was too plain to be a politician. At that time one of his constituents stopped at his office and he really talked too plainly to that constituent although he told him the truth. There are lots of people who do not like to hear the truth spoken so plainly. Mr. Ashby said: "Lloyd, that is my make up; if you are vexed, then you are vexed; and if you are pleased, then you are pleased." I said: "Well, I must try to take a leaf out of your book." However, Sir, it was very surprising to me to hear of Mr. Ashby's death, although we know that death is a sure debt which we all have to pay; because never mind how dishonest we are, we have to pay that debt ourselves. There is no judge or magistrate or bailiff who has to call upon you to pay that debt.

Mr. Speaker, it really becomes a shock to us sometimes when we hear of a young person going off the stage, especially one who can play a big part in the community. It has been laid down that so long as you have been born you must die; in fact, we have been born to die. I sincerely hope that all of us who are left behind will take a leaf out of Mr. Ashby's book politically. Let us be plain and outspoken to one another.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, I, too, regret the passing of Mr. Ashby. Having served with him as a Councillor, I must say that he did his utmost for the improvement of the area. I have known Mr. Ashby for approximately twenty-five years, and I remember him coming to St. Philip as a J.P. assisting with the registration of voters. In those days people were not interested in having their names placed on the List, but it was on account of the sacrifice of Mr. Ashby's time and his influence, that many people registered in the parish which I have the honour to represent. I feel that the late Mr. Ashby has rendered very good service to the community and, Sir, I would like to associate myself with the passing of this Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: I also would like to associate myself with the tributes which have been paid to the memory of the late Frederick Bertram Ashby who became a member of this Chamber on the same day that the present Attorney General and myself first became members of this House. Of those three, I am the only survivor, at least in this Chamber. I can attest to the intelligence and candour of the late Mr. Ashby and I join in the sympathy to his surviving relatives. I shall ask, in accordance with age-long custom in this Chamber, that honourable members signify their

assent to the passing of this Resolution by standing in their places for two minutes.

Hon. members stood in their places for two minutes as requested by Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. SPEAKER: Instructions will be issued that forthwith letters of sympathy be forwarded to the nearest relatives of the late Mr. Ashby.

RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY *re* DAMAGE
TO GUADELOUPE BY HURRICANE CLEO

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the other Resolution of sympathy is in connection with the devastation which has been wrought in the neighbouring French colony of Guadeloupe by Hurricane "Cleo". In this connection, I would like to say that hon. members and the public of Barbados were relieved by the fact that this island has been spared the ravages of another hurricane, and that relief and joy was mingled with regret on learning that our sister island in the Caribbean had been rather less fortunate. From reports which have been received so far, a number of people have lost their lives; some have been injured and conservative estimates have placed the number of people who have been homeless to over ten thousand. It is quite true that in this island, with the exception of 1955 and what took place then when we were struck by "Janet", only the fairly old had a knowledge of what a hurricane was like, because, for over fifty years, this island had been spared the ravages of a hurricane. With our experience in 1955 with "Janet" relatively moderate as it was, it still gave the current generation some idea of the havoc which these tropical storms can cause, and the suffering and disruption which they can leave in their wake. Guadeloupe is not, like ourselves, a British Colony, and so it has had but little association with the British Colonies; I think that the only association between the French and the British West Indian Colonies was under the old Caribbean Commission. Although our contact with the West Indian Island of Guadeloupe is of so slight a nature, yet on grounds of humanitarianism since we are located in the Caribbean and are therefore subjected from time to time by visitations of tropical storms, we feel it our duty to extend our most profound sympathy to the people of Guadeloupe in the calamity which has befallen them.

3.15 p.m.

I said earlier, Sir, that the people of this country over the last weekend heard the joyful news, the fact that a hurricane which at first seemed headed in this direction had diverted, and we therefore no longer had to look forward to being hit by it, and we sincerely hope that this shall be our experience for the remainder of the current hurricane season. We also hope that Guadeloupe will be the only territory in the area to suffer from any tropical disturbance during the remainder of what is known as the "Hurricane Season".

Formally to place on record our sympathy with the people of Guadeloupe, I am going to move the passing of the following Resolution:-

"WHEREAS this House has heard with profound sorrow of the suffering caused to the people of the territory of Guadeloupe by Hurricane Cleo;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House express its sympathy with those who have either been bereaved or injured or rendered homeless in that territory;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the contents of this Resolution be forthwith communicated to the Government of Guadeloupe."

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, historians have recorded that some of the most devastating hurricanes have struck Barbados - I suppose it is because it is the most easterly of these islands - and as the Hon. Leader of the House has said, whenever the question of an approaching hurricane

comes up, it leaves that fear in all of us, and then everybody starts to pray that we may be spared. I agree with him that on Friday evening last when we heard the news that this hurricane was headed for Barbados, the haves and the havenots became one and were all worried, because indeed a hurricane is never guided by any particular hand that will strike the poor and leave the rich, or strike the rich and leave the poor. Those of us who had the experience of 1955 saw the dwellings of the rich and cottages of the humble destroyed while the shacks of the poor in some cases stood up. It was with great relief - I cannot say joy, because it is mixed with sadness - that we heard the news that the hand of fate had directed and steered the hurricane away from Barbados; but indeed, Sir, we listened to the very sad news that it had struck one of our neighbouring islands, though not, as the Hon. Leader of the House has said, a British colony, which makes no difference. It struck a colony of human beings, and we are all indeed very sad to think of the destruction which has been wrought and brought about in the island of Guadeloupe. For us to pass this Resolution today, extending our sympathy to our neighbours, though they speak a different language, I wonder if it is just enough. I wonder that because from the mainland of the United States back to this most easterly of these islands, we have something in common, and that something is poverty; and when disaster strikes, we ought to come to the rescue of each other not only in words, but in a more tangible form - which I do hope in due course this Government will see fit to do.

On behalf of my Party and those of us on this side of the Table, I associate myself with the passing of this Resolution, because although we have not heard of it, I am still prepared to say that even in this Island of Guadeloupe you will find some Barbadians. One of the first things I asked this morning as I tumbled out of bed was what was the news of Jamaica. As we were listening in, we heard that it was headed directly for Kingston, and we were all worried; but God in His infinite mercy spared Barbados, spared Jamaica and up to now for this season has spared the other British territories in this area. You know the old adage that that which has missed you might not have passed you, and therefore we must still continue to pray that at least throughout this season we might be spared from the ravages which these hurricanes can cause.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to associate myself on behalf of my Party with the remarks of the Resolution moved by the Hon. Leader of the House, and further I say that I believe that speaking as Leader of the Opposition, the independent and other members of the Opposition would be quite willing to support the Government in any way that we could help rather than merely by this Resolution, whether by gift of food or gifts of any kind to the Red Cross. It is not a matter of their being French and our being British; it is a matter as the Hon. Leader of the House has said, of humanity, the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

I have much pleasure in seconding the Resolution moved by the Hon. Leader of the House.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this Resolution with respect to hurricane Cleo which struck Guadeloupe and has caused great disaster in that country.

3.25 p.m.

Sitting here I have heard various speakers, and their speeches have struck me and appealed to my attention. I would add that a hurricane or a storm when one arises, be it in Barbados, Trinidad or any part of the world, is uncontrollable in the hands of man. Man can do nothing when a storm comes; when it has done its destruction he can only sympathise; therefore, today we must sympathise with the poverty stricken people of Guadeloupe.

We have engineers, scientists and all kinds of people who can direct atomic weapons and satellites wherever they want them to go. Man can cause an atomic bomb to hit any part of the world, but I am sure that no man can direct a storm. He cannot stop it from its path nor can he reduce its power. I remember some time ago reading part of the Bible where it said that while a disciple was on a ship and

the Master was in it that a storm appeared and that disciple told the Master: "Master, seest not that we perish?" and the Master arose and rebuked the storm. There is only one person who can control a storm and that is God Almighty, therefore, we have to be in sympathy with the people wherever a storm arises. I hope that this Government would in the very near future bring in a Resolution for the relief of those poverty stricken people, and I will wholeheartedly agree with it.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on the question of more practical expression of sympathy to the people of Guadeloupe in respect of the havoc created by Hurricane "Cleo", I would just like to say that news about it only reached us on Sunday and naturally there has not been any meeting of the Cabinet since then; but I have no doubt that at the next meeting of the Cabinet, sympathy in a more tangible form will be extended - sympathy which this Government is able to extend.

I can say this beyond a shadow of doubt that the desire as expressed by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and the hon. senior member for St. Andrew will fortify the members of the Cabinet in any decision which they may reach with regard to extending financial aid to Guadeloupe, of course, within the limits of our own financial capabilities. The fact that no indication has been given to the House today of the Government's intention should not be regarded, Sir, in the light of the Government's non-intention to express its sympathy to our West Indian neighbours in a more practical form. It is merely that no opportunity has arisen for appropriate consideration to be given to this matter. In due course, that due consideration would be given.

I need hardly say that these statements today would be of some assurance to the Government that the Legislature would give adequate support to any proposal to extend practicable sympathy to the people of Guadeloupe so long as hon. members are convinced that this gesture is no more than this Government can sustain.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: May I say that steps will be taken to have this Resolution telegraphed to the Governor of Guadeloupe forthwith.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Private Members' Business be now taken to deal with orders Nos. 3 and 4.

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

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

THE ESSO STANDARD OIL S.A. LIMITED (JETTY) BILL, 1964

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order for which permission has been given to be dealt with is in the name of the hon. junior member for Christ Church; Second reading of a Bill to authorise the Esso Standard Oil S. A. Limited to erect a jetty at Half Moon Fort, St. Lucy.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill, to permit Esso Standard Oil S. A. Limited to erect a jetty off their property at Half Moon Fort, St. Lucy, for the purpose of establishing an Oil Depot for the refuelling mainly of fishing boats, I just want to say that at that part of the Island there is a large fishing fleet and there is a rather crude system of getting fuel to the boats. The Esso Standard Oil Company is prepared to erect this jetty for the fuelling of the fishing fleet there and it has all the safeguards in the Bill. Plans are submitted to the Government for approval and the Government is protected in every way.

This is just a Bill to have this jetty erected in time for the fishing season which would start in December.

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

Mr. SEALEY: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I now beg to move that this Bill be now referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

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

3.35 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: In accordance with the decision of this Chamber that this Bill be now referred to a Select Committee, I will ask the following hon. members if they will be good enough to serve thereon:-

The hon. junior member for Christ Church (Mr. Goddard); the hon. senior member for St. Michael (Mr. Sealey); the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries (Hon. G. G. Fergusson) and the hon. senior member for St. Thomas (Mr. Batson). It is thought desirable that at least one representative of a constituency which does not abut or bound the sea should be a member of this Committee.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that Your Honour associate yourself with the Members of this Select Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank the hon. member for that suggestion, and I am willing to associate myself with that Committee, if the House so desires.

ST. STEPHEN'S CHAPEL (VICAR'S RESIDENCE) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 4 is the other matter which the House has decided that it would deal with under Private Members' Business. That Order stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Michael:- To move the second reading of a Bill to authorise the Lord Bishop *et al* to sell land at St. Stephen's St. Michael.

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Speaker, this Bill, speaks for itself. It seeks to authorise the Bishop of Barbados and the Rector of the parish of Saint Michael either to sell as a whole or to divide and sell in lots a parcel of land containing by admeasurement eighty-two thousand seven hundred and fifty-two square feet (formerly part and parcel of a larger area of land containing five acres two roods seven perches) which together with the messuage or dwellinghouse thereon called "Wilton" is used as a residence for the Vicar for the time being of Saint Stephen's Chapel and to invest the moneys arising therefrom either in the erection or purchase of another residence for the Vicar for the time being of Saint Stephen's Chapel or in any of the modes of investments for the time being authorised by the laws of Barbados for the investment of trust funds and to apply the income to arise therefrom for the use of the Vicar for the time being of Saint Stephen's Chapel.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, this Bill speaks for itself. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to invite the following hon. members to be members of that Select Committee:- The hon. senior member for St. Michael (Mr. Sealey); the hon. senior member for Bridgetown (Mr. Mottley); the hon. junior member for St. Lucy (Hon. J. C. Tudor) and the hon. junior member for St. Michael (Hon. G. G. Fergusson).

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

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

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

RESOLUTION re. ESTIMATES FOR THE PORT DEPARTMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works:-

To move the passing of the following Resolution:

A Resolution to approve under Section 10 of the Barbados Harbours Act, 1960, the sum of \$7,200 to supplement the Estimates of the Port Department for the year 1964-65 as shown in the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, hon. members will recall that the post of Port Manager was established on a contractual basis in that it was felt that an experienced and very competent officer should be appointed, in the first instance, in order to give the Port Department the necessary experience and to give the necessary assistance by way of legislation in establishing the post at the very inception. It is for that reason that the first Port Manager was appointed and at that time the office was rather over and above the post of a regular officer on the Establishment Staff. The Port Manager was secured on contract and he received a non-pensionable salary of \$12,000 per annum or \$1,000 a month. He was employed on contract and that contract ended on the 31st July, this year. It is now considered desirable to appoint another officer, not on contract but on a permanent pensionable basis. After going into the matter carefully, it has been felt that the office is one of great responsibility and compares with other Heads of Departments, and that the salary scale in the order of \$8,640 per annum would be a fit and proper one for this office.

Therefore, Sir, this Resolution, as the Addendum sets out, seeks to provide the sum of \$7,200 which is required to supplement the Annexed Estimates for the Port Department, to meet the salary and pension contributions and to establish the post of Port Manager in respect of the period from the 1st August, 1964, to the 31st March, 1965. 3.45 p.m.

The post is being established by the provisions of the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 9) Order, 1964. The Port Manager is to be paid a salary of \$8,640 per annum and pension contributions are calculated at the rate of 25% of salary. For the remainder of this financial year the sum of \$5,760 is therefore required to meet the salary and \$1,440 pension contributions.

The present officer who has been seconded and who will be permanently employed in this post has received special training and is considered suitable for carrying on this very onerous job. The Port is run on a commercial basis, and he has received the necessary amount of training to carry on where the retired Port Manager has left off.

Our First Port Manager has done an exceptionally good job and has put the Port on a very firm and good commercial footing, and we hope that his successor for whom this post is presently being established will follow in his footsteps, and continue to make the Port a paying department of Government as it has been over the last three and a half years.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I support this Resolution. We look forward to the new Port to assist in strengthening the economy of this island. I said that on more than one occasion. It has been well constructed, it has been well established and put on a good footing, and I would say at this stage that the last Port Manager did lay the foundations for sound administration. He has been with us for four years; he came for three years and his term was extended by one year, and now we have a local chap who has been trained at the London Port Authority, and he has taken over. We have confidence that he will fill the bill. He has had the experience and he has the knowledge and know-how of local conditions. We want to see the Port keep to the same high standard that it has been for the past four years, and we wish to support the new Manager in this office. We feel confident that with his qualifications he will have the support of everyone to carry out his duties down there as well as they have been done in the past. We hope that he will be strong enough to deal with all, because he has to deal not only with the labouring side, but also with merchants and ships' masters. He knows his job, and with strong support we feel that the working and the administration of the Harbour will be maintained at a very high standard.

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

THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (NO. 9) ORDER, 1964

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 3 be the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: That Resolution stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned member for St. John.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of this Order standing in the name of the Hon. Premier.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for Christ Church seeks the leave of the House to take charge of Order No. 3 which stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Premier, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted and the hon. senior member for Christ Church may proceed with the Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 9) Order, 1964.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, as the Addendum sets out, this Order entitled The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 9) Order, 1964, was laid here, and deals with the very matter which I dealt with a few minutes ago. As the Addendum further sets out, on the construction of the Deep Water Harbour, it was essential to obtain the services of a Port Manager who had extensive experience in Port Management and could assume the responsibility of laying a proper foundation for the administration of the Port and advising the Government on policy and legislative matters relating to the activities of the new Port. The Government was unable to recruit a suitable officer at a salary

of less than \$12,000 per annum, and the officer's contract expired on 31st July of this year. At present a good foundation for the administration of the Port has been established, and therefore it is no longer essential to recruit a Port Manager with the degree of experience which was required in the early stages of the operation of the new Port. The post of Port Manager on a permanent pensionable basis is now being established, and the duties and responsibilities of the post seem to justify a salary of \$8,640 per annum. This is therefore simply establishing the post and putting it on a pensionable basis so that in future the Port Manager will be a regular Civil Servant and not a contract officer for a period of three or four years as the case may be, and entitled to all the facilities and pensionable rights and other perquisites to which Civil Servants are entitled.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

3.55 p.m.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE "THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (NO. 10) ORDER, 1964"

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is a Resolution to approve "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 10) Order, 1964", and stands in the name of the hon. and learned senior member for St. John.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking your permission to deal with this Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Andrew is asking leave of the House to deal with Resolution No. 4, which stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Premier, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted the Hon. Minister. (4 Pause)

There being no objection leave is granted the hon. member.

The hon. junior member for St. Andrew who is Minister of Health may now proceed to deal with the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 10) Order, 1964.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution deals with adjustments in the establishment structure of the Prisons and Home Affairs Section of the Office of the Premier. In the first place, it restores the former status of the post of Steward at the Prison *vis-à-vis* Chief Officer with effect from 1st April, 1961; then (b) it regrades the post "Hospital Attendant" at a salary of \$2,388 - 2,580 with effect from 1st November, 1962, in order to restore its former relationship with "Second Class Officer"; (c) it gives changes in the titles of the posts "Instructor" and "Hospital Attendant" to "Second Class Officer"; and (d) it makes an increase in the number of posts at the Prisons as follows:-

1 new post of Assistant Chief Officer	\$3,240
1 additional post of First Class Officer	\$2,880 — 3,120
2 additional posts of Second Class Officer	\$2,520 — 2,760
2 additional posts of Third Class Officer	\$1,200 — 2,520

The proposals in (a) and (b) seek to remove anomalies. The proposal in (c) is designed to provide flexibility in assigning duties; no adjustment in salary is involved.

It is also proposed that the Meteorological Staff structure should be changed so that the Department can operate a 24-hour day forecasting and meteorological service including hurricane watch.

Hon. members can see the proposed change in the Addendum to the Resolution.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

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.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the proposal to deal with Order No. 2 as the next Order of the Day?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 2 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 2 stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House, and it is to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Island.

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

Copies of Resolutions of which notice has been given today are now available for circulation and, therefore, I now beg to be added to my motion that it be an instruction of the House when in Committee of Supply to deal with the Resolutions of which notice was given today.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let those Resolutions be circulated forthwith.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: So far, I have the copy of only one Resolution and that is for the sum of \$6,203.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg your pardon, I said the Resolutions of which I have given notice today. Copies of them all are being circulated.
4.05 p.m.

Mr. LYNCH entered the House and took his seat.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am instructed that copies of this Resolution have been circulated to all hon. members who are now present, but two of these Resolutions are Resolutions which may be dealt with in Committee of Supply. One Resolution is for the sum of \$6,203 and the other one is for the sum of \$1,050. The others are two abstract Resolutions which can only be dealt with when we are again in the House. The motion has been duly passed, that I do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply to deal with the four Resolutions on the Order Paper and those two other Resolutions which have just been circulated.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1964-65 No. 25

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The first Resolution, Sir, is a Resolution to place the sum of \$5,828 at the disposal of the

Government to supplement the Estimates 1964-65 Part 1 - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1964-65 No. 25 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution. I am asking for leave to take charge of this Resolution which stands in the name of the Hon. Premier.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister of Communications is asking for leave to take charge of this Resolution standing in the name of the Hon. Premier, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted. *(After a pause)*. Hearing no objection, leave is granted and the Hon. Minister may proceed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is in respect of three Heads of the Estimates which we propose to take separately.

HEAD 17 - PREMIER - HOME AFFAIRS

U.K. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Head 17 - Premier - Home Affairs - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, under this Head there is a new Item - Item 30 - U.K. Technical Assistance. Hon. members will see that the services of Mr. David Gosling, A.R.I.B.A., A.M.T.P.L., Architect and Town Planner have been secured by the Secretary for Technical Assistance, under the United Kingdom - West Indies Technical Assistance Scheme, to assist the Town and Country Development Planning Office for a period of six months. The Secretary for Technical Co-operation in the United Kingdom has granted the services of this Architect to assist in the Town and Country Planning Development Office for a period of six months. He arrived in the island on the 2nd June, 1964, and he is specifically responsible, under the over all guidance of the Town and Country Planning Officer, for the Land Use Development Plan for the Cave Hill Development area. This sum of \$1,828 is to meet the local costs relative to house rent and transport for Mr. Gosling and incidentals for the drawing office during the period of his stay here. The breakdown is as follows:-

Transport	...	1,060
House Rent	...	713
Drawing office expenses	...	55
Total:	...	1,828

I beg to move that Head 17 stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 24 - MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES

CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

Head 24 - Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, under this Head there is Item 125 - Census of Agriculture - which is also a new item. As the note sets out, provision has been made under Colonial Development and Welfare Scheme D.5497 for the continuation of a series of statistical surveys of agriculture affecting Barbados and the Leeward and Windward Islands. Collection of data had commenced during the 1961-62 census of Agriculture but was interrupted by the dissolution of the West Indies Federation.

The Scheme covers the cost of field work including the payment of enumerators, the cost of employing the Agricultural Survey Officer to direct the work of the staff and the processing and publication of the data collected. It does not cover the cost of supervision of the field work for which the sum of \$1,000 is now required.
4.15 p.m.

I beg to move that Head 24 - Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries - stand part.

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

The question that Head 24 - Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries - stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

I - Annexed Estimates - Post Office - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, under Item 42 - Motor Vehicles - the sum of \$3,000 is required, and as set out in the vote this amount is requested in order to replace a Post Office van which was damaged beyond economic repair. An amount of \$2,290 was paid from the General Insurance Fund into General Revenue in settlement of the damage sustained by the van, and a Resolution for the entire amount of \$3,000, the cost of a new van, is now requested.

I beg to move that - 1 - Annexed Estimates - Post Office - stand part.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would give us a few more details. He usually has his files at his fingertips. The sum of \$3,000 is needed for a new van, but \$2,290 have been paid from the General Insurance Fund, which I believe is the Government Insurance. Of course no duty is paid, but I suppose the Minister will be able to tell us more about it.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, without appearing to be rude, I will repeat some of what I said. Probably the hon. member wants further details of the accident to find where the liability rests, but I will deal with the main points at issue first and then deal with the other matters. Now the Resolution requests the sum of \$3,000, but in reality the sum of \$2,290 by way of insurance was paid for the Post Office van which was damaged beyond repair on Maxwell Road by a truck which was reversing on to the main road. In other words, the van was considered as being worth that amount at the time it was damaged; so this amount of money was paid into the General Revenue of the island, and is no longer at the disposal of the Department or the Ministry for the purpose of purchasing a new van. We are now coming for the sum of \$3,000 which is really \$700 odd different in order to purchase a new van for the Post Office. Since the van has been out of service, the Department has been greatly inconvenienced in that our vans and vehicles are limited. I do not know if the hon. member wants any more information than that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister actually anticipated me and stopped me half way in my enquiry, because I noticed the Leader of the House trying to tell him exactly what I wanted. I am not quite satisfied and I do not believe other hon. members are either. Let us read the Addendum. It reads as follows:- "The amount of \$3,000 is required to replace a Post Office van which was damaged beyond economic repair." That is abundantly clear. Then it goes on: "An amount of \$2,290 was paid from the General Insurance Fund....." What is the General Insurance Fund? The hon. member said that this van was damaged beyond repair on the Christ Church road by a truck reversing on to the main highway. What I do not understand is this: if the Post Office van got into an accident with a truck reversing on to a highway which is obviously illegal, some insurance company would have to pay in this money for the actual value of the van that was damaged. Before I give way, there are two things here. You have "paid from the General Insurance Fund" and then "paid into General Revenue". I can understand you paying the money into the General Insurance Fund which is run by the Government. There are several insurance companies here, and you would either have collected from an insurance company or it would have been your fault. You must tell us something more of this accident. You had an accident, and what I want to know is whether it is the fault of the Post Office van. If it is, let us call it quits, and buy the new van.

If it is not your fault, you have the laws of this country, and the owner of the truck must be insured. Have you collected money from the owner of the truck with which your van got into the accident. If you have collected money, we want to know how much it is, because this does not make it clear.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in the first instance the General Insurance Fund is a regular fund for insuring Government vehicles as the hon. member knows, and the next big point is that the entire matter is still *sub judice*; so I cannot sit here and decide on the question of liability. The Court will decide the liability. The matter was reported to the Standing Insurance Committee which has released the amount of \$2,290 from the General Insurance Fund as settlement for the damages sustained by this van.
4.25 p.m.

The amount of \$2,290 has been paid directly to the Accountant-General, but the liability for the accident has not yet been fixed, and the matter is still *sub judice*; so I cannot go into the question of who is in fault. If a vehicle is being reversed into a highway, well, that is a breach of the Regulations; but if the person had third party insurance or not or whether the driver is licensed or not is a matter for the Court. Hon. members are fully aware of all of that; but the fact remains that if a truck is reversing into a main highway, that is a breach of the Regulations.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That makes it abundantly clear to us now.

The question that I - Annexed Estimates - Post Office - stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of \$5,828 do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1964-65 No. 24

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I am asking for leave to deal with the Resolution to place the sum of \$4,526 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1964-65 Part 11 - Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1964-65 No. 24 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

There being no objection, leave was granted the Hon. Minister.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, this is a Resolution seeking the supplementary provision of the sum of \$3,526 for the purpose of constructing a road from Prescod Boulevard in the Bridgetown Harbour Area to Park Villa, Fontabelle.

The Advocate Company Limited has acquired a portion of land there, and the Town and Country Planning Officer has granted them permission to develop the site for commercial and warehouse purposes. Access to this site is from Fontabelle, but the rear part of the property is on the Deep Water Harbour.

The Advocate Company Limited will be granted a right of way from this road to its property "Park Villa" in Fontabelle, and in consideration of this concession, the company has agreed to refund the Government half the cost of construction of the road.

It is the policy of the Government to consolidate this area for industrial or warehouse development. In other words, as regards those buildings which are along Fontabelle, it is the policy of this Government to give access to those buildings so that they would not have to go all around to get to the Harbour. For that reason, what Government is doing is for development purposes and it is a policy which is to be adhered to.

The Advocate Company Limited has agreed to the conditions and terms set out, and the Company is willing to refund the Government half the cost of the construction of the road in consideration of its being granted the use of this highway from their property. The Surveyor's Department will carry out the necessary surveys, and the Department of Highways and Transport will be responsible for the repairs and upkeep of this road. As a matter of fact, it will be the Government's road; it will be on part of Government's land; so to all intents and purposes it will be for the use of the Public at large.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I want this made quite clear. We are happy to support this Resolution because the Hon. Minister has made it abundantly clear that this is not done specifically for the Advocate Company Limited. But if I repeat the Hon. Minister's own words, it is the policy of the Government to give persons a road to their property on the reclaimed land, and, therefore, we look forward in the future that other applicants would be given similar treatment to this given to the Advocate Company Limited. That is exactly what was said here and I shall be keeping this for future reference. The Hon. Minister said that this is not anything done specifically for the Advocate Company Limited, but this is Government's policy. The Hon. Minister has made it clear that instead of people going all around Fontabelle, where their land abuts on reclaimed land they would be given similar treatment. We are, therefore, very happy to hear this and we hope that the statement made by the Hon. Minister in respect of Government's policy in this respect would be duly carried out when other applications are received.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, it is the policy of the Government to establish roads on Fontabelle, from the Folly back down to Lands End for the purpose of industrial and commercial development. This is a new policy. Properties on the sea side of Fontabelle will have access into Prescod Boulevard. That area of land, as time goes on, would become more important because of the nature of the business with the Harbour. As regards other properties on the other side, it will be also necessary to have easy access to the Harbour.

We have a road by Holborn in keeping with the surroundings of the Harbour, but there is a very short passage up by Lakes Folly which is in disrepair.
4.35 p.m.

It is used a great deal, not only by goods vehicles and passenger cars but also by the travelling public, notably the stevedores who come out from Chapman's Lane and who have to use their bicycles. That road is in a very bad state of repair. I draw the attention of the Hon. Minister to that matter, and I do hope that, before the rainy season is over, some attempt will be made to put that road in good repair.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1964-65 No. 27

NEW SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, the next Resolution is a Resolution to place the sum of \$34,053 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1964-65 Part II - Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1964-65 No. 27 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Sir, I am asking leave to take charge of this Resolution which stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Education.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister is asking leave to take charge of this Resolution which stands in the name of

the Hon. Minister of Education, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted. *(After a pause)* There being no objection, leave is granted. The Hon. Minister may proceed.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, the Estimates for the construction of the Florence Springer School in Government Hill is \$450,000. In last year's Estimates, the sum of \$240,000 was provided, and the actual amount spent by the end of the financial year 1963-64 is \$205,947. The remainder required for the construction of the school is \$244,053. There has been the provision of \$240,000 in the 1964-65 Estimates, and therefore the amount required for the completion of the construction of the school is \$4,053. In the original estimates there was no provision for furniture, and the estimates for furniture is \$30,000. Hence the total supplementary provision required is now \$34,053. This school is being constructed to accommodate 1,000 girls as against \$400,000 odd which was spent on the Parkinson School some years ago.

The cost of material and labour have increased. This school is costing approximately the same thing as the Parkinson School; it has a Science Laboratory and, as I said, it will accommodate a thousand children. More than one class room can be accommodated in the Science Laboratory at the same time, and also in the Domestic Science Section. This school is costing approximately the same amount of money as the Parkinson Secondary Modern School which was built some years ago. All the girls from the Parkinson School will be eventually transferred to the Florence Springer School, and more boys will be sent to the Parkinson School. The Parkinson School will be the Boys' section and the Florence Springer School will be the Girls' section. This is the first comprehensive school which we will have in the island. It will have two streams: (a) the academic stream taking children to the standard of the G.C.E., the L.C.C. etc.; and (b) besides having an elementary education the girls will be taught Handicraft, Needlecraft and Domestic Science.

Mr. Chairman, this is another step which has been made by the Government in order to satisfy the educational needs of the community. Hon. members will be interested in knowing what progress has been made in the provision of class room facilities for the past two and a half years. During that time this Government has provided 128 additional classrooms. The Government has provided eight at St. George, four at St. Lukes, six at Hindsbury, three at St. John's, ten at St. Paul's, six at Christ Church Girls', ten at St. Andrew, six at St. Lucy, ten at the New Workman's School, twenty at the Deacon's Road Primary School, twenty at the Stow Primary School, and twenty-five at the Florence Springer School. These places provide accommodation for 5,120 children in two and a half years. Hon. members will agree with me that that is a record which is unbeatable. The Government intends to pursue this policy of providing the necessary educational requirements for the community in its present Development Programme and the next Development Plan is now being drafted. With those remarks, Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I will start off by reminding the Hon. Minister that he must not get into the habit of making statements which are not correct. I say that no record is unbeatable, absolutely none. However, I do say this, and I will sound it as a warning today. When I sat on that side of the Table during the regime of the last Government, I severely criticised the spending of \$450,000 for the purpose of housing four hundred and fifty children because I did not believe that Barbados could afford that type of fancy school. Of course, my opponents who thought that they could destroy me, threatened that they would throw me out of public life; but today when the Hon. Minister makes the statement that the same money is being spent to house one thousand children, I say that it is my duty to cause an investigation to be made in this matter. Somebody has carried away something somewhere at some time. I am not accusing any member of any Government. None of you

has bought the land; you got it free from the Government; but to spend \$450,000 to house 450 children! When my Party criticised that, we were accused of not wanting to educate the children of this island, but we wanted to get them back into the fields. The Hon. Minister had better repeat that statement, and I would say that at the first meeting of the Public Accounts Committee, this matter must be investigated. Some people must go out of the island or their names will have to be changed to numbers. 4.45 p.m.

I have nothing but commendation for the Government, their architect or whoever is responsible for the building; and if the hon. member is referring to the fact that it might be hard to beat, it is really hard to beat.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I just want to correct the hon. member on one point. I said that the Parkinson School was built to accommodate 800 and not 450, and I also said that added to the provision for the accommodation for 1,000 children, there is a Science Laboratory and a Domestic Science section out of the same \$450,000.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not know if the hon. member is correct. It is on record what the Parkinson School was built to hold. You are building one for \$450,000 to hold 1,000 children which is really unbeatable.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I said at first that the Parkinson School was built to accommodate 800, and this is now built to accommodate 1,000. The Parkinson School was built years ago, and it cost about the same money that this one on Government Hill costs. In the light of increases in wages for carpenters, masons and so on and the increased cost of materials, the school at Government Hill still costs about the same to accommodate more children and with greater facilities.

Mr. MOTTLEY: How many children are in the Parkinson School today?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Approximately 800.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I can go back to the records, but at the time the then Minister, Mr. Ronald Mapp, said that it was built to hold 480. As a matter of fact, the Minister then agreed with me that it was extravagant. Of course he might not have been taking so much interest in his work and did not know how many it was built to hold. Anyhow, as far as this Resolution is concerned, we are supporting it, and we do hope that this Florence Springer School will soon be opened. I should like to know from the Minister whether he has decided purely on girls being at this school. It is not within his portfolio, but I wonder if he could tell us whether there is any policy on this matter.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, it is a Girls' school, and as I explained, the girls who would normally be going to the Parkinson School will be going to the Florence Springer School, and the Parkinson School will take in boys from the surrounding Primary Schools to give it its full complement, whereas the girls who live in that area will be sent from the Primary schools to the Florence Springer School.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It might not be fair to the Minister because this is not his portfolio; but some time ago I mentioned the question of the extension of the school-leaving age at the Primary schools, and it was suggested to me then that it was sixteen. Now I want to draw something to the Minister's attention although I do not think it would be fair to press him for an answer. I cannot understand the procedure and practice at these Modern Secondary Schools.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, if the hon. member would give way, I should like to say that we have no Modern Secondary Schools now in Barbados. We have changed all of them and we have Comprehensive schools where the school-leaving age is 17 plus. Children who are in the "B" stream will be taking up the School Certificate level, and those in the "A" stream will do

Handicraft, Needlework, etc. In the academic stream they can go to 17 plus.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am not interested so much in what age they can go to, because I am long past the age when I can have children to go to school. I do not want to take the Minister on in this debate, because it is not his portfolio; but I am very serious about what I am going to say. Are you telling me that you have no Modern Secondary Schools, but you have Comprehensive schools? A rose by another name is just as stink. At Richmond School, which is one of your Comprehensive schools, children at fourteen years have been given papers to take home saying that at 14 they are not to come back to school. I am responsible for a number of them, and I am packing every one back because I think it was bad manners on the part of the Headmaster not to send anything to those responsible for them saying that they are not to be sent back to school. I just want to let you know that when you say that they are going to school until 16, 17 and 18, and talk about streams, sometimes these streams run very muddy. What I am worried about is when you throw them out at 14 on the labour market with absolutely nothing to do. I got an answer here before that the age was changed to sixteen. I can understand what happens in the Secondary schools where you have the different streams — technical, academic or otherwise; but at these other schools where you get some little runt who is not suitable for anything technical and possibly only had a chance to go to school at eight or nine, as soon as he gets to fourteen, he is told not to come back to school. I throw out as a warning that I am telling people who have come to me within the last two weeks to send their children back to school and let us have a showdown on it, because a statement has been made on the floor of this House that they can go to school until they are sixteen. If you keep them until they are sixteen and there is nothing for them to do, then they will have to come out.

4.55 p.m.

I commend the Government for the swift action which they have taken in providing these places in school; but I must warn Hon. Ministers that making flamboyant speeches is not all. People are presented with the difficulty of having their children thrown back on them at the age of 14 years and they cannot get them entered in private schools. These children are told by the Headmaster: "You cannot get a School Certificate; therefore, you must go. I counsel the Hon. Minister to investigate the matter. My attitude to it is that these children should go back to school. I am sorry the Hon. Minister of Agriculture is not in here at the moment, because a lot of these people are in his constituency. Not very long ago I have told parents of some of these children to take their children back to school.

Sir, you cannot just do this. These flowery and flamboyant speeches are not good enough. I counsel the Hon. Minister to investigate this matter. We have a lot of boys and girls at Richmond School, and the Headmaster has disregarded even courtesy which is something that you can lavish on people. To tell parents that you cannot send them back to school is not good enough. Day after day they come and say that they are told: "You cannot come back to school".

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. If the children from Richmond are sent out at the age of 14 years, this is not in keeping with the Government policy.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The Minister has said that if they are sent out at the age of 14 years, this is not in keeping with the Government's policy. I repeat it. The Hon. Minister is saying that if they are sent out at the age of 14 years, this is not in keeping with the Government's policy. I invite the Hon. Minister to come with me tonight and he will see the number which have been sent out of school. They are being sent out at the age of 14 years, and parents have come to me telling me that they do not know what to do with these children. That statement was made to me.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Sir, this is a matter which I discussed with the Chief Education Officer this morning.

The school-leaving age for those who are in the "A" stream and who are going to take the School Certificate, is at 17+. Those who are in the "B" stream go to 15+. That is the information which I got from the Chief Education Officer. There is no legislation governing this; this is the Government's policy.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I can quite understand the Hon. Minister's point of view, but I stress that he should go into this matter. Mr. Chairman, I am telling you now that they are sending them out at 14 years as well. They are doing it. It is a pity I cannot say what I want to say now. (Mr. CORBIN: Say it now.) No, not at this stage.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, lest you think that my colleague is alone, I have had experience of people who have been turned out at the age of 14 years. I wondered when the Minister was saying that they are not turned out at the age of 14 years, if it was the educational policy of the Government or if it was his policy.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, two hon. members are saying that children are being turned out at the age of 14 years, but I know that there are some who cannot get into school at all. Now, Sir, the last Government had to abandon the St. Elizabeth's School; and from the time this Government took over, every year they have told my colleague and myself: "Very soon we will be ready." The Hon. Minister promised me: "Soon, I will take your colleague and yourself to the spot;" but "soon" has not come yet.

Now, Sir, the Hon. Minister this afternoon patted himself on the back and drew to our attention and the public's attention the speed which they are making relative to getting school places, and he called out nearly every parish in the Island. I think St. Joseph was the only one excepted. He called them out very quickly; but from what I have heard, it appears to me that he has called out the parishes where they have representatives. As it appears to me, it looks as if they are not prepared to do anything with the parishes which are represented by B.L.P. members. They have come down to Bridgetown, built schools, added on to some, improved some and have done everything else. They have done something with all the other parishes. St. Andrew abuts and bounds St. Joseph, and they have done something in St. Andrew; but yet still they have not seen their way to replace the St. Elizabeth's School in St. Joseph.

I had this to say on the floor of the House and the Hon. Minister denied it. It was told to us that it was said by them that they are not going to do anything with St. Joseph before the next elections. The Hon. Minister said "soon". I hope the elections will come soon too, because it is not fair to be building schools in the areas that are intended to carry most of the representatives and do nothing in St. Joseph. St. Michael is supposed to carry eight representatives, and they are building schools all over St. Michael so that they can get six out of the eight representatives; but that cannot happen as long as I am alive. They are forgetting the people in the country and are coming into town to do everything. Deacons Road and all about have a school, and St. Elizabeth's Village does not have a school. I hope the acting Minister of Education will take it up and do not promise me "soon", as I have been continually promised.

5.05 p.m.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Chairman, I do not think I could sit idly by and allow this Education vote to be passed without making a few remarks in connection with it. I see that this amount of \$34,053 is for the purpose of supplementing the item — New Secondary Schools — for the purpose of completing, furnishing and equipping the New Secondary School at Government Hill. As you know, Mr. Chairman, from the time that I have been in this House I have always been sounding my voice for the replacement of the school at St. Elizabeth's Village in the parish of St. Joseph. I have no quarrel at all about this Education vote; I am happy to support it because it is for the purpose of educating the children and I may say that the children of today are the men and women of tomorrow. I have been assured by the Hon. Minister of Education that soon and very soon from

now a school to replace the one at St. Elizabeth's Village will be erected, and therefore I take great pleasure in supporting this Resolution in the hope that something will be done for the poor children of St. Joseph.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, sometimes when I hear people trying to increase words without knowledge, it shocks my modesty. We have before us this Resolution for the sum of \$34,053 which is for the purpose of completing, furnishing and equipping this New Secondary School at Government Hill. We know that this money is really needed. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph is challenging the Government about not building a school at St. Elizabeth's Village for the benefit of the children in that district. I know the school which the hon. member is speaking about, and I can say that that school was in a state of disrepair for the last ten years. The School Mistress and the School Master have always been fearing that if we were to get a high wind, the school would be blown down on the children. I was in this House when the Hon. Minister told the hon. member that they would have started to build this school already, but they had to look for a suitable site on which to erect it — a site which would accommodate the children with a playground as well.

Mr. Chairman, it takes time for everything to be done; we cannot rush things in a hurry. I am sure that the Government will build this school because that is a matter which is under consideration. However, Sir, it hurts me when I hear those hon. members speak in the way in which they have spoken. Anybody who has eyes can see that the Government is going to deal with this matter, but as I say, it takes time. I do not see the necessity for hon. members to criticise the Government without any cause. We are doing the work and we are fulfilling the promises which we have made to the people. What more can we do? I am sure that this school will be built in the quickest possible time. I pledge my support of this Resolution.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, it is only natural that the hon. members for St. Joseph would feel anxious to hear something further about the St. Elizabeth's Village School. However, Sir, they are quite out of order now because this Resolution deals with a specific place, and this is a Head which has already been discussed during the consideration of the Estimates. I would like to say, Sir, that for the last ten years and upwards the Government Party of which the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was a member, had been charged with selecting a new site for the St. Elizabeth's Village School, and up to now their efforts have been futile. However, in order to allay the fears of the hon. members for St. Joseph, I will say that the Government is interested in the accommodation of the children of the entire island, and not merely the children of St. Michael or those of St. Joseph. The stage will be reached when the anxiety of the hon. member for St. Joseph will be set at rest in that alternative sites for the erection of this school are being explored and they have been inspected.

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph will know that the natural terrain of St. Joseph is such that you cannot easily secure land for building in that area. However, the stage has been reached where a site for this school has been selected, and therefore hon. members can rest assured that accommodation will be provided for the setting of a new school for St. Elizabeth's Village, a school which will have playing facilities not only for the children of that school but for those of the entire area. This Government is seeking after the needs of the children of St. Elizabeth's Village, and we are just as interested in those children — or the interest of those children is as much on our heart as it is in the hearts of the hon. members for St. Joseph.

Speaking generally, the question of the density of population is the criterion which governs the selection of sites for these new schools, and the claims of St. Joseph are also under very active consideration. Just as the new school is being developed and established at Government Hill, in the same manner a new school for St. Elizabeth's Village will be erected in another ten months, and not in another ten years.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1964-65 No. 28

BARBADOS NETBALL BOARD OF CONTROL

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, the next Resolution is a Resolution to place the sum of \$1,050 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1964-65 Part I — Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1964-65 No. 28 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

In connection with this Resolution, I should like to say that representation was made just a couple of months ago by the Barbados Netball Board of Control for assistance in meeting the expenses of sending a representative team to compete in a netball tournament in Trinidad during the month of August this year.
5.15 p.m.

It is true that representation was made late, and assistance could not be given to the Board before the team left for Trinidad. The estimated expenditure for the team was approximately \$2,100, and after this representation for assistance was made by the Board to the Government, it was considered as would be done in the promotion of any international or inter-territorial game or minor sport that if they would help themselves, they would be helped, and the decision has been taken to assist them on a dollar for dollar basis. The estimated cost of the tournament to the Netball Board of Control is \$2,100, and the Government is here asking the Committee to vote \$1,050 to be given to the Netball Board of Control as a grant on a dollar for dollar basis to assist them with the tournament.

Hon. members who are interested in sport and who have followed the game will have noted that the girls played a high standard of netball. We were not disgraced. Actually, we were tipped to be the winners, but were defeated by one point. This is a great achievement for our team to have held that position for the second year, and I should like to point out here that netball today is not only played by the well-to-do people of the community, but some of the poorest in our community are today playing the game and they are to be encouraged. I know that hon. members will be willing to assist these girls and give them the necessary encouragement to play the game.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1964-65 No. 29

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is for the sum of \$6,203. As the Addendum sets out, during the course of her duties — this is an officer in the Printing Office who is an Assistant Accounts Clerk — an officer attached to the Government Printing Office received certain injuries when she fell on the occasion of a visit to the Treasury, and this amount is required to compensate the officer in respect of the injuries received and to meet her expenses incurred in connection with the accident. This lady, while on Government business at the Treasury, was descending the stairs at the southern end of the Accountant General's Office when her foot slipped on the smooth edge of the steps and she fell backwards the whole length of the stairs, ending on the ground pavement. The accident occurred on 8th July, 1963, and since then the lady has been laid up and has had to seek medical aid of all descriptions, including the services of a Physiotherapist. It is only within the last month or so that three doctors, including some of our best specialists, have reported that she will always in future feel the effects of this accident, and that she is 20% permanently incapacitated.

The amount is made up as follows: payment of \$4,800 in respect of compensation for injuries sustained, payment of the sum of \$480 for legal expenses — I may mention that this matter is the subject matter of a writ which has already been filed with the Court, and the lady has secured the services of her legal advisers, Solicitor and Counsel, as the case has actually been put in the Court for compensation for damages which she has received — and the other amount which makes it up is the payment of the sum of \$922.31 for medical expenses, medicines and car hire. This has been one of the serious accidents which has taken place and the steps have already been seen after and changed up by the Public Works Department so as to avoid any recurrence of such accidents in future. It is felt by the medical experts that this lady will be permanently disabled as a result of this fall while in the course of her duties as an officer of the Government Printery.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the Minister on this matter, and while it is good that no disclosure was made of her name and address, the Minister did say that she has employed Counsel and that a case has been lodged. It would, I believe, appear to be far more humanitarian if the Government and the Ministry more or less acquiesced to her interest, and what is very sad and unfortunate is that you have referred to her permanent incapacitation to the extent of 20%. This is a very sad state affairs, and I am wondering if the Minister would tell us whether or not this lady made application to the Government for compensation, or if this Resolution is brought to the House only because this lady has lodged a case with the Courts, and it would be embarrassing to any Government to be dragged before the Courts to pay compensation when all Governments would handle any case similar to this through insurance.

5.25 p.m.

You may forgive me, Mr. Chairman, if I repeat this. If this Resolution is for payment for compensation to this person for injuries received, I would be obliged if the Minister in charge would tell us whether or not this was the Government's intention in the first place, or if he could not be afforded the exposure of the woman who was injured.

It is sad to reflect whether or not this \$6,000 can pay all the expenses of this woman as a result of her injury. I would just like to know whether the application was made by the Solicitors for this lady for compensation for the injuries she suffered. It is obvious that some claim must have been set out by the Solicitors for this lady. I suppose the Hon. Minister would be eager to explain. I would like to know whether or not compensation to this lady originated in the minds of the Government before this lady felt the need to take the matter into Court. I want to be sure that this lady's expenses are met by the Government. It would be good if the Hon. Minister would give us the detailed information.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I was out at the time when the Hon. Minister introduced the Resolution. I would also like to know if this lady was injured during the course of her duties on her visit to the Treasury. I hope the Hon. Minister would not think that I am making sport when I am wondering if this visit to the Treasury by this lady was one to draw her salary. I do not know her.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. If the hon. member was not in here, I think it was made clear that this lady was the Assistant Accounts Clerk in the Printery and she was at the Treasury in the course of her duties to receive payment for the staff at the Printery.

Mr. SMITH: Lots of things happen at the Treasury. It is money which you are going there for, and there are several vouchers to be signed; but the Addendum only says that this amount is required to compensate the Officer in respect of the injuries received. What will make me feel

that this lady was on her own is because she had to take the matter to the Court. I feel that the Government was a little reluctant in coming out as it should, and that made her take the matter to the Court. If everything was all well and the Government did not have any doubts at all, this lady would not have threatened them in order to get compensation. This makes me feel that something was wrong somewhere.

However, Sir, I am glad that the Hon. Introducer of this Resolution in order to save Court work has brought this down, but it has gone home to me that the Government did not want to pay any compensation to this lady. I feel that they are paying compensation through being forced to do so.

This Government can be very slow in coming out with payments because apparently for the last three years they have had poor people knocking at their doors for compensation, gratuities and pensions, and you will get a Minister saying that it was not this and that at the time, and the time that the person worked was not put down in the book. People are knocking at their doors all the time and they cannot get it. If these people were in the position to threaten the Government just as this lady, they would have got theirs; but because they are not in the position of this lady, they are treated in this fashion.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. For fear lest this debate generates in a general harangue, I will mention that this lady first applied in July, 1963, but at the time her condition was so serious and she needed so much medical attention that though it was considered in March, we thought it best to let the matter stay over until she had recovered. The matter was not finalised in the interest of the patient or the employee then because she was not fully recovered to know how much she should be compensated. The matter was considered in March this year. It was not until later that she sought legal advice. In other words, the matter was under consideration for some time, but the matter was not finalised in the interest of the applicant because she could not determine how much compensation she was entitled to. She was in bed sick up to that time.

Later we received a letter from her Counsel to the following effect:-

"I am to inform you that I have been retained by my client who was employed as Assistant Accounts Clerk to represent her interest in the matter of her accident at the Public Buildings on the 31st July, 1963, and, as I have understood from her that certain discussions have already taken place in order to arrive at some decision of the amount which should be paid to her by the Government, I wish to inform you that inasmuch as my client was not legally represented or was not aware of her legal rights, such discussions can only be regarded as being of an informal nature."

What I have just told you is that in March when this matter was considered by the Government it was purely to determine the amount of compensation; therefore, the holding back was for the benefit of the applicant. The Government has dealt with her in a fair manner and it is not by any pressure of the Court. The quantum can only be known now, not six months ago. It is only now that the lady can get around. Now that the Government has been advised by three medical experts apart from the Physiotherapist and other people who have given legal advice in this matter, we are able to proceed with the amount of compensation which should be given.

5.35 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, now that the Hon. Minister has replied and has tried to give an explanation in this matter, it would seem that there was some misunderstanding somewhere. They were in favour of helping the lady from the beginning, and they were waiting to gather further information from her. After she was told that they were waiting to see what would happen, and that the longer she waited the better it would be for her, why did she have to sue? That would make me feel that if this lady had not started something, the Resolution would not have been here.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister has tried to explain that, for the benefit of the injured lady, this matter has been delayed. As a matter of fact, the Hon. Minister has not really explained the matter because he thinks that he might be disclosing information which he should not disclose. The position is that when this matter first came up for consideration by the Cabinet, we turned it down on the ground that the compensation which was recommended to the Government was not enough. In other words, we deferred consideration of the matter until further medical information could be obtained. The Government was advised to pay a certain amount of compensation and we considered that that compensation was insufficient. We turned down the matter so that the lady in question could get her private medical practitioner and the Hospital authorities to give us a further report. It was on the basis of this action that the lady decided to retain Counsel. It is not that this lady sued the Government at all; she was medically advised, she got the Hospital Doctors to submit a report, and on the basis of that report she was advised what to claim. It is not a question of going to Court at all; it was only that the lady found that the Government was bending over backwards to help her and she then got medical advice and submitted what we would have to pay.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, a number of things have developed. The Hon. Leader of the House says that this matter was turned down by the Cabinet because the amount was considered to be insufficient. The Minister said that they delayed action because they wanted to go to the extent of the damage.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, what I said was that we turned down the amount which was recommended and deferred consideration of the matter until further medical reports could be submitted. That is all there is to it. It does not mean that we objected to the matter; we turned it down because of the specific amount which was recommended. We deferred consideration pending further reports.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, this is amusing. They turned down the matter because they were waiting for Medical reports. You have all of this difference in respect of a simple matter. It is clear that this lady made application to the Government for damages. How are you going to persuade this House that you will make a little rider now that you wanted to get these reports? It is amusing to hear the two Ministers; it cannot be anything but humorous. Anyhow, the Government is aware of the fact that this lady was entitled to damages. The Hon. Minister has said that the money was too little and who would know better than this lady's doctor? A year later this lady is told by the doctor that the injury is a permanent one to the extent of 50%. A year ago this matter was before the Cabinet and this lady.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The hon. member is deliberately misquoting what I said. I said that this matter occupied the attention of the Cabinet in March this year, not a year ago. The accident occurred in July last year, and the lady submitted a letter asking for compensation in July, 1963, two or three weeks after the accident. (Mr. MILLER: That is a year ago.) The position is that the Cabinet considered the matter in March last year and this lady had not recovered sufficiently from the accident so that the amount of compensation could be arrived at. We delayed the matter in order to get further information, and that was in March this year. Meanwhile, this lady is still in the employ of the Government and is still entitled to sick benefits and soon. Since then the lady sought legal advice and I have read excerpts from the letter which we received from her lawyer. The matter has been re-considered and we have now received Medical reports from Mr. A. G. Leacock, Dr. Maynard and Dr. Johnson, and these final Reports were from the 15th July, 1964. We could not have come here with this matter any earlier. The Medical Report shows that this lady has a lame back and that from the fall her movements are restricted; and the doctor says that he does not think she will have a normal back. The doctor estimates permanent disability to be 50%. That is the Report of Mr. Leacock and it is dated 15th July,

1964. The other Reports are dated between June and July. It is set out here that it is as late as July this year that we had the full Medical Reports and we endeavoured to determine what compensation the lady was entitled to. We were in a position to determine that compensation when the Crown Solicitor negotiated with this lady's legal adviser. There is no question of our trying to deny the lady any compensation to which she is entitled.
5.45 p.m.

By waiting until her injuries were completely healed, we are only now in a position, with the Medical Reports handed in, to assess the damage and injury which the lady has received.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, again I was only quoting the Minister. He referred to the first letter of July 1963 and he read it twice. Am I right in thinking that the first approach made by letter for compensation reached the Government in July 1963? At least that is what was said on a number of occasions by the Minister. If negotiations have been going on ever since March this year, certainly a year has passed since July 1963, and no sane, rational thinker would allow a person working with Government and having a request for compensation to carry the matter before the Law Courts. One would imagine that the attitude in this would be that they would want to have a full medical report from all the doctors to state whether or not her injury would be permanently 20% or 30%; but the big point at this moment is that Government was aware of the cause of the accident, and the lady at some time made a request for compensation. Nobody with commonsense or reason would want to pause to believe that the lady would withdraw or discontinue discussions with the Government or Cabinet and take it to the Law Courts, and this is an employee of the same Government; but you said that in March you requested this information from the medical men, and now in August it is before the Courts, and there is this hurried Resolution before the House today. There seems to be some reason. Nobody with any sense of reasoning would want to think that for nearly a year the Government has been negotiating on compensation, and now that the matter is in the open court, you want to rush through this Resolution. Before you had the information, you could not assess what the compensation would be, but you knew it was too little and now the lady had to carry it to the Courts. This is not the attitude of a Government. If you were satisfied and you have asked your medical advisers to tell you whether she deserves this or not, you would not have to wait for so long to make this decision. This is a little rushed thing to bring pressure upon Counsel as to whether it should be \$6,000 or \$8,000.

I feel, Mr. Chairman, that for reasons of humanitarianism if you are satisfied that the lady sustained injury and deserves compensation and you want to pay her, you should not wait until she goes into Court and then you come to the House and want to pay her. Do you want to wait until she dies and then you would not have to pay anything? When she dies, there would be nobody to make a claim; and if there was a claim, then you would fail to accept it. I think, Mr. Chairman, it is rather unusual and not the attitude a Government should adopt, especially to one of its employees. You have placed her in the embarrassing position of having to go into Court knowing that she is still working for Government. I do not think that is the way a Government with modern thinking should behave.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1964-64 No. 26

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to take charge of this Resolution standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. John.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to take charge of this Resolution standing in the name of the Hon. Premier, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted.

Hearing no objection, leave is granted the Hon. Minister.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I am moving the passing of this Resolution with the firm assurance that hon. members in this Chamber will give it their unanimous support. I am convinced, Sir, that every single member in this House - all members in the three Parties as well as the Independents - will accord unstinted support to this Resolution. (Mr. SMITH: You are begging.) The hon. junior member for St. Joseph said we are begging. I am not begging anything; I am entitled to this conviction for a number of completely unanswerable reasons; and since at least one hon. member, it appears, needs to be convinced of the logic of this argument, I think I had better set them out in plain fashion - in A B C style, so to speak - so that when I have enumerated them point by point it would be an easy matter for him or any other hon. member who thinks like him to answer the specific point. I know the members in this House even the hon. junior member for St. Joseph - and I know that when the logic of a position appears to him to be uncontestable, regardless of how much he might like to indulge in his flare for opposing, he allows his common-sense to prevail and bows to what is irrefutable.

If I may specify the points on which I base this case, I should like first of all to say that we in this country have been fortunate in a certain way.
5.55 p.m.

Since the time, in the normal course of constitutional advancement, the country has had self-government, all the Premiers, and for that matter all the Opposition leaders - because in the normal course of events, should the Government be defeated on a vote of "no confidence", one would hope the Opposition Leader would take over the Government - I say that, during the period the country was enjoying self-government, all the Opposition Leaders as well as all the Premiers have been people who were fortunate enough to live in homes which they could occupy as Heads of States, without any humiliation either to themselves or to the country.

Now, Sir, since the franchise of this country is based on Adult Suffrage, all that is needed for entry into this Chamber, either as a member or Leader of the Majority Party, is the confidence of the electorate, and the ability to impress the electorate that you have the interest of the country at heart. In the normal course of events, therefore, it is highly possible that the Leader of the Government might be elected from among the people, owing to the normal advancement of the country, to carry out the reins of Government, but at the time living in a home, modest perhaps, humble perhaps, but which because of his new position as the Head of the State, could be a source of embarrassment to him.

Involved in the position of Premier of this country is not only conducting the duties of the Head of the State, but the receiving of visiting dignitaries and other Heads of States and important persons arriving in the country. Mr. Chairman, you can consider the position of a man who through no fault of his own may from time to time suffer humiliation because of the fact that the house in which he lives is not appropriate to his position as Head of State.

In a democracy as this, the position should be one that, as long as you win the support of the masses, steps should be taken to avoid the possibility of embarrassment to people occupying a certain position who normally by their financial position might not be able enough to afford themselves a place of residence which is expected that the Head of State should occupy.

Another question is this. You will find that in every single West Indian Colony, with the possible exception of St. Kitts, the Chief Minister lives in an official residence provided by the Government. In Antigua, St. Lucia, Dominica, this is so; and even in Montserrat with only 12,000 people, the Chief Minister lives in an official residence. It is also so in Grenada. Mind you, these are all grant-aided countries; their Treasury has to be made up by subventions from the Imperial Government. I do not know how they provide

these residences, but the fact is that they have an official residence for the Heads of State. Mr. Gairy in Grenada took over the residence of an official when he became Head of State. I am told that it was one of the official residences of the country, and after he took it over, he spent a lot of money to renovate it, and it is now the present official residence of the Grenada Chief Minister. Mr. Chairman, you know that the former West Indies Federal Government provided residences for the Ministers and residences which also included gardens, and they paid for gardeners and chauffeurs. They also provided a residence for the Prime Minister at a cost of \$150,000. It was a place called "Spanish Acres": and shortly after the Prime Minister moved into it, he said he did not like it and the Federal Government allocated \$1/2 million from an Imperial grant of \$5 million for the purpose of building a new official residence for him.

I mention these facts, Sir, in the beginning to substantiate the claim that an official residence provided by the Government for the elected Head of State is not creating any precedent. In Trinidad we have an official residence for the Head of State. In Jamaica, the Government under Mr. Norman Manley secured a residence known as "Fort Royal" and then turned around and spent \$144,000 to renovate it. And then, when the Government of Mr. Norman Manley fell and Sir Alexander Bustamante took over, he walked into it and said that it was too small and refused to live in it. His deputy, Mr. Sangster, now lives in it, and the Jamaica Government is taking steps to provide an official residence for the Head of State more appropriate to the position, in the opinion of the present Head of State.

We base our parliamentary practice and institutions on Great Britain. Not only has the Prime Minister of Great Britain an official residence, but also provided for him is an official week-end residence. It is a place called "Chequers" donated as a house to the State for Prime Ministers by Mr. Chequers on the grounds that he felt that the person occupying the position of Prime Minister of Great Britain should have a week-end retreat, a country residence, to which he would retire on week-ends. And if it became necessary for him to entertain visiting dignitaries, he would not be embarrassed and he, himself, would be able to relax in surroundings which were congenial to the dignity accorded his position.
6.05 p.m.

Therefore, when at long last the Barbados Government decides to fall into line with other countries, it means that any future Prime Minister or Premier who has been elected in this island, regardless of the majesty of his dwelling, need not be humiliated because he finds himself in an improper place to discharge the duties of his office. When I say that, the Premier of the land does not only mean that he is sitting at Government Headquarters in Bay Street directing the affairs of the country, because people come in at all hours. In passing overnight they may come from everywhere. The Prime Minister does not live in Bay Street, and therefore people have to go at his home. The residence in which the Prime Minister lives can be a source of embarrassment not only to him, but to the country itself. No Barbadian, no member of this House, would want to think that the Premier of this country was called upon at night or at weekends or on evenings after he left work, to confer with a visiting dignitary, and the place where he had to carry him was not a proper place for him to receive that dignitary. I say, Sir, that we have been fortunate. Every Premier and Opposition Leader in the past has lived in a house in which neither he nor the State has felt ashamed. I do not know what is going to happen tomorrow, but I am quite sure that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph would be the last person who would want to think that the Premier of this country found himself living in a home which was a source of embarrassment to the island. Fortunately, I know that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph would not want to think so; neither he nor his Government would want to think so. As a matter of fact, in 1957 the Government, led by the hon. member's Party, had been looking around for a home for Premiers of this island.

They inspected several properties. As a matter of fact, just before the last Elections, the report was that they

had decided to acquire Codrington House as an official residence for Premiers. The same House which we are considering of acquiring now was also considered by the last Government as a residence for Premiers. In 1959 the cost was \$100,000. The negotiations proceeded to a certain point and then they broke down. I understand that the owner of this property refused to sell it to them, but I do not know why. Although both Premiers of this island occupied the houses in which they lived, is the office of the Premier any less dignified here than it is in other places? Even certain people, in their somewhat benighted minds, will realise the importance of providing proper housing accommodation for the Head of the State. If, in 1964, we are taking the necessary steps to put this matter right, I feel that it is a matter for people to be completely unanimous on and to give it their unqualified support. This is a matter which should receive the unanimous and unqualified support of every single member of this Chamber. We are not providing a house for the Premier who is provided by the Democratic Labour Party. If, in the distant future, we go out of office, we are not taking this House with us. This House will be there for all time, for all Premiers supplied by the Barbados National Party, the Barbados Labour Party, the Fascist Party, the Communist Party or whatever have you. I am sure, Sir, that hon. members on all sides of this Table will therefore support the Government in the effort now to put this position in its true perspective. The Addendum to the Resolution states this:-

"The property known as Culloden Farm standing on 8 acres and 2 perches of land or thereabouts has been offered for sale to the Government together with the furniture and fittings of the house. The owner is willing to accept a price of U.S. \$60,000 which is considered reasonable by the Standing Valuation Committee.

It has been recommended that the House would be suitable for an official residence for the Premiers and Heads of Government of the island and that part of the land would lend itself to development for other public purposes.

It is therefore proposed to purchase the property for \$103,800."

Mr. Chairman, this House was first in the market in 1957, and the price asked for was \$85,000 American which is roughly \$130,000 West Indian. Then, in 1959, it was purchased for \$60,000 (U.S.) and, as I said, Sir, the previous Government had offered, as far back as 1957, to pay the same price which the subsequent owner paid for it in 1959. This house stands on eight acres of completely flat land which can be easily developed, and it is in the heart of the suburban area. It is furnished and the furniture is worth between \$10,000 and \$15,000. We have not got to look for anything to furnish it, and I should like to express the hope now that succeeding legislators in Barbados will maintain this house, if we acquire it, in a manner which is in keeping with the position of the person who occupies it. We have spent considerable sums of money all down through the years in maintaining the official residence of the British pro-consul and in keeping it at a proper standard; and, Sir, considering our historical background, I think it is even more important, if we have reached the point at which we are now, charged with the responsibility of conducting our own affairs, that those who are conducting these affairs should be accorded no less respect — as a matter of fact we should be according them even greater respect — than what we would accord the pro-consul of the Imperial power.

6.15 p.m.

The country must regard this home as their home, and not the home of any member of Parliament or any Party Leader. Barbadians should be able to point with pride and dignity at the House of their Prime Minister. The building should be kept in good repair, the grounds should be well attended and everything possible done to ensure that the appearance of this place is in keeping with the important position of its occupant. Therefore I hope that neither this Legislature nor subsequent ones will ever quarrel at any reasonable expenditure proposed to keep this house in proper order. Government House is a place to which we

point with pride, we have felt that a non-elected Head of State should be properly housed. It is more important that the elected Head of State be accorded similar status, because he has to command the support and respect of the people in this Island; and if the State is niggardly in providing him with the trappings appropriate to his office, then do not be surprised if the public does not accord him the support and respect to which he is entitled.

The price, Sir, which, as I said, we are paying in 1964 is the same as that which the Government considered paying seven years ago; and with everybody knowing that property values have risen because of labour and because of material, there can be no charge of extravagance in proposing, as we are, to pay \$60,000 U.S. or \$103,800 W.I. for the place. The furniture is in good order and I have here a complete list of the pieces in each room. I do not think it is necessary in a debate like this to recite them in detail, because we are not having an auction sale; but if any hon. member wants to see the list, he can have a look at it.

I also thought it might be of interest to hon. members to have their minds refreshed on the fact that there is already a very long list of Government officials in this island for whom the State provides housing; and if the principle be accepted that these are entitled to housing accommodation, it is beyond the slightest shadow of a doubt that if they are entitled, then the Head of the State must be entitled too. This list comprises His Excellency the Governor, the Chief Personnel Officer, and in the Ministry of Education we have at least 30 people including the Chief Education Officer, masters at Harrison College, mistresses at Queens College, school teachers and what not, and even the Housekeeper at Erdiston College who are all provided with houses. In the Ministry of Communications and Works, you have another 20 odd people provided with housing. These include the Construction Superintendent, the Harbour Master, Director of Highways and Transport, three Surveyors, three Executive Engineers and the Engineer at the Waterworks Department. In the Ministry of Health you have Doctors, Radiographers, the Director of Medical Services, Tutor at the Mental Hospital, all the Medical Officers, Hospital Staff and what not, Superintendent of the Lazaretto, the Matron at the Hospital, the Matron at Speightstown Health Centre, who are all provided with housing at the expense of Government. In the Judiciary you have the Magistrates, the Crown Counsel and the Chief Justice provided with housing. In the Legal Department, you have the Director of Public Prosecutions, Parliamentary Counsel, Assistant to the Attorney General, Senior Parliamentary Counsel, all provided with housing by Government. In the office of the Premier himself, you have the Financial Secretary, the Chief Fire Officer, Police Superintendents, Air Traffic Control Officer, Director of Music and others attached to the Premier's office who live in Government Houses.

In my Ministry, Mr. Chairman, there are the Controller of Supplies, Customs Officer, the Keeper of the Powder Magazine, and in the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, there are three Senior Agricultural Assistants, seven Agricultural Assistants, Veterinary Officer, Assistant Livestock Officer who also live in Government lettings, and I have in addition the valuation in detail not only of these lettings but of all the buildings already owned by the Government.

Now, I do not think, Sir, that the price we are offering can be considered extravagant. I would be the last to encourage any Leader of a Party of which I was a member to indulge in extravagant spending at public expense, and I would expect every hon. member in this Chamber to adopt the same attitude under similar circumstances. If, Sir, we were being asked to follow the extravagant example set by the West Indian Federal Parliament in this respect, I should expect every single hon. member here to oppose it. To spend half a million dollars, as was proposed by the Federal Government, in a single house for a West Indian Prime Minister was unmitigated squandermania.

6.25 p.m.

I am sure that if the hon. junior member for St. Joseph follows this Resolution, he would agree with me that if he was in the Federal Parliament, he would not have supported it. He would be bound to feel that he was doing wrong, and the West Indies Federal Parliament could not afford this money. I know him. I know that he would not have endorsed this.

However, here we are in 1964, with the same place, with the same building. I expect to hear him therefore commend us for our sense of responsibility, and to assure us that although he regrets to see that he sees no possibility of a member of his Party occupying this place in the near future, yet he feels that the principle is sound and the Government is on the right road and the matter deserves our prompt attention. Both his two Premiers and our Premier were blessed enough with a reasonable share of material wealth, not in terms of the hon. senior member for the City, but they were in moderate circumstances and it was no embarrassment to them, whether or not the house which they were living in was one in conformity with the responsibility of this office. But we cannot consider whether or not the position which we are trying to guard against exists now or whether it may exist in the future; what we are saying is that in principle this is right and I feel, Sir, that we are taking the right step in ensuring that for the future the elected Head of Government of this country regards this as a material possession and would be able to devote his time and talent to the development of the country, and will not have to worry or be embarrassed over the fact that the home in which he finds himself could be a source of embarrassment and humiliation both to the country and himself.

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

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, maybe it is expected that coming from me would be a strong opposition to the acquisition of this property; but because politics is such a tricky game and can play such fantastic tricks, I, myself, think that the principle of acquiring premises or a home or a house to live in for the person who holds the office of Premier of this country is a correct thing; therefore, I am supporting the principle, I believe even my hon. friend, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, would support the principle because if you believe in the principles of democracy, if you fight an election and you oppose your friend because of a different political philosophy, then it is your duty to see that the law is carried out to its fullest and that you offer support, and to use the words of the hon. member who introduced this Resolution, so long as you see that there is no reckless squandermania.

It is part of my vocation to deal with real estate. When people become snobbish in other fields, I smile sometimes. If the hon. junior member for St. Joseph becomes snobbish in motor mechanism, I bow. If the Hon. Leader of this House becomes snobbish in journalism, I solo bow. I do not think there is anything wrong in my going to the hon. senior member for St. John and bowing in matters of economics because I know nothing about it.

I feel, Sir, that the principle of acquiring this House is correct. When the last Government was in power and they had brought this Resolution, some members on the other side would have accused me of supporting it. I do not believe in being parsimonious. I took an interest in politics just as I reached my maturity; therefore, I sat in the back of this House and watched not only the political complexion of it, but the pigmentation. It was so different from what it is today; and as you looked around, you realised that the wealth of this country then was in the hands of just a few people. In those days, the Attorney General and the Speaker lived in certain residences; therefore, people in this country feel that that was the sort of criterion to the ability of being a member of this Chamber. Conditions have changed, not because people believed one man changed the conditions in this country, but because from Ashton Chase up to the Prime Minister of the West Indies made a contribution.

Now, we have reached a stage that we have a political set up which demands that the person leading the Government or the Head of the State should be in such a position, or occupying such a position, that he is able to feel he can occupy it with dignity or that he would not be ashamed when people come to this Island and he has to entertain them; therefore, the principle today of your acquiring a place for the Premier is not necessarily that you are acquiring a place for the hon. senior member for St. John. Who could have imagined that in December, 1961, such a radical change would have taken place?

6.35 p.m.

Who knows who may occupy this place within the next three years? As I said, Sir, politics, like other things, play fantastic tricks. You might be going along the straight and narrow path and suddenly something happens; you will become in disfavour with the populace and you will no longer be the person who will occupy these premises. Therefore, today I hope that we will have a unanimous decision. I am speaking on behalf of my Party and I say that when we support this Resolution, we feel that it is absolutely necessary.

Speaking now on the presentation of the Resolution, I have some criticism to make and I sincerely hope that the Hon. Leader of the House will take it in good faith. It is not what I have heard via the grape vine or not; it is not what I have heard officially or not by way of business, that this place has been in the market. When I read this Resolution I felt that the Addendum should have been started, or it should have been introduced in a different way. It should have been set out or stated that this is the policy of the Government. I say that this Resolution, or the Addendum to it, has been badly drafted. This Resolution has been presented to this House today and it should have made the position clear, first of all, that it is the policy of the Government to acquire a home for the Premier for the time being, if I may use that legal phraseology, lest it be thought that you are acquiring a home for the hon. senior member for St. John. If, by some peculiar fate or unfortunate occurrence, the Hon. Premier did not come back here, this place would not be for him. Therefore, I say that this Resolution should have stated that it is the policy of the Government to acquire a home for the Premier. After that, you could have gone on to tell us about this house which is being offered for sale and so on.

It may be that I am a stickler for particulars in dealing with matters relating to real estate, and that is why I am making this criticism. The Resolution states that the property is known as "Culloden Farm". I know this property which was the property of Mr. J. R. Bancroft. This is "Culloden House". Why should this property be referred to in this way? Why should it be referred to as Culloden Farm? As I say, Sir, it was the property of Mr. J. R. Bancroft, who was the father of Mr. Oswald Bancroft whom we knew as a Magistrate here. I support this Resolution in principle and I will prove that there is no squandermania in it. Apparently, as has been stated in the Other Place, the less you put in the Addendum to a Resolution, the quicker you think you can get through with it. Some of us who are *au fait* with matters will allow things to pass without offering much criticism, but it should have been said that this house is being offered to the Government and the owners are willing to sell it for \$60,000 (U.S.)

Mr. Chairman, I know what was asked for this place before, and I am in a position to know that more than this amount was offered for this property. If I did not know that, I would make the Hon. Minister tell me what is the price of this property. This Valuation Committee which has been mentioned here does not at all times know what it is doing. When you say that the owner of this property is willing to accept a price of \$60,000 (U.S.) for it, does that mean that the owner asked a price and you bargained him down to \$60,000 (U.S.)? The intellectuals whom you have writing these Addenda think that with a modicum of commonsense and intelligence you do not understand.....

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sit down. Do you want to get me off my stride? You can speak when I am finished.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the official name of the property on the plan is "Culloden Farm". That is all I want to say.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I will bet you, Mr. Chairman, that the first time he knew that the property was named "Culloden Farm" was when he saw the plan. I say, Sir, that the property is known as "Culloden House". Anyhow, Sir, let us get back to the point; I will get back in my stride. I am saying that you should have declared what the Government policy is. I will say to the Minister that he must tell those boys who write these things not to write this nonsense which we have here. You decide on the policy that you will buy a house for the Premier. You say that the house is suitable for an official residence for the Premier and Heads of Government of the island. Well, Sir, the House in which I am living is suitable for occupation by a Premier too, but I say to the Minister that he must tell these people not to write nonsense which we have here. I could pull this Addendum to pieces. In this way you are just opening yourself to criticism. As I have said, you have decided upon a policy and it should have been stated here that this is the policy of the Government. If you agree that the Premier of this colony should have a house, we agree to that and that is why I am supporting this Resolution.
6.45 p.m.

The note further states that it has been recommended that the house would be suitable for an official residence for the Premiers and Heads of Government. Mr. Chairman, I should like the Minister to explain what he means by 'Heads of Government'. Instead of coming here and saying that it is the policy of Government to provide a residence for the Premier that "Culloden Farm" is on the market for sale, and after going into the matter carefully the Valuation Committee has been able to get the owners to accept this money, you come around and say that it would be suitable for Heads of Government. I do not know what you mean by 'Heads of Government' and I cannot vote for anything like that. I am voting for the acquisition of "Culloden Farm" as a suitable residence for the Premier of Barbados.

Mr. Chairman, you may laugh at what I have to say now. The Hon. Leader of the House said just now that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph had no hope in the immediate future of a member of his Party occupying this residence, at least without having to spend money to buy it. He might say the same thing about me, but fate can play some fantastic tricks. On the other hand, Sir, although I am supporting this, I must have an explanation of what is meant by 'Heads of Government' of the island. The note further states that part of the land would lend itself to development for other public purposes, and it is therefore proposed to purchase the property for \$103,800. Now this is where you can get me. If you want to take me as a partner if you find yourself in difficulty, I am willing to come in, because if I know "Culloden Farm" with the entrance on Collymore Rock and the entrance on Culloden Road, I can tell you how many mahogany trees are on the land and how much you can get for them. When I go any place on behalf of my clients, one of the first things I look to see is how we can get back our money, and I have therefore come to the conclusion that you are making a good buy. I agree with your policy not because a particular person is Premier; but whoever else for the time being is Premier of Barbados should occupy the residence.

Mr. Chairman, the leader of the House will remember that there was a time when there was talk about reducing the size of Government House as it was too much to upkeep and that the Governor should move into smaller quarters, and I said that this was our Government House, and if a Governor came here and said he wanted a smaller place, he should go back in one of the mews and live. I therefore agree in principle with having a home for the Premier for the time being as you have one for the Governor for the time being.

Now some people will feel that the sum of \$103,000 is a lot to pay for eight and a half acres of land. You will notice that I have not asked for a breakdown, but I have full

data of everything. There used to be a big mahogany dining-room table there. The house was owned by Mr. Wood who was married to J. R. Bancroft's daughter and then he sold it. Let us forget the furniture and the house. If the 8 1/2 acres of land cost \$43,560, you are paying less than 30 cents a foot for it. You have not taken into consideration the house that would cost £15,000 to build today, and I challenge anybody in this country to build that house for less than £15,000. I like old fashioned houses. To the general public the price of \$103,000 sounds a lot of money, but if you gave me a chance to go into this 8 1/2 acres of land with a bulldozer and push down the house, sell the mahogany trees and grant me the right to sell out the land, with the development cost of today for roads, water and gas, that would be twelve to fifteen cents a foot, and with Highways and Transport, it might cost 80 cents a foot; but I will tell you that (a) I agree with the principle of buying a house for the Premier for the time being, and (b) there is no squandermania in this at all. The furniture, it is true, is the type that appeals to me and not to the limers and modern day chaps.

Mr. Chairman, a lot of people like furniture that can last right down to their great grandchildren. The Fifth Avenue people in the United States do not change furniture every year; it is only the happy-go-lucky people who do. They like the four poster bedstead which they can hand down to their grandchildren. However, Sir, I feel that for \$103,800 you are getting a bargain. To my way of thinking and knowing the layout of "Culloden Farm", six acres of this land could well be developed into houses if you have a Federation for the Minister or whatever you wanted. If you did not have that, near as it is to the Hospital you could develop that land for such purposes. I do say, however, Mr. Chairman, that I do not accept the argument of the Hon. Minister about having to provide housing for the Chief Justice, because he has to pay for it, and I hope there is not going to be the idea of compelling a person to live in a house and then telling him that he has to pay for it. Now you are buying a house for the Premier for the time being to live in. You do not tell the Governor that he has to pay for Government House, and that is where I do not agree with the argument of the Hon. Leader of the House, because you should not tell the Premier for the time being that he has to pay for the House, because when he is not Premier he should get out. The argument that other persons are provided with houses cannot hold water, because they have to be provided with houses in which to live; but when you take off the six acres, you will leave 2 1/2 acres for this property which the Premier can normally - and barely - upkeep on \$1,000 a month.
6.55 p.m.

Anyway, Sir, I am supporting the principle that you provide a house for the Premier and I am quite satisfied that the price which you are paying for it is a very reasonable price. I will also say that if you run into difficulty and you want to get rid of any portion of it, you can always see me and I would be always willing to do business with you, and you will not lose money from it.

I support the principle and I believe, knowing "Culloden Farm" as I do, that the Government has got this property at a reasonable price. It is true, that since 1959 I know that this property was on the market. I know the broker who offered it to the last Government at the time. I know that I have offered this property to certain persons for the use of a school, but I failed to make this sale, much to my displeasure. I am no shoemaker; I am a real estate agent. I will take pride in selling this property today. I support the principle and I believe the price which they are paying for it is quite reasonable.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I am first committed on the principle of this Resolution and I would like to say on behalf of my Party that we agree with the concept. The whole concept is that the Governor, the Head of the State and the Head of the country should have an official residence. That was so for a number of years, and with the advancement of the Constitution it is clear that this is not changed. Even in tribal society it is the question now of the elected head; therefore, a house for the Premier or the Governor does not mean the same thing as it was years ago.

It is a question of whether or not you can afford \$75,000 a year, as was represented to us, to make arrangements for keeping this property in order, but we have reached the stage where we want a change in this Twentieth Century. This will forever remain the Premier's house or a house for the Prime Minister, whatever name you give him.

As I have said before, the idea of it is that the Governor ceases to be Head, but the Head of State is the Premier. It is a matter of timing. You must come to it; you must face the fact that there will be a Federation, and you will be faced with the twin concept, whether or not you like it, or I do not know if it is going to be within the ordinary arrangements of the Federation. It is a question of pride to some extent, but it is bound to come if we are to survive.

You know that in another 30 or 32 years you will have to support it. We know that we will be thinking in terms of half million souls within that time. When you think in terms of how much land you have, how much there is in roads, and so on, you have to think twice, since you have no means of increasing this 166 square miles.

Mr. Chairman, we want to give opportunity to our children. What will happen in the next eighteen years is still a matter of speculation, but the idea of a house for the Premier at this time is something that you must think about. Let us dismiss any thought of whether or not the Premier of this country should occupy an official residence. That is now something which you cannot hope to change. It is just a natural development which takes place in a community. If you will admit to people, one of the principles of democracy is that the majority of the state decides, when they select a particular individual, whom you call the Premier. When that is done in the ballot box, the country says that he is responsible. But, Sir, there are a number of other factors which we have to consider along with us. I have had a lot to do with this particular project when I was in the Ministry. The files before the Hon. Minister would show that. I recollect on two occasions that this property was offered to the Government, and on one occasion it was offered to the Social Welfare Department. I am not saying that this property is a white elephant, but I know that it is a very difficult property to sell.

The Hon. Minister says that you are buying this land at 13 cents a square foot. However, we must face the fact that it is a difficult property to sell. I am not saying that it has not got its value, but the peculiar thing which we have to concern ourselves with is the timing. You cannot think otherwise.
7.05 p.m.

Let us examine the properties already owned by the Government and which could become a residence for the Premier. Codrington House is occupied by the Head of the Agricultural Department. You take a look at it, you have the gardens to be developed and what is more, during the period when it was occupied by Sir John Saint, he was also in trouble lamenting the upkeep and the cost of help with that property. I could say so much on this that you would probably tremble; Mr. A. DeK. Frampton ran from it because of the cost of upkeep. The present occupier, Mr. Cave, inhabited one-third of the house and the rest of it was empty. That is the sort of house we could support with all the glory of the trees, including the roads on which the prisoners used to work. You could not attract the Head of the Department of Agriculture who could comfortably occupy this house. A new house was built for Lord Hailes, who was the Head of the Federation, and here the Savages occupied Government House and we had to make a contribution there.

I say, Sir, that this is a question of timing. You are now spending \$75,000 on Government House and which of these things could you deny the Premier? This house could not cost you less than \$60,000 for its running. You are bound to give him a Private Secretary and a lot of these Prime Ministers Conferences are bound to be held here. You are bound to supply furniture and equipment, stationary, flags, water supply, upkeep of gardens and so on, and some of this work is done by prison labour. You cannot

easily think of a Premier's house now. When he is getting a thousand dollars a month, you cannot give him a residence like that. To give him that residence and ask him to live on a thousand dollars a month and say that the land is suitable for other public purposes is farcical. Are you now robbing him of the majestic dignity which must go with his home? You must give him servants and gardeners and you have these eight acres of land. You are thinking of the dignity of a Premier's house. The front door of the Prime Minister's House at No. 10 Downing Street is on the road; there is a garden in the back not used for entertainment and that is given as the Prime Minister's home.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that we should deny the people of this country a residence for the Premier, but the question is: Can we afford it now? I repeat, Sir, that is a question of timing. Look at the stagnation of the masses! With this \$103,000, we could easily erect a two storeyed building for Harrison College or Queen's College in order to accommodate so many more school places. Have you any idea of the children who would be affected by neurosis because of defeat? You pass an exam and there is no room for you! This money would build two Premiers' houses. These are the things which you want to examine. If you say that this is not important or that it does not matter, you are not fit for the representation of the people, and you would not deserve the right to occupy a chair in this ancient and august Chamber. These things are real; these are the grim, cold and naked facts. Think of sending three hundred children for examination, children who would never have got the opportunity for Secondary Education, and people who have passed the examination for entrance to a Secondary School cannot get in.

The Premier himself is bound to wait, and in the process of time a house can be provided for him. You are destroying the very meaning of education in the hearts of too many of our children, - and I am not thinking in terms of the ambitious ones, but in terms of a simple demand. These are matters which you cannot deny. Right now you can build eight or twelve classrooms at any of the Secondary school premises. There is room for that at Harrison College, there is room for it at Queen's College and you can make room available at Combermere School. You could provide for 300 children who have passed this examination for entrance to the Secondary Schools. As to providing a house for the Premier, you could give that up for the sake of the education of children. How can you decide right now that you must have this residence for the Premier?

In this same house, 82 years ago, the decision was taken to bring down the grandfather of the man Coode who built the Deep Water Harbour, and his grandfather journeyed to Barbados in order to estimate the cost of a Harbour in Bay Street. It is a question - or it was a question - of first things first. When we could have built the Deep Water Harbour for one and a half million dollars, we were not allowed to build that Harbour until in 1963 when we had to spend \$3 1/2 million. Mr. Chairman, there is no shrewd or clever argument about this; you cannot escape the truth, and facts are stubborn things.
7.15 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, it is a question of timing. You cannot deny the fact that, if you buy this for \$103,800, it does not end there. I would probably not be talking about this if it would end there, but you have to give him an office, and you have to develop the eight acres of land. I remember that Arundell pleaded with the Executive Committee to take off six or seven acres of land at the back of Government House; so do not let us fool ourselves about this 8 1/2 acres of land which you will have to maintain. I agree with the country providing a State residence for the Premier of the country. We want to accept it as one of the main and essential tenets of our growing and expanding democracy, but we want to be sure whether or not we are doing the right thing at the right time. Do not let us fool ourselves with all this second hand old talk about old furniture and a big mahogany table. It would be of interest to know who will get the commission from this sale. All we know is that Government House is costing us \$75,000, and the Premier

must be free to invite the Governor, and entertain like the Governor. Will you ask him to do it with rum-and-ginger or rum-and-coke? It would cost us at least \$60,000 a year and probably more, because you would not like, in going to see the Premier, to see prisoners keeping the gardens. Even at Government House I have often felt it to be humiliating and embarrassing to see prisoners sweeping the gardens where every day they are embarrassed and exposed. Where is the social strength in all this? Where is the Socialist idea if it is correct to believe that any other individual is entitled to certain rights and privileges?

I know, Mr. Chairman, that the Government is going to use its numbers to vote for this, but the sorry thing about it is that a few years ago Coode's grandfather came to Barbados and could have built the Harbour for \$2 million less. We wanted a new Hospital before you were born, but it was a question of timing. How long did we have open slaughter taking place at the back of the market? It was a question of whether we could find the money, and it was a question of priority. You have a suitable place at Codrington that could be the Premier's house. You could remove the little office in the yard, and you could shut the area off and there you have something that could for ever belong to the country. The furniture in the house is not anything. I am not saying that it is not worth all this money, but you cannot ask the Premier to occupy this house for less than what it would cost the Governor, and you are spending \$70,000 or \$75,000 a year. Do you really want this? Can you afford it? As I said, when Savage was occupying Government House, it was his wife's father who had to help him keep it. I know that Lord Hailes had to use some of his capital from investments in England to make a contribution to the property in which he lived. I know that No. 10 Downing Street is given to the Prime Minister. I am not saying that we should have philanthropy here, and wait for 300 years and nothing happen. I agree with providing a home for the Premier, but do not tell me that with this long gap you are going to have children going to school in the backyard, or a house for the Chief Justice or Lord Pope, because that must destroy the meaning of all this. It must have a concept, a glory and a halo of its own.

Mr. Chairman, a massive castle was built for Nkrumah but he elected to build a simple house. These are things that will not change. I appeal to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the Government. I know it means nothing, but it is my duty and that of my Party to say this. It would be misleading this country if you tell them that \$103,000 will be the answer to the Premier's house. I agree that you must have an elected representative, and if it were not so, Parliament would have thrown out the Queen and said "God bless you." Why did Socrates perish in attempting to formulate a policy to give to the world a Christian democracy where the majority of people would have a say in the Government? There were only three greats that perished- Joan of Arc, innocently burnt at the stake, and I think of the Messiah, King of the Jews, the Carpenter's Son. He too perished on a hillock, and to this day one is forever unable to answer why He died. In the midst of all this, we want to agree with you; it is something we have been working towards, but like the Harbour it is two years late. It is a question of timing as there are so many things to be done. I should like you to re-dress your minds and give this further examination. Go and look at "Codrington." I am sure there are rooms in that house which the officer Mr. Cave, has not seen for months. These are things that are stark, grim realities that are in front of you. You must decide in your minds whether or not this country can afford \$60,000 for the upkeep of this house. If he can live in the comfort and warmth of his own residence, what he can do with \$1,000 a month there he cannot do in this house; and if you take a quick look at what I said on this matter, you are coming to the country for something it cannot afford at this moment. There are a number of things that should be examined and a number of things to be done, and, as I said, what is more important; woe betide you as Government when the time comes and you have to deny a child the opportunity even in an elementary school! Woe betide this Government - and for that matter any Government - in a growing society like ours! 7.25 p.m.

It was all right in that period when you found half of the children rejected from Entrance Examinations into secondary schools, and not fit to get into schools for a number of reasons. But that is not the position today. When you deny a child whose parents know only too well today what is the position, you know what is going to happen. You are going ahead to spend \$70,000 a year at this period on the upkeep of this property. Something must be wrong. You must have some feeling. Can you really understand the shadow of darkness which falls on homes today, people being hungry and threadbare? You are telling me that you need this \$103,000 to purchase a property for a house for the Premier. Have you examined these things? Is it because you have not examined it fully? Something must happen to your conscience; there must be some reflection; if not today, tomorrow or sometime. Is it because you want to fall out with your conscience? Is it because you think that probably some of these boys would occupy this Chamber? I forgive you, Sir, but I appeal to you to postpone this. Yes, the Premier should have a house; but it can be "Codrington" or somewhere else. Do not tell me that at this time you are going to commit this country to recurrent expenditure of \$70,000. I am thinking in the majestic silence or the solitary confines of this home, but you must bear in mind that it is what the people of this country by their taxes must pay for. Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by? Postpone this, not because "Freddie" Miller says so, not because the boys of the Barbados Labour Party say it, but make sure that your conscience does not recall with agony that for doing this you deny 300 children an education, one of whom may be a Premier of this Island.

Mr. Chairman, so much can be said of this Resolution. I repeat, not because the Barbados Labour Party, not because "Freddie" Miller, Lloyd Smith and Ellsworth Holder say so, but I appeal to members on the other side to examine this. This is a reality; this is a price based on human suffering because it can mean a denial, and the Hon. Premier can still do without this for the moment. If you have to wait for another five years until our economy is of such, I appeal to you with all that I am capable to re-examine this. I feel that you are committing the taxpayers of this Island, besides this \$103,000, to another \$3,000 added to the emoluments of the Premier. I appeal to you with all the dignity that is left to re-examine this. I appeal to you to use another property which is at present owned by the Government, but do not use this \$103,000 to pay for this property now.

Sir, I take it that you may have made the necessary arrangements already and may be, there is nothing which I can say to stop you from going forward; but I still appeal to you to postpone this. I appeal to you to examine this again. It is too costly. Do not buy it now.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Chairman, as a member of this Chamber, I hasten to support this Resolution because I consider it to be a worthwhile Resolution. There are times when we look forward to making long speeches, but I consider that this is not the time to make a long speech; this is the time to face hard, cold facts. The time has come when we are gradually moving forward; and if we must have the standard of living raised in this country, the only thing to do is to move forward.

Mr. Chairman, I sat here and heard the Hon. Leader of the House when he was introducing this Resolution say that countries like St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Grenada and even Montserrat have an official residence for their Chief Minister. Why not Barbados? I am sure that if we are to be the capital of the Federation, those countries should look up to a place like Barbados; but here it is, we in Barbados are still lagging behind those countries although we are self supporting.

I am surprised, Mr. Chairman, to hear the remarks of the hon. junior member for St. George who has been in here for some time, and I am saying this not because the Government of which he was a member did not see fit to purchase this residence for the Premier, but I believe that a place of this sort at the price which was offered is

very reasonable and there is no squandering of the money. This is no time to mislead the public or for one to say that this sum of money should be earmarked to build houses for poor people or that it could be spent in educating children. This is the time to face facts.
7.35 p.m.

It may cost you \$103,000 today and in years to come it will cost you more. I feel, Mr. Chairman, that we should not continue to lag behind the small countries. These small countries are looking up to us for leadership; and therefore we should keep in front of them. We should continue to go where we are going. I feel that in any country the Premier should be regarded as the Governor is regarded. It is not a question of purchasing a place for the Premier as an individual; it is a question of purchasing a place for the Premier of the country. If I, as an individual member of this House, am supporting this policy, then members of Parties should be supporting it the more so. If any Party were to gain a majority in the House, who knows who will be the Premier at the next election? The hon. junior member for St. George may be the Premier of this country. *(Laughter)*. I can only say that the hon. member is afraid. I feel that members of his Party should be supporting this Resolution more than I am.

Mr. Chairman, I have never yet heard of an individual running a Government; you can only run a Government if you have a Party. I do not think that there should be any fear on the part of hon. members who are members of a Party; they should see the wisdom of agreeing to this Resolution for the purchase of this property, because in the next Election they will be putting out the present Government and taking over the reins of Government. If I were a member of a Party, I would support this Resolution. I am an Independent Member and I have much pleasure, Mr. Chairman, in supporting this Resolution. With those remarks, I hope that hon. members will see their way not to prolong this debate, because at the end of it the place will still be purchased. *(Cheers)*

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this Resolution. I would not like my stand on this particular Resolution to remain in any doubt, and therefore I rise to support the Resolution. We have reached a point in our development when there is a certain amount of prestige attaching not only to our Premier, but to the residence which he inhabits. It is important that the residence which is inhabited by the Premier of this country should be a proper one. I am not now referring to the present Premier, but to those who are to come in future, and those Premiers should command respect. This has been done in West Africa. The idea of national pride has reached the West Indies, and why should we lag behind others who, in our heart of hearts, we sometimes consider to be our inferiors?

As to the price to be paid for the residence suggested, I feel that we are very fortunate indeed to obtain it at so low a price. If two and a half acres of land were to be retained and six acres were to be sold, whether the six acres were to be called "Culloden Gardens" or whatever you will, my arithmetic works out that if it could be sold at sixty cents a foot that would be \$160,000. I know that some back land at Roebuck Street cost \$2.40 per square foot, and therefore it is in no way alarming to suggest that land in that particular area might well fetch a price of 60 cents a foot. Not only would the Premier's house be situated in a proper district and command respect, but the Government could very well make some money on this project. I have had the opportunity of visiting the homes of Premiers in the West Indian area, not only of English communities but also of French and Dutch communities, and none of them constitutes a traffic hazard when you are leaving them as does the home of the present Premier. It is therefore high time that our Premier should be housed in a dwelling which would command the respect of the populace.

We must bear in mind that we are not obtaining a residence only for the present Premier, but for Premiers who are to come. Prestige and national pride must be built up in the home of the Premier in any progressive community. I am sure, Sir, that we can afford this money, and I also feel

certain that by selling off, or alternatively by using, the six acres of land which will not be needed as a curtilage for the Premier's dwelling, we will be actually making a great deal of money, because even at sixty cents a square foot, that is a good figure when it is considered what land in other areas of equal popularity is fetching at this time. I think it is a very good business project for the Government to purchase this land and so I beg to give my support to this Resolution.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, it is getting late and all of us want to get home, and therefore I do not have much to say on this Resolution. The hon. introducer of this Resolution will remember that in very nearly every word he used he mentioned the name of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. I do not know why the hon. member was doing that, but he must have had some reasons for so doing. He has mentioned that the Premier has to receive dignitaries and people of that sort. Sir, before I go further in my remarks, I want to say that I am not for one moment against building or purchasing a residence for the Premier because it will not be a building belonging to the Premier, it will be the Government's building just as when you give the Governor a car, it is our car.
7.45 p.m.

I can remember, Sir, that some of the members on that side of the House gave no end of trouble when a Resolution came down here for, I think, \$7,000 or \$8,000 for a car for the Governor, but you still hear one saying tonight that no respectable or self-respecting, thinking person would say anything about the buying of a home for the Premier, and it is not the Premier's own. I wonder if the car is the Governor's car. *(Mr. BOXILL: Yes.)* I heard some idiot say "yes".

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There are no idiots in this Chamber.

Mr. SMITH: Yes, Sir. The Hon. Introducer mentioned all of the other territories which have buildings for their Premiers and Leaders. He mentioned some that are not able to pay their own way and have to go hat in hand begging, but that although as they have to do begging, they still have a Premier's home. I would prefer not to have a Premier's home and not to go begging, because I do not like to beg. There is one thing that I used to beg for, but I have stopped. Now, Sir, the Hon. Introducer mentioned the officers for whom Government provide homes, but he failed to call a particular one who is not an officer, but a Government man. The Government finds homes for watchmen too, but these people are paying rent for the homes. A certain amount of money is taken from their salaries. It would be the same thing if I was working in the Government and rented a home from a private landlord.

Mr. Chairman, does the Minister want me to understand that the Premier will be paying rent for this house, because he has compared it with housing for other officers? I do not know if he is thinking in terms that whoever is Premier will be paying rent when this home is provided, because he mentioned all the rent payers to bring out his argument. Does it mean, Mr. Chairman, that because these other places are providing homes for their Premiers, whether or not they are in a position to do it, we must do it? Now I want to find out, if we do not provide a home for our Premier, if it is going to prevent the rain from falling, crops from growing, people from working, people from buying food, or cause business houses to close. First things must come first. There was a time when we did not have a Government Headquarters. We have one now, and even then a lot of opposition was put up on the floor of this House. I can remember that one particular member was so vexed about it that he told us he had been into one of the offices, and taken a nail and scrawled up the wall as a mark of protest. One of the members of this House said that because he understood that a bath was being erected for the Premier, I do not think I have been to that building three times; I do not know if there is a bath, but it was a question of a bath being erected. A bath was erected so that if the Premier was in his office and had to meet dignitaries or had to go somewhere, rather than having to go home and cool off, he could get a bath there. The present Premier criticised it and said he scrawled the

wall as a mark of protest. A bath-room in a building caused a big debate on the floor of this House, and now the hon. senior member for St. Philip is telling me tonight that I should not say anything against a Resolution of this sort, or words to that effect. This is a building for \$103,800. Now, Mr. Chairman, there he is. He will be doing that until I have finished, and he has not done it for the night with the other speakers.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is anticipating me. I have not had to do it because I have not been misquoted. I never said that the hon. member should not say anything about the Resolution. Why should I? He is entitled as a member. What I said is that as far back as 1957 his Party, then in Government, had been negotiating to buy this place. They had agreed to buy it at a price of \$110,000 and then the owners refused to sell. That is what I said.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, I am accustomed to the hon. senior member for St. Philip getting up. I like him to get up, but both of us will get up and sit down all the time. As I was saying, Sir, they criticised Government Headquarters when it was being built, and the present Premier said on the floor of this House — I think he called it Adams Castle — that he scrawled the Premier's office because a bath room was erected.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I must rise again on a point of order. I have never in this Chamber heard the Hon. Premier say that he scrawled up any bath. 7.55 p.m.

What he said was this. During the erection of the building, he paid a visit and saw the bath and he attempted to prophesy that one day he would occupy that bath; so he wrote his name in the bath.

Mr. SMITH: That is no point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am listening to the point of order.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I am contradicting the statement made by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. If you refer to the Hansard, you will see that the Premier said that he wrote his name in the bath. I am saying that he played being a prophet because he knew he would be occupying that bath.

Mr. SMITH: He never said so. He said he scrawled up the bath.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I object to that. I am willing to bet anything on this. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph is willfully distorting what he said. He never said that he was scrawling up the bath.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, if he wrote his name, how would he get it in? I call it "scrawl". What would you call it? 'Ignorant me' calls it "scrawl"! What would an intelligent person like you call it?

Mr. Chairman, well, he wrote his name in the bath, because he was so bitter against it. He criticised it. They now feel, because they are in office, that nobody must say anything against this Resolution: but that cannot happen to me as long as I am in here. I am in here to represent poor people and I am going to represent them. Here it is; they are willing and ready to assent to \$103,000 being placed at the disposal of themselves for the purchase of a place for the Hon. Premier. We have poor hungry people, people who are responsible for 92 per cent of this country through their sweat, knocking at the doors of the Housing Authority for houses to live in and they cannot get one cent. They have the qualifications to get a loan and they cannot get it.

This Government is now asking for the sum of \$103,000 for the purchase of a house for the Hon. Premier, not a particular Premier. We have had two already. The Hon. Premier does not have to go to the Housing Authority for any loan; he is living somewhere already. But look how it is with those poor people! Three and four live in a house.

Mr. Chairman, listen to this. Last year when we had the declaration of a storm hitting Barbados and just a high wind passed by, it blew down a few of the houses in districts near to me. Up to now, the poor people who lived in those houses have not got back a house yet, and they are still drawing up with some other people. I hope that a storm does not pass here this time, because if one were to come now, there would be nothing for the people. I am saying: first things first. Yes, it is right to have a home for the Premier; but are you going to put the Premier in that lovely house when people cannot get anywhere to live? Could you be so irresponsible to the people who are responsible for putting you here?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I would like to ask the hon. junior member for St. Joseph this. Anyone would tell you that there was pure destruction falling on this Island within the last forty years. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that when we came into office there were applications for over 6,000 houses in 1961. During the fifteen years that the hon. member's Government was in power there was more unemployment in the Island than at any time. Today there is less poverty, there is a better standard of living than it was during their reign.

Mr. SMITH: The hon. member is saying that pure destruction has fallen on this country. I am trying to prevent it because his Government is causing it minutely. Since they have got into power, how many houses have they done?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I rise on a point of order.

Mr. SMITH: What point of order can he rise on?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would have to hear the Hon. Minister.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: We are not building houses for people to shelter in. What they built were cattle pens. We are building proper houses for the people.

Mr. SMITH: The hon. member is talking about cattle pens. Where was our Saviour born? The hon. member is talking about cattle pens. That is where he wants to keep the people. There were three or four people who lost their houses during the high winds last year, and this nice Government that has done so much cannot see their way to take people out of the homes which they are drawing up at.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I rise on a point of order.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, what point of order is he rising on?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will have to hear him.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The hon. member is referring to houses which he made representations for here. Investigations revealed that one of the houses which the hon. member was making representation for had already fallen down before the high wind. The hon. member wanted the Government to give the occupant of that house a new one although it had fallen down already. That is the sort of political dishonesty which you get. They come and waste hon. members' time. They want you to provide a house for somebody whose house had already fallen down. That is the sort of thing with which we do not put up. If they are accustomed to doing that, we will not do it. 8.05 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, you sat there and heard the hon. member accuse me of dishonesty.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I did not hear that.

Mr. SMITH: What did you hear?

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

Mr. SMITH: Well, you did not hear the word "dishonesty"; but if the hon. member is accusing me of being

dishonest and wanting them to give someone a house which had already been blown down before the hurricane, then he is corrupt because he gave the person the house. The person to whom the hon. member is referring got a house. He knows that I am dishonest, but now he is corrupt. He should resign now.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The Oral Reply to the hon. member's Question was given on the floor of this House and it was pointed out that that house — I can call the name of the owner of the house, but I would not do it. However, Sir, the house is in Sugar Hill, not far away from where the hon. member lives. He knew that the house had fallen down before the hurricane, and he made representation in this Chamber for the Government to give that person a house. The Government has not given that person any house; the hon. member is speaking a deliberate untruth.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, did you hear that?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Yes, I heard it.

Mr. SMITH: I will not ask you to ask him to withdraw that statement. I will say that he is a little liar; not even a big one.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the hon. junior member for St. Andrew had categorically denied that the Government has rebuilt this house which has been blown down. The hon. member has said that it was a deliberate untruth to say that the house was rebuilt by the Government; therefore we are not sitting here and allowing the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to call the Hon. Minister a liar — which is completely unparliamentary — and we will have to ask the hon. member to withdraw that statement.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has gone a little too far when he said.....

Mr. SMITH: Call on the junior member for St. Andrew first.

Mr. MILLER: Let both of them withdraw their statements.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the Hon. Minister willing to withdraw the words "deliberate untruth"?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, the records of the House show that the hon. junior member for St. Andrew was completely correct in stating that the remark made by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was deliberately untrue. The question which was asked by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph on the 14th January this year was this:

"Has it been drawn to the Minister's attention that the house of Viola Farmer of St. Bernards Village, St. Joseph has been extensively damaged by the hurricane "Flora" that passed the Island last year?"

And this was the Reply:

"The Minister has been informed that Viola Farmer's house was blown from its groundsel by high winds on the night of 24th September, 1963, but that it was beyond repair before it fell."

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph will therefore withdraw his allegation that the Hon. Minister is a liar.

Mr. SMITH: Now, Sir, you have heard the Hon. Minister with the Reply. I will say, Sir, that the people removed out of the house and went into the St. Bernards Village School. If the warning had not been given out, they would still have been in the house.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order. Our information by Police investigation was that the people had moved out of the house before we had the high winds.

Mr. SMITH: That is not true.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: We are sticking to the records in the files in the Ministry which are to the effect that the house was in such a bad condition that the people had to remove out of it. I may say that when I speak of political dishonesty it is because of the fact that people consider that politicians like to take the taxpayers in this island for a ride. They ask the taxpayers to pay money to repair a house which was irreparable before the high winds came. That is political dishonesty.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like both hon. members to withdraw both statements in view of the fact that they are both unparliamentary, and it would be better for us to get on with this Resolution. I ask both hon. members to withdraw those unparliamentary remarks.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I am willing to withdraw the words "Political dishonesty" and say that it is unethical politics, it is not in keeping with the ethics of the political profession.

Mr. SMITH: What I am referring to is the use of the words "deliberate untruth"; that is what I am objecting to.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the day that I accuse anybody of political dishonesty, I am not withdrawing that. That use of the words "political dishonesty" is not unparliamentary. There is nothing unparliamentary about that. What is unparliamentary is the use of the words "deliberate untruth" and "liar"; but if you are politically dishonest, you are politically dishonest. I would never withdraw that, because there is nothing unparliamentary about it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What the hon. member is objecting to is the use of the words "deliberate untruth".

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, if the facts prove that what the hon. member was saying was not true, what am I to say?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The words are unparliamentary.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Well, Sir, in withdrawing the words "deliberate untruth" I would say that the statement made by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph does not correspond with the facts of the case.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Now I will hear the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I most respectfully beg to withdraw my remarks.
8.15 p.m.

I will say here and now that I am not so narrow; but when the hon. member talks about fleecing the Government and dishonesty, if I were to make one move now, the hon. member would be a surprised man. I would warn him to stay in his seat and not try to step in hot water for others, because he will notice that no one is going to step into it for him.

Now, the Hon. Introducer wants to force this Resolution on us. To begin with, they should pay this House the courtesy of inviting us to visit this place, because we are all buying it. If the vote was lost tonight, no Premier nor anybody could get the money; so we are the buyers; we are untying the strings of the taxpayers' purse. Mr. Chairman, you would not buy a place you have not seen or do not know. They may have seen it, but I have not, and although my colleague here is in favour of it, I doubt if he knows the place. Is he going to tell me that he would buy something he has not seen? He is a businessman.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the hon. member is asking whether I would buy something I have not seen, but he does not remember that he objected to buying The Mount though he had not seen it. (Laughter).

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member said I do not know The Mount, and that is the excuse he is making. Now, Sir, the amount of \$103,800 is required to buy this place, and I was making the point that you have people knocking at the Housing Authority door and cannot get homes. Up to yesterday a man went to me and said he had \$100, and that they told him he could not get the money yet. They are not telling people they do not have the money, but are turning them round and round. The Housing Authority wants money in it.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the hon. member will have to refer to me again as a suckling, but he has more experience in politics and in the affairs of Government than I have, and he should know that the Housing Authority Fund is supposed to be a Revolving Fund, and they get a limited amount of money from the Labour Welfare Fund annually. If the people have funds from the Housing Authority and refuse to repay the loans, with rents being \$3 million out and loans \$2 million out, they cannot get the money. The people who are now applying are the fathers, sisters and brothers of those who would not repay; so how can you have a Revolving Fund? So much per annum comes from the Labour Welfare Fund, and not as an annual vote from General Revenue. The amount paid into the Authority from the Labour Welfare Fund depends on the amount of sugar produced annually. If the funds loaned out were repaid punctually, there would never be this turning back of people, because it would be revolving.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, did the Hon. Minister say that there were \$3 million owing for rent?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I have issued instructions to collect the rents, and only yesterday a lady came to me who owed \$638 in rent for 228 weeks after being in the house for 5 1/2 years. After being in the house since 23rd November, 1959, this one person owes the Housing Authority \$638.46. This is the sort of thing that obtains, and responsible people are telling the tenants not to pay the rents. What is to be expected if one person paying \$2.79 a week for a house can only pay twelve weeks' rent out of 5 1/2 years? We do not come here in the Estimates to say: "Give the Housing Authority \$1 million;" so if the hon. member does not understand it, let him ask a question and it will be explained.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I should just like to thank the Minister and I must confirm what he said. A letter he wrote me was to the effect that a woman did owe this money, but she only depended on money which the City Council gave her. I only wish that Jackson was here to hear what you said tonight.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member got up on a point of order and explained that the people would not pay the rent. Well, Sir, in *Gazettes* one night your humble servant stood up and heard the Hon. Premier of this country tell the people up there not to pay one cent because the houses were theirs.
8.25 p.m.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. During 1961, at no time did the hon. member for St. Joseph hear the Hon. Premier tell the people not to pay their rent to the Housing Authority. What he heard the Hon. Premier say was that occupancy tax was long abolished and they were not the owners of the house; therefore, they should not pay occupancy tax. But never at any time did the Hon. Premier mention to anybody not to pay house rent. That, too, is a deviation from the truth.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I always respected the Hon. Minister for being a bold man, but if he would come with me, I can go now and put my hands on the person and bring him out and I know that the person would say "yes". It is all right for the hon. member to get up and butter up something.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Chairman, I do not hold any brief for the Hon. Premier. I have heard that statement too often. The Hon. Premier said to the people not to pay

any occupancy tax because occupancy tax was abolished long ago and they were not the owners of the house; therefore, they should not pay any ownership tax.

Mr. SMITH: Therefore, I think they should tell those people that they misunderstood them. Mr. Chairman, they had better go back and tell the people that they misunderstood them. That is so even in the private places. But it was not so bad. However, I am not talking about the ones who are in the homes; I am talking of the agricultural labourers — those people who want their old houses repaired.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I referred to the fact that those people are in a worse condition because there is less money floating about. We still have \$2 million out. The hon. member must bear in mind that it is a Revolving Fund, and those people are making it worse for their brothers and sisters. If they pay up their loans, the people would not even have to bring \$100 because the money would be there and it would be available to them. But if the money is not revolving, what have you to do?

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister is making a point for the people that have already got loans. I am trying to make out a case for those who have not got any loans — those people who are entitled, who are qualified to get a house, but because other people do not pay, they cannot.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I rise on a point of order. I would like to invite the hon. member to read the Housing Act and see where the provision for the funds of the Housing Authority comes from. If he gets himself acquainted with the Act, I am sure he would not come in here with that nonsense.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, did you hear the Hon. Minister? I would not ask him to withdraw. I would hit him and he would scream.

Now, Sir, I am making out a case for those people that are qualified for a loan, not for the ones that have had a loan already. As you know, Sir, a certain amount of money is taken from those persons too; therefore, is it fair to take from me to help him and because the next fellow did not pay back, I cannot get any help at all? I can tell you what was going on at the Housing Authority.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am appealing to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. Let us stick to "Culloden House".

Mr. SMITH: As I have said, Sir, in my opening remarks, I am not against the principle of purchasing this home, but I am arguing my case. It would be now real political dishonesty to vote \$103,000 for a house for the Premier when there are hundreds of people at the door who cannot get anywhere to live. There are some people who cannot get anywhere to live, but you cannot tell me that any Premier that is going to be elected to this Chamber would be such a man who does not have a home. That is my case.

I do not want to refer to the present Premier, but he is in office; so he is going to vote \$103,000 for a home for a Premier. When this home is bought, he is going to move out of his home. He has a home already. Do you think he is going to shut up his home? He is going to rent it out. You have some old people who are being relieved by the Public Assistance Board. They get a little pension, but that cannot keep them. If you go to their homes, you will see that many of them are in a bad condition. Those people are suffering like anything. Knowing these things, I cannot at this time vote this money. There was a time when we had no Deep Water Harbour although representations were made to get one. It was only after a long time that we got one. We wanted a new Hospital, and for a long time it was being talked about but we have now got it. Let first things come first. A home for the Premier at the moment can wait a little longer. If you are going to take \$103,000 from Loan Funds, take it and lend it out at the Housing Authority and to those people who want a house; help them. You have a Transport Board and things of that sort. You have to do

something about it. Transport is the sort of thing which you must help. It is the upkeep of the Island; because if you do not get your teachers who have no cars to come out, you are no wiser. If I do not get my people to come out and do my work, I would be nowhere.
8.35 p.m.

If I do not get people to come out, I am not any wiser. If the hon. senior member for St. Michael did not get out his people, he is nowhere. The question of Transport is a serious thing, and we have to do something about it. We have to spend money, and if we have to borrow this money from Loan Funds then that is something. This house can remain; I am in favour of a house being acquired, but first things should come first. I am pointing out to the Government and I intend to point out to the people that I will let every elector know who voted for this Resolution and who did not vote for it, I will do that if I do not die and go to Heaven. Because you are in the House of Assembly, you feel you can do as you like; and when you go back to the people, you think you can do as you like. We have to press upon the Government that the people must be helped first.

The Premier has a home and I will say that this \$103,000 cannot give all the people homes. If I am living in my house day in and day out and all the year round, do you mean to say that that house is not good enough for me to entertain a stranger for an hour or two. I am not inviting him to sleep and if I have something good to drink he would not even look at the house. The most of these strangers like our stuff, and if a stranger wanted something I would mix it strong and he would not even know when he left. You can carry a stranger to any hotel if you do not want to carry him home. I want to say, Sir, that the argument about dignitaries coming to this island is not sufficient to bring forward in connection with the acquisition of this house. I want to raise up those who are on the ground. Imagine the hon. introducer of this Resolution talking about dignitaries coming to this island! I do not think that it was the Government's policy to purchase a home for the Premier; that was not in the Government's Manifesto. At that time they could put anything in the Manifesto, but I do not think that they could put that in the next Manifesto. I am sure that there are things in the Manifesto which they have not carried out, but there are things which are not in the Manifesto which could be carried out.

I think that Hothersal Tenantry was mentioned as property to be bought, but that has not yet been bought. If they were buying this tenantry which they had promised the people they would buy, that would have been carrying out the wishes of the people. I have lost my copy of the Manifesto but I will try and get back one, and what they do not do I will put before the people. Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand why there is this rush to purchase this house for the Premier. The other Premier will have to come in and rough it just like the others. I do not know if they want a house with a long gap leading to it so that they can have a few policemen placed in the gap, and so on; I do not know that. If they want more protection, let them say so, because the people must be protected; but do not let us talk about dignitaries coming here as a reason for buying this house. The Addendum to this Resolution says this:-

"It has been recommended that the House would be suitable for an official residence for the Premiers and Heads of Government of the Island and that part of the land would lend itself to development for other public purposes."

I should like to ask: by whom has this recommendation been made? It has not been made by this House and therefore I am wondering who is making these recommendations? You will have to stand by to pay out some good money, because if you are carrying out the Report relative to transport, then you will have to look for a lot of these things. It is all right to borrow money because pay day will come; but it is also a question of the interest. No sensible businessman will borrow money which he cannot invest and get back more money. If you invest money in something which will bring back money, that is a good investment. If you buy all the buildings with the money which you borrow, you must realise that you will want money to maintain the

buses. Do not let the Government think that they will buy over the business of the private concessionaires for any penny.

As I said, Sir, I am not talking in two different ways; I cannot blow hot and cold at the same time. I say that I agree with the principle of acquiring a home for the Premier, but at this moment I will be dishonest to agree with this proposal when there are many other things to be done. They should satisfy the people who want houses first. The Premier could go up to Sam Lord's Castle or Farley Hill, but you are buying this house in this hot place. I say that when the time comes and you are acquiring a Premier's home, let it be a country home and not a home like this place in Collymore Rock. That does not suit a man to live in peace and accommodate his friends; but I say that we must first satisfy the wants of the small people.
8.45 p.m.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, no one would have thought that this debate would have been so protracted, but apparently some of the members on the opposite side must have been from the Southern States of the United States, because they did nothing else but filibuster. They have not said one tangible thing for the whole night, but such is the price of democracy. We have to sit here and put up with this kind of thing. During the talk by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, he apparently seemed to be more interested in poor people than anybody else in this world; yet I know there was a time when he was Chairman of a Board that a woman, whose husband was suffering from tuberculosis, went to him.... (Mr. MOTTLEY: He who?) Mr. Chairman, I will not be interrupted by any hon. member. Members must realise that they must sit and keep quiet as I have done when they were speaking. This lady went to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph asking for some help. This is a poor lady with two children and a sick husband, and all he could have seen his way to give her was 75 cents for a fortnight. I would like this hon. member to realise....

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, you are allowing the hon. member to be personal because he is your colleague. If you allow him to be personal, I will be personal too. If he wants to reply to me on the Resolution, let him do so; but if he does not know how to reply, I cannot help him. If you allow him to be personal, I will be personal too and it will get out of your hands.

Mr. BOXILL: As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, what the hon. member and his colleague have got to realise is that the poor has always been with us, and whether we buy a mansion for the Premier or an island, you will always still have the poor. The United States is spending something like \$17 billion to send a man to the moon, but there is poverty in the United States, and I have seen it for myself. You get the poor wherever you go. But hon. members have the tendency, every time they get on a platform or come to the House, of trying to give the impression that only a particular type of person seems to be interested in the poor. Mr. Chairman, apart from two or three members of this House, all of us are poor.

The hon. member said that the buying of this House for the Premier was not in our Manifesto. That is true. Also not in our Manifesto was what to do with the sewage from the new Hospital; but because it was not in the Manifesto, it does not mean that we should throw it in the Constitution Swamp. Apparently what these hon. members fail to realise is that they were the first Government in the history of Governments that was ever a Government by trial. You will remember, Mr. Chairman, that the ministerial system under the regime of the Barbados Labour Party as the Bushe Experiment, and because of that, hon. members who belong to the opposite side feel that as long as they did not implement something, the world must stand still. They are the makers of politics, politicians, and everything, and so long as it is something they have not implemented, you should never do it. The hon. member is saying that people cannot get houses and we are buying this house for the Premier, but the hon. member should tell the people about the 1951 election when in platform speeches the members of the Barbados Labour Party said that six weeks after they got

into power they were going to nationalise the Barbados Electric Company. It has not been nationalised yet.

Now the house which we propose to buy is not for a specific Premier; it belongs to the taxpayers of Barbados — rich, poor, white, black and blue. A little before they went out, they were about to buy a building in England for some exorbitant price of £75,000 not for the people here. I have always advocated that the Premier of any country, whether it is Barbados, St. Lucia or Timbuctu, should be expected to live as such, as he is the Head of Government. There was a house for the Colonial Secretary known as "Savannah Lodge" which is still at the Garrison. The Governor has a free house and nobody says anything about that. The Chief Justice also has a free house. But because it is a man from among us for whom this house is being bought, we should look for the poor people first and do first things first! Suppose the hon. junior member for St. Joseph becomes Premier — God bless us that it does not happen — would he expect to entertain people in Chimborazo? This house is not for a particular person, but for the holder of the office for the time being, and we want to have somewhere conducive to the office and where he can entertain dignitaries. Let us assume that we wanted to borrow money from the United States and that Mr. Black from the World Bank came here. Would you expect him to entertain Mr. Black in a 16' x 9'? What impression would Mr. Black get of Barbados and the Premier? The hon. member must realise that he is not only Premier of the Democratic Labour Party; he is Premier of the whole island, and we must stop this insularity.

Now the hon. member for St. George talked about how many school places would be made available from this \$103,000. He should be the last person to come into this House and talk about school places. Probably if what took place last year did not take place, we would have had added to the economy of the country about \$7 million. (Mr. MOTLEY: What took place?) The fires. (Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Who is responsible?) I do not know, but I know whom I suspect. I remember that the Barbados Labour Party came here and passed a Resolution that no person be allowed to send a child to Harrison College without first depositing £5, and their argument was that a lot of foreigners were coming here and sending their children to school, and Barbadians could not get in. 8.55 p.m.

My argument was that it was against the man in the street who had to throw a dollar a week in a meeting turn. It was not a way to handle the educational system of the Island. He should be the last person to say that. He is a man of fairly good means. Those people come in here with the most petty and insular statements that one can expect to hear in the House of Assembly. It is true that this House is a place for debate and it is not for the purpose of holding a Mother's Union meeting, and therefore, you would expect to hear debate on matters. But at the same time, you do not expect to hear the verbiage which you hear.

The Hon. Minister got up and explained something in a way which a Primer standard boy could understand. When something has been explained fully, and then a person gets back up and deliberately repeats himself in the wrong way, it means that that person should go back to school. I am really ashamed. It seems as if this thing is done deliberately because certainly nobody is so dull of comprehension.

To get back to the Resolution....

Mr. SMITH: You see that, Mr. Chairman? You see how far he has strayed?

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, when I calculate this thing, it works out to less than \$13,000 per acre. Now, this Government just a few weeks ago offered \$1,400 per acre for rab land and I heard hon. members in this Chamber say that this Government was trying to wring land out of a poor man's hands. This place is a big mansion in Culloden Road with two entrances; one on Collymore Rock, and the other in Culloden Road. The price works out at less than \$13,000 per acre. Look at the area in which it is! Apart

from the house which stands on this land, the furniture and all those things are thrown in for good measure. It is eight acres of land plus a lot of mahogany trees on it. I heard the hon. senior member for the City saying what he would do with these mahogany trees. All in all, I am not an expert in this field, but I do not think I am such a village idiot; therefore, I know that this is a bargain. I am sure when this place has been bought, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph would be entertained there like any other hon. member, and I am sure he is going to retract all that he said about it. Before he took a look at this place, he started to criticise and he is only doing it for the sake of criticising, because, as I have said, he has not made one tangible point. In criticising this thing, he has said that poor people cannot get money to buy houses.

Sir, I would like to know this before I go off. All of us, or the majority of us in here, and all of us on this side of the Bench are poor people. We may not be as poor as some, but we are poor. (A VOICE: How can you be so poor when you have now bought for yourself a new motor car?) A man should carry himself to a certain standard. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph is always inviting me to come to St. Joseph to see things. Suppose I was riding about a bicycle, how could I get up there if I did not get a car?

Mr. Chairman, before I go off, I would like to admonish the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that it is the duty of the Opposition to make things as interesting as it can for the Government, but it also the duty of the Opposition to be constructive and not to be destructive.

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make my contribution to this debate. I have perused this Resolution over and over again and, honestly, I cannot find any moral reason why I should vote against it. If we take this property, "Culloden Farm", into consideration, it stands on eight acres, two perches of land. It is just a half mile from the City of Bridgetown, and it has on it a dwelling house with all the fittings that are necessary. We have discovered that we are buying land in St. Michael at just a little over 28 1/2 cents per square foot. The only thing I have against it is if we can afford to spend today \$103,000 on it as we stand today. That is my only criticism.

Sir, I am going to support this Resolution because I feel it is a bargain and I do not think you get such a bargain in haste. I definitely feel that the Premier of Barbados should have a proper house to live in. When you go to Trinidad, you find that the Premier of Trinidad can entertain you at his official residence; he has not got to take you to a club. In a little place like St. Lucia, the same thing happens. Antigua does not have the number of people whom I represent, and that country has also an official residence for their Chief Minister. Whoever is the Premier of Barbados, regardless of where he lives, this place, "Culloden Farm", would be his official home. I do not see why this Resolution should cause all this criticism. What I would say is that my colleague would have to give me some tenantry roads, playing fields and so on. That is what I have been asking for, Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this Resolution. 9.05 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I will make a few remarks in reply to hon. members, not because I think that the remarks made by the Opposition merit a reply, but mainly for two reasons. The first is in view of the fact that I do not want anybody who is reading this debate twenty years from now to think that the Government was incapable of replying to the arguments of the Opposition or that there were no arguments to be waged against their arguments; secondly, because the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has threatened that when the time comes he intends to go around and tell people who voted for this house for the Premier when there were so many people who wanted houses. Therefore, Sir, I will ask hon. members to bear with me if I reply briefly to some of the utter nonsense talked by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and the hon. junior member for St. George. Firstly, I want to say this; the Government since 1957 had been looking around for a house for the Premier and at that time school

places were wanted for children and the poor people wanted houses. The Premier then lived in an elegant home. They looked at several properties and they tried to buy this one, as I mentioned earlier. At the time of the Election in 1961, the Barbados Labour Party had decided to acquire Codrington House as a residence for the Premier, as the hon. junior member for St. George has said; and if they had been elected, by now this house would have been converted into a residence for the Premier.

Secondly, I have never heard the hon. junior member for St. George or the hon. junior member for St. Joseph criticise the vote towards the cost of the Federal Government. I have never heard them say that the people in the West Indies wanted roads and houses and could not get them. Both of them knew that not only had the Government of Trinidad bought a house for \$150,000 for the Federal Premier, but the Federal Government earmarked a considerable sum of money towards buying a new house for him. All of this time the people of Barbados needed houses and roads and so on.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order. If the hon. member is speaking about Trinidad and the Federal Government I would say that I was not concerned with that. It was for the hon. member to concern himself with that, not me.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The hon. member should not have been in here then. The hon. member sat in here and allowed his Party to vote a subvention to the Federal Parliament. The people in St. Joseph wanted houses all that time, and why did he not say that the Prime Minister should take this house and not buy a new house? The hon. member was not concerned with the Federal Parliament but, as he said, he was concerned with the Barbados Parliament. The hon. member was a member of this House when his Party paid £27,000 for 5,000 square feet of land or less than that, and nothing was done with it at all. Do you hear me, Mr. Chairman? The people in St. Joseph wanted houses and roads and school places too.

The hon. junior member for St. George who reached a high degree of nonsense with his usual theme talked about the necessity for providing school places instead of providing this money to purchase this house, whereas in two and a half years we have provided over five thousand additional school places in the island as well as providing free secondary education. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph said that we should have invited hon. members to see this house first. Well, Sir, during my time in this House, the party to which the hon. member belongs have squandered thousands of dollars and nobody had been invited to see anything. A man had a house there all the time and the Government came along and bought it; the Government had not asked us to see it. They paid a million dollars for the Gas Company. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph said that not one single poor person in St. Andrew had gas and yet they took up one million dollars at a time when there were no houses or roads or anything, and they paid that one million dollars for the Gas Company when no poor people had gas, and that was only to give certain people gas. At that time we did not even hear one squeak from the hon. member about school places or that the people could not get houses and so on. Here are some of the places which the then Government bought; they bought "Enmore", "Avalon", "Herbert House", "Sedge Pond Plantation" and all sorts of places and no member of this House was invited to see one shingle anywhere.

As to the land at Six Roads, that was a scandal. They paid a farcical lot of money for a small acreage of land, and the hon. junior member for St. Joseph did not know that they were squandering all of this money or that we did not have sufficient school places. The hon. member also had the audacity to say that it would offend somebody in saying who voted for this and who voted for that. Apparently, everybody is going to be dumb at Election Time, and when he starts to open his mouth, let nobody else open his mouth because the people of this country will blindly accept what he says.
9.15 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, all we have listened to from the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and the hon. junior member for St. George is pure poppycock and does not amount to a row of pins. It might amount to a row of pins if there was nobody who knew the facts of the case, nobody who knew that they were not even playing proper politics when they were speaking, because it is so easy to answer them and easier to convince the public that if they suddenly have acquired this deep interest in the people of this island, what on earth were they doing all this time when they made all these sins of commission during the years they were in office? This is nothing to be ashamed of. Every property acquired by this Government during its term of office was acquired at a reasonable price, and if we could not acquire it outright, it was done by compulsory price, and if we could not acquire it outright, it was done by compulsory acquisition. It is not like their refusal to buy Gazettes, and then paying £20,000 more a few years after for a small part of it. If the hon. member is going to plead ignorance of what his leaders were doing, everything they did was vulnerable and open to attack, and the least he should do is to come in here and keep his mouth quiet, because all he is doing is creating further exposure for his party. We are inclined to let some sleeping dogs lie and forget some of their attacks, but we are bound to reap them up in order to expose more fully the illogicality and the lack of truth in the allegations they want to make against us.

I do not think, Sir, that I need say very much more over this matter. I think there is only one other point I should like to reply to, and that is to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph saying just now that if we adopt the Report of the Commission appointed to enquire into the Transport Board, we have to look for a lot of money and we cannot afford to spend it in this direction. He should be the last person or any member of his Party to talk about implementing reports where the Transport Board is concerned, because they appointed a Commission to enquire into the Transport Board and then ignored the recommendations completely, and if they had adopted the Report, the country would not be in this mess. It is sheer unadulterated, cheap stupidity for any member of the Barbados Labour Party to talk about implementing the Report of the Transport Board, because they had it in their hands at one time to adopt the logical and rational recommendations of the Committee they themselves appointed. When we came into office, we found the Transport Board over \$2 million in debt. We did not create the debt. If his Party knew what it was doing, the country would not be in this mess today at all; and if all he is going to do is to ask these silly questions which we can easily knock down, in fairness to himself and to his Party, it would be far better if he kept quiet, because instead of attacking us, he is attacking himself and his Party. We can defend ourselves, but they have no answer to the charges we can make against them.

The question that the Resolution for the sum of \$103,800 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, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of six Resolutions in Committee of Supply 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 Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

RESOLUTION TO SUPPLEMENT THE ESTIMATES OF THE PORT DEPARTMENT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Resolution to approve the expenditure of \$2,400 to supplement the Estimates of the Port Department for the year 1964-65 be the next Order of the Day.

Notice of this Resolution was given today and copies were circulated.

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

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

9.25 p.m.
Who?

"It is proposed to obtain the services of Consulting Engineers to undertake preliminary investigations as to the feasibility of deepening part of the Bridgetown Harbour to a depth of 40 feet and expanding the harbour to provide additional berthing accommodation. The sum of \$2,400 is required to meet the cost of the proposed preliminary investigation which will include the preparation of a layout drawing and approximate estimates of cost."

We are expecting a Consulting Engineer to come here very shortly. He is at present in the Caribbean area, and we are exploring the possibility of deepening the Harbour to 40 feet in order to provide better berthing facilities for the larger tankers to come here for bunkering purposes. At present, there is a certain steamship company whose smaller vessels come here for bunkering purposes, but the larger ones do not come here owing to the draft; and if the Harbour is increased to a depth of 40 feet over all, it would be possible for those larger ships to come here. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we are taking the advice of the Consultant Engineer who would be in Jamaica very soon.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE SPENDING OF TWENTY THREE THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED AND FIFTY DOLLARS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the final Order to be dealt with is one with just a change in the note of a Resolution previously passed by the House. The principle has already been agreed to, but there is some change in the manner in which the money is to be expended. Therefore, it is necessary to seek the approval of the House before the money can be expended in this direction.

I, therefore, beg to move that the next Order of the Day is for approval to be granted to the expending of a Resolution in connection with the sum of \$23,550 for constructing hard tennis courts at the Garrison Savannah.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: This is a Resolution for approval to be granted for the sum of \$23,550 to be used:

- (1) for the constructing changing and toilet facilities at the Government Tennis Courts at the Garrison, in the Parish of St. Michael; and
- (2) for constructing, fencing and flood-lighting three asphalt hard courts on the site occupied by the College of Arts and Science, at University Row, in the Parish of St. Michael.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Briefly, I would like to explain that, Sir. A decision has been taken against constructing hard courts at the Garrison Savannah, because representations have been made to us by the Lawn Tennis Association that our Tennis Courts at the Garrison are about the best in the West Indies, and we should have four of them for players who come here to play for the Brandon Trophy, and so on.

We, therefore, took advice to have another site for putting down hard courts, and it is proposed that the old Trade Fair Site on the Harbour which is now in the hands of the University College would be a suitable place to site them. We are, therefore, just seeking for a change in the terms of the Resolution in order that the hard courts should be constructed at the Trade Fair site instead of at the Garrison Savannah.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution, no doubt, is for encouraging more sport. Sport is mentioned; and as it is mentioned, I would continue to hammer away for something more to be done for the encouragement of sports at Trents.

It is now clear to all that that site in St. James is occupying a very important position not only in respect of the North, but in respect of the Island as a whole. It is a question of promoting sport and I would ask the Hon. Minister to consider sport at Trents. I will ask the Hon. Minister to find it possible to provide a sum of money to buy the adjoining piece of land at Trents, if for no other reason than to get tennis being played there.

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Speaker, speaking on this Resolution, hon. members will agree with me when I say that where sport is concerned it is a good thing to promote it for the young people of Barbados; but speaking on this principle for tennis, I would point out that I have asked a question in this House with respect to tennis courts being provided at Thorpes. I do hope that the Hon. Minister in charge in due time would do whatever he can because the position as regards Trents is known. I am sure that with the community hall and the spacious ground being well laid out at Trents, it will redound to the whole of Barbados.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Trents Playing Field is open to all and sundry and no single person can say that he or she is prevented from going there. Even when First Eleven cricket is being played there, children can be found there playing games. Rather than being adequate, Trents has outgrown its uses and it would be a very good thing if the adjoining land can be bought to extend this sport of tennis.

Mr. HOLDER: The hon. member rose on a point of order and spoke on segregation.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. junior member for St. James spoke of under-privileged, and I am saying that the Trents Playing Field is open to all people from beggars up.
9.35 p.m.

Mr. HOLDER: I do not want to carry on this debate to any great point. If I told the hon. member that I am the person who went all out in this matter - as a matter of fact, there is nobody either in the Vestry or the Local Government who could say anything against what I was talking in relation to that playing field. I saved money by going out of the parish to be the philanthropist. If I use the term about the under-privileged I would like to say.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that we are going too far afield now.

Mr. HOLDER: I thank Your Honour for your advice. I rose to speak not about Trents, but about the two tennis courts about which I asked.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I hate to interrupt the hon. member, but there are Standing Orders of the House which must be observed. There is absolutely no latitude available in the discussion on this Resolution to talk about Trents or any other Tennis Court in the island.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is a time to talk about the grass courts at Trents, but Trents is too far from the Garrison to be included in this Resolution.

Mr. HOLDER: I will finish my remarks, but there are grass courts at Thorpes.

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

RESOLUTION re LOAN TO THE CARIBBEAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that some of the papers which came down for distribution earlier today were not distributed, and I am asking the leave of the House to deal with the matters contained in those papers. It is not our fault that these papers were not circulated.

Mr. SPEAKER: I very much regret that these documents were not distributed, if they were here, I must appeal to hon. members that, inasmuch as it is proposed to take a long vacation in the month of September, they should deal with this Resolution which has just been circulated.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Resolution to approve the guarantee by the Government of payment of principal and interest on authorised borrowings of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation not exceeding in the aggregate \$510,000, be taken as the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The instant Order of the Day is this Resolution to approve the guarantee by the Government of the payment of principal and interest on authorised borrowings of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation not exceeding in the aggregate \$510,000, and it stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, the Hon. Minister of Education, who is not now in his place. I take it that another Hon. Minister may be seeking the indulgence of the House to deal with this Resolution.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to deal with this Resolution which stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Education who is not in the island.

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret that this Resolution was not distributed earlier, and it does not appear to be the fault of the Government.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

9.45 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the position is this: when we passed the Resolution earlier this year with regard to the guarantee by the Government of the payment

by the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation of a fixed amount for the purchase and supply of transmitter and studio equipment for the establishment of a television station, we did it under certain conditions, and the conditions were that the Government would secure the equipment without downpayment and pay for it subsequently on the instalment basis. Now, Sir, the Company thinks this is too restricting. They claim now that in order for the Corporation to obtain the best possible terms from manufacturers, it would be necessary to negotiate with the manufacturers and be able to bargain with them and make down payments, if necessary, or buy for cash, if necessary, and earn cash discounts to reduce income charges on manufactured credit and be able to avoid being in the hands of any particular manufacturer. In other words, if they had the cash to play with, they could buy the equipment under better terms. That is all there is to it, and the Resolution before us therefore is to change the text of this agreement. What we are doing now is to provide the guarantee of the payment of principal and interest on the authorised borrowings of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation from a Bank not exceeding \$510,000. The Bank will advance it on our guarantee, they will have the cash to play with and they hope to save money by buying on a cash basis rather than on restricted terms.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to waste time, but I think at the time you will remember that I made this suggestion. You will recall that I said it would not be the best when it was suggested what arrangements you had made and how much business you would do, and I said I was rather doubtful. I think you are having the best arrangement now and I must say that whoever is the brains behind this, this is the best arrangement that could be made and I support it very strongly.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think that concludes the entire Agenda for today under Government Business, and I am happy to move the adjournment of the House until Tuesday, October 6th, at 2.30 p.m.

I will extend to Your Honour and hon. members a very enjoyable summer vacation.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank the hon. Leader of the House for his wishes for an agreeable summer vacation, and I reciprocate his good wishes.

The question that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 6th October, 1964, at 2.30 p.m., was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

9.50 p.m.

X

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1961-66

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 6th October, 1964.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 2.30 p.m. o'clock today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., (*Speaker*); Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, (*Minister of Development, Trade, Labour and Social Security*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, O.B.E.; Mr. F. E. MILLER; Mr. E. St.A. HOLDER, J.P.; Mr. S. E. SEALEY; Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; His Honour E. L. CARMICHAEL, J.P., (*Deputy Speaker*); Mr. G. V. BATSON, (*Chairman of Committees*); Mr. N. W. BOXILL; and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (*Minister of Health, Housing and Community Development*).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the Meeting of 18th August, of this year, have been printed and circulated and if there is no objection, I declare them to 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 the following:

The Public Officers Loan and Travelling Allowances (Amendment) Regulations, 1964;

The Public Officers Loan and Travelling Allowances (Scheduled Officers) (No. 4) Regulations, 1964;

Barbados Statistical Service — Selected Monthly Indicators — April to June, 1964;

The Quarterly Digest of Statistics No. 29 — March, 1964;

Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for five months ended 31st August, 1964.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on my own behalf, I beg to lay the following:—

The Customs Duties (Shrimp Industry) (Vehicles) Order, 1964;

The Customs Duties (University of the West Indies) Order, 1964;

The Customs Duties (Containers, Ingredients and Materials for the Manufacture of Gin and Vodka from Rectified Local Alcohol) Order, 1964;

The Customs Duties (Machinery and Equipment for the Mechanical Mining and Finishing of Coral Stone Blocks) Order, 1964;

The Customs Duties (Machinery, Equipment and Raw Materials for use in the Manufacture of Aluminium Products) Order, 1964;

The Report of the Displaced Workers' Allowances Board and the Audit of the Accounts for the period 1st January to 31st December, 1962;

The Final Report of the Displaced Workers' Allowances Board and the Audit of the Accounts for the period 1st January to 9th December, 1963.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works, I beg to lay the following:

Statement showing the sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of Money Orders, the amounts repaid to the Accountant General, and the amounts due by various Post Offices to 30th June, 1964;

Statement showing the sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of Money Orders, the amounts repaid to the Accountant General, and the amounts due by various Post Offices to 31st July, 1964.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On behalf of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, I beg to lay 'The Markets and Slaughteringhouses (Amendment) Regulations 1964.'

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On my own behalf, I beg to lay the Annual Report of the Director of Medical Services for the year 1962-63.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On behalf of the Hon. Premier:

A Resolution to place the sum of \$14,616 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1964-65, Part I Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1964-65 No. 32 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On behalf of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture:

A Resolution to place the sum of \$172 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1964-65, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1964-65, No. 30 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On behalf of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works:

A Resolution to place the sum of \$132,895 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1964-65, Part II Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1964-65, No. 31, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution;

A Resolution to place the sum of \$1,000 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1964-65, Part II Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1964-65, No. 33, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution;

A Resolution to approve under Section 10 of the Barbados Harbours' Act 1960 the sum of \$150,000 required to supplement the Estimates of the Port Department for the year 1964-65 as shown in the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On behalf of the Hon. Premier:

A Bill to amend the Income Tax Act 1921, 1921-6;

A Bill to amend the Teachers (Secondary Schools) Pension Act, 1962.

NOTICE OF REPLIES TO ORAL QUESTIONS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, there are two replies which are ready. The first is Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 13 asked by the hon. junior member for St. John.

The second is Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 11, asked by the hon. senior member for St. George.

DOCUMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank a Statement of the Profit and Loss Accounts for the year ended 30th June, 1964.

The Statement was forwarded by the Auditor Mr. A. B. Way.

QUESTIONS

Mr. SMITH: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is the Government aware of the discomfiture and loss of sleep caused by night clubs and steel bands playing and operating in the thickly populated areas of the City of Bridgetown and the lower part of Christ Church to inhabitants of the said areas?

2. If the answer is in the affirmative, can Government cause something to be done by way of regulating the hours of these clubs and bands so as to remove the inconveniences caused by them?
3.00 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is also another question standing in the name of the same hon. member.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is the Government aware that workers who have been required to resign because of age two years or more ago from such departments as the Highways and Transport and the Public Works, have not yet received their pensions or gratuities?

2. If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Government alleviate the hardship, inconvenience and possible starvation facing these people by immediately paying such pensions or gratuities?

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICE

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

WHEREAS the bend on the main road of Rock Hall, St. Thomas, is very dangerous to vehicular traffic as well as pedestrians using the said road;

BE IT RESOLVED that Government explore the possibility of effecting repairs to the said bend with a view to widening the road in an attempt to prevent disaster befalling the users of the said road.

DOCUMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a letter from Mr. A. B. Way of the firm of Fitzpatrick Graham & Company, Chartered Accountants, in which he writes as follows:-

1st September, 1964

His Honour the Speaker,
House of Assembly,
Public Buildings.

Sir,

I wish to offer myself for re-appointment as Auditor of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank for the year commencing 1st July, 1964, under Section 4 (7) (1) of the Act, 1943-15 at a remuneration of £125.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,
A. B. Way

This letter is dated 1st September, 1964, and I received it on the 2nd day of last month.

RE-APPOINTMENT OF AUDITOR OF SUGAR INDUSTRY AGRICULTURAL BANK

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the terms of that letter, I beg to move that Mr. A. B. Way be re-appointed as Auditor of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank for the year commencing 1st July, 1964, to 30th June, 1965 at a remuneration of £125.0.0.

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

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

REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO DEAL WITH RESOLUTION

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, my attention has been drawn to the fact that a Resolution has just come down which is very urgent and with which I am asking leave to deal in all of its stages at today's meeting. It is a Resolution for the sum of \$172 in connection with a new item "Caribbean Food Crops Society" under the Head "Subsidies and Grants" of the Current Estimates.

You will see from the Addendum that this Resolution seeks to provide the necessary funds to enable the Government of Barbados to become a sustaining member of the Caribbean Food Crops Society which will be holding its second Annual General Meeting in the island during this month.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS in each case, the following Bills were read a first time:-

A Bill to amend the Income Tax Act 1921, 1921-6.

A Bill to amend the Teachers (Secondary Schools) Pension Act, 1962.

MOTION FOR SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, there is a very short Order Paper for today. There is a Resolution under Government Business dealing with the compulsory acquisition of "Fairy Valley Plantation" and when the time comes we will postpone that Resolution. I suggest that we deal with the two Replies to Questions which have been laid today, and then with this Resolution for \$172 of which I have just given notice and which it is highly desirable that we should get through in all its stages today, and then we will adjourn. I am therefore moving for the suspension of Standing Orders 5, 16, 14, 18, 40 and 45 at this stage so as to deal with the Resolution of which I have just given notice.

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

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity as a matter of privilege to draw to Your Honour's attention (*ASIDES*)..... Mr. Speaker, this is not a motion which deals with anything on the Order Paper; I am drawing to Your Honour's attention a report on page 5 of today's issue of the "*Advocate*" Newspaper, and in this report there is an article or statement with the headline! "Mr. ADAMS: STOP TAKING SIDES, Mr. SPEAKER." And then in the body of this article it is stated that Barbados' veteran politician, Sir Grantley Adams, has called on Mr. J. E. T. Brancker, Speaker of the Barbados House of Assembly, to act as a Speaker and to stop taking sides.

Mr. Speaker, I think that everyone will agree that Your Honour's position in this island is no less high and dignified than that of the Head of the Judiciary - the Chief Justice - or the Head of the Administration.
3.10 p.m.

This is an ancient Assembly of over 300 years; and with a Speaker who has an honoured and dignified position; and I think that when a person can get on the outside and make such statements, we should begin even to amend the law dealing with defamation and slander to protect this high office. When the newspaper can print this outrageous statement that has been made accusing Your Honour of taking sides, with Your Honour's picture showing prominently in the newspaper, surrounded by those who associated themselves with this statement, that goes to the very core of our Assembly, I think that all members here must protest vehemently against such a statement and such a charge. To make such a statement in public in Barbados for political purposes is, to say the least, indicative of, not a puerile mind, but a corroded mind. Only a person whose mind is corroded and who is not a member of this Chamber could attempt to accuse Your Honour of taking sides, and I would not enter into the merits or demerits of this matter, because when I see that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph's picture also appears in the paper and he was presumably at the meeting - and I think St. Joseph is his constituency, though I heard questions today about St. Michael, and I do not think there are any night clubs in St. Joseph - and when one remembers the latitude that this hon. member has been given in this Chamber at Your Honour's hand, though he is not a member of Your Party, then it is one of those reverses of charity to find that not only is this statement made against you in St. Joseph, but it is also made against you in the presence of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that if we in this Chamber had to take a vote on whether you have been charitable, I believe the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has received more charity from the Chair in this House than any other member, - and this statement was made in his constituency under his nose. Now you have been accused of taking sides. I think the first person who should jump to your defence at that meeting should be the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, because I am sure that if you had to put somebody in a stand to give evidence about taking sides, and if 'taking sides' means in the context that you have not been fair to members of the Chamber, I am sure that it could not be attributed to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that we have a right under an Act that has

been passed here to seek protection, and I hope that the appropriate stand will be taken. All I can say is that under our Rules it is left to you to decide what action should be taken in a matter such as this; but I feel it is my duty, as this is the first meeting of the Chamber since the Statement was made, to let the public know that we resent this statement. It is the sort of Colonial statement that is still being made in Colonial territories. I doubt very much, Sir, that, if a similar statement had been made in the height of the election now going on in Great Britain, the *London Times* would have published it in this manner, because I am sure that if a member says in this Chamber that you are taking sides, it is a challenge to your authority, and the member can be called upon to withdraw promptly or apologise; and if he refuses, action could be taken by Your Honour to suspend him for improper conduct. That is the procedure within the Chamber itself where we have limited privileges; but outside this Chamber and in the public Press, for such a statement to be published in such glaring headlines, not only does it undermine your authority and high position as Speaker, but it undermines the position of Parliament.

I will not deal any more with the subject matter that is within the context of the article or the statement that was made, but what I would like to say here is that those of us in Parliament, no matter what our political persuasions are, should be the first to protect this high office of Speaker, and I am sure that if we do that, we are acting in the highest tradition of Parliamentary procedure and Parliamentary behaviour. If the Speaker of the Barbados House of Assembly is going to be treated in this manner, it is the inroad of challenging constituted authority and it is the inroad of breeding disrespect. I doubt very much that this statement would have been made, for example, against the Head of the Judiciary. If the Chief Justice was blatantly accused of taking sides, then what would happen to this country?

Your Honour presides over an Assembly which is the highest Assembly in this land and passes laws for the Chief Justice to administer; so in the first instance we are the ones to come into contact with the making of the behaviour in this country. The Chief Justice cannot pass a law at all; he is there to administer the law; and if the highest position in our Parliament can be so treated, I think it is time for us to get up and see about these things. I take this view, Mr. Speaker, because for those of us who are in public life, and for those of us who are politicians, some idea has gone abroad that a politician is some monstrous beast without any regard for honourable things, and is capable of doing anything not necessarily good, and this jibing at persons in political life sometimes by our opponents gives substance to this general idea. Some of us have to put a check to it and preserve our honour and dignity as men in public life, and demonstrate to the public that some of us are in public life for the contribution we can make, notwithstanding the criticism we are bound to receive and face as public men. We should resent these things that go towards injuring our character.

I feel that this is not only going too far in one respect, but it is going too far on the other side, in that if these public statements are allowed to be made like this without any check, the next time there is an election in this country there would be a sort of attack that could be made on Parliament itself that would make the electorate ask: "What is the use of having Parliament at all?" If that is the sort of place to which they are going to worry to send their people.
3.20 p.m.

I need not say anything more because from where this statement is attributed to come, that person suffers from a pathological disease of having no respect for any person other than himself, and as long as he is in that position he will always do these things. This thing is the worst thing in the world to do to any person, so we cannot allow these statements to go unnoticed, notwithstanding whom they are made by.

Sir, some people, today are asking to preserve the memory of such persons. My idea is that you do not need to preserve the memory of such persons because their memo-

ries are preserved in such a way which we do not think about. When I read the article this morning, I concluded that this is the sort of fulsome statement which we are accustomed to hear coming from certain quarters. Such people only have to get some makeshift crowd coming before them and such a crowd makes them say any sort of thing. Those people are sometimes taken away with the crowd. Some of us address bigger crowds than they, but we do not lose our balances nor do we say things which we should not say.

However, Sir, I feel the position of Speaker of this Chamber is something which should be respected. I have no doubt in my mind that if the holder of this high office had been a person of the pigmentation of the hon. junior member for Christ Church - and I have had the privilege of being in this Assembly and seen Speakers of another pigmentation - that the person who made that statement about the Speaker of this House of Assembly would not have made that statement. If the holder of the office of Speaker was a person of a different pigmentation, like that of the Hon. Mr. George Evelyn, that person would not have made that statement. But that person's mentality is one of a slavish mentality; therefore he thinks nothing of disrespecting men of colour. This sort of thing springs from that type of mentality.

Sir, I feel that the occasion will come for me to deal more positively with such a person, and I am sure that when I am finished dealing with that person, may be, some action will be taken against me because no quarters would be drawn. I believe that this is the last election which I would have to say these things, but I say them quite bluntly, ruthlessly and cruelly if that is going to bring people of Barbados to the impact of what this means. This is not only uncharitable, but it is the sort of statement which you cannot begin to understand. You cannot understand how one can get down to this low level in politics just to get a point over to electorate. The electorate does not come to a meeting necessarily to hear the detailed procedures in this Chamber: they take them for granted. But when someone is going out of his way to charge the Speaker for taking sides and then that statement is published in the daily newspaper, that then is something which we cannot ignore.

Your Honour cannot do what I am doing here, and at least some of us must have the courage to do it. I do not feel that I am lacking in courage even to support quarters which subscribe to different political thinking, and it is a fact that I am not doing it because I would like others to do it for me because sometimes you do not get such things done for you. I am here to speak as I think fit: and when I have done that, I feel that my reward is in satisfying what my conscience tells me that I should have done.

Sir, I feel hon. members should take strong objection to this publication and then to leave it to Your Honour to instruct us as to what is the most proper action this Chamber should take to vindicate the action which you have taken.

I would not move a Resolution because I think the Hon. Leader of the Opposition would be the more suitable person to do so after he has made his own contribution to this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the hon. senior member for St. Peter sits, I would just like to say that he said he was not making any motion on this matter. Standing Order 68 speaks of a motion directly concerning the privileges of this House and that it should take precedence of all other public business. I wonder if it is the intention of the hon. senior member for St. Peter to give notice of a motion of a breach of privilege.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, if I can think now that I am on my feet, of a suitable motion quickly, I would phrase it along these lines: I beg to give notice "that this House notes with grave concern the published article in the *"Advocate"* of this date under the caption "ADAMS: STOP TAKING SIDES, Mr. SPEAKER".

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that this matter is being raised by means of that motion under Standing Order No. 68, which gives precedence over all public business.

Secondly, the document which the hon. senior member for St. Peter has read from automatically becomes a document of this House. It is, as I understand, a copy of today's newspaper called *"The Advocate"*.

May I further mention for the information of this House that from 8.00 o'clock this morning my legal advisers were instructed by me to take action and are now so doing. It is a matter for this Chamber if hon. members propose to take action under the Legislature (Privileges, Immunities and Powers) Act, 1963-6, or any other steps which they may think fit to take, but I emphasize that I am personally taking steps as a citizen in respect of the publication in this morning's newspaper.
3.30 p.m.

I may just add this, because I expect that in a very short while my colleague, His Honour the Deputy Speaker, the learned senior member for St. James, will be good enough to take the Chair. In view of the possibility that this matter may go either before the Supreme Court in an action for defamation, or that steps may be taken under Sections 35 and 39 of the Legislature (Privileges, Immunities and Powers) Act, 1963 - in view of such a possibility I would suggest to hon. members that they do not even give the impression that they are trying a case or cases before the case or cases reaches or reach any Court of Law. The matter is not yet *sub judice* and that is why I have allowed the senior member for St. Peter to continue his address; but I do ask hon. members not to allow it to appear that they are doing the work of any Court of Law in anticipation of any trial.

Mr. WALCOTT: Very well, Mr. Speaker, I feel that we have a right which transcends any Court. We are not like the American Parliament where our matters go to the Supreme Court in order to decide whether we are right or wrong; we can make a decision in here, notwithstanding what a Court may do, in so far as concerning anything said in the Chamber. We regard this statement as something which affects other hon. members of this House, because His Honour the Speaker seeks privileges for all members of the House. We are not, in any way, challenging the rights of any Court, but at the same time we are not going to allow the Court to supersede us in any matter which comes within our jurisdiction. His Honour the Speaker is Speaker of the House, and therefore we can pass a motion which we consider is in defence of the Speaker's position.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, the first thing I would like to say is that I am seconding the motion for the passing of this Resolution which I hope will be unanimously agreed to in here today. As I read this article this morning, it struck me, as a layman, that all is not well in the State of Denmark. I was reminded of the stand which a Magistrate in this country took against a very wealthy man for being abusive of a Policeman, and after summing up the case one thought that he would have imposed the maximum fine or penalty of the law, but funnily enough, we were disappointed. He castigated the man because of his position until tears came down his eyes and then he fined him one shilling. I have drawn that analogy because it seems to me that within recent years, because the owners of this newspaper are of the very wealthy class of people in this island, they care nothing about what they write about people, whether what they write is true or not. I am not in a position to say whether the alleged statement was made or not, but what I am in a position to say is this; that if Mr. George Evelyn or Mr. Douglas Pile or Sir Frederick Clarke were in the Chair, these people at the *"Advocate"* would not have published that headline. Whether it was said on a platform by Sir Grantley Adams or anybody else, these people at the *"Advocate"* would never have published this headline. Therefore it seems to me that when people have a lot of money and there are no other means of bringing them to their senses and making them respect people of colour - I am not mincing any matters about this - it is time that they realise they will either abide by our laws or pay the penalty and subject themselves to a prison term. That is what must happen in this country.

At this stage Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you take this headline; what can be more shocking? When I first came to Parliament I was taught that the Speaker of the House of Assembly usually gave more latitude to the Opposition in dealing with a matter than to the Government; but if you take this headline which must go all over the world and then take the body of the article - this is what it says: - "Barbados veteran politician, Sir Grantley Adams has called on Mr. J. E. T. Brancker, Speaker of the Barbados House of Assembly, to act as a Speaker and to stop taking sides." I do not agree with Mr. Speaker, in what he says in relation to bringing his case. He can bring whatever case he likes. He is the Speaker of this House because we have made him Speaker; and anything which is written against the Speaker, that he is such a dishonest person as to be taking sides and allowing other hon. members continually to jump up on points of order, that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is a reflection, not on the Speaker alone, but on other hon. members of this House.

The hon. senior member for St. Lucy became Speaker of this House because we made him Speaker; otherwise he would not have been Speaker of this House. I hope that he will bring his case, and to the "Advocate" the sum of £50,000 may mean nothing. I understand, Sir, that they can carry a big insurance; but this shows how they disrespect people of colour, and those who think that they have the nation around them are only living in a fool's paradise. Some of the white-washed, low-class Englishmen whom we have to invest money in this country - I am going to be strong enough because I am expressing the views of the Conservative Party. I hope that we will take strong steps in this matter. I see that Dr. Eric Williams has taken strong steps in these matters against foreigners who go in there and own newspapers.
3.40 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is a matter on which I feel very strongly. Immediately I saw this article, I got in touch with the Speaker. I do not know what was said, but I am in politics long enough to know that the gentleman who is alleged to have said this is capable and shrewd enough to say it is misrepresentation of the statement which he made, and he is going to throw the whole thing down on the "Advocate". Let us say that he did say it. This is what the article said: "Sir Grantley made the call at a political meeting at Mayers Corner, St. Joseph on Sunday night. He said that in the House Mr. Brancker allowed members of the Government Party one after the other to keep jumping up on points of order to interrupt whenever Mr. Lloyd Smith of the Barbados Labour Party was speaking." I will not comment on the hon. junior member for St. Joseph or anything of the sort, but let us say that Mr. Adams did say this. Look at these glaring headlines: "Adams: Stop taking sides, Mr. Speaker." That means: "Stop being dishonest; 'because if you are taking sides and you are in the Chair, you are dishonest. The people at the "Advocate" would write this about Sir Kenneth Stoby or about Sir Allan Collymore, but you would never see them write it about Hanschell, and it is about time that we bring pressure to bear on them. The position is that the Speaker can do what he likes. This Resolution will pass, and the Attorney General, as the law stands, can bring his case. If the common people of this country would sit as jury and allow money to predominate against an Assembly like this, and not send whoever is the perpetrator of the action to prison, then they can afford to go on libelling people; but if you change their names into numbers and bring them here, then they will stop.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is the most disgraceful thing I have ever seen, and I have been in this House for eighteen years. I have seen the same Sir Grantley refusing to obey the Speaker, and the Minister of Education knows this. I have seen the last Premier throw down his papers and walk out of this House. There were occasions when many of us felt that we were being treated unfairly by the last Speaker when we were in the Opposition, but at no time did we throw down our papers or go outside for that matter and say that he is taking sides. We would go out in the Lobby and criticise him, but we would not do it as long as he was in the Chair. In this matter it is alleged that this veteran made this statement. You know, Sir, it is said that a candle burns

brightest when it is getting to the end. I did not go to the meeting, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but I promised to ask my friend, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, whether it is true that Fields Lowe took the Chair at this meeting. Fields is the man who has been in the Hospital...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will ask the hon. member to stick to the Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am doing so, Sir, but I am referring to the fact that this headline states "Adams: Stop taking sides, Mr. Speaker." He does not mean Speaker of the Landship or Speaker of the Salvation Army. He said "J.E.T. Brancker, stop taking sides." I have much pleasure in seconding this Resolution, because I feel very strongly on it. After a majority of members have voted to make a member of this Chamber Speaker, I would like to see the member who would sit down and let any paper write that the Speaker is taking sides, and ask him to stop doing so. When you are taking sides in a Chair in which you must be absolutely impartial, it means, in common Barbadian parlance, that you are a dishonest, worthless and a depraved type of man. If you are dishonest, you are depraved, and if you are depraved, you are worthless; so if you are dishonest, it means therefore that you are worthless and depraved.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is our solemn duty to pass this Resolution, and it is the Government's solemn duty to call upon the Attorney General to act in this matter; and I will say that if you cannot act, let us pass a law retroactively to deal with people doing this sort of thing. It is all right to say things about the member for the City of Bridgetown or to say that the Minister of Education cannot feed people, because it is politics and you have to take it; but when you are Speaker of the House, and a statement like that is made concerning you, we cannot as elected members who have elected the Speaker stand for this. Let whoever at the "Advocate" is offended be offended. We must come together as one body and unit in this matter. We are dealing with the headlines, and even the members of the Barbados Labour Party are honestly bound to say that they are offensive. Even the members of the Labour Party would realise that if Mr. Husbands or Dr. Cummins was in the Chair, we would not sit here and let a newspaper say that the Speaker is taking sides and call upon him to stop doing it. He sits there and allows people to get up and take opportunity of what is their absolute right on a point of order, because as a matter of fact, the Speaker never knows a point of order until the member starts to speak, and therefore when a member rises, he rises on a point of order and then the Speaker has to decide. You cannot stop a member from rising on a point of order, because you do not know what is in his mind. This article says that he went on to say that the Speaker allows members of the Government to get up on points of order to stop Mr. Smith from speaking. I want to say, Sir, that if Adams knew Smith well, he would know that all the points of order could not stop Mr. Smith from speaking. If that is a statement to get back into his good books, well, he made an improper statement, but there is no chance of his going to St. Joseph to unseat Mr. Smith.

I have much pleasure in seconding the Resolution.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR rose.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker,.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister of Education was on his feet, but the Hon. Leader of the House has just walked to his seat and started to address the Chair. I want it to be made clear what is to be done.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: As a matter of fact, Sir, I felt that some further contribution to the debate would have been made from the floor before anybody spoke from the Government.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I waited to see if any other member wanted to speak.
3.50 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: My position is this. Your Honour began to put the question and it is highly possible that some other hon. member would have wanted to speak.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let me inform the Hon. Leader of the House, that I waited and no hon. member got on his feet to speak. Do not say that no opportunity was given to hon. members to speak.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I said that when Your Honour started to put the question, it was highly possible that some hon. members may have wanted to speak.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am letting the hon. member know that before I put the question, time had passed, long enough that any hon. member could have got up and taken the opportunity to speak. If the Hon. Leader of the House wants to say something on the motion, I will hear him on it.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to begin by saying that the only reason why the Government is paying any attention to this newspaper report is because the character of the Speaker has been impugned. Normally, Sir, we are much too busy to pay any attention to the ranting, senile, domineerings of a conscience-stricken man, and personally my only wish to elaborate on what has been said is because I seem to recall that in my time the alleged author of this statement was the only member of this Chamber who was so disrespectful to a Speaker while in the Chamber that he had to be named. He had to be named for disrespect to the Speaker; so I am not at all surprised if it turns out that outside of this Chamber he is just as disrespectful to a Speaker.

Your Honour may be aware that in so far as your position as Speaker and in so far as the hon. junior member for St. Joseph are concerned, from time to time we actually accused Your Honour in this Chamber of leaning over backwards and being more partial to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph than you should be. Normally, it is expected of a Speaker that he should give a member of the Opposition more latitude than he should give to a member of the Government. But it appears to us that Your Honour as Speaker goes out of your way to be partial to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph; therefore, it comes with more than passing surprise to us to hear this allegation which appeared in today's publication, and we have no doubt that from the source which it purports to come it can only be from a wanton mind; since it goes so far as to defame Your Honour the Speaker, we have to take this action and we have to pay attention to the Bill which we passed last year - the Legislature (Privileges, Immunities and Powers) Act - which describes the action which should be taken in this respect.

Under Section 35, it is stated:

"(1) Any person who -

- (a) publishes any statement, whether in writing or otherwise, which falsely or scandalously defames either chamber or committee, or which reflects on the character of the President or the Speaker or the chairman of a committee in the discharge of his duty as such; is guilty of an offence and liable on conviction thereof by a magistrate's court to a fine not exceeding one thousand dollars or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding twelve months or to both such fine and imprisonment."

Now, Sir, I agree with the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown, that the first thing which we are going to read in the next day or two is a firm denial by the alleged author that he has not said it. Whether he said it or not does not exculpate the newspaper from publishing the defamatory statement, but the fact remains that the Act declares the action which should be taken.

The Act further states that no prosecution for an offence under this Act shall be instituted unless the matter

giving rise to the prosecution has been reported to the Attorney General, in the case of a matter relating to the Council, by the President, and in the case of a matter relating to the General Assembly, by the Speaker; or except by or on behalf of the Attorney General.

I am suggesting to the Hon. Mover of the Resolution that the Resolution be amended to include the words "and recommends that appropriate action be taken under the Legislature (Privileges, Immunities and Powers) Act, 1963-6".

I agree with the hon. senior member for the City that we have to bring to task the newspaper in this country to a conception of their functions in the community and more so, we have also to make people who have again aspired to political service or who are active politicians understand that gone are the days when any agitator can get up on a soap box, and with impunity slander the members of this Legislature or even other politicians. This Government is determined to stamp out that. One of the first acts which this Government has performed was to remove the slightest possible doubt of people continuing with their habit of maliciously slandering and maligning people on a public platform. Perhaps the alleged author of this statement still thinks that we are back in the days when he could with impunity get on a platform and say anything which he likes about anybody in this community. (A VOICE: Big falsehood). I expect that hon. member would say that the alleged author of this statement did not say it.

However, the position is this. I suggest to the hon. senior member for St. Peter who unfortunately is not in his place that the proposed Resolution which he gave notice of during the course of his speech should include these words, "and recommends that appropriate action be taken under the Legislature (Privileges, Immunities and Powers) Act, 1963-6.
4.00 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It has been suggested by the Hon. Leader of the House that the hon. senior member for St. Peter should accept the amendment. However, the hon. senior member for St. Peter is not now in his seat, and therefore it becomes necessary for some other hon. member to second the amendment which has been moved by the Hon. Leader of the House.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to second the amendment to the motion which has been moved by the hon. senior member for St. Peter. Although the hon. member is not now in his place, I think that this is the sort of amendment which he would accept because it amplifies the feeling of the House, or at least the majority of the House. Mr. Deputy Speaker, in a British Parliament, there are only two ways in which a Speaker becomes Speaker; either by a vote of the entire House or by a vote of the majority of the House; and whether by unanimous acclaim or by majority vote, the ultimate result is the same. From the time that the Speaker is accepted by the House to that office, he becomes the Speaker of the whole House and he has certain obligations to discharge, one of these obligations being that he has to afford to all members of the House without any distinction of Party, equal protection of the Chair. And in all British Commonwealth countries, the Speakers try, according to their individual ability, to act impartially. In addition, a Speaker has certain rights which have to be protected. For one thing, because he is Speaker of the whole House, whenever his character and office are attacked or his integrity is impugned, the whole House should rise to his defence, and in most Parliaments the whole House does rise to the Speaker's defence.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is nothing to do with any opinion which you might hold about an individual ruling by a Speaker given in certain circumstances; this is a general principle, the recognition of which makes for the smooth working of Parliamentary Government. Therefore, on this occasion we have ample evidence before us so that we can reach the conclusion from what we can read, that the Speaker of the Barbados House of Assembly has been grossly and outrageously attacked in a newspaper published in

this island. There are, of course, two or more aspects of this matter, and with some of them it is not necessary for us to deal. So far as the person who is alleged to have made the remarks which have been published is concerned we know that he is easily the most mischievous and non-sensical person there is in our public life today. This is a man who has shot his political bolt and who has not got the slightest opportunity or chance to be again directing the affairs of the people of this island, or indeed the affairs of any part of the people of this island. Consequently, all that is left for him to do is to walk up and down the community, like Satan walking to and fro, seeking whom he can devour. It is true that we are in a free society, and it is under the strength of our free society that people can carry on their subversive work and they become slanderous until at some time or other the full rigour of the law catches up with them. What is said on a public platform.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not want to restrict the hon. member in his remarks, but I think he should stick to the newspaper publication and the functions and duties of the Speaker. I know that the hon. member is capable of narrowing down the matter, and not to deal so much with who is alleged to have said it. There are two sides to the matter.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I have said, Sir, that there are several aspects of the matter and we are not concerned with some of them.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The particular side of the matter is the publication.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I think that Your Honour will understand that there could be no question of publication unless there had been the report. With that aspect of the matter we are not now concerned because, as I have said before, that could be handled at its own level and in its own circumstances. The publication, however, is a much more serious matter; it strikes at the root of this community in ways which we do not always understand and cannot always be aware of. In societies, Mr. Deputy Speaker, which are emerging from colonialism, one of the things which we have to guard against is that the organs of public opinion in their territories do accurately reflect the thoughts and feelings of the community or, at any rate, the vast majority of it. If the organs of public opinion, far from cementing nationalism or consolidating the forces of decency and order, are actually destroying them, then one has got to examine the *bona fides* of these organs of public opinion.

No question is involved here of the freedom of the Press. The Press cannot use its freedom to destroy Parliament; and if the Press reports alleged remarks so as to make it appear that Parliament is to be held in disrepute, then the Press must be prepared to take the consequences of its actions. When, therefore, the Speaker of a Parliament is attacked in a newspaper, the Parliament of which he is the Speaker is confronted by an attack on itself. And any newspaper which believes that it is merely reporting what is alleged to have been said and what it thought its reporters to have heard, and in extenuation of its gross folly, feels that it was merely bringing to its readers a fair and accurate comment of what took place at the particular meeting - no such excuse holds good.
4.10 p.m.

No such excuse holds good, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for the people who run the "Advocate" must know that when they report somebody as having said that the Speaker of the Barbados House of Assembly is unfair and partial, they must know when they make the decision to let that be published in their newspaper that they intend that it should be read, and that if it is intended to be read, it is intended to be believed, and if it is intended to be believed and is published for that purpose, then they must also be guilty of the intention of defamation of the integrity of the Speaker, and of the Parliament of which he is Speaker.

When some time ago the Government introduced the "Legislature (Privileges, Immunities and Powers) Bill, the very people who are seeking to undermine Parliamentary

Government from the outside in this island, were bitterly opposed to it as being unnecessary, but the House quite properly felt that the only way in which a free Parliament and a free community could continue to exist was that the rigour of the law could be called in to protect the integrity of all members of the House and Senate without exception. This is no partisan consideration. Every single member of the Legislature is entitled to a certain amount of protection under the law, and even among ourselves in this Chamber. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have Standing Orders which protect us from the excesses of one another, because the whole House is committed to the principle that the best construction must be placed on what an honourable member says or does in the course of a debate; and if we protect ourselves against each other, how much more so ought the Speaker of the House be protected against unfair, unjustified and dastardly attacks in newspapers.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is something which you cannot possibly overlook, and I was astonished to hear the Hon. Leader of the Opposition expressing doubt as to whether on this side of the House there was equal seriousness and equal determination as on that side. I do not know why he thought that. There could not possibly be any doubt in anybody's mind but that the members of this Party on this side of the House would spring to the defence of the Speaker as readily and certainly as determinedly as any other member of the House. I am going to say something now which illustrates not only how we regard the Speaker's duty, but illustrates the attitude of the Government Party on all matters connected with parliamentary integrity. It is well known, for instance, that the Speaker is a member of our Party; but from the time he has been Speaker, by common consent and with the approval of us all, he never attends the Executive meetings of our Party, he never attends meetings of the General Council, although as a member of the Party he is an ex-officio member, as you yourself are, and therefore he avoids being involved in Party matters which might some time or other conflict with his duty and integrity as Speaker. He does not even attend the Annual Conferences of the Party which are open meetings for all Party members. So resolutely and with such integrity does the Speaker regard his duty and his position in this House that he separates himself entirely from anything to do with the governing of our Party, so that his freedom of action in this House should not be embarrassed in any way, and he does this with the full approval and consent of us all, because we are as anxious as anybody else that parliamentary integrity should be maintained.

That being the case, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is inevitable that we should spring to his defence with the same readiness and the same determination as other members; and therefore, speaking on behalf of this side of the House, I beg to give strength and support to what the Hon. Leader of the House has said, that we regard it in the same light as the hon. senior member for St. Peter and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, and it will be a test of the integrity of every single member of this House without exception if they accept or reject the motion with its amendment which is before the House. There is no question here now of Party allegiance. The Speaker of the House is under attack in a very vicious and dastardly way. The House is now rising to his defence and is prepared to take the necessary action which the law says it can take. Anybody therefore who contracts out of this decision which the House is now about to make is showing himself up to what he is thinking and for how he is acting, and therefore is serving notice on the House and the rest of the community that he does not care that the integrity of the Chair should be maintained; so hon. members do not have any choice. This has got to be a unanimous vote of the House, that the House expresses its disquietude and its anger at the attack on the Speaker, and the House also wants this whole matter drawn to the attention of the Attorney General so that the provisions of the law in this respect can be complied with. There is no contracting out of it, and this is a good test case to show who wants to uphold the integrity of Parliament and who does not.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is very little I need say after what has been said by the various speakers

in this matter. The point at issue is whether or not the headline in the newspaper constitutes a breach of privilege. The answer obviously is "yes". The contribution made by the last speaker should be with respect to the Speaker, but earlier on in the speech his remarks tended to show the man called "Adams" as being the devil on this earth. That is not the matter before Parliament at all. The question is whether the members of this House are expected to believe that the headline is accurate. No one on earth would believe that of Adams, whom the said publication referred to as a veteran. Nobody would believe that he would have made such a statement, and it is obviously the exuberance of a reporter who wants to win his way through to the top; but what appears is "Adams: Stop taking sides, Mr. Speaker." This is not something you would expect from an old veteran.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let me remind the hon. member that when the Hon. Minister of Education spoke on that point, I stopped him. We are dealing purely with what appears in the publication. We are not discussing the merits of who said what, and I am again issuing the warning to you as I did to him.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe in this case you will have to stop me. We are concerned with a Resolution on a breach of privilege, an impingement of the rights of the Speaker; that ends it, and we are expected to support it. What we have to concern ourselves with now is whether or not the ethics of the newspaper are in good hands, and for this reason we must take exception to it. Whether or not we should continue to decide that the alleged statement fell from the lips of the person who is supposed to have made it is an entirely different matter, but nobody would believe that it ends there. It is a breach of privilege of our Parliament, and it is as simple as all that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I should like to enquire of the hon. senior member for St. Peter whether he has been informed of the proposed amendment made by the Hon. Leader of the House to his original Resolution, and whether he accepts it.
4.20 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I accept the amendment.

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

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I now ask that the motion with respect of the suspension of the Standing Orders which I moved earlier be now put.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think that the hon. member should put the motion.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16, 18, 40 and 45 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting.

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

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

QUESTION TIME

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Question Time be now taken.

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

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

ACCURATE RECORDS OF BUILDING MATERIALS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I ask that Parliamentary Question No. 13, asked by the hon. junior member for St. John, be now read.

Mr. YEARWOOD: To enquire of the Minister of Communications and works:

Can the Minister state whether Works Departments keep accurate records of the quantity of building materials, such as cement, stone and paint used for the many projects they undertake?

2. Will the Minister state what quantities of said material have been used in the financial years 1962-63 and 1963-64?

3. Will the Minister state specifically what quantity of cement was used by the Department of Public Works during these years, and whether the figures supplied by the Central Office of this Department tally with figures supplied by the individual sites?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the replies are as follows:-

Accurate records are kept of the materials supplied for each project and instructions have been issued to the Director of Public Works to ensure that in future accurate records are kept of all materials transferred from one job to another.

2. The following quantities of materials have been used in the financial years 1962-63 and 1963-64:-

Public Works Department

Materials	1962 - 63	1963 - 64
Cement	38,854 bags	42,060 bags
Stone:		
(a) Block Stone	16,677 feet	19,060 feet
(b) Boulder	5,582 cu.yds.	6,202 cu.yds.
(c) Concrete	8,097 " "	9,130 " "
Paint	6,228 gals.	6,675 gals.

Highways and Transport Department

Miscellaneous Paints	177 gals.	261 gals.
Road marking paints	353 gals.	407 gals.
Portland Cement	22,794 bags	61,378 bags
Cement Ferrocete	375 drums	--

Waterworks Department

Materials	1962 - 63	1963 - 64
Cement	16,848 gals. or 1,849 bags	12,866 gals. or 1,429 bags
Paint	42 1/2 gals.	62 1/2 gals.
Stone:		
Concrete Blocks (4")	2,007	3,120
" " (6")	-	758
" " (8")	2,065	520
Coral Stone	4,280 feet	1,380 feet
Boulders (9")	-	8 loads

New Hospital Construction

Cement	44,062 bags	20,500 bags
Concrete Stone	11,960 loads	4,572 loads
Paint:		
Paints & Emulsions	1,855 gals.	2,158 gals.
Snowcem	1 1/2 tons.	2 1/2 tons

3. The quantity of cement used by the Public Works Department during the two years is 80,914 bags as shown above. Records of the delivery and receipt of materials are kept at Headquarters only. The question of the agreement of figures supplied by the Central Office with figures supplied by the individual sites does not therefore arise.

WOULD-BE NURSES FRUSTRATED

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 11 is now ready.

Mr. LOWE: To enquire of the Minister of Health:

Is the Minister aware that many of the young girls who wish to pursue a career in nursing have been frustrated and at times completely humiliated by the attitude of certain officials at the Barbados General Hospital?

2. Is the Minister aware that many of these girls fail to qualify here as nurses but subsequently leave for the United Kingdom, enter reputable hospitals and qualify without apparent difficulty?

3. Will the Minister state whether he considers the abovementioned situation to be satisfactory and in the best interest of the community or whether he proposes to institute some remedy?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The reply is as follows:-

"No, Sir. Any report of improper action by Hospital officials will be promptly investigated.

2. I am advised that a Student Nurse who failed to pass the local examination for Nurses has subsequently returned to the Hospital as a trained nurse.

3. There are, however, no statistics as to the number of Student Nurses who, having failed the Preliminary State Examination in Barbados, have afterwards qualified as State Registered Nurses in Great Britain.

4. A thorough investigation of the system of Education and Training in Barbados is being carried out. When it is completed any necessary reforms in the system will be introduced as soon as possible."

4.30 p.m.
Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That brings Question Time to a close.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken.

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

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Committee of Supply be taken as the first Order of the Day under Government Business.

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that you do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply, and that it be an instruction to the House when in Committee, to consider the Resolution for \$172 of which notice has been given earlier today.

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

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1964-65 NO. 30

CARIBBEAN FOOD CROPS SOCIETY

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is a Resolution to place the sum of \$172 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1964-65, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, 1964-65 No. 30, which forms the Schedule to this Resolution. It is clearly set out in the Addendum to the Resolution what this money is for. The Government has been invited to become a sustaining member of the Caribbean Food Crops Society which was established in May, 1963, with the assistance of the Caribbean Organization. The object of the society is to advance Caribbean Food Crop production and distribution in all their aspects in order to improve the levels of nutrition and the standards of living in the Caribbean area. This Resolution therefore seeks to provide the necessary funds to enable the Government to become a sustaining member of the Caribbean Food Crops Society which will hold its second Annual General Meeting in this island in October this year. Last year this Society had its Annual General Meeting in the United States of America. The cost of sustaining membership of this Society is \$100 (U.S.) per year. As is set out in the Addendum to the Resolution, this will be the second year in which the Society will be holding its Annual General Meeting, and Barbados has been asked to be the venue during this month for this meeting.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

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

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

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

The CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER who resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, seconded by Hon. J. C. TUDOR in each case, the Resolution passed in Committee was read a first and second time and agreed to.

RESOLUTION POSTPONED

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to give an explanation as to the Resolution which stands on

the Order Paper. It is a Resolution which deals with the compulsory acquisition of "Fairy Valley Plantation". Normally, Sir, the Government usually resorts to the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act, 1949, when it is impossible to reach what the Government considers to be a reasonable agreement with the owner of the land. In this case, I am happy to be able to say that the situation is now more propitious than it was when this Resolution was drafted. The owners of this land have signified their intention to negotiate with the Government on terms which the Government regards as a more reasonable basis for negotiation than hitherto and therefore, in these circumstances we are not proceeding today with the passing of this Resolution.

4.40 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, that brings Government Business to an end for today.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until next Tuesday, 13th October at 12 noon.

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

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

4.43 p.m.

