
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 17th March, 1964.

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

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., (*Speaker*); Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, (*Minister of Development, Trade, Industry, Labour and Tourism*); Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS; Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Mr. F. E. MILLER; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (*Minister of Education*); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. W. R. COWARD; Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. G. V. BATSON, (*Chairman of Committees*); Mr. N. W. BOXILL; Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (*Minister of Social Services*).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret to have to inform the House that the Minutes of the last meeting are not yet ready.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I am commanded to lay Message No. 5/1964 forwarding the Draft Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for the financial year 1964-65.

Also, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Statement of sums of money paid over to the Accountant General by the Commissioner of Police during the quarter ended on 31st December, 1963.

The Immigration (Amendment) Regulations, 1964.

The Teachers (Secondary Schools) Pensions (Amendment) Regulations, 1964.

And on my own behalf, I am commanded to lay the following:-

The Customs Duties (Amendment) Order, 1964.

The Customs Duties (Resin and Chemicals for use in the manufacture of Building Materials from Bagasse) Order, 1964.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

Resolution to advance the sum of \$8,361,212 from the Public Treasury to be defrayed from Loan Funds and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, to meet the expenditure to be incurred during the financial year 1964-65 on Capital Works included in the Estimates Part II - Capital.

A Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Public Treasury and to appropriate the same for the service of the Island for the year ending on the 31st of March, 1965.

A Bill relating to the pensionable emoluments and service of the Anglican Clergy.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to approve under Section 10 of the Barbados Harbours Act, 1960, the Annual Estimates of the Port Department for the year 1964-65.

Resolution to approve of the compulsory acquisition by the Governor-in-Executive Committee of a parcel of land at Ashton Hall, St. Peter, for providing a new pumping station for the development of water services.

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.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. SPEAKER: I am advised that there is a Resolution in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas.

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

"WHEREAS the main road in Redmans Village in the parish of St. Thomas needs proper drainage to regulate the flow of water after a rainfall;

AND WHEREAS the said water flows under the homes of quite a few people of the area;

BE IT RESOLVED that Government make provision for the construction of proper gutters to the said road in order that the people living in the area will be better able to get in and out of their homes."

QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: There are none on the Order Paper.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Speaker, I submitted a question here before noon on Friday and I should like to know if it is ready for me to ask it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid it is not on my Notice Paper which is blank. I shall look into the matter and see what I can do to help the hon. member.

Mr. COWARD: The Clerk has just intimated to me that it will be ready today, but I thought it right to let you know about it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am grateful to the hon. member for his information, and I will see what can be done.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON a Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Public Treasury and to appropriate the same for the service of the Island for the year ending on 31st March, 1965, was read a first time.
12.25 p.m.

On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, a Bill relating to the pensionable emoluments and service of the Anglican Clergy, was read a first time.

STANDING ORDERS 5, 14, 16 and 18 SUSPENDED

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, before you begin, in view of the Government's commitment this week, I think, as I intimated last Tuesday, that we may be called upon to meet three times this week, including today, of course. Therefore, I am going to move at this stage since the Order Paper is a rather lengthy one and because we have to begin the Estimates at the next meeting, that Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16 and 18 be suspended for the remainder of the day's Sitting. When we come back later this week, I hope that hon. members would have had the chance to peruse the Estimates and the Appropriation Bill which have been circulated today and be able to deal with them.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the suspension of Standing Orders, you will note that practically every Tuesday, the Hon. Leader of this House asks for the suspension of the Rules. I would say that he has to get on with Government Business but there is no Rule in the Standing Orders for Government Business to be struck off after being on the Order Paper for a certain time. Government Business can remain there until I get an old man which, as you will see, a Bill to amend the Bank Holidays Act was there practically before I was born and it is still there but as soon as a period of three months elapses, any item under Private Member's Business, if it is not dealt with, is struck off. The Hon. Minister is not considerate with these suspensions of Standing Orders because he just does not mind whether Private Members' Business is got on with or not.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I object to the hon. member's saying that I do not mind whether Private Members' Business is being attended to or not. Far from being wanting to hinder or retard Private Members' Business or dealing with their Items on the Order Paper, we allot some of Government's time to deal with them. It is not true, as the hon. member has said, that practically every Tuesday we are suspending the Standing Orders. We did it last Tuesday for the same reason which we are doing it today, but two meetings before, we allotted some of our own time to deal with Private Members' Business.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, you will remember that two meetings before the last, I had to complain about this same action

on the part of the Hon. Minister and we were allowed two meetings to discuss Private Members' Business. But, Sir, you will also remember that it was no better for us because the time of those two meetings was taken up on a particular Resolution which has not been finished yet. The Hon. Minister of Education took up the time of a whole meeting for himself on that Resolution and the hon. member in charge of the Resolution took up the time of the other meeting. I am not responsible for that. That is their prerogative but I am responsible for sitting here and allowing the Hon. Minister to move the suspension of those Standing Orders every Tuesday without objection.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I object most strenuously to that allegation. Two Tuesdays before last Tuesday, we answered no less than 50 questions which is a record of this House.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I would call Government's replies to questions, Government Business also.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I rise on a point of order. If the hon. member calls that Government Business, he does not know the proceedings of this House. Government does not ask questions. These questions are asked by hon. members who are Private Members of the House.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the Government does not ask questions neither do they reply to Resolutions of Private Members. Government does not reply to Resolutions of Private Members but Private Members' Resolutions are being struck off after a certain time. Why do you not strike off Questions after a certain time too? Questions can be on the Order Paper for any length of time. I am sure, Sir, that some of the questions which were answered last Tuesday were asked as long as two years ago but they were not struck off. Resolutions are struck off, therefore, there seems to be some great difference between Questions and Resolutions. I take it that Government has a big part to play with Replies to Questions. It is very — I will not say it because I know Your Honour will ask me to withdraw but — it is a very nice way for the Government to get away from the attacks or the replies to some of these Resolutions by enforcing the time limit.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I object to that statement. We have no desire to get away from them. The hon. member knows that at no time in the history of this House we have dealt with Private Members' Business at Budget Time. Year after year, he has sat in this Chamber and seen his party come in and postpone Private Members' Business for the same purpose. The hon. member is just absolutely wasting the time of the House.

Mr. SMITH: The Hon. Minister can call it wasting as much time as he likes, but is he handling the Budget today?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, You will remember that before Your Honour began to call the Order Paper, I said that we had a number of important matters on the Order Paper which the Government would like to clear off before we start the Budget because when we start with that, our time must be devoted to that. If you look at Government Business, you will see that some of the Items arise out of the new constitutional position.

Mr. SMITH: There are only two hours allotted in today's Session for Private Members' Business and the Government has the remainder of the time for themselves. They can work until tomorrow morning. I take it that Private Members' Business has no meaning. However, the Hon. Leader of the House wants the whole of the day's Session to be allotted to Government Business when two hours belong to us. It is not fair to rob us out of our time and I am objecting to that. Two hours cannot hurt, so for that reason, I am objecting.
12.35 p.m.

A division was taken as follows:—

AYES: HON' BLES G. G. FERGUSSON, W. A. CRAWFORD, C. E. TALMA, A. DaC. EDWARDS, J. C. TUDOR, Messrs. BATSON, CORBIN, WEEKES, LOWE,

YEARWOOD, CARMICHAEL, BOXILL, WALCOTT,
SEALEY, LYNCH and GODDARD - 16.

NOES: Messrs. HUSBANDS, COWARD, HOLDER
SMITH and MILLER - 5.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been resolved in the affirmative, sixteen hon. members voting "AYE" and five hon. members voting "NO". I now declare that the "AYES" have it, and accordingly, those standing Orders now stand suspended.

CONGRATULATIONS TO HER MAJESTY THE
QUEEN ON THE BIRTH OF A SON

Mr. SPEAKER: It has been intimated to me by the Hon. Minister of Education that there is an Address with which he would like to deal today, copies of which have been circulated. The Hon. Minister may proceed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise to move the passing of a Resolution to Her Majesty the Queen on the birth of a son. It reads as follows:-

Most Gracious Sovereign,

The House of Assembly respectfully desire to convey to Your Majesty, and to His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh, their loyal and affectionate congratulations on the birth of Your Son.

I do not think I need to detain the House very much on this matter. It is traditional in this House that on occasions of Commonwealth significance occurring in the Royal Family, this House, like other Parliaments, and especially like the Mother of Parliaments, follow suit in offering respectful congratulations to Her Majesty the Queen on such occasions. Looking at the records, I have discovered that within recent years, this House and the Other Place have passed Resolutions of congratulations in 1948 on the birth of the Prince of Wales, and in 1960 on the birth of Prince Andrew. Therefore, Sir, this Resolution follows common form and I am very pleased to be able to move the passing of it and to commend it to the House. Within two weeks almost to a day from now, the people of this island will have the pleasure and privilege of welcoming the Queen Mother on her informal visit to this island. It is therefore fitting that, on this occasion, members of this ancient Assembly should join in submitting their respectful congratulations to Her Majesty the Queen and the Duke of Edinburgh on this happy occasion. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to second the motion for the passing of this Resolution which has been moved by the Hon. Minister of Education. I would like to say that we are all very pleased to know that the health of the Queen and that of the babe have been very gratifying. I support this Resolution on behalf of members from this side of the Table.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my Party, I would like to share and join in the congratulations which have been expressed to Her Majesty the Queen, the Duke of Edinburgh and the Royal Family.

Mr. SPEAKER: I beg to associate myself with the congratulations which have been extended to Her Majesty the Queen and other Members of the Royal Family from all sides of this House, and I will ask hon. members to signify their acquiescence in the passing of this Resolution by standing in their places.

Hon. members stood in their places as requested by His Honour the Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: This Resolution has been unanimously passed.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House:- To move the House

into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Island:-

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

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

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE APPROPRIATION
OF C. D. & W. GRANT re CONSTRUCTION
OF NEW HOSPITAL

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The first Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is a Resolution for the sum of \$192,000, and it arises out of the financing of the new General Hospital. This Resolution is to appropriate this sum of money which has been available to Barbados as part of the unspent portion of the West Indies Reserve Allocation from Colonial Development and Welfare Schemes.
12.45 p.m.

Now that the hospital is nearing completion, Sir, it is desirable that these funds should be utilised to meet part of the total expenditure. As hon. members are aware, the amount provided in the Estimates for the current year for the construction of the General Hospital is \$3,456,623, and out of this portion the sum of \$824,933 came from Labour Welfare funds. Well now, unlike loan funds, funds from Colonial Development and Welfare had to be appropriated, and therefore this Resolution seeks to give the necessary authority for such action, whereby altering the method of financing previously approved for expenditure in 1963-64. The amount of expenditure chargeable to loan funds would consequently be reduced by the same amount as we are getting from this Reserve Allocation Fund, the amount of \$192,000.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to see that we have this amount of \$192,000 to be spent towards the building of the new hospital. I should only like to ask the Minister if he has figures available, whether he can furnish the Committee with what sum would have been provided from C. D. and W. towards the building of the hospital. I think it was originally thought that they would have furnished about \$3 million. Could he tell us how much has been paid in by C. D. & W. including this \$192,000, and if there are further sums to come? I intended asking this later in the Estimates, but I can see we are going to be rushed then, and I should be very pleased if the Minister can give the information now.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the Addendum here is a little bit confusing to me because it speaks about the amount which is provided in the Estimates this financial year for the construction of the New General Hospital being \$3,456,623. It is not clear what "this financial year" means, because when I look in the Estimates for 1963-64, I find that under the Head this amount appears for this year, and then I see the provision of \$1,018,000 being provided in the Budget for 1964-65. What I should like to ask the Minister is if he can take this opportunity to give a progress report on the Hospital, because I have been in this House long enough and have had something to do with the original estimated cost of this hospital, and it was agreed at one stage that \$2 million would be used from Labour Welfare Funds to finance the Hospital which at that time was estimated to cost \$3 million or \$4 million at the outside. I would like to know what progress report can be given on the hospital, but I should like to make this general comment. I think that this Barbadian society and some politicians in Barbados

have some colonial style whenever we build any public institution, of calling it the best in the Caribbean or the best in the world. I do not want to subscribe to that sort of wild description, because I cannot see if we have a budget of approximately \$32 million how we can have the best of these public institutions when other people are much better off than we are, and in my view the time has come when the Government must look at the cost of these capital works, because I am satisfied in my mind that when this hospital is finished, it is going to cost 100% more than the original estimated cost. When you have a recurring expenditure of \$13 million out of a budget of \$26 million or maybe \$32 million, without the capital works that you are now adding falling due, it seems to me that you have to do a little bit of rethinking about the standards that you set in building these very important social institutions.

I would say, Mr. Chairman, that this elaborate idea of constructing buildings may be very good from an architectural point of view, but from a financial point of view, we have to trim our cost to suit the economy that we have to regulate. You can do nothing now about the hospital since it has been constructed along given lines, but as a layman it does seem that if a hospital in Barbados with a \$32 million economy is going to cost you in the vicinity of \$6 million or \$8 million, you have to have a complete right-about turn, because any one project that is going to cost 25% of your total revenue is a very serious item you have to consider, and it is time that we take stock of the cost of capital works and the cost of these social institutions, if not we will find that instead of priding ourselves about our means of controlling ourselves and running our affairs, sooner or later we may have to ask for so much assistance that somebody else will want to run our affairs for us. I do not subscribe to the view that Barbados must have the best hospital in the Caribbean, because Barbados cannot afford to have an \$8 million hospital.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, the hon. junior member for Christ Church has asked for information with regard to the allocation of C. D. & W. and other funds towards the construction of the hospital, and the hon. senior member for St. Peter has posed a question as to whether or not Barbados in the context of its financial capacity can afford an edifice of this elegance and cost.
12.55 p.m.

I am afraid from purely an academic point of view and also from the point of view of repaying that with all we can afford to do in the future, this question might be considered but, in so far as this building is concerned, it is now nearing completion to be ready in a matter of weeks and as regards the question of whether or not we can afford it, the answer to it may only be useful from the point of view of reflecting on what we can afford to do in this direction in the future, whether your capital projects must fall within a certain financial limit or not.

Obviously, no Government in its right senses should embark on the expenditure to build institutions which are beyond the capacity of the country to carry but, in so far as this is concerned, we inherited it and it is also true to say that some of the expenditure have been for things over and above what was estimated for. There are instances if proper caution had been exercised from the beginning that the Government would not be involved in the expenditure which it has been involved but we are carrying on this project and the Government in office has had to split its head wide open from morning to night in order to finance the project.

There were, of course, additional items of expenditure in access roads and hon. members know very well that you cannot have an institution of this size and capacity, particularly bearing in mind that it would be a Hospital for teaching persons also, unless you had included such things as proper access roads and proper improvements to the approaches on all sides. If hon. members had been to the site, they would have seen apart from the construction work itself, that a lot of this money has been spent in building up the area and removing the unsightly slums nearby and taking houses from their locations, where they never should have been, and siting them elsewhere. Hon.

members know that houses along there get washed away and people lose their lives and this total expenditure is included more or less under the single item of the erection of the New General Hospital.

Unfortunately, the files with all the available information which hon. members would want are now here, but hon. members can rest assured when we come to consider this item in the Budget in a day or two that we will have all the available information here and all the information with regard to the total construction cost and the allocation of funds from public revenue, from the Labour Welfare Fund and C.D.C. as well as any outstanding information which is required will be answered then.

I trust hon. members will possess their soul's impatience and be co-operative enough as to await the discussion on the Budget later this week.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Leader of the House usually gives information on these matters and I am sorry I did not hear him start off but I anticipate from what I have heard that he was dealing with something asked relative to the cost of this building.

Sir, I have visited that Hospital and have spoken to medical men who had the opportunity of travelling to not only the United States and the United Kingdom but all over Europe. In this community, with its revenue capacity and its population, I personally think although we should have an up-to-date Hospital, that this new Hospital is somewhat too expensive for the community of Barbados. I see, myself, that a lot of things which are put into the Hospital from the point of view of its structure are actually not necessary. Sir, I am no architect or anything of the sort but I have spoken with people and the small tiling which you have on the outside of it is something which is a sort of expensive luxury. My criticism is that the Hospital while possessing all the up-to-date equipment for the healing of human beings who possibly cannot go abroad to get the necessary treatment should not be a luxurious building. From buildings which I have seen abroad for hospital, Mr. Chairman, while they have all the necessary equipment possible and which you will have at this hospital or even more, you will find that the people are not erecting a monument to any particular Government or party as you may be doing. That is as far as I can see - and I offer this as a criticism - because I have seen some of the most up-to-date hospitals in the world. Sir, I have had the unfortunate experience to go into one of the most up-to-date hospitals in a modern city like New York to get medical treatment and I have not seen up to now the necessity of having a hospital constructed with all this fancy tiling. The money spent on that could have been spent on something which can be used more for the assistance of human beings.

Sir, I do not know if this was sanctioned by this Government but when you look at the interior of the Hospital, you will see it constructed with inch square tiles. I do not have to apologise to any architect for this but it is a question of finance. There is a certain position to which a company can go and when you have these inch square tiles, it means that a man has to take so long to put in all those things. Does that make the Hospital better? I hope that this Government, when such plans come before them, would know how to deal with them. If you take the cost of doing things like that, it looks like taking advantage. We cannot afford that.

Sir, I intended to ask the same question which the hon. junior member for Christ Church asked but I shall be content with the explanation given by the Hon. Minister that when we come to deal with the Budget, he will have all this information ready. I only just want to say that when we are building these things to let us build something which is strong, lasting and reasonable, but nothing luxurious. I am not criticising the equipment and the like which you are going to have at the Hospital.
1.05 p.m.

I have not been to Jamaica to see the Hospital which is attached to the University College but I am told that this Hospital here is something which is elaborate to that. We

were told just what this Hospital would cost us but it is costing us (A MEMBER: Nobody knows) a tremendous lot more than what we thought. I hope that the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works will take heed to what I am saying. I have had the courage to say to Captain Tomlin that I do not see the necessity for this. If you want to put up one of these fancy things, go down the St. James coast and let one of them put it up; but not this draught-board business.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: On a point of order. I would like to draw to the attention of the hon. senior member for the City that these draught-board tiles are not in one by one. They come in a large roll of paper, the entire batch is put on and then the paper is taken off. As I say, Sir, they are not put on one by one, which would take quite a lot of time.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I thank the hon. member. I hope he does not think that I did not understand that; I just wanted to pull out the Hon. Minister on that, but we really cannot afford it at a Hospital. We want something which is for the benefit of the people. What do you want to put up all this stupendous thing for? Years before I came in here, in those days you had to give a hell of a lot of reasons for these things.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. The hon. member is still in the House; he cannot use those words.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am using the words "a hell of a lot".

Mr. WALCOTT: That is unparliamentary, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member's vocabulary should be wide enough for him to know that he cannot use those words. Let the hon. member keep the debate on a proper level and, Mr. Chairman, it is not for me to say that; that is something for you to do.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I quite appreciate that. (A MEMBER: Well, rule.

Mr. WALCOTT: I will make a motion that those words be withdrawn from the debate. It is not a question that you are listening to these things; it is not a question of that. Are you going to condone that type of language, Mr. Chairman? What language are you going to use in these debates?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sometimes I wonder if you listen to the hon. member.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am asking that those words be withdrawn.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What is the difference between "a hell of a lot" and "a devil of a lot"?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think that those words are unparliamentary.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not know what is wrong with the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, May's Parliamentary Practice is replete with words which you cannot use in Parliament. Do not let the hon. member go on with that; do not let us reduce the debate to unparliamentary language. Nobody is quarrelling and therefore let us use language which is appropriate.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What is wrong with the hon. member?

Mr. WALCOTT: I am a member of this House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: So am I.

Mr. WALCOTT: Well, then, you are honoured with a position which you do not regard.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am appealing to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to moderate his language.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, you can make all sorts of jokes in Parliament but there is a simple dignity which we want to preserve. I must agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter; I think that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition would be happy to withdraw those remarks. In the interest of this august Body, I am appealing to the hon. member to withdraw those unpleasant remarks.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I would withdraw anything I have said and I will use the words "a devil of a lot"; but when people want to usurp authority, they are not doing me anything; they are really telling you, Mr. Chairman, that you are not reading May's. (ASIDES) Are you telling me what I must do? Do you appreciate what I say, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I agree that the words are unparliamentary.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, if I were to get up and say that I happened to buy a copy of May's and looked it up and tried to embarrass you every time somebody says something which is wrong - you cannot embarrass me when I say "a hell of a lot" in here.

Mr. WALCOTT: I rise on a point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You can rise on six points of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: I have never been able to buy a copy of May's. I do not associate money with integrity and commonsense; as long as you are a member of this House, you must submit yourself to the Standing Orders. Position has never appealed to me yet. This House has a copy of May's and I take time to read it, because it applies to Parliament.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: You are dealing with the wrong man.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You are dealing with the wrong man all the time. All the hon. member is saying is that you have not been reading May's. What the hon. member has objected to has often been used in here.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like the hon. member to get on with the Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY: When you raise questions like that, what happens? When you talk about position, well, Sir, I really would not like to get heated in this debate. When a person rises on a point of order about something which does not affect him personally, what he is doing is reflecting on the Chair. This is something which the hon. member could have said to the Chair privately. As far as I am concerned, I appreciate what the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works or what the Leader of the House has said, and we will wait until we are dealing with the Estimates in order to see what will happen as to what the hon. junior member for Christ Church has asked in relation to the subscription by C.D. & W. to the cost of the building. 1.15 p.m.

I appreciate the fact that he would not have had the information here, and we look forward to getting it during discussion on the Estimates.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I should like to know from the Minister, now that we have spent somewhere in the vicinity of \$8 million in building this hospital, if he has in mind opening the hospital to the general public about a week or two before it is opened for patients. It would be a good idea to allow the general public to inspect the hospital which can only be done before it is officially opened.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I did not want to join this debate on this question of the hospital, but again, Sir, it is unfortunate that the Chair sometimes does not exercise greater strength. I remember on one occasion what happened with the simple word "discrimination". It is really unfortunate that things have happened in Parliament in the

last two or three years which have never happened, I believe, in its entire history. However, I more or less must challenge the remarks of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition in connection with the tiles at the hospital. The hospital is one of these structures built for all times. The hon. member is probably quibbling about what appears to be loss of time with these small tiles. I had to do with that matter, and as a matter of fact, it was my idea in finishing the outside of that institution to follow the United Nations building and I am correct in saying that Mr. Coulter, who is the representative for Evelyn Roach, did make a trip to the United States. You would be interested to know that 180,000 tons more of steel have gone into that building. After all the advice from architects including the great Llewellyn Davies of Nuffield Foundation who is known as a specialist in hospital architecture, we did request the makers of that steel to make it specially to take care of hurricanes, tidal waves, and what not at a cost of \$1/4 million over and above what the steel would cost. There is no hope of rebuilding such an institution, and all the plans for the expansion of that hospital will probably carry another four buildings on the floor plan, and maybe in another 30 or 40 years you can extend it. The tiling, I think, comes from Czechoslovakia on the Continent, and there are little squares which you mount in cement forms. That was done because I felt that the country could afford \$240,000 to finish the outside of that building as it is finished at the United Nations, and there is nothing to stand up like that. I saw it on one occasion and I decided that we should have that for the hospital. It is not the type of building for a school that you can change; it is a hospital which you have built for all times, and I am sorry the Leader of the Opposition is worried about what it will cost.

What is lamentable, Mr. Chairman, is that you are exhausting the man who is doing the job. If you take a quick look at him, you will see that he is almost dead, and I am hoping that the Premier of this country will take a look at him and see that he is doing the job of his life. He never had an idea of the concentration and how much of his life is expended on that job, and it will be good to secure a place for him to rest for three to six months. I have worked at close range with him for three years in planning this institution, and I know that the country has been very fortunate to have Captain Tomlin. I am sorry the hon. member has taken the route of discussing rats in the hospital institution and the other things that happened in the Casualty of this institution, but that hospital was intended to be a monument not only to Barbados but to the Party to which I belong, for all time. I will be sentimental about it and whatever happens I do not believe that more time or concentration could be spent than in the building of such an institution. It is indeed the largest steel structure in the whole Caribbean including British Guiana, and as I said, an additional \$1/4 million was paid for an additional one-sixth inch stress on all that steel to protect the building against hurricanes, tidal waves and what have you.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry if the hon. member has said that his Government was responsible for this. It is distressing to hear this talk from the hon. member on this sentimental basis. You do not have to be sentimental about a hospital. You are sentimental about some little antique that one of your parents has left for you, maybe an old pocket watch that does not work or a ring, but you are not sentimental when running a Government. You have to be practical, and a hospital is nothing which is going out of fashion that you have to build the last, with all this talk about the kind of steel used in the Caribbean. This kind of country buck chat must cease. This is like a man coming from the bottom of Bawdens and telling you that he bought the best pair of shoes in town. As the Hon. Minister said, it may be academic because you are committed to the cost, but what I say is that we have to be careful about these things. I do not like, however, bringing in these personalities. I do not think anyone in this Chamber would query Captain Tomlin's ability as an architect or would not agree with the hon. member that any job like this would have been gigantic, but I would say further that my view on this matter is that these things should not be done by one man. No one man should be expected to devote his life and time to the construction of an \$8 million hospital in Barbados. What

we have to bear in mind is that when we have those erections put up, we should think of getting around to organisations with the team of people. The Harbour was built but it was not done by one man in Costain's, but by a series of engineers, and I believe if anything is going to breakdown Captain Tomlin's health, it is this idea of designating a person to be completely responsible for the construction of an \$8 million job. It is asking too much of human nature. A man may be a brilliant architect, but do you know that this Island might suffer as a result of not having him in the public Works Department? You are probably building one thing for \$4 million or \$5 million, but maybe spending another \$6 million or \$7 million through not having the supervision and knowledge to deal with it. All these are things we have to be careful about. I think the hon. junior member for St. George lives on sentiment. He calls his house "Solitude". 1.25 p.m.

He is sentimental enough but I think he must realise that not to his dying day would he see this Hospital with the tidal waves and the hurricanes which he talks about. You will not see a Hospital like this in the Caribbean. Trinidad has a Budget of \$200 million. Barbados has a Budget of \$30 million, therefore, you will see that Trinidad has a Budget seven times the amount of that in Barbados where there are less people. If you take the size of Trinidad and its Budget, you can easily see that they have a higher *per capita per person*. Are you going to say then that Barbados must compete with Trinidad? I think that it is the mistake which we have been making all the time. Of course, we pat ourselves on the back and say that Barbadians are the best in the Caribbean until we are put to the test when sometimes we find to our sad experience that the best economist in the Caribbean did not come from Barbados but from St. Lucia.

Mr. MILLER: Again, Sir, we are reaching to such honoured history of our times and I think it is good to differentiate between sentiment and sentimentality. We have reached the stage where we have the Victorian outlook and where we have denied the right even to personal satisfaction. One is in trouble to understand the differentiation. One can give his life to an ideal. I call my house "Solitude" because it is the place where I can go and get away from all that is around me. This is no form of idle ignorance.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member speak on the Resolution before us?

Mr. MILLER: The first thing is to understand your history. I am discussing this Resolution for \$192,000. All of our architects are working on these walls of time. I think this is in keeping and you can enjoy the satisfaction of it. One is entitled to his feelings. What is greater in a man's life than for him to be given the opportunity which he can be forever be happy about. I do not know if you want to change the name of the Hospital to the word "Solitude".

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, I am glad that the Hon. junior member for St. George has spoken because his remarks underscored what I said about our having taken over this project and then our being committed in carrying on with it. The hon. junior member for St. George who was himself the Minister in charge of Medical Services in the last Government said that this was to be a monument to his party.

Mr. MILLER: I did not say that.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The hon. member said that this Hospital was to be a monument to his party.

Mr. MILLER: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I hate to interrupt anybody in his speech, least of all, the Hon. Leader of this House, but so often we are in trouble with elementary truths. I did not say "monument to our party"; I said, "a monument to the people and the administration".

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I do not mean what he said just now, I mean what he said first of all.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think that we better get from the Reporter the remarks which he used.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, you cannot do that, I will lend you a copy of my Rules to show that you cannot do that if the Hon. Leader of the House so desires.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I want those words read back before we proceed any further.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman,---

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member cannot speak now. 1.35 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Clerk will read back the words referred to by the Hon. Leader of the House.

Mr. CLERK: The words are as follows:-

"I am sorry the hon. member has taken the route of discussing rats in the hospital institution and the other things that happen in the Casualty of this institution, but that hospital was intended to be a monument not only to Barbados but to the party to which I belong for all times."

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I cannot,.....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, words have been taken down and read by the Clerk, and there can be no debate about what he intended to say. He has no right to speak now since the words have been taken down and read, and it is for you to proceed.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, hon. members will realise that I quoted the hon. junior member for St. George correctly. He said, according to the report, that this was to be a monument to his party for all times. In other words, they were going to use public funds to construct a monument to his party for all times. Now none of us could have any quarrel with them if this monument was their party building in Roebuck Street.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of interruption, Mr. Chairman, I was talking about a monument to the country; the party that brought it into being is another matter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Leader of the House is correct from the words which have been read back.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, with unchanging respect for the Chair, I would ask that that be read in order that Parliament might hear what I said. I said that it was to be a monument to the country. Can I seek your permission to have the records read?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will read the last part of it which reads as follows:-

"but that hospital was intended to be a monument not only to Barbados but to the Party to which I belong for all times."

Mr. MILLER: I thank you, Sir.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: There was an over-reaching desire of the hon. member to tell us that this was to be a monument to his party, and I say, Sir, that if they were going to construct a monument to their party out of private funds or party funds, nobody would have any quarrel at all about it, but we certainly must take up the matter when it comes to constructing a monument to any Party with public funds. The hon. member says that he went to the United Nations in New York and saw the building, and it had these tiles on it; so he came back here

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, it is sad that I have to be misunderstood. I said I saw the finish on the building at United Nations, and I wanted that duplicated here on our building, but that it was too costly.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: All I want to say is that the hon. member and his Government has United Nations taste with West Indian colonial poverty-stricken finances, and that is why today we are in the financial trouble we are. To

get a little hospital in an island of 166 square miles finished we had to find almost \$3 million last year, and since it was a public project, the finances had to come from public funds. It could not come from the pockets of the Ministers; so we had to increase taxation. We had to impose taxation where it would create the least impression on the type of people who would be affected, and therefore there was increased taxation on rum, beer, sweet drinks and jewelry.

Mr. MILLER: If the hon. member would give way, I just want to know if we are being told that last year they had to find an additional \$3 million towards the cost of completion of the hospital. He said he had to increase taxes on rum and sweet drinks because of this additional cost at the hospital. I should like him to make that clear for the records, because we may elsewhere have to refer to these things.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, what I said was this: the original estimate of the hospital was \$5 million; it now costs over \$8 million. The position, Mr. Chairman, is that so long as there is an increase in expenditure on a public project, you have got to find public funds to finance it. Let us say that if you did not have to find extra money in one direction you could have had it from somewhere else, but the fact remains that we were committed to increase expenditure on this project, and therefore if we had no surplus funds in this direction, we had to find extra funds for this purpose, and therefore we increased taxation because we needed more money and this taxation was placed on items which we thought were not absolute necessities but were regarded as luxuries, such items as jewelry, sweet drinks, rum, beer and what not. If his party wanted this hospital to be this monument, one would have expected we would have to find more money and it must come from somewhere, but they ran all over the country trying to create a riot saying that we were exploiting people and imposing additional taxation unnecessarily by putting up the cost of the poor people's rum, beer and sweet drinks, when he knew that the monument modelled on the United Nations must cost money. United Nations is comprised of the most important and wealthiest countries in the world: the United States of America, Great Britain, France and all those important countries. What they can afford on their walls or in their bathroom we could not afford on our external walls, but the hon. member said he wanted to duplicate the finish of the United Nations building; so he ordered these extra fancy tiles apart from the steel with extra tensile strength and eventually we are spending such an amount on the hospital that on all sides of the Chamber we are being warned by the hon. junior member for Christ Church and the hon. senior member for St. Peter that in future we must cut our coat to suit our cloth, and that secondly we cannot afford these extra fanciful projects with our limited finance. All I want to say is that the extra cost is nothing we involved the country in; it was a legacy which we inherited, and any time you get a small poverty-stricken country with the taste of wealthy countries, you are going to find yourself in that trouble.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of interruption,....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What interruption are we getting now?

Mr. MILLER: On a point of Order, the hon. member talks about legacy, inheritance and what not. Are we today in Parliament begrudging the increase in salaries to those working at the hospital? The hon. member said he inherited a legacy. Mr. Chairman, I understand what is respect for the Chair, but I am in trouble to know which chair I must listen to and from which I must take some direction. I am on a point of order, and you must save me from interruptions from the second Chairman. The Hon. Leader of the House says he inherited what he considered a legacy. (A VOICE: Sit down!) Now you hear "sit down". Later on he would not be able to say "sit down".

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member for St. George please address the Chair?

Mr. MILLER: I am on a point of order, and I am taking the words used by the Leader of the House about a legacy

and inheritance. Are we worried, Sir? We are talking about this gentleman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think the point of order has been made.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order, the hon. member's remarks about legacy and inheritance are incorrect. Are you worried because you had to increase through a general overall cost of living the salaries of the workers including the watchmen? We started the Deep Water Harbour and understood it would cost \$30 million. There was no grudging or legacy, and that was completed before the end of our term of office, and we did not have to increase sweet drinks or rum to do it. Those are things that are normal.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The point of order has been made.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, it is a waste of time trying to regulate these things. We had to find money for all these things he is talking about. He said that the cost of the Deep Water Harbour went from \$22 million to \$30 million; but they had not paid for it. We had to find \$18 million to finish off the construction cost of the Deep Water Harbour. Similarly with the hospital, Sir, the cost now is \$3 million more than the original estimate.
1.55 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: All that I am saying is if and when the people of this country are called upon to make a bigger contribution because of people going up to United Nations.....

Mr. MILLER: Is there anything wrong with the place?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to hear the Hon. Leader of the House.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The point is this, Sir. You must expect that this is going to cost money. The hon. junior member for St. George said that he ordered steel costing \$1/4 million more than what ordinary building steel would have cost in Bridgetown. He said that it would cost \$240,000 more than what normal steel would cost. Sir, we are about to build the Hilton Hotel which is going to cost an appreciable sum of money because it is being built on the beach but nobody wants to build it with steel of that expense which the hon. member talked about. But what is important is for the people to realise that if and when they are called upon to make some contribution to the increasing expenditure of this country, appropriate blame must be placed where it should be placed and in the cost of this Hospital we have had it today straight from the horse's mouth that this extravagantly constructed building in Martindales Road was to be built to be an eternal monument to the hon. junior member for St. George and his party. None of us begrudge the country for this Hospital. In the future expenditure in this country must be ordered to our potential financial resources and I am particularly happy speaking for myself and I am sure the entire Committee that today we have found out the reason why this country was committed to this extravagant project.

Mr. MILLER: Is there anything wrong in wanting the best? I will always think in terms of having the best.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I have to rise and thus prevent you from putting the question now.

The hon. junior member for St. George is one of those people who always want to shed abuses on the Chair and it is people like him whom you have to watch because in the name of democracy they are crying out about "Wolf, Wolf, Dictator", and they want democracy, but it is true to say that they are doing everything possible to destroy it and that is why we have to be very watchful with those persons.

In the first place, the hon. member talked about pride but in your innocence as a new member of the Chair, the hon. member is trying to exploit his position for which he takes pride in laughing at the things which he is doing and

thinking that he is bringing you to ridicule. He is one of those soulless individuals to say something which is not true and to have the compunction to repeat it with a smile. Any member who rises on his feet in Committee to a point of order when he is replying to something and to which he has replied 89 times can only be a soulless individual.

The hon. member is going to reply to me. I take this opportunity to reply to him based on what he was trying to exploit, that is, exploiting the Chair, when there was actually no point of order. The hon. member said that he wanted this to be a monument to his party. If the hon. member had any regard for his own statement, he could have even defended what he said but after he said what he did he said that he did not say so, he said something else. He now wants to be a Daniel coming to judgment. After parading over the whole country trying to pull this Government down, out of his own mouth comes this sentimental ignorance. As I have said already, some of them have been to secondary schools and came out after they had reached the first or second form and they have never done any more reading since then. They try to criticise others who have not been to secondary schools. I have done a lot of reading and I have no inferiority complex to some of that trash which has been there. Therefore, when they find people like myself can stand up to them, they cannot face us.

The hon. junior member for St. George comes here and talks about being sentimental. What should you be so sentimental about? No Minister can be sentimental about building buildings in his time or building a hospital. Are you building the first hospital in the world or are hospitals going out of fashion? The hon. member talked about tidal waves and hurricanes. Antigua is not in the hurricane belt. The hon. member comes here and tells us about his sentimental innocence and that he has been to United Nations. I have been to United Nations various times and any one who has been to Russia, the U.S.A., the U.K., France and the other countries which make a contribution to the United Nations would know that only a man who is not fit for the Mental Hospital but fit for the grave, any man who is ready to be buried, would come in here and want to duplicate by the most infinitesimal amount anything which he sees at United Nations. Do you think that a place like Barbados with a population of 240,000 people and a per capita income of less than \$700.00 a year can afford to do what the hon. member has done because of personal pride? Does the hon. member think he is building something in his backyard to dedicate to his children? Mr. Chairman, do you know what members of his party want? They want to take the credit that they were the country's bookies. They say that this is their Hospital in one breath and in the other breath they say: "Look what the new Government is imposing on you!" The hon. member should be the last person to say what he did about the Deep Water Harbour when everybody in this country including the late member for St. Michael and the late member for Christ Church, Mr. W. W. Reece, when he was returned to this House in 1948 after being defeated in 1944, which is sixteen years ago, moved a Resolution calling upon the then Government to go into the matter of the construction of a Deep Water Harbour. As a matter of fact, the only persons who were against it were the same giants of that party and they kept back the building of this Deep Water Harbour until it became inevitable and it was an urgency to build it and that is why it has landed us with this amount of cost which we have to face when we could have had it many years ago at a cheaper cost if they had the imagination.
2.05 p.m.

The same hotel industrial business you have today on higher costs, but they had no financial or economic projections in this country and when anybody goes about with these projections, you have them masquerading about the country; you have the vandalism that these people are burning the canes, because if they do not get the Government out of power, they burn the canes. That is the kind of vandalism you get and members of this House are encouraging and condoning that sort of thing. Who is saying that? - The hon. junior member for St. George. What is the parliamentary contribution which he has made to this country that you can say: "here is where he stands"? What

he likes to do is to trot out these hypocritical statements which mean nothing and he cannot even make one quotation right; but this garbled business he likes to come out with and he puts any name to it whether it is by Byron, Macbeth or anybody else.

I heard him here today; it is these acts of vandalism which encourage people with that mentality. That is the price which you pay for democracy. When you talk about dictators you have to be dictatorial or otherwise they will destroy democracy under the guise in which they are shouting "Wolf! Wolf!" When you look at Africa there is something before you start to condemn. You have elements operating in a democracy today, a democracy which gives people the freedom to underwrite all the methods which will destroy a country if you were to allow democracy to go too far. You cannot imagine what the hon. member sat down here and told people that they are doing. Imagine the hon. member saying that they are going to burn down all the canes if they do not get rid of the Government. Sooner or later you will have to deal with such a person in a positive manner, otherwise when you wake up it will be too late. You cannot be afraid of exercising authority when you get subversive elements operating with a smile; that is why I say that the half has not been told about these subversive efforts which exist in Barbados on a level which will destroy the whole country. To some of these people it will not matter what happens to the country so long as the other members are within the Government.

The hon. junior member for St. George is one of them. With all of this sentimentality, they will join forces with any element so as to destroy this country. The hon. member just scraped back in here in the last Election with the same pomp and pride with which he would look at his senior colleague before the Election and laugh at him; but his colleague is the senior member for St. George and the hon. member has not yet got over the shock to see that his colleague is the hon. senior member for St. George. That is the sort of subversive element or subversive elements which are at work and are being used. Out of the hon. member's own mouth, we heard him. I said what I said because the Government is the Government of today. The hon. member should be ashamed to talk about the cost of living. We know that costs will go up from the original amount from what we started, and you know where you started from.

Any country with a 32 million dollar budget can afford an eight million dollar hospital and therefore there is no thought or being the best. You cannot expect to have the best when you did not have the best persons. You cannot begin to define or qualify what you mean by the best; the best means the best. We have to realise that we are going to spend \$8 million and I may say that no Government, at any time, has the right to calculate to spend any amount on a capital project because the higher the capital costs, the higher will be the recurrent costs, unless you have an automation hospital and that is not such a hospital. The hon. member says you have to put up this kind of steel. Well, Sir, who is the hon. member? The trouble is that when you have these Ministers and they have some knowledge of these things, they themselves want to undertake them. The hon. member is saying that he was the man who, even more than who constructed the Hospital, really decided what they were doing to put in the Hospital, and if somebody is responsible for some of these exorbitant costs, then the hon. member is that person. These additional costs should be placed on the hon. member and we would be able to indemnify ourselves with these costs.

I heard the hon. member say: "Look at the Hospital", as if we were having a Hospital for the first time; but Sir, from the time I was a boy, there was a hospital. I think it has to be made clear that it is not this viciousness of the Government, and members of Parliament in exercising their right fully should not allow people to feel that the taxation situation in this island has got out of hand, and all the Government is doing is imposing taxation on people without any development purpose. I do not think that these half truths should be allowed to be stated. This Government was left with a legacy and the ones who have now gone are so dishonest that they cannot tell the public the

truth. The hon. member said that they calculated to spend \$5 million, which was not true, because the original estimate was \$4 million. In the Auditor General's Office, when the Barbados Workers' Union was asked if we would approve of the sum of \$2 million being used in the Hospital project, I said "Yes." There are some people who say that we have put \$2 million in the Hospital. We said that people are going into the Hospital and we would put in that amount because you may not be able to give people money to build or to repair their houses. We did not mind using this money in the Hospital because we regard the Hospital as a national project. We said that there were not only agricultural workers who were going into the Hospital and by using this \$2 million from the Labour Welfare Fund that would relieve the country of \$2 million of taxation. You will see if you were to take 4% on this money what the charges would be on the people of this island.
2.15 p.m.

The hon. member did not go around and tell people that the Government had to budget for \$3 million more, but he had the effrontery to say that the Deep Water Harbour was finished paying for before they came out of power. It was not. The full finance came up in this House after this Government came into power. At one stage they were telling the world one thing about the Deep Water Harbour, but now they are saying something else, and we have from their own Party member a Resolution about the Deep Water Harbour. I hope I will be around to deal with it, although the hon. member says I will not be coming back. I wonder if the hon. member feels that this national position in this Island is of such importance that he can look at me and tell me that I am not coming back, and I cannot look at him and say the same. I wonder if he feels from what has been going on in this country for the last three or four months that it is a position in which I am to get worried? I have said on public platforms that if I cannot be returned here as a member for the convictions I hold and will continue to hold, I am not coming back here on the basis of expediency. I am not like some of the others who for convenience do things as the wind begins to blow. I have seen a lot of them change positions as soon as it looked as if something was going. That shows the character of people, but I started one way in public life and will go out the way I started. The hon. member cannot say that for himself.

Hon. E. W. BARROW and Mr. MILLER rose.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I saw the Hon. Premier first.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member said he was on his feet first, he is not speaking the truth.

Mr. MILLER: Well, I will be speaking after the Premier.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, very interesting facts have emerged here today which are not consistent in my opinion.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to say again that from the beginning of the financial year, I will have to recommend to the House that no vote be appropriated for the payment of equipment or anybody to run the equipment unless we are going to have a proper system in here. I complain about it every week.

The reason why I am joining this debate, however, is because I think it is an opportune time to bring to the attention of the public all that I know. The hon. member seems to have employees engaged on the staff of major newspapers in this island, and the members on the Opposition side would know what I am talking about. I want to bring something very important to the attention of the general public. The former Minister of Social Services, after making an extensive tour of the United States and after visiting the United Kingdom ostensibly to study hospital administration and construction as Minister of Social Services, admits that he personally ordered materials for the Barbados General Hospital to wit, steel; and the reason he gave for that action on his part - this is not under his

department but should have been done by the Hospital architect and the Minister of Communications and Works, which is highly reprehensible in the first place - is that he wanted steel of tensile strength which could withstand hurricanes, when every building including this one does not have one single bit of steel except the tie-rods in the beams on the roof which would simply prevent it from blowing off. This has cost the country \$1/4 million; but the reason why I rose to my feet....

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, a point of order is not to contradict.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. junior member for St. George has already said that he will speak after the Premier.

Mr. MILLER: I have a right to correct the hon. member.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: A correction is not a point of order. He can get up in Committee and say what he wants to say. He can condemn and hang himself and speak for an hour on different things. I went outside to check and I have come back in because I am going to tell you what he said before.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I have a right....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will listen to the point of order, but if the hon. member does not make it, I will ask him to sit.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I talked about the tensile strength of the steel, and I referred to Llewellyn-Davies of the Nuffield Foundation who was released to Barbados and was accepted as hospital architect number 1, and it was on his advice that it was ordered.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, when the hon. member was talking about what a glorious monument the hospital was to his Party, it should be a mausoleum in which most of them should be buried, because we have just added a mortuary to hold twenty-six bodies, if there are so many people in his Party. What I want to say is this: the hon. member - and when I say "hon. member", I am using it purely because I am in Parliament and in its lucid sense - mentioned Llewellyn-Davies in connection with the architecture of the hospital. He did not mention him in connection with advice. He personally ordered this steel to make sure that \$240,000 more was expended. The reason why I left in here, apart from the fact that I was flying early this morning and did not have a cup of coffee, is that I plead guilty like the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that I could not rise to do justice to this debate without some proper foundation being laid. I do not understand suspending the Standing Orders and interrupting the normal biological process of hunger and soon; but I also took the opportunity of checking because I raised this matter in this House two years ago about the hon. member ordering steel from the United Kingdom and delaying the construction of the hospital, when steel was available from Germany at a much cheaper rate, and the excuse the hon. member gave then was - and hon. members here will remember - that he did it as a token of gratitude to the United Kingdom Government because C.D. & W. funds had gone into the construction of the hospital, and it would be ingratitude for him to order cheap steel from Germany to the exclusion of more expensive steel. I challenge that about three and a half years ago on the floor of this House. I will not tire you now, Mr. Chairman, by reading word for word, but if you check you will see there was not a single word about Llewellyn-Davies' name coming up or about the tensile strength, but here was a Minister of Social Services who should have nothing to do with ordering of goods, making an extensive tour ostensibly to study hospital administration, putting contracts in the United Kingdom for steel which cost \$1/4 million more than steel from Germany, and he now talks about a monument, and we have to find \$3 1/4 million more. They did not have a

single penny to pay Civil Servants, but they gave them the increases, and I have to find that money year after year plus increased old age pensions which he denied people. The same way he was advised by Llewellyn-Davies, he was also advised that they did not have money to pay increased old age pensions, and these mealeay-mouthed hypocrites we have in Barbados are going about the country saying how this Government has increased taxes, that this Government has done this, that and the other and that the Barbados Workers' Union is no good and all that kind of stupidity. 2.25 p.m.

I say, and I make no apology for it, if they were living in another country outside of Barbados the people would have drawn and quartered them long ago because I do not know of any country outside of Barbados - and I do not mean outside the Caribbean - where from their leader back down would have been living today. I say that this is downright wickedness. The hon. member has given two different explanations to spending the quarter million dollars on steel. He talked of hurricanes, tidal waves and that sort of nonsense.

I am not finished with the hon. member yet because he is going to condemn himself more than what he has done today. We cannot at this stage give hon. members all the details of the increased cost but when they talk of the increase in the cost of living, in 1961, when we came into office up to now, the cost of living index has only moved upwards 1.6 points. It was standing at 113 points so that it is less than 1 1/2% which it has risen. Construction wages have gone up 52%, so our wages are higher than in Trinidad and even in places outside of the Caribbean. Our wages in agriculture are the highest in the Caribbean. The total bonuses paid out to workers in agriculture last year equalled 45% of their crop-time earnings. In Jamaica it was 8% and in Trinidad it was less than 12 1/2%. This is the cost of living in Barbados but we increased the price of rum by 52 cents a bottle. The average Barbadian is buying rum at \$2.00 a bottle and we pay for a whole gallon of rum less than \$10.00. His brothers in the United Kingdom who are working in severe climatic conditions where they need rum not as a drink or novelty but more of a necessity have to pay between \$30 and \$40 for a pint and a half bottle of rum and they are not complaining. The duty on rum in the United Kingdom alone is \$72, and I may mention that 58% of the United Kingdom's national revenue comes from rum and cigarettes and they are taking it and building jet bombers with it but we are taking ours and building nothing else but monstrosities. We are buying rum for less than \$10 a gallon and have increased wages to over 52% to the workers in agriculture and all the hon. junior member for St. George is talking about is erecting monuments to the Barbados Labour Party.

I think I can take this opportunity to mention to hon. members of the House that much to the disappointment of the Leader of his party we know that he has gone as far as the United Kingdom on several occasions trying to wreck the credit of this country. The B.B.C. called me in and I was told that his son had to be dismissed from there and they had a complete set of tapes recording where the Leader of his party talked about wild boys running the country, total financial irresponsibility, that Barbados is bankrupt and that the present party does not know what it is doing. Every time the Leader of his party goes to the United Kingdom he tries to get some opportunity to discredit the name of Barbados. I will not talk about that any more today because that would have to be a three-day debate. The bill sent to us by the Chairman of the Common Services Conference, which was presided over by Sir Stephen Luke, the Commissioner, is on behalf of the Leader of his party for money of over \$7,000 spent five or six years ago. As I have said, that is going to be a three-day debate. I invite them to get up and talk about the Tenders Committee. All I would say now, is that at that debate to which unfortunately the hon. members's colleague, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph referred to, it only shows that the Government Ministers of that time were debauching the Civil Servants.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I rise in a point of order. I do not want it to be said that I am trying to stifle debate, but you are allowing the Hon. Premier to stray all over the Resolution and it is really and truly not fair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I allowed the hon. junior member for St. George the same amount of latitude.

Mr. SMITH: The Hon. Premier can talk the whole day but you are there to rule and you must not allow things of the sort to happen. You cannot let it be said that because he is the Leader or the boss of your party that you let him do as he likes. It is a reflection on the Chair and I am saying this for your benefit. It is a reflection on you.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I can understand the agitation of the hon. member. I personally believe when he asked those questions that he wanted to embarrass the hon. junior member for St. George. I am inviting him now to ask some more questions. If Officers in the Government allowed themselves to be used in a certain way by Ministers, I say, that Government Ministers were not milking the Treasury but debauching the whole community. It is going to take a lot of hard work to put it on its right footing.

I am strong but I am not as strong as I should. However, I am serving notice on the hon. member of the kind of questions which I want the hon. member to ask me and, that is, increased expenditure on the Hospital and I will give you a blow by blow description when the hon. member interferes.

You talked about Mrs. Joshua. (A VOICE: He has gone to St. Vincent.) I am going all the way to Germany, then to Chicago and I am going to come back to St. Joseph. Let me take the case of Mrs. Joshua. Mrs. Joshua at the time was Minister of Social Services. Like any Government Minister or Mayor or Chairman of Committees, she would have people coming to her and seeing her day after day for jobs. What happened is that they held a Commission of Enquiry and found that Mrs. Joshua had instructed certain Civil Servants to take on certain people in the Public Works Department. 2.35 p.m.

The Opposition Party is aligned to the Barbados Labour Party; that is another reason why I would have to interfere. Mr. Sandys has told them the same thing that the former Colonial Secretary told Mr. Adams in 1961. They had this Commission of Enquiry and they found that Mrs. Joshua had no right to interfere. That has happened three years before the last Election and no newspaper had brought that out. Nobody could accuse Mrs. Joshua of receiving one cent corruptly, but she allowed her good feelings to interfere with her administrative judgment. That is exactly what every Government Minister in the last Government did, and they felt that if you were sympathetic towards the members of the Democratic Labour Party or the members of the Barbados National Party, the Conservative Party, you had no job at all. People in the Transport Board were in that position. They felt that this was the job of the Minister of Communications and Works. (ASIDES) I am asking the hon. junior member for St. Joseph not to be distracted because this is a very important matter. How could I believe Mrs. Joshua had signed this paper because what would she sign in the interest of St. Vincent if we could have this sort of thing going on? How could I stand silently here when a former Minister of Social Services has admitted that he interfered with a Government contract and caused this island to spend a quarter of a million dollars more than it should spend and he gave two different excuses on two different occasions? One relates to the matter of the purchase of steel, but the purchase of steel has nothing to do with the Minister. As to the Tenders Committee, I am asking the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to ask me more questions. Out of the former Minister's own mouth he ordered steel to the tune of a quarter million dollars more. It is not a mere question of saying: This man comes from my constituency and you must take him on; that is what Mrs. Joshua did and pundits in Local Government do this sort of thing every day.

Mr. Chairman, I am quite sure that if the Mayor of Bridgetown had gone and ordered materials to the tune of a quarter million dollars more, let me say \$500 more, I believe that he would get away with \$500 and then send to my Ministry and ask for something more. I believe that the Members of his own Party would expose him in public. I believe that the members of his own Party would ac-

cuse him directly of fraud or ask him to resign his position as Mayor. (MR. SMITH: That is not true.) If you can prove to the contrary then you must know something about it; you must have fixed it right already. (Laughter). As regards the standards of public behaviour, I would not attack a Minister in his private life. The hon. junior member for St. Peter has referred to the hon. junior member for St. George and I would say that I do not think that people's private lives should be the proper subject of debate in here. As to standards of behaviour.....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, I have never said anything about private life. I said that both my private life and my public life can stand the glare of any inspection. It can stand up to that of the hon. member any day.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I stand corrected, Mr. Chairman, if I could contrast what was going on in this island with what is going on elsewhere, if the "Torch", the "Observer", the "Advocate" or the "Daily News" think that I have said one half of the things that I could say - I feel I have reached the point of exasperation if I do not say what was going on. Everybody knows what was going on in the Public Works Department before the present Minister of Communications and Works took over. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph and other hon. members could call the names of people who had houses built out of the Housing Authority.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, The hon. member has said that I have assisted people in getting houses out of the Housing Authority (MEMBERS: No! No!)

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would not expect that the hon. member would have a house built out of the Housing Authority. I said he could render a great service to this community by way of disclosing a list of the names of persons who have had it done.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, that makes the matter worse. The hon. member is accusing me of knowing who have built houses out of the Public Works. I think, Sir, that the Hon. Premier is going too far. What he has said is not true; I know nothing about that. The Hon. Premier must be more careful in the utterances which he makes. I can stand in public and hold my hand up in the air and no one can say that Lloyd Smith has ever done anything dishonest.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Again, the hon. member does not understand me. I have never suggested that he had any complicity; I said that if anybody told me that the hon. member ever had anything like that done personally, I would disbelieve him. I said that he, along with other hon. members, are fully cognizant of the fact that prior to the assumption of office of the present Minister of Communications and Works, lots of houses were built in Barbados, out of material and funds or labour and order books of firms in Bridgetown, and people ought to be ashamed of themselves of doing that out of the public funds of this island. 2.45 p.m.

We have clamped down on it and I throw out a warning here. People think I get a rush of blood to the head, that I am under pressure and that I am slightly crazy, - that is what they say on platforms - and I like abusing Civil Servants; but sometimes I like to issue warnings to them to save people from themselves before the Police arrive with a warrant. Since I threw out that statement, you would be surprised to know how much money we have saved. Take the Transport Board. In the Transport Board alone since I threw out a certain statement and we have done a little reshuffling and so on, though the Union has raided us for \$197,000, and by eliminating certain appointees and putting them in positions where they could not cause any damages we collect \$25,000 a month more with the same services. Since we have been in here. We have not come to the House despite the increases in wages, and we had been losing \$150,000, nor have we been asked to vote a single penny for the Transport Board. (Mr. SMITH: How much do they owe away?) I want the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to understand that he can attack me and

call me all kinds of names, but I am a very peculiar person and I would never accuse the hon. member. I personally have never known the hon. member to get into this kind of hole with the Government, and nobody has ever complained to me otherwise; so I am not concerned.

Mr. Chairman, this debate has served a useful purpose. Sometimes it shows that when Ministers are being criticised for being irresponsible they have acted with a certain amount of restraint, but fortunately we have to debate the Public Accounts Act of 1964 and we have amended the Standing Orders so that from the first of next month, we can have our Public Accounts Committee in full operation. I should only like to say that I hope the hon. leader of the Opposition exercises his full powers of summoning people. The Leader of the Opposition is automatically Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, and I hope that when he gets into that position with the members whom the House chooses to put on it - it will be an all - Party Committee - they will exercise their full control over the Civil Servants and the spending of Government funds, and even call in Ministers when they go on a trip, although the hon. member for St. Peter feels it is undignified for Ministers to give an account of how they spend their allowance when they go on a trip. The Public Accounts Committee will have power to call in Ministers and ask them to produce bills from hotels. I want to make it clear that this Government has nothing to conceal.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the Hon. Premier said that the hon. member for St. Peter says that it is undignified to do something. There are two members for St. Peter, and I should like him to make a distinction.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the hon. senior member for St. Peter said that it is undignified to ask Ministers and people when they go travelling to produce bills. He said that last week, I do not have to give authority to the Leader of the Opposition, the hon. senior member for St. Peter and any other member of the Public Accounts Committee to call on Ministers even to produce bills for expense accounts when they go away. We have nothing to hide and we will have them to produce. I want to say that I am Minister in charge, and I invite the Public Accounts Committee to go to the root of justice itself and check on the Courts first. They should check on what is going on over there, and if justice is going to be kept pure, let them go over there and talk about accounts now. You can come to my Ministry any day. When they talk about dictatorship, we will throw the management of the financial affairs of this Island firmly into the lap of the Opposition Parties and give them the responsibility now. I would not have to get up and make statements anymore because you will have the power. You can commit them for contempt; so I want you to exercise all those powers, and if you want to go back ten years, you can do so and you will find a lot of interesting facts coming up.

At this stage, I do not want to take unfair advantage of members by prolonging the debate when a suspension is not needed in my own case, and I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended for forty minutes.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.
2.55 p.m.

On resumption,

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, there is no quorum and I ask that the Bell be rung.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank the hon. junior member for St. George, let the Bell be rung.

The bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE

Mr. SPEAKER: When the Sitting was suspended, the House was in Committee of Supply.

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

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, unfortunately,.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, the hon. junior member for St. Andrew intends to speak.

He seconded the motion for the adjournment.

Mr. MILLER: I seconded the motion for the adjournment.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Whether it was seconded or not by you, I am asking the Hon. Minister to speak now.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The hon. junior member for St. George must know the Rules of the House. If there is a motion made for the adjournment, the mover of the motion has a right to speak when consideration on the motion is resumed. If he does not want to speak then any other member can speak.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that one has got to sit and listen to all these dress rehearsals by hon. members such as the dress rehearsal by the hon. junior member for St. George in which he said that he not only constructed a monument for his party and the territory of Barbados but even for himself. What is worse is that it is an eternal monument. It is very interesting to see how people who are supposed to be considered responsible can make such statements but, of course, when one makes these statements, one expects that that person who made such a statement has his facts and knows what he is doing and is speaking from what he knows was done such as the statement made by the hon. junior member for St. George.

Now, Sir, the hon. member has emphasized that he has ordered steel and this steel, as has been pointed out, involves the Government in additional expense. But that is not surprising. It has been a common thing with the hon. member and his party to establish monuments which they term to be monuments for themselves or on their own behalf but which were very expensive monuments. Their estimates were always higher than anybody else's and they knew why. I think of some school buildings which they have built. Today, with increased wages, as the Hon. Premier has pointed out, the hon. junior member for St. George has prided himself because of the increased salaries which have been paid to Civil Servants and the increased cost of living, yet we can provide school buildings of a greater capacity at less expense than what they have done. It is a fact which cannot be gainsaid, yet you will hear the hon. junior member for St. George going around the country with his fellow companions misleading the people and giving the people the impression that they are interested in them. Their interest is to establish monuments at the expense of the taxpayers.

Now, Sir, I was the most surprised man to hear such statements as were made by the hon. junior member for St. George. I think the hon. member was dealt with in the way he should be dealt with by the Hon. Premier, but because of that, the Hon. Premier has cut a lot of wind out of my sails.

There are one or two questions which I would like to deal with. The hon. junior member for St. George was trying to give the impression that all the work done at the new Hospital is being done by one engineer and it would appear as if he succeeded to some extent in selling the idea to the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I would just like to point out to this honourable Committee that the architect at the Hospital has the able assistance of several civil, mechanical and electrical engineers, so it is not fair to say that all of the work is thrown on this one man. It is true that in any organisation or establishment, there must be a head. The only organisation in which there was no head was the last Government because everybody seemed to be the boss; everybody could order steel when they did not have the authority to do it and everybody seemed to be the Minister of Finance, the hon. junior member for St. George being able to spend an extra \$1 1/4 million on steel.

In reply to the question asked by the hon. junior member for St. Thomas when he referred to granting the general public permission to see the Hospital before it goes into operation, I would say that that would be a very dangerous step. There is a lot of destruction which can take place if the new Hospital is made a thoroughfare. It is true that we do not want to deny anyone the privilege of seeing the Hospital and we will not be opposed to allowing persons who will be under the control of someone to visit the Hospital. As a matter of fact, that has been done with some of the schools. Some of the headteachers of the schools have approached the Ministry to allow some of their Sixth Form pupils to see the Hospital as it is now and permission has been granted to those schools to see the Hospital under the control and supervision of a teacher, with at least the maximum of 40 children per teacher. Those children under the control of a teacher will be granted permission to look at the Hospital but to permit anyone to go in and visit without the necessary permission would only lead to additional expense.

3.55 p.m.

I was saying, Sir, that we do not want to deny anyone the right of seeing the Hospital, but we would prefer the visiting to be done in organized groups. The hon. junior member for St. George has expressed the pride which he has in this Hospital, I suppose rightly, and he should know why; but in relation to this lovely building of which the hon. member spoke, the sum of \$8 1/2 million has been spent and you will be surprised to know that there was no Plan or provision made by the former Government for canalising the Constitution Swamp which, if it had remained as it stood, the habitation of the Hospital would have been impossible. It is true that the canalizing of the Constitution Swamp is not any part of the cost of the Hospital, but what I was trying to point out is that although the hon. junior member for St. George has so much pride in this Hospital and he was responsible for matters relating to health in this country, he never thought for one moment that something could have been done with the Constitution Swamp if people were to be pleasantly looked after in the Hospital. The hon. member never thought of that for one moment, yet he is proud about the Hospital.

The hon. member also criticised the Government when we started the Crash Programme in connection with the Constitution Swamp. Hon. members will remember that in my maiden speech in this Honourable House, I had to take the hon. junior member for St. George to task about the stand which he took in relation to the Government when we asked for the \$1 1/4 million for the purpose of canalising the Constitution Swamp and for carrying out other projects in our Crash Programme. A part of this money was for the purpose of canalising the Swamp and the hon. member criticised it; so that while he was putting up a big monument for himself and his Party, the environment was not what it should be. The monument was to be placed in the Swamp. Not only that, Sir, but the sewage was to be disposed of in the same Swamp. That was the sort of thinking of people who say that they have knowledge of administration and people who can walk about and boast about having a lovely building. This building is to go down in everlasting memory of the Barbados Labour Party. Imagine that, Mr. Chairman! I wonder sometimes if when some hon. mem-

bers get up to talk they really begin to think. Mr. Chairman, I really do not want to go any further into this matter, but I think it was my duty to point out the inefficiency of the planning and thinking of people who boast and pride themselves of having established monuments out of the taxpayers' money to themselves, rather than think of the community.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Leader of the House was at pains to find opportunity for the Hon. Minister of Health and Social Services to address the Chamber and join in the battle. I know that the Minister is not aware of the Resolution which is before the House, but why did the Hon. Minister, of all members, speak when you have a stalwart like the hon. senior member for St. Andrew or the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, the Parliamentary Secretary? But, Sir, you have seen the fledgling in his political rompers. *(Laughter)*. I do not think that anybody would regard him as a Minister with the knowledge and sincerity required of such a person. Not even a porter in the Hospital would think of him as a Minister. I do not think he could do worse than allocate criticism of the erection of the Hospital by the last Government on that spot. He now wants to make a claim; he is hiding behind his dark shades, but I will say that the Hospital is a reality and it will be there forever.

In their helplessness they are throwing mud against the Barbados Labour Party, but I should like to say that the role of the Minister is that of the Master of the Choir for the Animation of the Sick and Incapacitated travelling out the Island. Let us give the hon. member all the pride he deserves in that direction. He is criticising the remark made of a monument not only to Barbados but to the West Indies. Mr. Chairman, this is not like taking two houses of the Housing Authority, putting them together and calling the building "The DaCosta Edwards' Day Nursery".

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, that is the biggest misstatement which has ever been made. I want to say that there is no place in this island bearing the sign "The DaCosta Edwards' Day Nursery".

Mr. MILLER: Not now.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I will ask the hon. member to withdraw that statement.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister is asking that those words be withdrawn.

Mr. MILLER: We have members of the Council who were present when this thing was done; we have members of the Council here when the decision was taken. That was printed in all of the newspapers and the criticism was in the newspapers.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The hon. member has said that two houses of the Housing Authority were put together, in fact, he accuses me of having the Housing Authority to put up two buildings and place my name on them. I strongly object to that and I ask that that statement be withdrawn. 4.05 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. junior member for St. George willing to withdraw the words to which the Hon. Minister has objected?

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, allow me to clear up this point with regard to the remarks made by the hon. junior member for St. George about the DaCosta Edwards Day Nursery. This matter was discussed by the Northern District Council.....

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has risen on a point of order about something the hon. member said. This is nothing to do with the Northern District Council. I would like to point out that it would be improper for the Minister to ask the hon. member to withdraw, because there is no stigma to withdraw nor is there anything offensive. All he has to do is to deny it. The

hon. member has not got to withdraw having said that he saw the Minister's name on something, because the Minister can get up and say his name was never on it.

Mr. MILLER: All I can say is that I had nothing to defend in the remarks of the Hon. Minister. It is common knowledge and everybody in this Island knows this.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, this is what I definitely deprecate now, because I agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter that there may be nothing offensive *per se* in the remarks made by the hon. member. There may be nothing unparliamentary, but I would not like to say inoffensive. The Hon. Minister got up and denied there was any such sign on any building in St. Andrew or anywhere in the Island, and the member replied that it was in the newspaper and that there was a photograph of the site. The hon. member for St. George has called a lot of names he would be aware of, but it does not necessarily mean they are true or untrue. After the Minister has corrected him, he has no right to get up and say that everybody knows it is so, because it is definitely misleading the House. The hon. member has not insisted on the withdrawal because it was not unparliamentary, and the hon. member for St. George should get on with the debate.

Mr. MILLER: I think even the hon. senior member for St. Andrew at one time objected; but let me treat with silent contempt all he has said and pass on to something else. Now we have had some remarks from the hon. senior member for St. Peter, and a lot was an attempt to be personal. He started off talking about secondary schools, but I know the hon. member.....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I do not want the hon. member with his garbled stuff to misunderstand what I said. The hon. member said I did not understand the meaning of "sentiment" and "sentimental", and I said that going in a first or second form at a Secondary school does not make you any wiser. I will say to the hon. member that when he has to deal with me, he has to deal with something, because the question of a person going to secondary school in the first or second form does not give him the right to know the meaning of words. I can read and try to educate myself, which is something he has not tried to do.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, second or third form in a secondary school is a lot different from second or third form in an elementary school.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, only an idiot like him can think that somebody like me went to second or third standard, because I had to give him help both in politics and otherwise. I do not ask people to write things for me. He had to get a paper written on "Labour Marches On". Ask him who wrote it?

Mr. MILLER: He was opposed to me at that time in Speightstown, but the hon. member becomes allergic when he hears about secondary schools. I admire the enthusiasm he took in getting his son through secondary school.

Mr. WALCOTT: What is that? The hon. member says that I was responsible for sending people to secondary schools. I was a pioneer in helping people to get to secondary school.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I sat down and listened to the hon. member, and now he cannot hold his seat. I said I admired the enthusiasm and interest he showed in sending his boy to secondary school. Nobody said anything about school in here today, least of all your humble servant, but he is allergic and gets a rush of foam at his mouth, and in my discussion about the hospital, I am saying that no provision has been made for a psychiatric ward. This member for St. Peter is pathologically sick, suffering from a neurosis that is chronic, and you can only pity him and feel sorry.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I should like to draw to the hon. member's attention the Standing Order that no member may refer to another member of the Chamber in any derogatory manner.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I thank the hon. member but he knows that the words the hon. member for St. George used are only froth, because to put him to the test, I would ask him to spell some of the words he used. It is all right to hear words like "psychiatric" and "neurosis" and repeat them, but he does not know their meaning. Nobody could tell me I am a psychiatric person; that can only refer to a mentally chronic person like him.

Mr. MILLER: I think for the first time you will agree with me Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member is in trouble even to syllabize and pronounce the words he is asking me to spell. That is the sort of behaviour we cannot understand, and there should be a psychiatric ward whether or not it is attached to the same hospital. The question of defeat makes him a wicked animal.....

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I appreciate that it would be difficult for the hon. member to find words because his vocabulary is not wide enough. But he cannot make the vulgar remark to me that I am a wicked animal. How dare him! He should be the last person in this House to talk about a wicked animal. If you go through the records I can show you how he has indulged in the biggest vulgarities as a human being. Is he crazy to call me a wicked animal? If he does not know what words to use let him sit down. He gets up with these fulminations, searches for words he cannot find which represent proper Parliamentary language and is making reference to me as a wicked animal. He has to withdraw those words promptly, if not this debate cannot continue.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I said "Like a wicked animal".

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, he has to withdraw the remarks made to me of being a wicked animal.

Mr. MILLER: I did not use those words.

Mr. WALCOTT: Then we will not go on.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will both hon. members please sit? I am appealing to the hon. junior member for St. George to stick to the Resolution.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to sit here and let the hon. member make reference to me as a wicked animal.
4.15 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. junior member for St. George will give way, I just want to say that the hon. junior member for St. George did say that the hon. senior member for St. Peter was a wicked animal and those remarks are unparliamentary and they have to be withdrawn. The hon. member did say so.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am calling on the hon. junior member for St. George to withdraw those remarks.

Mr. MILLER: This is what I said: An ill wind bloweth where it listeth. If the hon. member wants me to withdraw it, I will withdraw it and substitute something else. He talked of vocabulary.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I want the hon. member to withdraw those remarks in the proper parliamentary way. Even today earlier he had to withdraw words which he said he did not say.

Mr. MILLER: I have said that I withdraw the remarks. You are making all excuses but this cannot help you to hold a seat. He was perplexed to see what is happening.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, he has to withdraw those words in a parliamentary manner.

Mr. MILLER: Whatever he wants me to withdraw, I withdraw. I repeat, there is a certain behaviour which is going on.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will both hon. members sit?

Mr. WALCOTT: I am going to make a motion that those words which the hon. member used in respect of me be withdrawn and not in any old vicious manner which he likes. I repeat, that the words which he used referring to me as a wicked animal are unparliamentary and I wish them withdrawn. The hon. member can say whatever he likes.

Mr. MILLER: Whatever words the hon. senior member for St. Peter wants me to withdraw or parliament wants me to withdraw, I withdraw them.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the hon. has not withdrawn those words yet.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will both hon. members please sit? I am asking the hon. junior member for St. George to couch his withdrawal in parliamentary language.

MR. MILLER: Sir, anything which I said today or yesterday which is unparliamentary, I withdraw. Ask yourself what does the hon. member want.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. junior member for St. George has been a member of this Chamber sufficiently long enough to know how he should withdraw unparliamentary remarks.

Mr. MILLER: What do you want withdrawn?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The words which the hon. senior member for St. Peter complained of.

Mr. MILLER: Well, I withdraw them twice.

Mr. WALCOTT: Do you know that the Chair should be respected?

Mr. MILLER: Do you want "wicked animal" withdrawn? I withdraw them ten times. Why do you not put somebody in the Chair who understands it?

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I rise in a point of order.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am now listening to the Hon. Leader of the House.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, you cannot afford to have the debates of this Chamber degenerate to a low standard. The hon. junior member for St. George must withdraw the remarks and let us proceed with the debate. He must also withdraw what he said about you in the Chair.

Mr. WALCOTT: I rise on a point of order to support the Hon. Leader of the House. I have said already in this Chamber that people utilise democracy to destroy it. The hon. member made offensive remarks about you already today. What we are playing with is democracy. What happens is that when members come to this path they should be removed. The hon. junior member for St. George should be suspended until the end of the Session. That is the only way the hon. member can be put in his place. I would move that motion too. He has been doing this sort of thing too repeatedly.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I want to add this. I have been in this Chamber now for twelve years and am still a comparatively young man. We have had most disgraceful, outrageous abuses in this House by members of that party and all that you read in the newspapers in the next day is that "Walcott and Miller in a Row" and a few phrases

picked out and published which give the general public the impression that members get on the floor of the House and do not defend the ancient privileges of the House.

I am going to make two motions, and I am really going to play dictator now. You have to choose between dictatorship and anarchy. You have to choose between parliamentary Government and Government by the machette and cutlass which those members go in for. The world is reaching a funny stage today. I spoke to students yesterday about it.

There are two things which I want to bring to the attention of hon. members. If the *Advocate* newspaper publishes an article on this matter and it is not pointed out that the hon. junior member for St. George is obstructing and defying the Chair and making uncomplimentary remarks to the Chairman, Your Honour will have to see that the newspaper Reporters are excluded from the precincts of this General Assembly. The general public of this Island generally gets an entirely wrong procedure of what goes on in here. I am going to be a dictator if the hon. junior member for St. George does not unqualifiedly withdraw the offensive remarks which he made of the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I am going to make a motion and if any member of my party does not vote for the suspension of the hon. member, not only would he be suspended, but he would be expelled from my party and that is the dictator which I am going to play. We cannot have the democratic processes made a laughing stock of in any way by these people. They are not holding up parliament to ridicule only, they are holding up the whole Island.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, it is at this stage where I come in. Sometimes, I stir up troubled waters and sometimes I throw oil on them. I think we are at the stage where I can throw oil on them.

My appeal is to the hon. junior member for St. George to withdraw his unparliamentary remarks to the hon. senior member for St. Peter. As far as I am concerned, the remarks used to the hon. member in his speech must be unparliamentary and I appeal to him to withdraw them. The remarks used to you, Mr. Chairman, which I did hear, were such that members of my party would have no hesitation if the hon. member did not withdraw the remarks, but to vote for any motion for suspending him but I know what it is to be in the heat of a debate and lose your temper. It is not necessary for us to go into the process of naming the hon. member. I am still watching this debate.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The champion of the privileges of this House has deserted his colleague.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That has thrown a little more oil on troubled waters.
4.25 p.m.

Although we are two animals of a nature, I would suggest to him to withdraw those remarks. Besides that, the most offensive thing to which I would plead guilty myself is to take advantage of the Chair because you are a junior member of this Chamber; I would refrain from doing it. Mr. Chairman, I have been guilty of being more heated than the hon. junior member for St. George, but he is an experienced member. I do not think that hon. members should take advantage of the Chairman, because he is a junior member of this House. I feel that the hon. member should withdraw the remarks.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw any remarks which are objectionable although I do not think I said anything which would be unparliamentary. Is that satisfactory to you, Sir?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, if you were to say "Yes" to that question and we did not consider that the withdrawal of the hon. member is an appropriate one, we would still reserve our right to move a motion for the suspension of the hon. member from the privileges of this House. I am serious about that; I am not

threatening you. I heard that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is asking you to accept that withdrawal; I notice that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is always trying to throw oil on the troubled waters, but he will find that they will not come to his rescue or throw oil on the troubled waters.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I can be as heated as anybody else in this House. How could I come to anybody's rescue? I am suggesting to the hon. member what is right and fair. Let the hon. member withdraw the offensive remarks because you cannot deny that the remarks were offensive both to the hon. senior member for St. Peter and to the Chair. If the hon. junior member for St. George says: "I unreservedly withdraw the remarks which I have made to the hon. senior member for St. Peter and to the Chair", what more can the hon. member do? I think he has done that.

Mr. WALCOTT: I agree with the Hon. Premier completely. I do not like the intervention of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition with the sort of hand of goodwill and peace. As to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, if there is one man in this island that the hon. member sought to crucify, I may say that if everybody in this island had done like what the hon. junior member for St. George and his group had done, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition would have been crucified, put on the Cross and would have died not to rise again. (Mr. MOTTLEY: I know that better than you.) The hon. junior member for St. George has made offensive remarks to me, and while I do not mind the hon. member attacking me in debate, because any hon. member is entitled to do that and I am not thin-skinned; I take and I also give, but I will give my blows above the taking. - I do not like the attitude adopted by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Moreover, Sir, when hon. members are objecting to remarks made by the hon. junior member for St. George, he is making fun and bringing the whole thing into ridicule. As far as I am concerned, the hon. member has to withdraw the remarks or I will take the appropriate action. The hon. member not only refused to withdraw the remarks which he made, but he also insulted you, Mr. Chairman, and then told you what he did. He did all of that on purpose. When you have an hon. member suspended he cannot take advantage of the suspension as he can take of the withdrawal of remarks. I realise, Mr. Chairman, that you are a new Parliamentarian. I want to say, Sir, that no hon. member has made more threats to name me than the hon. junior member for St. Joseph when he was Chairman of Committees in the last Government. You have not seen fit to threaten anybody because you are not sure how hon. members will take it, but the hon. member takes into account that he can do this thing and get away with it.

Mr. MOTTLEY and Mr. MILLER rose to speak.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition was speaking and the hon. junior member for St. George and the hon. senior member for St. Peter rose on points of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. senior member for St. Peter has not told you anything that is new. I am one of those characters who feel that when people think they can bury me - I am one of those who will bury the hatchet. I will bury the hatchet but I will leave the handle so that I can get at it when I want it; but, Sir, why in a small debate like this, should we add fuel to fire? I do not say that the hon. junior member for St. George was right; I only made it clear what our position on this side of the House would be if the hon. member had refused to withdraw the remarks in a parliamentary way. If he refuses to do that, then we have no other alternative than to vote with the Government. I know that the hon. junior member for St. George, in his usual way, gets up to make fun, but would like you like me to suggest that he should not withdraw the remarks and then have a big row? Those of us who are educated in Parliamentary procedure should allow the hon. member to know that he must withdraw those remarks. The hon. member became heated and went out of

the way in his disrespect of the Chair; the hon. senior member for St. Peter must know that I am one of those who believe to my dying day that when some people die you will find inscribed in their hearts the words "Mottley, my mortal enemy". However, Sir, I say that you must give a man a chance to withdraw something. If it is not withdrawn how can we decide that we will vote either in one way or in the other unless we make an appeal to the hon. member to withdraw the remarks?

Mr. Chairman, it is my duty to ask the hon. member to withdraw the remarks. I want to say, Sir, that I have been in bigger rows than this when the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was Chairman of Committees. I used to be heated and I have even threatened to break up the House.
4.35 p.m.

I threatened to break up this House and was called all sorts of names, because there were two people here who thought they could do as they liked. Because of that, I never had any ill feeling against the Chairman. I have said things and had to withdraw them if I thought I was wrong. My appeal therefore is to the hon. member to withdraw. The biggest fool in creation would know that if everybody on this side voted for him, he is bound to get a vote against him by the Government with its strength, therefore I appeal to him to withdraw because there must be an unguarded moment for every member of this House. I appeal to him to withdraw in a Parliamentary way which you will accept.

Mr. MILLER: Am I permitted to continue? If you get the agreement of other members in this decision, need I withdraw further?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am listening to the withdrawal.

Mr. MILLER: Do I withdraw in its entirety everything I might have said, what I could have inferred, what I may say or what I can say? There is nothing coming from the Chair to indicate that I said anything wrong to the Chair, but I withdraw ten times the remarks which the hon. member said I did say. Can I go on and speak now? I want to know if the members of the House are satisfied. I have satisfied you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, this exhibition of insolence which has been exhibited by him may be all right for under the tamarind tree where you are carrying on an argument, but in an assembly where a member is called upon by the Chair to withdraw specific remarks, it is not a question of withdrawing what he might have said. You have asked him to withdraw words you have called out and he has in a Parliamentary manner to withdraw the words complained of and named by you. Moreover, he made offensive remarks to you which he must withdraw, and not get up in this sort of tamarind tree style and say he withdraws everything he has said. We have rules and I am of the opinion that they should be brought into force on the hon. junior member for St. George, and although it would be a bit improper for me to make the motion since the words were used to me, I would be willing to support the motion for suspension made by the Hon. Premier, because he has been carrying on this misconduct to the Chair for the whole day.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I was not here when those words alleged to have been used by the hon. junior member for St. George were used, and I have absolutely no intention of taking part in the discussion and I will not vote one way or another. As a matter of fact, I will leave the Assembly before the vote is taken. But *apropos* the words used by the Premier when I was leaving the Chamber that I am the champion of the.....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, the hon. member who was a former Speaker cannot interject in a debate on a point of order what he heard from outside the Chamber. He has come back in, slid into his seat and has risen on a point of order now to say what he heard the Premier say when he was going outside. This is the biggest bit of nonsense I have ever seen.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I rose to address the Chair and you allowed me to speak in turn. I was given permission by you to speak and I am taking advantage of that now. (A VOICE: The Chairman said you were speaking on a point of order.) The Chairman was in error. I do not know if I can appreciate the honour bestowed upon me, because I think it was done rather facetiously, to name me as a champion of the rights and privileges of hon. members, but I am glad if I could ever rise to that eminence. For the Hon. Premier's benefit and for the benefit of all hon. members present, I will withdraw from this House temporarily in order that I do not take part in any voting because I know nothing for or against what is alleged to have taken place. The Hon. Premier need not be so exasperated when he sees me leaving the Chamber to say words to bring me back into an affray. He knows there is no affray where he and I are concerned at the present moment. I think he is exasperated, may be a little hilarious, but I think it is a good thing for his temper and equilibrium.

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

Mr. MILLER: I respectfully and with unswerving respect to the Chair withdraw the remarks complained of one hundred times ten times four. I withdraw them in advance least I should say them at a future date to the hon. senior member for St. Peter, if that is still complained of, I respectfully withdraw. Does that suffice, Mr. Chairman? Let us continue the debate. Anthropologists in trying to work on primitive man referred to him as animal, and it is consistent with behaviour patterns when we determine whether or not the several accepted codes of society will ever be found. When referring to an animal and its behaviour, - it maybe in society or chained in a cage or elsewhere - it is a question of acceptance when we look to patterns or structures for which we accept a code. Why should the hon. member take objection to being referred to as an animal? I have already withdrawn and apologised. I like to be known as an animal and am happy to be accepted as such, and my behaviour patterns must be consistent with my own belief, and a man always has his own beliefs.

Today, Mr. Chairman, we attempted to debate a Resolution for \$192,000 re the hospital. All sorts of language were used including hopeless remarks from the member who is in charge of that Resolution about pride. When is a man without pride? When he is without pride, he is a hopeless animal and maybe sick, and what is lamentable today is that we were not debating the expenditure of \$192,000 on the Hospital. I would have been happier to use that expenditure to provide the additional facility of a ward for psychiatry. It is a mental condition which develops very often when men are exposed as we are to things we have failed in, not only our idealisms, or dreams or hopes, but our ambitions; and ambition is not always a good index of ability. It is written that ambition is made of sterner stuff. There is also a criticism about my Party and about fires. The speech made by the Hon. Premier was nothing at all to do with the hospital; so what is wrong with having brought in something with which I have to deal. It is a physical reality. It stands out and will outlive even your dreams or monuments. It is a mercy institution, and whether you want to laugh or take claim for it, at least give me the right to enjoy a personal satisfaction.
4.45 p.m.

We have heard all of these childish remarks. You hear the Hon. Premier criticising Sir Grantley over some speech which he made at the Airport. He is also criticising Mr. Milton Cato. He is doing all that in this Chamber because he has the privilege because they cannot reach the public platform any more, not even in their constituencies. We have heard today the talk about corruption. Note even the Ministry under his control believes his statements or information in statements which he makes about corruption. I have brought in many Resolutions asking about corruption. He said he had a file so thick with them. The Hon. Premier wants to suspend me. Why do you want to suspend the voice of the Barbados Labour Party. What you want to do is what the elections would not do. You want to suspend me but I would only be returned at the top. Provide this

country with the freedom which it wants, give the electorate of this country opportunity not only to exercise the vote, but to elect a new Government. The country is in trouble. We all know it. Most of us before we go to bed at night are asking the people to fight against the cane fires. All over the country we are beseeching the people to stop it. I, myself, am getting out of my bed and asking the people to fight against cane fires.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. It is rather remarkable that with all the persuasion of the hon. member and his colleagues that our information is that there is a cane fire immediately after they leave, therefore, I do not know what his power or persuasion is. I am deducting from the information which I have on fires now. (Laughter). The hon. member and Mr. Cox go around at night. I advise the hon. member not to challenge me too much on that. When I talked of mealy-mouthed and hypocrisy, you will understand what I mean.

Mr. MILLER: All of us have information. You know, Sir, the least the Hon. Premier should do, if he wants to do the country a favour is to resign. You know, Sir, that this country is in trouble by fire and otherwise.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member made a statement today that the manager, a man from Bulkeley, had told him personally that they intended to burn the country down until the Government is changed. I feel as a citizen, the hon. member should have gone straight to the Police and given them the information and the manager's name. He said so from his seat and the hon. senior member for the City, the hon. junior member for the City, the hon. senior member for St. Michael, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, the hon. junior member for St. James, all heard him because he said so six times. He should have gone straight to the Police and given them the manager's name or the man's name.

The hon. member has confessed that he has spent his time, as well as other members of his party have spent their time, in going throughout the country and beseeching the people to stop the cane fires. How does he reconcile that with the statement which he made? I am saying as far as he, Mr. Alder, and Mr. Cox are concerned, that their powers of persuasion are so meagre that the fires start as soon as they have left.

Mr. MILLER: I never said that anybody, any manager, or any factory worker said so. You hear of the Tenders Committee because you know that they are defenceless. They are not like the Clerks of the House who have the Speaker to defend them.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I am not letting it go down when my name is called that the hon. junior member for St. George denies and says that I am a liar. The hon. junior member for St. George speaking *sotto voce* from his seat said that people were going to burn the canes down until the Government resigns.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I rise on a point of order. The hon. member knows that he said that he was up at Bulkeley and he said that either a man or the manager said so. I say that if it was a man or the manager, the hon. member should have gone straight to the Police and given the information. I am saying that it is a positive fact that he has talked about his party going throughout the country begging people not to catch fires and I say that it is remarkable that the fires are lit immediately after they leave.

Mr. MILLER: The Hon. Premier is compromising now by saying a man or a manager.

Mr. WALCOTT: I rise on a point of order. I said in the debate that it was an act of vandalism because the hon. member repeated it from there and with such fervour that now when he has got up and spoke in the way he has I can only come to the conclusion that he is part and parcel of the same thing. He said that they said so and now he says that you should resign. What can we draw from that? We

can only draw from that that he means that they should burn them down until you resign.

Mr. MILLER: The House was told that I said the Manager of Bulkeley. That has lost its meaning. What I said about this is what everybody knows and what Parliament was hearing.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I said at the beginning - and the hon. member repeated himself about seven or eight times although I could not make out exactly what he was saying - that if he said a man or the manager of Bulkeley said that, that he should have gone to the Police and given the information. The hon. member cannot deny that he made that statement and all I am inviting him to do is that if he is so concerned about the amount of cane fires and he is not part and parcel of this movement that he should go to the Police and give the name of that person whether he is a man or a manager.

Mr. MILLER: There is no question about man or manager. All this is a new thing. I would have to be a ventriloquist to throw my voice over to the Premier because hon. members on this side did not hear. The Hon. Premier said that he heard it six or seven times. He started with "manager" and now he says "man". It does not matter which Government is in power but we must be concerned about the preservation of our country and that is the concern of all of us over here because we await the appeal from the Hon. Premier. He says that he would lock up all the officers for something more than manslaughter and today, look at it, even the electors in his constituency gave him a demonstration. One of the largest fires we have heard of was in St. John.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I am not going to say again that I am not coming inside this House and putting up with this indignity of having this public address system.

The hon. junior member for St. George has made a very interesting statement and I cannot allow it to pass. He said after I spoke pointing out the large number of fires that the people in my constituency gave me a demonstration.
4.55 p.m.

He said that two days after I spoke over the air pointing out the danger of cane fires, the people in my constituency gave me a demonstration. Therefore, the hon. member is in a position to know. I take it that he is accusing my constituents of setting cane fires. I am inviting the hon. member now to go to the Police and point out to them the people who are indulging in that kind of practice. The hon. member is exulting that the people in my parish are giving me what he chooses to describe as a demonstration, and therefore he is in a position to know. I will allow the hon. member to talk, because if I let him talk for half an hour or so longer, that might lead to a few arrests and do not be surprised if you have a few vacant places at the next meeting of this House. The hon. member says that nobody went from outside of St. John and therefore he knows who the people are.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, we are in need of an institution for the sick. Is it because we are aware that it is not the worker or anybody connected thereto? Nobody has said that the sugar workers have had anything to do with the cane fires. We know that nobody who is connected with the cane cutter, the weeder the sugar worker or what, is connected with this. Are we in trouble because the Sugar Producers' Association carried out the position with regard to the windfall, or it may be the Niagara Fall? There are abundant platforms that we could say these things on. Whenever the Hon. Premier speaks he will lock up everybody - the Clerks of the House and the plantation workers - everybody is going to Prison and the fires are burning. You can use your majority in the debate on the Hospital because the word "pride" is hurting somebody. But, Sir, I have the most personal satisfaction deep down in my heart; long after I am dead, Governments will continue to polish

the walls of the Hospital because that Institution will be there for eternity. You should probably remain a monument and probably give a lasting service to the country by giving it the right to have an Election and let us elect a new Government. When that decision is taken, it is only then that you will be accepted by the masses of the country on the various platforms.

You are using your fourteen members and the hon. senior member for St. Peter and what have I got at the end? It will be a sense of history, success and achievement. Now that you have failed miserably, and you are marking time, you can go hat in hand and the monument will be here. You are filling in one-half of the Careenage because you want a small plume before the Election. It would be doing this country a great service if you were to give the people their freedom. In all Governments, there is a purpose which is connected with the people. When you see the country going up in smoke and the masses have nothing to do with it, I am asking you for the freedom to elect a new Government. Mr. Chairman, it is unfair, ungracious and undemocratic to deny 80% or 90% of the adult population the right of an election of Government when the final administration is there and they have been able to make it clear to you that it is time to quit. Mr. Chairman, this whole debate has been a crushing

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has said that the country is going up in smoke because the people are denied the right to have an Election. Is that what the hon. member is standing by?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. I must ask hon. members to exercise a little bit of patience; we want to hear the hon. member. The Minister took him straight out of the gates of Glendairy by getting up on a point of order. The man is a psychologist and you must allow him to go on. We stopped him when we had the key to turn on him.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, of all this pomp and passion for power we are all victims. All of this pomp you may call an empty passion for power. Napoleon was brought to a stop and he died in exile. The columns of Rome were all thrown down when it went up in smoke. Napoleon had his Waterloo and what are these feeble-minded people, who by the anxious desire of the sadistic view of power, they deny the people the right and freedom of an Election?

What I say you can bear in mind and you can twist it however you like. We have been accused of the corruption seen at Calvary like the Nazarene the King of the Jews of twisting the truth; Mr. Chairman, we have been accused of all these things. Imagine today the Premier who holds the highest office that an elected member of the House can hold, would use Parliament in any direction in a debate after a Minister is responsible for \$192,000, and he spends half an hour in accusing the last Government of corruption - something which he has been doing for the last three years - and it is because there is no access to public platform that he is doing it. This Parliament has lost its meaning; it is no longer the highest Forum of debate. In Parliament, all that is decent and endearing and great - all of these things have been thrown down. We have seen, Mr. Chairman, not only the cracking of the walls but we have seen them tumbling to the ground.
5.05 p.m.

All these things are thrown down and not only do you see the cracks in the walls as they come toppling down to the ground, but the memory that is left of an idealism, because man is sometimes obsessed with a lust and hunger for power that means exactly nothing. The least you can do for the country is to provide it with the freedom and the right to elect a new Government. You want to send a police to arrest me; you were going to lock up the Clerks of the House; and you have talked about the Tenders Committee. There can be no greater lie in Christendom than tenders arriving at Ministerial Buildings two days late. The staff of the Ministry appealed on more than one occasion to the Premier and they were denied.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, you will appreciate that we have given the hon. member a lot of latitude, because we feel he is rushing swiftly down the Gadarene slopes to his own destruction, and we are really fascinated by the histrionic display. We feel a bit of sadness that people who have been inflicted with madness at such an early stage. Apart from that, the hon. member has made statements completely irrelevant from the debate, and I know this is what is concerning him and worrying him. If he wants to have a full-fledged debate on tenders, he can have it as I said earlier, but he cannot get up there and make statements that members of the Ministry have been trying to get a hearing from me and have not been heard. That is absolutely untrue. As a matter of fact, I have protected a lot of people in this matter up to now, I disclosed as much as I thought in the public interest I should disclose, and there are other members who are aware that far from attacking Civil Servants, I have been shielding them sometimes. I am not going to be exasperated and say what I do not want to say. The hon. member says there is no power to suspend him. We will test it. I am inviting you, Mr. Chairman, to make the hon. member turn back to the debate, and if he does not return to the debate, but goes on to a lot of side issues by making false and untrue and wicked and malicious statements, I am going to ask that he be suspended under Standing Order No. 36 (3) where he can be suspended for disregarding the authority of the Chair, or of persistently and wilfully obstructing the business of the House by abusing the Rules of the House. He says we do not have power to suspend him. Let him go on talking about tenders and I will get up and move a formal motion and he will see if we have power. I am prepared to have a discussion on tenders. I say it is corruption for an ex-Minister when something is advertised for by tender to get \$89,000 out of the Public Treasury on false pretences. I say it is corruption to order steel costing \$250,000 more to be delivered nine months later than steel from Germany. We are allowing the hon. member to talk, but we know he will convict himself sooner or later.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, again the hon. member talks about corruption but I am not asking him to withdraw.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I have made a specific charge and I say it is corruption. I am saying categorically that I am of the opinion that it is corruption for a Minister to use his office to get tenders awarded to him, and secondly to spend \$250,000 more on a construction project which was not in his ministry. I know the "Advocate" is not going to publish that, but I will deal with them on Monday. I am saying categorically that it is corruption to spend \$250,000 more to order steel from the United Kingdom which was delivered eight or nine months late and held up the construction of the hospital when we could have got it cheaper from Germany, and he was aware that he had no right to interfere unless there was something corrupt about it. Let him deny that, and if he thinks that I am afraid to get up and make a motion for his suspension and the House has no authority to do it, let him continue with his irrelevancies. I have been quiet for 2 1/2 years. We have not charged them in Court because Government has had too much to do, and the attention of the populace would be diverted from the real work going on in this country, and Barbadians are funny people. They say if you have a man out, leave him alone and get on with the job. If he wants to provoke me, I have spent enough time practising in the Law Courts in the United Kingdom and in this country to know what to do with him when I am ready for him. He would not face the electorate at all.

Mr. MILLER: You said that during the election campaign at Flat Rock, St. George. We have heard all about this corruption. I have brought a Resolution in here asking him to prosecute, but he is telling us that some innocent soul in the road asked him to spare somebody. Is the Hon. Premier of this country aware of corruption and is failing to send the culprit to prison? You don't make that sort of sport, Mr. Premier. You are not afraid. I throw you this bold challenge.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is referring to me, but I am not making any vague alle-

gation about corruption. I have named the Tenders Committee, and I have mentioned the \$250,000 in connection with the order he placed with an English firm when he had absolutely no right interfering with it at all, and he still says I am throwing out vague hints. I have challenged him specifically on that issue, because he condemned himself by saying he placed an order at a cost of \$250,000 more and gave an entirely different explanation some three years ago when he said it was loyalty to Great Britain and British manufacturers.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am making a final request to the hon. junior member for St. George to stick to the Resolution, and I will not permit any argument outside of the Resolution.

Mr. MILLER: I take it that you are aware of your position on this matter while speaking on all matters in Parliament. Now the Premier knows that this is done.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has absolutely no right to refer to me like that. He can refer to the hon. senior member for St. John; but he gets and names me personally in my office. He does not have the right to do that.

Mr. MILLER: If I say the hon. senior member for St. John, it means the Premier. Is he worried about this now? Are we in trouble with our conscience on matters? We all know that contracts are made through the Crown Agents and I would have no right whatever to make orders. That would be done by my advisers, and I called the name of the great Llewellyn-Davies. He advised us and through the normal channels the order was placed. What the hon. member said about C. D. & W was not true because the money was an outright gift from the British Treasury and from the man in the street in England, and the Labour Welfare Fund in Barbados allocated \$2 million. He knows that no Minister can write any order for steel, but I had technical advisers to advise me. That is the right Ministers of the last Government had whether or not that is so now, because you hear the Premier instructs or the Premier directs. Under the last Government, a Minister was always a Minister. All these contracts were handled by Crown Agents, and loans for payment of the hospital were made well in advance of the last election. All this talk about the Minister ordering steel and about corruption is for those who probably cannot understand, but undemonstrative as they are all over this country, day and night there is the battle cry.
5.15 p.m.

We have come to this passion for power. You will lock me up. I will leave this Chamber not to return until after the elections, if that will make you happy. I will leave this Chamber not to return and dare you to stop in my constituency.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I do not think anybody can accuse the hon. member of being a meatless bone. He has more meat than anybody else.

Mr. MILLER: Little things amuse little minds. However, Sir, we have had a gallant day. My honourable friend, the hon. senior member for St. Peter --

Mr. WALCOTT: Do not worry with me.

Mr. MILLER: We have heard about a tamarind tree, a meatless bone. I am not going to refer to the Gallery. March up and down this country and you will hear. How can this attitude prevail? This is an act of sadism. Give them power and they lose their balance. He said that he would send home the Civil Servants. He chased the Marshal out of in here. He told the Clerks of the House that they should resign, when we are entitled to debate a motion of "No Confidence". What a gallant debate it is going to be! Mr. Chairman, I apologise to you but it may be that they will resign when I say that they even make mistakes. We are still on the Resolution for the sum of \$192,000.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I think this has gone on far enough. Either

the hon. member sticks to the Resolution or we will invoke the Rules of the House. We cannot stay all night to debate a single Resolution.

Mr. MILLER: We have had about forty speeches from the Hon. Minister. A word which is unknown to modern society -

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the question be now put.

The hon. junior member for St. George is not confining his remarks to the matter under discussion and under Rule 2 of Standing Order No. 26, it is stated that a member shall confine his observations to the subject under discussion and may not introduce matter irrelevant thereto. In view of that, I beg to move that the question be put.

Mr. MILLER: All that I have done is to speak on the question of the Resolution before us. Look the Hon. Leader of the House is going to put the question! I am going to move a reduction of the vote by one dollar.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am going to put the question.

Mr. CORBIN: Sir, we have been on this Resolution from 12 o'clock today and it is for financing the construction of the new Hospital. The time which we have spent on it, 100 Resolutions could have been passed. I say that everything has been brought up today and spoken of on this Resolution.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. While we know that the hon. senior member for St. Andrew has the best intention, he is out of order, and for the question to be put, there can be no further debate.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that this Resolution for the sum of \$192,000 do now pass.

Mr. WALCOTT: No, no, Mr. Chairman. You cannot go from one extreme to the other. You cannot have the question put when somebody is on his feet. You cannot rise on a point of order and move a motion. You do not need to have Rules about that. You cannot have one wrong method to introduce another. If the hon. member is speaking, you cannot rise on a point of order and ask that the question be put. You can only get the question put if the hon. member sits down.

Personally, Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is asking that the question be put. We do not have the power but what the hon. junior member for St. George really wants is seeing a medical practitioner because I am satisfied that he is mad. When a member gets up in this House and talks about the Pope, Cromwell and all that sort of stuff, he can only be mad.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I dislike the term "mad". I will ask the hon. member to withdraw that or something will happen. I dislike the remark and it is unparliamentary. I know when the hon. member sees the reflection, he will withdraw it at once.

Mr. WALCOTT: I agree with the hon. member. He does reflect that to me and I withdraw the remarks.

Mr. MILLER: I enjoyed the remarks made by the hon. senior member for St. Andrew. We have seen a new form of dictatorship. We have seen the Hon. Leader of the House getting up on a point of order and making a motion to stop debate in a progressive parliament. What else will be done!

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I do not know where the hon. senior member for St. Peter got that from, but I was never on a point of order when I made that motion.
5.25 p.m.

I can see that the members of that Party are willing to support me by reducing this amount by \$1. We were told, I believe, that the Parliamentary Secretaries work would

be more in the Ministry. In the glory of man's pride, the joy and personal satisfaction in the new Hospital, Mr. Chairman, I think I have said as much as was necessary for me to say even with a meatless bone, but they will fail to return here at the next Election.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to prolong this debate; it is my intention just to make one point. We have had an excellent revelation from the hon. junior member for St. George here today, and I am asking the Hon. Premier to note what the hon. member said very carefully. In all of this debate on the new Hospital, the hon. member's whole mind was taken up on the question of a vote of "no confidence" and calling on the Premier to resign. He asks "Do you not see that the whole country's going up in smoke?" Not only that, but the hon. member said that the people are saying that they are going to burn the canes until the Government resigns. Do you not see how they are going? Imagine a man seeing something and not being an example of what you spoke! When he says that you got a demonstration, what can you believe? The same hon. member who is saying to these people that they should call for an Election, is saying that the people are saying that they will burn the canes, and he evinces that what he is doing is encouraging people. One cannot say otherwise; I cannot say anything more. The hon. member is encouraging the burning of canes as a means of demonstrating dissatisfaction in this country. That is the method by which.....

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member must withdraw that statement. He has repeated that I have been encouraging the burning of canes, and the least I could do is to ask the hon. member to withdraw those remarks. The hon. member says over and over again that I was encouraging this thing. I think that the hon. member is aware that he wanted me to withdraw something and now he is accusing me of encouraging people to endanger this country by means of fire. I repeat, Sir, that I think the least the hon. member should do is to withdraw that statement.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am analysing what the hon. member said in this Chamber. The hon. member, in the course of the debate, told the Hon. Premier that up and down the country the people are burning the canes, you have a demonstration of the people's dissatisfaction and that after the Premier made a speech he got a demonstration of what it is to be calling upon the Premier to resign. What more encouragement do you want than for an hon. member to get up in Parliament, not condemning the fires or the outbreak of fires, but saying that the fires analyse his condemnation of the Government in power?

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman.....

Mr. WALCOTT: And calling on the Government that they should resign as a result of these fires; is that not a positive danger?

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order. (Members: Order).

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member cannot make two points of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will hear the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member's point of order is that he said that he is not encouraging the cane fires. All he said today about the Hospital, even in his closing remarks, in his peroration, he said "give the people the right and the freedom". What is he saying? He is saying that you are denying the right of the people to an Election. If you were to read his remarks tomorrow would anybody not say that it is the hon. member who is doing nothing but underwriting the fires as a demonstration against the Government and that the Government should call for an Election? Mr. Chairman, far from my withdrawing the statement the hon. member should be withdrawn from this House for his lack of contribution to the economy of this country.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman,.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman,.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will hear the Hon. Leader of the House.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member cannot be greater in his interpretation of what is happening today. The entire country has been astounded over this spate of cane fires which have been occurring over the past few weeks, but nobody attached any full significance to these fires. It was left to the hon. junior member for St. George today to inform us that there is a connection between these fires and the political situation in this country. It has never occurred to me, Sir, that any cane fires had any underlying feature that the Government should resign. It is more than passing strange that the hon. junior member for St. George should be able to have at his disposal today the information to be able to get up in here and say that these cane fires have a particular connection with the Government, and in order for them to stop the Government must resign. This is something to which we must attach some significance. The inference is that the people are catching these cane fires with a special ulterior motive that the Government must resign. The hon. member -- I do not know whether maliciously or whether he is speaking from the depths of his knowledge -- has put an entirely new twist on the cane fires of this island. Never have we in this island been faced with disaster like this.
5.35 p.m.

It is significant for a member of Parliament in his right senses and with a full sense of responsibility to get up on the floor of Parliament and make a distinct connection like that. He has not said that he interprets so and so, or he believes so and so, or the implication is so and so; he is saying that the country is going up in smoke, people are saying they want the Government to resign, and the implication is that unless the Government resigns the fires will go on. This is a very serious matter and it means that the Government cannot sit idly by in the face of the exposure made today by the hon. junior member for St. George. He is a member of the Opposition Party, and there must be some connection between his Party and these fires. He must know what is going on to be able to speak from the abundance of his knowledge on it. He spoke authoritatively, not what he thought or heard. He has as much as told the House that if the Government resigns the fires will stop, and if the Government does not resign the fires will go on, and so they are prepared to make a funeral pyre of the entire island because they feel the Government must resign. If he were in a country other than this, his freedom would be menaced after a remark like that. After a remark like this in any other part of the world, he and his Party would be suspected. There is not a single person in this Island, rich or poor, ignorant or educated who interprets these cane fires to be an indication by the public against Government with the specific purpose that we must resign. He has said that these fires must go on unless the Government resigns, and it means from now on that nobody has to speculate as to the cause of the fires anymore.

Mr. Chairman, we are deeply indebted to him for having enlightened us today. We know now that the fires have a specific purpose of trying to force the Government to resign, and this is the underlying ulterior motive, and that so long as we remain in office, the fires will go on.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I was addressing you when he interrupted me on the last occasion.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I thought the hon. junior member for St. George had concluded his speech.

Mr. MILLER: All I want to say on this occasion is that it is common knowledge that there have been fires. There is no secret that we have been having all sorts of cane fires. If I have a duty to Parliament, to my electorate and to my country, and if I have a duty to the people of this country when faced with the dangers of its economy, in Parliament I am free to say what can be said. Everybody knows that we have been having more cane fires

than usual, and I must be concerned and unhappy like any other member of Parliament. What is wrong with my worry, anxiety and unhappiness about what is taking place? How can I be saddled with any information as the hon. senior member for St. Philip has said? We have been seeing demonstrations, and Police have been going to the homes of notables and V.I.P.s of this country. You can come to any conclusion. You have heard with a crushing effect the threat of what would take place if the money was not paid out by the two bodies. Who paid any credence to this? Is it not true to say that after the speech by the Premier re the cessation of fire that we had an ungodly demonstration in St. John? Does the majority of people including your humble servant believe it is the worker in the sugar industry? I don't and I never did. Everybody knows that there is a number of factors and everybody is unhappy, but we are seeing and hearing about fires all day. Yesterday I trembled at the fire that was taking place at the Airport. As a matter of fact, I drove there myself frightened that we would have to close that unit. Are you saying that you are hearing this for the first time, that I have some information, and you want to call the Fire Brigade and the Police and put somebody behind bars? I throw you a bone, do what you like. You are dealing with an indomitable spirit in a man who believes and has reasons to believe, who has pride in himself, not anxious for any pomp. You have been told to resign, but you come crashing in with your dark shades and asking for more. Do not come and ask for more, because I will bite you up in here.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I should like to let the hon. member understand that there are no dogs in here.

Mr. MILLER: I am alarmed to believe that you are aware of dogs.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think only dogs bite human animals.

Mr. MILLER: My life extends to animals including dogs, and I think you are insulting me when you talk about dogs. He is man's best friend. If you have such an animal as a dog, you will see he cannot pretend. He either likes you or he does not, and whatever he does is based on his own sincerity. Every member of Parliament, Mr. Chairman, has said that the country is unhappy about what is taking place, because we are sacrificing the country's economy in smoke. Why should I have more information than the masked men? Is it because a Policeman was not standing at the door to salute and say "God save the Queen" when the same member of the Union was charged because he disagreed with the attitude of the Federation? We have been hearing all these things, and it is my duty to inform Parliament.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am again reminding the hon. junior member for St. George of Standing Order No. 26 (2) which reads as follows:-

"A member shall confine his observations to the subject matter under discussion, and may not introduce matter irrelevant thereto."

Mr. MILLER: The more I have to do with men, the more I love my dog.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I was never accused of setting fires.

Mr. MILLER: I never said he was accused.

Mr. WALCOTT: I could never be accused of setting cane fires. If the hon. member is finished, I will deal with what he has said, because I have said what he has said in the House which he cannot deny. He knows that this Government's not resigning is the cause of the cane fires. That is what he said today. He has a close association with them, and he is the member who has come in here with a vote of "no confidence" in the Government. Do you think people are showing any confidence in you. All he is trying to cover up is that from the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh, and I say he is an extremely lucky man to make these

statements on the floor of the House today. He is the greatest accomplice in this country, because what he has said today has under-written in no uncertain manner that his thinking is a party to this wanton destruction that we are having, and it is only a hypocritical cry when he says it is worrying him. He is pleased about it, because what he wants is for people to demonstrate against something that is best for them.
5.45 p.m.

He is pleased about it because this is the sort of thing that you see in a man who get people to demonstrate against something which he is opposed to. This is the sort of thing which he wants to happen. He has said that you should resign. He is passing his opinion that people should not return you there. If returning here is to be based on vandalism and all the criminal acts associated with vandalism, we do not want to come back here. Any man with any self-respect who gets in the highest Assembly and by his own action demonstrates beyond a shadow of doubt that he is supporting this idea and with no remorse is laying out people to their faces like that, I say, that we are having an example of the things which used to happen in the old biblical days. He said, "have you not seen that a demonstration is staring you in the face?" "Why don't you give in and let the country be peaceful?" It is not the workers who are doing it, it is your accomplices and cohorts who you are getting to do it.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. The hon. member has made about fifty speeches on this already. He has repeated all that he has said. He said that he would not come back here. This is like the little boy with the sour grapes. This is what he is worrying about. I have on the Order Paper a motion of "No Confidence" and we were promised to be given a day to debate it. Although it is Private Members' Business, I am entitled to debate it in Government Business Time. But you say so and we have all these things which we have been talking about today, the anguish which has been expressed and the heat of the debate. Do you mean to say that the Sugar Producers' Federation is the cause of all the fury that has been going on and that you are going to lock me up and send me to prison for it? Mine is a spirit which has no fear for any human being. A member of parliament, a member of the Union, all that means nothing to me. It means not a rusty row of old pins to me. I have a soul of my own and the tools with which to live to wit. When you have those things, you have no fear.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: When the hon. member says that he has the tools to wit, I presume he means a box of matches.

Mr. MILLER: I will not ask the Hon. Premier to withdraw that statement. What is unfortunate is for the country to hear the Premier say that. He has never made a speech yet befitting a Premier. Of course, he is incapable of it. That is the sort of thing which can only originate in his breast. That is the tools of the picture which he has painted on the walls of his breast.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is straying all the time.

Mr. MILLER: Why don't you call on the Hon. Premier and ask him to withdraw that statement? I am treating it with the contempt which it deserves. Little things amuse little minds. God himself dictates the pace at which your heart should work. All these things have been said by the Head of Parliament. Let it be written deeply in Hansard because everybody outside of this country wants to read of these things.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that I have to rise, but I am not going to allow this debate to close without my saying this. The hon. member said that I have a lot of things on my mind and breast. He has disclosed a revelation. He said that he was told what they were planning to do. I wonder whether he was giving a free hand to it. He has disclosed that all day and all night he and ex-ministers of his party are asking people not to burn

the canes, yet he says that it is demonstration against the Government. All I say is that their powers of persuasion are not great. It is a rather remarkable fact that those members of his party are persuading the people not to burn the canes yet a conflagration starts soon after. I find it ugly. He said that he had the tools to wit.

Mr. MILLER: The Hon. Premier is not even aware that he is Head of the Government now. He has won the elections three years ago and all this time he is still beating the last Government and talking of corruption and matches and fire. One wonders if you really want to carry this country further. The Hon. Premier can talk about the last Ministers of Government being unemployables. I hope that he would give us a full day debate on the vote of "No Confidence."

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, all that we have been asked to do today is to give legislative sanction to certain Colonial Welfare Funds being spent on the New Hospital. It cannot be agreed that we all agree that this Resolution is not only necessary but it is expedient and we should pass it as soon as possible. I had no intention of speaking on it. I cannot see any hon. member disagreeing to the passage of this Resolution. To my mind it is non-controversial and one would have thought that it would have got rid of ever since. It appears to me that hon. members have got out of hand one way or the other and we are now finding ourselves either in some Crown prosecuting Court and we are hoping to have members incriminated.
5.55 p.m.

This is still Parliament and although I would be the last member of Parliament to say things on the floor of this House which I would not dare to say outside of Parliament, yet Parliament has its limitations and they are legislative, not judicial; we do not exist for the means of introducing prosecutions against hon. members. If those who are on the Government Benches see the need of an enquiry into any matter, they know how to go about that matter in the proper manner. We need not be told that some hon. member may find himself deprived of his liberty whilst we are debating what appears to be one of the most harmless of Resolutions which could be debated in this House. This is something which has been left over from C.D. & W. Funds; this is something which we are asked to give our assent to.

If hon. members will pardon me, I will say that what we had had here today is just hot air and nothing can come from it unless hon. members want to have a legal enquiry into the matter. If that is not to be the intention of the Government, I do not think that we have been demeaning ourselves in Parliament as we should have been doing. I will now rise to respond to that eminine position to which the Hon. Premier sometimes raised me, that is, to the position of defending the rights and privileges of Parliament. If it were not very apparent that no hon. member wants to continue in this debate I would now, while I am on my feet, make a motion that the question be now put; but I do not think it is necessary to do that because I do not think Mr. Chairman, that you will have any series of clashes and threats among hon. members which mean absolutely nothing unless it is intended to institute a proper level enquiry of such things which have been said in this House.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the question be now put.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman,.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the Standing Order says that the closure of debate is moved by an hon. member and it has been moved more than once. I am looking for the appropriate Standing Order; it is Standing Order 32 (1) which says this:-

"After a question has been proposed, a Member rising in his place may claim to move "That the question be now put", and, unless it appears to the Chair that such motion

is an abuse of the rules of the House, or an infringement of the rights of the minority, the question "That the question be now put" shall be put forthwith, and decided without amendment or debate notwithstanding that the mover has had no opportunity to make his reply."

The last motion made for the closure of debate was more in order than the first.

Mr. HSUBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I said that I would make the motion that the question be now put inasmuch as I had seen that the atmosphere had been deemed to be quiet and there would be no former return to verbal clashes. I did not move that the question be put.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I will not be long. This Resolution should have been passed fifteen Minutes after it was put to the House. I do not want to prolong this debate, but I want to say that it is regrettable that the cane fires crept into the Resolution. Anyhow, Sir, the question of cane fires has crept in. As a member of a Party, I am involved in the matter and I want to defend myself. Relative to the remarks which have been used by my colleague, I am very much confused, annoyed and everything that is unhappy, because I cannot understand the hon. member's speech relative to this cane-lighting business at all. Anyone who reads this in the newspaper tomorrow, or who has been listening to the speeches of the various members on the floor of this House, would he not think that the hon. member, the members of my Party and myself are encouraging people to set these fires? All I want this House and the members of the public to know is that there is nothing of the sort. I cannot, or I would not, associate myself with anything of that sort. The members of my Party would never do that and if they did it, the public would know it because I am that type of person who would come out and open my mouth wide. We could never be so stupid as to encourage people to damage the economy of this island, because, as a business man, I would have to suffer. Any other businessman would also have to suffer because if no money is in circulation, nobody can get any; therefore we, as a Party, would never do anything like that. I just cannot understand the remarks of my colleague; he means well, but it is the way in which he puts things that hon. members hold on to them.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: To which colleague is the hon. member referring?

Mr. SMITH: The hon. junior member for St. George, because he is the only person who spoke as far as the Labour Party is concerned. At all of our meetings, as far as I know, we told the people not to burn the canes, Mr. Chairman, I went so far as to tell the people long before the crop started: "If, in the morning you feel that by drawing a match to boil your tea, the match will fly away and burn the canes, don't do it: buy a Ju-C". As far as the hon. junior member for St. George is concerned, he attended a few of the meetings; but as I say Sir, I do not feel happy about the situation.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, at that time they were not telling the people not to burn the canes; they were telling them not to cut the canes. We are now saying that the hon. member did not know what he now knows about what the hon. junior member for St. George has said; the hon. member said what was said to him.
6.05 p.m.

I do not know what he is going to say about that. He has said that people are saying that if the Government does not resign, they are going to get fires. That is what the hon. member said he did not say.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I should like you to rule.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member for St. Joseph is saying that the hon. member did not say what he did say. We are talking about what the hon. member for St. George said in here today, not what the hon. member said at meetings. He is saying the hon. member could not mean what

he said. He did not understand what the hon. member said today, but that is what we are interested in.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I thought everything was boiling down and we would soon be able to get on, but now we are bringing in cane fires and cane lighting, and not cutting canes; so you will hear a speech on not cutting canes. I am only trying to explain myself and defend the Party to which I belong. I myself am not satisfied with the speech made by the hon. junior member for St. George with regard to these cane fires, and I am going to take up what he said with the National Executive of my Party at its next meeting. I do not want the public to feel that the Barbados Labour Party is influencing and encouraging people to sacrifice the Island's crop. That is all I want to say.

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Chairman, after listening to the hon. junior member for St. George, I must say that I have always learned that in making a speech you must be exceedingly careful in shading your words. I do think that the hon. junior member for St. George in talking about these matters today did not shade his words as he should have, therefore hon. members on the other side of this Table took the chance of carrying this debate to the length it has gone.

Before the House is a Resolution for \$192,000 for the Hospital, but all sorts of things have been said here today. If the hon. junior member for St. George was once Minister of Social Services, all he need have done was reflect on his past days; but what I am speaking chiefly about now is this matter of the cane fires. I want to make it clear here today at this very hour that if hon. members around this honourable and ancient Table are using any means or measures of accusing other hon. members of cane fires, I am asking them to exonerate me as a citizen. I would be in no Party where such is going on, and I am asking to be exonerated. One hon. member on the other side already today talked about the Party. Many of them over there came into the Party to which I belong, but I have not changed my coat yet, and will continue in the name of God until there is nothing more in me. I begun one way and I am going one way.

Mr. Chairman, a cane fire is a serious thing. I have worked on plantations, and I know what it means to the economy of this Island and to the workers. I speak but very seldom, but when I speak it must go home with force. Tomorrow when one reads that something has been said portraying to the public that the members of the Barbados Labour Party have something to do with fires, I beg to exonerate myself first as a citizen. I could never contribute to or align myself with anything like that, and if that came up in my Party I would speak as a man against it. Only last Sunday evening, Mr. Chairman, while sitting at my desk writing some letters, I heard the cracking of canes and I could only go through my house and tell Elliot to come - the neighbour's canes were burning. This fire was caught below an old lady's home. These fires are peculiar, but I am saying that it hurts me when you do not shade your language correctly, you give something for others to misconstrue. I close on this note: I personally am very hurt to see these fires, because I know what the loss means to the economy of the Island and to the workers in the sugar industry.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. member a question? He has sworn undying and unending allegiance to the Party despite the warnings which he has got on the floor here today that he might be associating himself with the wrong bunch of people. In view of what his colleague has said, I should like to ask the hon. member whether he is of the opinion that the Government should resign, and that the cane fires would stop as a result of that. The hon. member has been in the planting business for a long time. Is that the opinion of his Party. If he gives me a clear indication, I would know how to act.

Mr. WALCOTT: Moreover, Mr. Chairman, both members made these revealing speeches about their Party, but what they have not done is to categorically deny that what the hon. member has said is indicative of anybody in this community or in the Party. The hon. member made this

broad statement about the people in the country, not the members of his Party, wanting the Government to resign, and I was tempted to ask the hon. member when the cane fire started by the old lady's house if that was a demonstration calling on the Government to resign. You may have a fire that burns 1,000 acres which in 1962 in the same place burned 20 acres, but it depends on how dry the season is and how the wind is blowing. I would say that up to the present time the number of cane fires in the Island this year is only a few less or more than last year, but the damage is greater. This incidence of fire and the damage are two different things. What has happened this year is that the acreage of damage is greater than it was for the corresponding period last year, but I will not go into that. I do not think the member will answer the question asked him, but what should be made clear is that the cane fires are indicative of the Government not resigning, and if the Government resigns, you would not have all these cane fires.

6.15 p.m.

What should be clear to all of them is this. Is it a fact that people are saying that the result of the cane fires is indicative of the Government not resigning and if the Government resigns, we would not have all these cane fires?

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I asked a question before the hon. member got up and I am very interested in the reply.

Mr. HOLDER: I did not write down the question and from the nature of things if you do not want to answer a question, you just ignore it. When the hon. senior member for St. Peter talked about the fire in close proximity to my home, the hon. member can take it from me that I only replied knowing the excitement it caused me with my home and the people around me. Everybody turned out. There were more canes around the old lady's home. I know what it means to have a fire around you. I want to make it clear to the hon. member that I knew the excitement which it caused me. I do not have to demonstrate here. Immediately after the old lady fainted and they sent for Dr. Gibbons and they tried to revive her but it was only fifty holes of canes which were burnt.

It is not that I know what was going on. I am not a party to setting fires. By my mentioning the old lady's fear, they misconstrued my words. The fire was only a stone's throw from me. I went out to pacify the old lady and then the firemen came. We suppressed the fire and in the evening about a quarter to four when I was going to look for the old lady I heard two voices and one was Dr. Gibbons. I was not talking about the fire nor would I go around with anybody setting fires.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Much as I appreciate that the old lady was near to him and the hon. member says that he was very fortunate in being able to go to her assistance, what I really want to know is this. He said that his party has nothing to do with the cane fires. Which is the last meeting of his party to which he has turned out? Is he saying that no member of his party has anything to do with cane fires, and is he disassociating himself from the statement? He says that he is a loyal member of the Party.

Mr. HOLDER: I turned to the hon. member sitting on my right and told him that I did not write down what the question was. I have answered it already this way. I was told from a child that if you do not want to answer anything or recognise anything, to keep quiet.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Am I to understand from the hon. member that he is not answering any question which would incriminate himself or his party? The hon. member is not in court. This is a privileged position. He has made a statement. I am asking the hon. member. He is not on oath. Why is he afraid to answer the question? He has disassociated himself from the remarks made by the hon. junior member for St. George. Why is he afraid to answer the question? I can only draw my own conclusions.

Mr. MILLER: There was a discussion going on and the feelings of the Barbados Labour Party were expressed by the hon. junior member for St. James about the excitement. We are treated as a scapegoat. We know what happened. When the Sugar Producers paid out the windfall money, we know what has happened. You want somebody to accuse. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition got up and said that it was not true. Up and down this country, I have heard it. You want to pick something. You think you are shrewd. You have accused us of corruption. Bring all the files. Prosecute us if you can. We have a sense of achievement when you think of the country's economy. When I said just now "monuments" which would live up and down historical antiquity, why continue to fear about our achievements in building the Hospital, including my pride in the Hospital? Today, Parliament is used to find a scapegoat. The Barbados Labour Party will not be dragged into this ugly misdeed. We have a responsibility in the sense of history.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1963-64 NO. 54

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution seeks to supplement Part I - Current - Head 30, Waterworks, Item 43, Upkeep of Vehicles by the sum of \$1,500. *(Loud Asides)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot hear the Hon. Minister because of the asides. Will the hon. members on my left desist from interrupting?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution seeks to supplement by \$1,500 the amount of \$11,740 which has been provided for the upkeep of the Waterworks Department's vehicles during the financial year 1963-64. *(Loud Asides)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If hon. members do not want to hear the Hon. Minister, it would be a nice thing if they would go outside.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, as set out in the Addendum,

"A total of \$11,740 has been provided for the upkeep of the Waterworks Department's vehicles during the financial year 1963-64. This amount has proved insufficient to meet expenditure to the end of the financial year. It is estimated that a further \$1,500 will be required."

During the financial year 1963-64, a very heavy works programme has been carried out and in doing this, the vehicles had to work harder than normal. Besides having heavier vehicles and more traffic on the road, there was a greater number of burst mains and besides that, there was a greater number of vehicles carrying tanks and water.

6.25 p.m.

This Resolution seeks the approval of the sum of \$1,500 to supplement the amount which has already been voted. This amount is required mainly for maintenance and out of that amount the sum of \$1,200 is required for the replacement of tyres. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am not saying anything against this Resolution; I am just throwing out a hint to the Hon. Minister. As this Resolution is for the maintenance of the lorries which take out water, it makes me to think of those who are responsible for the inability of the water to reach certain parts of the island. We were suffering from the lack of water in St. Joseph, but shortly after there is this lack of water, a lorry should be sent around

with water. For the whole day on Sunday and today there was no water; we could not get a bath, we could not use the toilets and we had no other provision. Hon. members would therefore know what the position was with us. I am asking the Hon. Minister to direct the Department to allow a lorry to pass through the District with some water for us. I have to come to Bridgetown on mornings and go to the sea so as to get a bath.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: For the information of the hon. member, I would like to say that only this morning I got in touch with the Chief Engineer of the Waterworks Department and asked him about the information which was given to me that at Lammings there was no water, and that some of the agricultural workers had to go to work without their tea and they were unable to bathe. The Chief Engineer of the Department said to me that due to the failure of the electric current, no water had arrived at that point and when the electric current came on, due to air locks in the pipes and owing to the distance which the water had to travel. There was a water delivery from St. Thomas until you came to Sugar Hill. I asked him if it were possible to put another lorry into the work and it happened that no other water carrier was out to work. Provision is being made for extra lorries to be used and in the case of emergency they would be able to place water tanks on these extra lorries so as to provide water for the people in the various districts.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

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

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

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

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

CABLE TO HER MAJESTY re BIRTH OF A SON

Mr. SPEAKER: Before I call the next Order of the Day, I have the honour to inform the House that I have received an intimation from His Excellency the Governor that the Address which we passed earlier today to Her Majesty the Queen, has been duly forwarded by him by cablegram to the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty.

STATEMENT re LOAN ON THE LONDON MARKET

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, before you proceed to call the next Order of the Day, I am asking permission to make a short statement.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable and learned senior member for St. John is asking the permission of the House to make a short Statement, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted the hon. member. (After a pause) Hearing no objection, let the hon. and learned member proceed.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to inform the House of the following:-

The Barbados Government loan of £1,500,000 (7,200,000 B.W.I.) was over-subscribed one minute after

it opened on the London Market today. The loan which was 6 1/2% stock at 95 redeemable in 1975-77 will be used to finance the Government Development Programme. It will be recalled that in December, 1962, the Barbados Government also raised a loan of £1,279,000 (\$6,139,200 B.W.I.) and that this loan was similarly over-subscribed in record time. That loan was 6 3/4 stock at 95.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (VESTING OF PROPERTY AND TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Honourable and Learned Premier:- To move the Second reading of a Bill to repeal the Executive Committee (Remuneration of Members) Act, 1949, and to provide for the vesting of all property vested in or held by the Governor-in-Executive Committee or the Executive Committee, for the transfer of functions of the Governor-in-Executive Committee and the Executive Committee and for other matters consequential thereon.
6.35 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill, I should point out that there are what I consider three main objects. The first is to repeal the Executive Committee Act, 1891-22 and the Remuneration of Members Act, 1949-30, and then on the positive side to make provision for the transfer to and vesting in the Crown in the right of the Government of this Island of all lands and other property at present vested in or held by the Governor-in-Executive Committee by virtue of the Executive Committee Act, 1891-22. Then the other aspect of its positive function is to make transitional provision in respect of functions being performed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee and the Executive Committee (Clauses 6, 7, 8 and 9).

You will remember, Sir, that all the property of the Crown was vested in the Executive Committee, but this Bill now makes provision for the vesting of all public property in the Crown, and the control of such public property will be as far as real property is concerned under the jurisdiction of the Minister for the time being having the administration of lands under his portfolio.

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

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

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

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 14 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

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

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

THE SENATE (DISPUTED APPOINTMENTS AND DISPUTED VACANCIES) ACT, 1964

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned member for St. John, to move the second reading of a Bill to provide for the determination of question as to membership of the Senate and for matters connected therewith and incidental thereto.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, as you are aware, the procedure for disputing or challenging the election of members to the House of Assembly is dealt with by the Election Controversies Act and the different provisions of the Representation of the People Act referring to the Election Controversies Act. It is now proposed to establish a Senate in the very near future, and the object of this Bill is to make provision for disputing and settling disputes as to appointments and eligibility of members to sit as members of the Senate.
6.45 p.m.

It is now proposed to establish a Senate in the future and the object of this Bill is to make provision for settling disputes as to appointments of members of the Senate and for settling questions relating to vacancies in the Senate.

The other provisions under Clauses 26 to 29 are purely formal rather than of a substantial nature and I, therefore, beg to move that this Bill be read a second time.

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

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

On motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 11 inclusive, were called separately and passed.

Clause 12 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to move that Clause 12 stand part.

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to you that the procedure which is standard in the House of Commons is that you do not go through a Bill clause by clause. Members are required to do their homework. If members do their homework, they would be able to read the clause in the time that we put the question on that particular series of clauses.

I am therefore going to move that Clauses 13 and 18 stand part and any hon. member who wants to speak on any of those Clauses can get up and speak on it.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am not against the Hon. Premier wanting to get along with the business of the House, but right away in between a Bill, he is changing the procedure. Even if the Hon. Premier had hinted to us when he moved the second reading of it, it would have seemed more businesslike but in the midst of the clauses being put he has got up and put on his brakes and is saying what he wants done. That is not good enough. I will not oppose him, but what he is doing makes me feel that because he has his numbers he is going to do this thing. He has said that so long as members have done their homework that is O.K.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I said that it is standard procedure to deal with a Bill *en bloc*. We should have put it that Part 1 stand part, and then a member who wishes to speak on a particular clause in that Section would get up and speak on it. I only allowed the procedure which we have been adopting to go on for hon. members to see the blatant absurdity. There is no Rule or Standing Order which stipulates that each Clause has to be put according to my knowledge.

I beg to move that Clauses 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18 stand part.

This is no attempt to stifle debate. We have had here a Bill one night in which we had 100 Clauses read at one time and when I got to Clause 158, a member on the other side said he wanted to discuss it.

I beg to move that Clauses 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18 stand part.

I am suggesting that they be done *en bloc*.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph said that he did not like the way in which the Hon. Premier wanted to do this at this stage.

He suggested that the Hon. Premier should have given a hint of doing it in this way in his second reading speech. While that may be applicable to some hon. members, to those of us who appreciate what we know, what we are facing must do our homework. When I came in here at first, I remember that every section has to be read by the Clerk. Then that procedure stopped and there was the procedure of the Clerk calling the section which was adopted. I am not in a position to say whether the statement made by the Hon. Premier as to standing procedure in the Mother of Parliaments is correct or not, but I would prefer to suggest to him rather than to adopt it in the middle - and I am agreeing with the hon. junior member for St. Joseph - that he should give us the opportunity of dealing with this Bill in the way which we are doing and then say that from now on that members must come prepared and when we are in Committee we are going to deal with any Bill in the manner which he suggested. This would put members in the position where they must acquaint themselves with the particular clauses of a Bill and be ready to deal with them. There are those of us who have looked through this Bill but those who have not would not be in a position to raise any question. We who have looked through it would naturally be in a position to raise any question which we want to raise. However, in the middle of our consideration of this Bill in Committee, to suggest that, it does not seem a right thing to me.
6.55 p.m.

I would suggest to the hon. member that we should proceed with this Bill in the normal way as we did since we were in here. We should know that it will be the Government's intention to move that Part 1 of the Bill, which comprises several sections, stand part of the Bill. Similarly, with Part 1, and allow hon. members to make their marginal notes. However, Sir, at this stage, it would be more in keeping with democracy to go through with this Bill in the manner in which we have been going on with Bills, but you can serve notice on us that in future you will deal with Bills of this sort in the way in which the Hon. Premier has suggested. There are members of my Party who are in a position to say whether the statement made by the Hon. Premier is correct or not and whether we should follow that Statement in its entirety. If the question is put that we vote for the Sections of this Bill *en bloc*, then I will have to vote against the motion. I suggest that we do not deal with this Bill in that way.

Mr. WALCOTT: In a matter like this it is for the Chairman to do what he wants to do. If the Chairman decides that he will treat the whole thing in a certain manner then the Committee will have to agree with that. If the Committee say that they will deal with the Sections *seriatim* that is another matter. I say, Sir, that this is a matter for the House to decide how we will deal with it. If you consider that the House has been dealing with these measures in a certain way and you are not satisfied that there should be a change, you have to decide what should be done. I quite agree with the Hon. Leader of the House that this is too simple a matter to be worrying about as to how we are going to deal with these Clauses. I would suggest, Sir, that if we were to go along in the normal way we would spend less time in dealing with the Bill than we are spending now in deciding how we should deal with it.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, we do not want to toy with the Standing Orders. The appropriate Standing Order

says that the Clerk shall call the Clauses of a Bill in succession. You wanted to tear up all the Standing Orders and now you want to change them. This is nothing which has to be agreed upon by the Chairman. The Clerk should call the Clauses in succession according to the Standing Orders. Standing Order forty-five (1) reads as follows:-

"1. The Clerk shall call the number of each clause in succession; all if no amendment is offered thereto or when all proposed amendments have been disposed of, the Chairman shall proceed to put the question 'That the clause (or the clause as amended) stand part of the Bill.'"

You cannot criticise something when it is wrong but you can criticise somebody and rise on a point of order and now you want to tear up all the Standing Orders.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I like the righteous indignation of the hon. member, but I should like to remind him that when the former Premier, a member of his Party, was in this House, he used to deal with the Appropriation Bill *en bloc*. Personally, I think that what I have said is quite in order from the House of Commons procedure, that is to say, to call Clauses 1 to 10. All it means is that you cannot call Clause 10 before you call Clause 8.

Mr. MILLER: There is provision made for the Appropriation Bill and there is a Standing Order for this. I have never seen where a Minister would call Clause 14, for instance.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I have called Clauses 1 to 68 in a Bill and then I went on from Clause 68 to Clause 230. After we had reached Clause 264, the hon. senior member for St. Peter objected and then we had to go on and call the remaining Clauses *seriatim*.

Mr. MILLER: That does not make it right.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member does not know when he is right, (*ASIDES*).

Mr. MILLER: What the Premier did does not mean that it is right. Are you going to tear up all the Standing Orders? (A MEMBER: Man, sit down.) Do not tell me to sit down; we want to stick to the Standing Orders.

Mr. WALCOTT: As I was saying, Sir, the hon. junior member for St. George does not even know when he is right.

Mr. MILLER: I do not need any help from you.

Mr. WALCOTT: I do not agree with what the Premier has said, but for the sake of convenience he was able to get the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to agree with that. There were quite a number of Clauses to be dealt with.

Mr. MOTTLEY: When was that?

Mr. WALCOTT: They went through something with over 200 clauses in here and the hon. senior member for the City agreed with it.
7.05 p.m.

I have a memory like an elephant; so do not tell me. I said it did not matter to me, because there were 200 Clauses odd and you said nobody was going to oppose the Bill. I do not remember the Bill, but it did happen. We were more or less giving a blind eye. What the hon. junior member for St. George does not understand is that the House can do anything. If we decide to call a Bill a night and pass it, it is passed; but if somebody objects, we would have to stick to the Rules. I agree with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, and I would be reluctant to agree with the hon. junior member for St. George, because I feel I would be contaminated with his stupidity if I said that I agreed with him. I will not associate myself with anything he says today, because I believe I will be contaminated, and I do not want to be. I would say, however, Mr. Chairman, that

the Hon. Premier should accept the objection of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition as a good Parliamentarian and revert to the *status quo*.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make my position clear. I made the suggestion to the House in order to expedite matters. I did not accuse any member of not doing his homework. I said that hon. members are presumed to have done their homework, and therefore they would know what Clauses they want to speak on, and any member who had not been in the position to have prepared his Bill before coming here would not have time to do it while the Clauses were being called. I should like to remind hon. members that if there was any doubt about the interpretation of the Standing Orders - and I have no doubt - or the right of this House to deal with the Bill in Sections or by blocks of Clauses, the Standing Orders were suspended today anyhow; so it is a free-for-all and we can make orders as we go along. But the Hon. Leader of the Opposition objects; so we will go through the normal procedure.

The question that Clause 13 stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 14 to 29 inclusive were called and passed.

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

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

THE FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION AND AUDIT ACT, 1964

Mr. SPEAKER: We will now proceed to Order No. 4 standing in the name of the Hon. and Learned member for St. John, to move the second reading of a Bill to provide for the control and management of the public finances of the Island; to regulate the receipt, control and issue of public moneys; to provide for the audit of public and other accounts and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to repeal the Public Accounts Act, 1955 and makes better and more detailed provision for the control and management of the public finances of the Island.

The Bill is divided into five parts, Sir, and I think that at this stage I should serve notice on members arising out of discussion held earlier today that unless there is any objection and since the Standing Orders have been suspended, due to the length of this Bill and the lateness of the hour, this Bill can be dealt with by calling parts of the Bill one after the other, that is, Part 1, Part 11, and so on. I just thought I would give notice to the House.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.
7.15 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Before the Hon. Premier continues any further.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move that this Bill be read a second time.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I suggest.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: This is not a discussion on the second reading at all. This is on a point of elucidation.

Mr. WALCOTT: The Speaker is going to speak. You have to sit.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I suggest that the situation can be easily settled by the suspension of Standing Order 45 if the House so desires.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I am standing and I wish to address you.

Mr. SPEAKER: Standing Order No. 45 has not been suspended and the situation can easily be remedied by the suspension of Standing Order No. 45.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What I wanted to say was that I do not think it is within the knowledge of the Hon. Premier that this Bill has only been circulated to us yesterday. That is all I wanted to say. It is a very important Bill and, therefore, I am suggesting to him to postpone it. We have not had the time to go into it.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The position is that I did not understand that the horses were not through the gates.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not understand racing parlance.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I saw this Bill several times and I was not aware that copies of it were only received yesterday by hon. members. In view of that, I will not move the second reading now.

I, therefore, beg leave to withdraw my motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Premier has asked leave to withdraw his motion that the Bill be now read a second time.

If there is no objection, leave will be granted. (A Pause)

Having heard no objection, leave is granted, and the Bill will not be proceeded with.

ORDER No. 6 POSTPONED

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is Order No. 6, standing in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Order No. 7 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.

THE COMPANIES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1964

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is Order No. 7, standing in the name of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries: Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Companies Act, 1910.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the object of these amendments is to enable Unit Territories within the British Commonwealth to retain the benefits previously enjoyed by them under this Act.

As the Objects and Reasons set out:

"This Bill seeks to amend section 224 of the Companies Act, 1910, 1910-7, in order to enable companies registered in any part of the Commonwealth, as defined, to hold lands in the Island on the filing with the Registrar of the documents and particulars prescribed by subsection (1) of the section. At present subsection (1) restricts this power to companies incorporated in the United Kingdom or any British possession which expression as defined under the local law excludes many independent members of the Commonwealth, e.g. Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago. Companies incorporated in such countries at present can only hold lands in the Island on the same conditions as companies incorporated in foreign countries, i.e. under licence from the Governor-in-Executive Committee."

Companies incorporated in such countries can only hold land in the Island on the same conditions as companies incorporated in foreign countries. Therefore, the object of this amendment is to insert in the particular clause of the Bill the words "any part of the Commonwealth" for the words "the United Kingdom or any British possession".

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

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

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

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

Clauses 1 and 2 were called separately and passed.

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

RESOLUTION re ACQUISITION OF LAND AT OISTINS, CHRIST CHURCH

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day, stands in the name of the same hon. member: To move the passing of the following Resolution: Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition by the Governor-in-Executive Committee of a parcel of land at Oistins, Christ Church, for the building of shelters and for providing other facilities for the fishing industry.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution seeks the approval of the Legislature for the compulsory acquisition by the Governor-in-Executive Committee under the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act, 1949, of the land described in the Schedule for the purpose of improving the fishing industry and providing other facilities for the fishing industry. Providing buildings and other shelters and other facilities in the fishing industry in that area. 7.25 p.m.

As the Addendum sets out, Sir, under the provision of Section 5 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1949, the approval of the Legislature is sought for the compulsory acquisition of this land situated at Oistins, Christ Church, containing by admeasurement 14,363 square feet. It comprises three parcels of land abutting and abounding on lands now or late of one Archer and it is required for the purpose of providing facilities in the area for fishing boats, as has already been mentioned.

The Addendum goes on to state the following:-

"Efforts have been made to acquire the land by private treaty but the owner has been unable to produce evidence of a good title. The Government has therefore been advised to acquire the land compulsorily in the absence of a good title by the owner."

The Schedule is as follows:-

"ALL THAT certain piece or parcel of land situate at Oistins in the parish of Christ Church in this Island containing by admeasurement 14,363 square feet or thereabouts abutting and bounding on lands now or late of one Archer deceased on the sea on lands formerly of George Ward but now of the Executive Committee of this Island and on the public road leading to Oistins or however else the same may abut and bound."

The Government has already acquired two lots of land in this area and this Resolution is for the purpose of acquiring the other three lots which are contiguous to these two lots which have already been acquired, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that. (ASIDES)

Mr. SPEAKER: May I draw to the attention of hon. members that Standing Order 29 is not one of those Standing Orders which have been suspended? This Order relates to the behaviour of hon. members who are not speaking. I should like to draw to their attention paragraph 6 of this Standing Order which reads as follows:-

"6. While a Member is speaking, all other Members shall be silent or shall confer only in undertones, and shall not make unseemly interruptions."

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to see this Resolution which is before the House. It confirms my opinion all the more that, just as in Christ Church where provision has to be made for fishing boats and things incidental to that, the same thing is needed in the parish of St. James. It is known that all or most of the beach land in St. James is bought by local persons or foreigners at high prices. What is happening is that these places were used by the owners of the fishing boats with the permission of the owners of the land, and that privilege is now being taken away. There is now in Paynes Bay, not very far from the Market which the Government has so timely erected, land which is occupied by "Moses" boats. The owners are now erecting buildings on these lands and it has become necessary for the Government to search along the coast of St. James for some spot which the fishermen might be able to use.

I think that some time ago I did draw the attention of the Hon. Minister to a piece of land and he has given some consideration to it, but it was a question of priority. I know that the Minister's hands are full but I am again asking the Minister who never turns down any suggestions from me, if he would explore the avenues in order to acquire some land for the convenience of the fishermen. At least, I have my eyes on two portions of such land.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does any other hon. member want to contribute to this debate before the Hon. Minister replies? (After a pause). Apparently, no other hon. member wants to contribute to the debate and therefore the Minister may reply.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I must say that I appreciate the request of the hon. member who has just sat down. It is the Government's policy to acquire beach land at various points in order to facilitate the fishing industry and to provide beach facilities. If the hon. member could describe the parcel of land, on which he has his eyes, more accurately or give some indication of it, it may be that that parcel of land which he has in view may be

considered. What I say to the hon. member applies to hon. members generally, because this provision is for the benefit of the island as a whole. I would like the hon. member to know that the acquisition of these portions of land with which we are now dealing, has been in the melting-pot since 1956, so that on the question of priority, it stands on firm ground. I might say that the former Government has been negotiating for this piece of land at Welches since then so that the question of priority is in place.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to state that it is quite in order to purchase beach lands; but great consideration must be paid to the matter of buying these lands in the right direction. Lands which are required for the hauling up of fishing-boats must be free from rocks and they must carry sufficient depth of water with a sound bottom so that the boats can come in. You cannot just consider the purchase of land just because it is for sale; you have to look for land where boats can be hauled up quite safely in rough weather, land where there are no rocks or any other inconveniences. Therefore, Sir, great consideration must be given to the matter to make sure that the land which is purchased is land which is directly opposite channels which are suitable for boats coming through to go to the beach, otherwise it will be completely useless for the fishing industry; and the Government would not like to own land where boats cannot come in, in case of emergency or rough weather.

Less than one-third of our fishing boats remain out during the months of July to October; they number anything as large as over 450 boats and the only Government place is on the Pierhead. Giving fishermen ten days periods for repairs and painting of boats might be all right, but today it is necessary during the months of July and November to have places on the beach with shade so that the boats can be kept in good condition under the shelter, otherwise it would be a very expensive business to the fishermen, because it would not be good to keep the boats, after being hauled up, lying on the beaches.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, we propose to take the adjournment at this stage.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Thursday, 19th March, at 2.30 p.m.

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

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