

7

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1961-66

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 29th October, 1964.

A Special Meeting of the House of Assembly was held at 12.00 o'clock (noon) today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER Q.C., (*Speaker*); Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, (*Minister of Development, Trade, Labour and Social Security*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, C.B.E., (*Leader of the Opposition*); Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Communications and Works*); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Mr. S. E. SEALEY; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (*Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries*); Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; His Honour E. L. CARMICHAEL, J.P.; (*Deputy Speaker*) and Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD.

Prayers were read.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR and Mr. LYNCH entered the House and took their seats.

SPECIAL MEETING

Mr. SPEAKER: I beg to inform hon. members that this meeting is summoned by virtue of Standing Order No. 5 (9), it being represented to me by the Hon. Leader of the House, one of Her Majesty's Ministers, that the public interest requires that the House should meet at an earlier date than that previously adjourned to, namely, Tuesday of next week; hence I gave instructions to the Clerk to have the meeting summoned and the business set down on the Order Paper may be the only business which may be transacted today.

The First Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House, the hon. senior member for St. Philip: To move the passing of an Address in reply to the Senate's Message inviting this Chamber to agree to the holding of a Joint Session on Saturday 14th November, 1964.

May I suggest to the Hon. Leader of the House that before you proceed with that item, he gives notice of all matters which are on the Order Paper inasmuch as they have not been given notice of at the previous meeting.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I was only awaiting my opportunity to do so. *Papers laid*

Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following: The Shops Order, 1964. *No trees*

On behalf of the Hon. Premier, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to place the sum of \$20,000 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1964-65, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1964-65 No. 35 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

On my own behalf, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to sanction the Shops Order, 1964.

Mr. SPEAKER: The First Item, as I have mentioned a short while ago, is the passing of an Address in reply to the Senate's Message inviting this Chamber to agree to the holding of a Joint Session of both Houses on Saturday, 14th November, 1964.

Mr. WALCOTT entered the House and took his seat.

RESOLUTION TO SANCTION SHOPS ORDER, 1964

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The First Item of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Development, Trade and Labour: To move the passing of a Resolution to sanction an Order made by the Cabinet under Section 4 of the Shops Act, 1945.
12.25 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, this is quite a short, formal matter; it is merely to give effect to a decision reached by the Government in connection with an amendment to the Shops Act, 1945. As hon. members are aware, His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh is expected to visit Barbados on Friday, 13th November, 1964, and in connection with the celebrations which are scheduled to be held in his honour, it is suggested that the following day, Saturday, should be a public holiday. In order not to inconvenience the shopping public, the proposal which is now before us is to permit shops which ordinarily would be closed before 7.30 p.m., to remain open on Friday 13th November, until 7.30 p.m. In order to give effect to this proposal, we have to amend the Shops Order which is attached to the Resolution and this amendment is now before us.

The basic portions of the Order read as follows:-

"Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in any Act or subsidiary legislation, it shall be lawful for any shop to which this Order applies, to be open for serving customers on Friday, the 13th day of November, 1964, until the hour of 7.30 p.m.

This Order applies to all shops which, but for the provisions of this Order, would be required under the law to be closed on the said day before the said hour."

In order words, without this Order it would be illegal for any shop legally compelled to close before 7.30 p.m.,

to remain open until 7.30 p.m. The Government proposes that the Legislature should sanction this proposal in order to facilitate the shopping public on Friday, 13th November, bearing in mind that the following day is to be declared a public holiday. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House heartily agree to the extension of the Shop Closing Act on Friday, 13th November, seeing that the next day is to be made a public holiday. While we are on this matter, I thought that the Hon. Minister of Labour would have had the time to have made his study of the Report of the Shop Closing Committee and, as it is getting so near to Christmas, he could have extended this Act until the end of December by which time he could have studied more closely and fully the Shop Closing Act and bring down legislation as suggested by that Committee. The Report of the Committee is not yet public, as a matter of fact, I do not know whether it is or not, but I am pretty sure that this will be one of their recommendations. The pattern of offering merchandise throughout the world has changed tremendously and I would think that Barbados is singular in having provision stores closed early on Friday evening. In England and in the United States of America, the extension of the closing time for food particularly goes late into Friday evening for week-end shopping, but in Barbados just when business is getting started we have to close our shops at 5 o'clock. That matter has been drawn to the Government's attention and the extension of 2 1/2 hours to 3 hours — that is all that would be involved — would remedy something which the public is clamouring for.

Mr. SPEAKER: I suggest to the hon. member that he has made his point and he should not risk going too far astray of this particular Order which has reference only to one day in this year — and for certain special reasons for which we have this meeting today. I take it that the hon. member's point has been well taken.

Mr. GODDARD: I thank you, Sir. I will just repeat that it is so near to the Christmas shopping that it is a pity that the Government did not think of extending this provision in this same Order to December by which time the Government could have brought down the necessary legislation.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I was waiting to hear the hon. senior member for St. Peter in this matter. I well remember that we were at cross purposes when we made our contribution on this question of the Shop closing Act some time ago. Like the hon. junior member for Christ Church, I agree with this provision. As the Hon. Leader of the House has said, we are extending the closing time for shops until 7.30 p.m. on Friday, 13th November, in view of the fact that the next day would be declared a public holiday by the Cabinet because of the visit of His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh, and every one would have the opportunity of assuring His Royal Highness of a good welcome and it would be right to declare that day a public holiday. Without going too far from the point on which Your Honour has pulled up the hon. junior member for Christ Church, I say that this is something which, in our opinion, should be given serious consideration. The hon. junior member for Christ Church is right. In all countries people in the business community and in the shopping centres have a provision like this. I think the Trade Union Leader has more experience of this matter than we, but I do not think that employees should ask people to work for more than a certain number of hours a day. It would be well if you were to have the law so enacted — I remember some time ago that there was some protest and the representative of labour rightly said that advantage had been taken of people by some of the employers who called upon them to work until a late hour, and we on all sides of the House, agreed that that should be remedied by the Labour Department, 12.35 p.m.

Since the passing of that Act, we still today see shops within the prescribed area opening after these hours, and

yet a number of shops cannot open and do not open. My personal view is that it would be easier to have this arrangement not only for the holiday season. I understand that the Union is pressing for a five and half day week, and those of us who have reached my age would like the opportunity of a longer weekend. If we are going to have a five and a half day week and you give the shopping public an opportunity to shop later on Friday nights, when they get half day on Saturdays, they would be able to go to the beach or have a longer rest. As it stands now, some of these stores open all day Saturday, and some close half day, but the general shopping public suffers tremendously, because in a country like Barbados, when people get off from work, it is easier after dinner on evenings to go in the cool of the evening up to 7 o'clock or 7.30 p.m. and do their shopping rather than to rush off from work and go to shop.

While we do not know what is in the Report, Mr. Speaker, we feel that you will have to consult the Trade Union on this matter and it will be amicably settled. None of us on this side of the Table would like to see people work more than the usual eight hours a day, or see them being exploited, even if it becomes necessary to take on extra staff or pay overtime. We feel that this is something which the Government should consider not only for Christmas time, not only because of this dignitary who will be coming here, not only on this occasion, but for the benefit of the masses of this country who would welcome the idea. We have gone from the service over the counter into the self-service business where it is much easier for people to shop, and while we do appreciate this Resolution for one day, we hope that the Government will extend it and give favourable consideration to what has been requested by an overwhelming majority of the public that Friday evening late shopping is not anything that is setting the clock back, or anything which you do not find in socialist governed countries or in modern societies. We should give favourable consideration to enacting or amending such legislation as would allow such shops to open. There are instances where on the borderline one shop must close at 4 o'clock while another opens until 9 o'clock. I therefore hope that the Hon. Leader of the House will take what we have said today into consideration and give favourable consideration to this amendment.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, my views are known on these matters and I need not repeat them. This matter is an *ad hoc* arrangement because the Government has decided to declare the 14th November a public holiday, and as a result of that declaration, the Order is to allow shops to open on the preceding Friday until 7.30 p.m. This gives a five day week in that week of November, and I do not think anyone would object in these circumstances to working later in the evening to compensate for the free day on Saturday. I dare say that if that system was introduced generally, nobody would object. There would be no question of worry if you were closing down on Saturdays to work 2 1/2 hours more on Friday. I think that would meet with universal approval, and I am sure the employers would not say "yes" to that as readily as they are saying to the shopping hours. I do not know if the employers feel they would like to close on Saturdays, but if they are willing they will find that the Trade Union would have no objection. If they are willing to close on Saturdays and open 2 1/2 hours more on Fridays, they would have an unequivocal "yes" from me now, and we would be willing to start as from next Saturday; so they need not worry.

However, I would say to the Minister that I sat on the Committee with another representative of the Union which went into this matter, and we have submitted our Report. We objected to the manner in which the Government sent down the first Bill to amend the Bank Holiday Act. I objected to it vigorously in here and a Committee was set up, and we have sent in a Report to the Government. I dare say the Report has been in the Minister's hand long enough for him to have been able to make a decision on it. I think it has been in the Minister's hand fully four or five months; so there can be no question about this matter. We have settled our views, and it is a matter for the Government to act.

Whilst we are on this, I would say that it is a very noble gesture, and the plea I am making on behalf of the workers in the Government Service now is that with the declaration of Saturday being a public holiday, the Minister must also declare in here today that that day will be a pay day for those persons working for the Government, casual or otherwise, and that it would not be said that they did not work on the Saturday and are therefore not entitled to wages. We hope that the same way there is a Resolution for \$20,000 to spend on the Duke, that there would be no misgivings that the persons working for the Government in all Departments in that week will be paid for the Saturday as if they had worked. If that is quite clear, we hope we would not have to come back here and say somebody was knocked off or did not work after the Friday, because some of the Heads of Departments and overseers in the Government have their own interpretation to give, but my interpretation is that if the Government makes this a public holiday, none of the casual employees - because those are the ones to lose - should lose as a result of Saturday, 14th November being a public holiday, and I hope that the Minister will give the necessary assurances to this Chamber today. 12.45 p.m.

I can say that Local Government also comes under my organisation because in my organisation, we represent Local Government employees, therefore, we feel that everybody in Government employ and in Local Government employ who would happen to lose as a result of this day being proclaimed a public holiday should not lose anything by it.

There is nothing in this Order to object to. What the hon. junior member for Christ Church said is sound and so long as it would be without loss of pay to those persons whom I have mentioned, there would be no heartburns about it.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, first and foremost is the statement with reference to the casual employees of the Government. I would like to tell the hon. senior member for St. Peter that as far as I know those workers are always paid for public holidays so long as they work the other days of that week in which a public holiday falls, therefore, the hon. senior member for St. Peter needs not to be apprehensive as to whether or not they will be paid for Saturday, 14th November, 1964. There is no reason why that directive will be departed from on this occasion.

As to the matter with reference to the Shop Closing Report, I would just like to say that the position adopted by the hon. junior member for Christ Church and the hon. senior member for Bridgetown is not by any means the same as that adopted by the hon. senior member for St. Peter. The hon. junior member for Christ Church and the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown talked about extending the work day of Friday until 7.30 p.m. to accommodate shoppers but they said nothing about closing on Saturday whereas the hon. senior member for St. Peter was talking about substituting the extended working period for the closing of the entire day of Saturday and this is what makes the position of Government difficult in rationalising matters like this. Presenting the Shop Closing Report is one thing but resolving the problem with a decision which is likely to be acceptable to both parties is where the headache starts.

Sir, I am sure that the hon. junior member for Christ Church will be talking with his tongue in the other side of his cheek if the adoption of the Shop Closing Report means that merchants will be called upon to close for the entire day of Saturday for the extended working period of two and a half hours on Friday. You come in here and tell the hon. senior member for St. Peter that you agree to the extension of the shop closing hour on Friday but you still include Saturday as a working day. Unless it be that proper arrangements are made for separate staff to work during the extended period of your engaging fresh staff for the extended period on Friday afternoon.

The Shop Closing Report is now before a Committee and the Government is quite prepared to deal with it, but I only warn that these things are not as easy to be dealt with as they appear to be. I hope, myself, that the airing of these conflicting elements of opinion on this matter today will at least demonstrate one aspect of the difficulty which people of the Government have on this matter. Normally, whether the Shop Closing day is on a Saturday or a Thursday or *vice versa*, it is clear by this Resolution that the Government is requesting the extension facility of Friday for Saturday and it is to declare Saturday a public holiday so that there will be no work at all that day.

I will repeat that what was represented by the member for the Trade Union was not requesting the extension of work from 4.00 p.m. to 7.30 p.m. on Fridays and then to work Saturdays as well, because if that were so, the public would not finish talking on that matter for a few days. Although the hon. junior member for Christ Church, the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown and the hon. senior member for St. Peter appear to be singing in the same key, they are singing far different tunes, therefore, the hon. members will readily realise the position of the Government in matters of this sort.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, if you may not mind, may I suggest that you call Order No. 2, on the Order Paper as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is seeking leave of the House to call Order No. 2 as the next Order of the Day.

If there is no objection, leave will be granted the hon. member.

There being no objection, leave was granted the hon. member, accordingly, Order No. 2 becomes the next Order of the day.

It is: To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Island.

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

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

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1964-65 No. 35

VISIT OF H.R.H. DUKE OF EDINBURGH

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that any hon. member would express his surprise that the expected visit of His Royal Highness, The Duke of Edinburgh, properly known as Prince Philip, will be involving the Government in additional expenditure and that the Legislature is asked to provide the sum of \$20,000 in this connection. 12.55 p.m.

Hon. members will see from the copy of the Resolution which has been circulated that His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh will be visiting Barbados from 13th to 14th November, 1964, and a number of ceremonies and engagements have been arranged in connection with the visit. The expenditure on transportation has been estimated

at \$465 and there are other expenses for entertainment, stationery gratuities etc. The Minister of Communications and Works has to provide a Government stand at the Deep Water Harbour for the Civic reception to be held by the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown in his capacity as Mayor of the City of Bridgetown. The Police Department would be involved in this expenditure. There have been a few minor repairs to the Senate Chamber carried out by the Public Works Department. For the opening of the new Hospital the sum of \$9,438 is being provided. This includes a reception for almost 2,000 guests, which reception is to be held at the site of the new Hospital as part of the opening ceremony. If hon. members require any further details other than what have been listed here, we shall be pleased to give them, but I do not think that anybody would be against what is proposed here. It is sufficient, in my opinion, merely to say in this context that we were minded to provide entertainment appropriate with the distinction of a Royal occasion and, simultaneously, we had to bear in mind the limitations of the Public Treasury. We were not therefore inclined to go into expenses which we considered to be superfluous or unnecessary. I expect hon. members, especially those on the other side of the Table, to cavil at this expenditure on the ground that it is not enough and to say that we should be spending more money on an occasion like this. *(Laughter)*. My reply to that is that we would do that if we had the money. If we could afford it, we should have laid down the most lavish sort of entertainment for the simple reason that occasions of this sort are few and far between and having regard to our 300 years' membership of the British Empire our unbroken period of association and loyalty to the Crown and our position even after the attainment of Independence, we feel that if we could afford it we would signify our loyalty and what not in a more auspicious manner. However, Sir, the demands on the Public Treasury are such, our commitments in divers directions are such, that they have to be taken into consideration with the amount we propose to spend on this occasion. I am submitting that this amount of \$20,000 represents the happy medium between these two conflicting ideas as to whether we should spend more or whether we should spend less. With those remarks, Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, as to anything I say I do not think that any single soul would regard it as a criticism of the expenditure of this money. The Hon. Leader of the House apparently attempted to anticipate hon. members over here saying that the Government is parsimonious in this expenditure, but owing to their commitments they are not spending any more money in this direction. I am not suggesting that they should spend more money, but speaking in my capacity as a member of this House, I should like to say that I am more than grateful for the assistance which the Government is giving to the Bridgetown City Council in respect of the erection of sheds for the Civic reception which must be offered to His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh on his arrival here. On the other hand, Sir, I do say that we have different views on matters of this sort. As is set out here in the Addendum to this Resolution, the ceremonies and engagements include a State Dinner, a State Reception, the Opening of the New Hospital, a Civic Reception by the City Council and a visit by the Duke to the Legislature. While I agree that all of these things seem to be in keeping with the 300 years of unbroken association with the British Crown and with English traditions behind us, I agree that we should do all this, but I cannot help thinking that for the opening of the new Hospital by His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh and with the reception to be held where a lot of sick people are, that is not the right place for such a reception. With the numbers who will be at the Hospital and the name to be given to the Hospital I wholeheartedly agree, but to have a civic reception on the site of a Hospital where there are sick people, I consider that such a thing should take place at Government House. His Royal Highness could go to Government House at 4 o'clock in the afternoon for this civic reception. For my part, I would not have a civic reception for any 2,000 people like that at the Hospital at all. I do hope, Sir, that my remarks will go down to the Minister of

Education, I believe that on an occasion like this you should create the greatest impression upon the youth of the country. We know that the Duke of Edinburgh has a great interest in the youth of the Commonwealth.
1.05 p.m.

I believe that instead of having a reception for 2,000 people, that arrangements should have been made by the Education Department whereby children could have been brought into the area, and be in some way given some token of appreciation by way of a treat. What is it to me if I go to a cocktail party and have one or two drinks or a couple of bouches or something like that. I will soon be gone and we will soon be gone, but we want to make an impression that another fifty years from now the youth of this country will remember that the Duke of Edinburgh visited Barbados and that the Education Department did something to leave an indelible impression on their minds. I can well remember - and I do not think I am so young now - the occasion of the Coronation of King Edward VIII when the then Government made it possible for children to be given some sort of treat and had a reception for the purpose. If I had this Government to run, I would not be preparing any drinks for 2,000 people, but would take that money and use it for the benefit of the youth of the country by giving them some sort of treat. I want to assure the Hon. Minister that I have gone all out to see what we in the municipality can do. There is nothing that would allow me to do it from the point of view of financing it, but I am still trying my best to see if I can get the bourgeois who are of greater affluence and others to make some sort of subscription or give something whereby the children of the municipality can form part of the persons who will be giving this reception for His Royal Highness. I am quite serious when I say that, because I am absolutely certain that with my being Mayor of Bridgetown and with the other Government that was in power, they would never have given me an opportunity to show our appreciation in this Civic Reception, and it would take nothing off me to boycott the reception. You will therefore appreciate the fact that I offer you criticism on having your reception at the hospital, and I do it in good faith.

Mr. Chairman, I do not subscribe to the view that the Hospital should not be called the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I agree with it, and I do not care who disagrees that the Duke of Edinburgh should open it; but I do not like the idea of having the hospital opened by the Duke of Edinburgh and having this amount of gaiety there. If you are going to have that, I think it should be carried to Government House. However, my view is that with this money, I would certainly provide something for the youth of the country, and it is my considered opinion that Prince Philip would have a greater appreciation of that than this.

I have much pleasure in supporting the Resolution. I do not know if the Government would attempt to change their plans now, if it is not too late, but I think there are hon. members of this House, who, following His Royal Highness' activities in respect of youth, sport and so on, can testify to what I have said. I do not like the idea of having this reception at the hospital.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am not opposing this Resolution for \$20,000, but it would appear that we could never spend too much on Royalty. We are inviting His Royal Highness here, and we cannot make it appear that we are paupers; we have to make it appear that we are big shots in the Commonwealth, and we must do everything big. I have nothing to say against it because I like to invite people and I like people to invite me.

What I want to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works, however, is that now that we have signified our willingness to spend \$20,000, and with the same speed that this Resolution has found itself in this honourable Chamber, I am going to remind him that in some of his departments there are workers who have been laid off on the grounds that there is no money to spend. I want him to consider it and be in sympathy with those workers who have families, and are now being told that there is no money to spend especially at this time of the year. The same way that the Minister can find \$20,000 to

spend now at the snap of his finger, I am asking him to do the same thing by next Tuesday by bringing in a Resolution asking us to vote some more money to find work for these people at least up to Christmas time, because we would not be true representatives of the people if we can see our way to spend \$20,000 on entertainment, but cannot find anything at all to help these people and their families.

You may not know it, Sir, but quite a few people have been laid off, and when they are told that there is no more money, one expects that they will not be employed until the end of the year when there is an allocation of more money to carry on the various projects or road works. I am ever so proud for more than one reason to see this Resolution here today, and the Minister will have no excuse next Tuesday for not bringing a Resolution for at least this paltry sum as the Hon. Leader of the House has said.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be quoted as saying anything about this paltry sum. For me the sum of \$20,000 is a considerable sum, and therefore I could not say it was a paltry sum.

Mr. SMITH: I thought the Minister had said that the members over here would say it was too little, and when a thing is too little, then it would be too small or it is not big enough.
1.15 p.m.

Well, Sir, that is how I take it, I hope the Hon. Leader of the House, his Premier and his colleagues will give consideration to the bringing down of a Resolution for at least half of this amount to re-employ those people who are home nursing their fingers and waiting their call for work. Some of these people are going to take up the newspaper tomorrow and see \$20,000 voted for this and yet find that they are at home and cannot get anything to do - and I daresay some of them are starving. I hope that the Hon. Minister will get up and start the ball rolling with the same speed as he has done in the bringing down of this Resolution.

As you know, Sir, we were supposed to meet next Tuesday but we were called in to meet today so as to assist in voting this money. The speed with which we met was jet speed, so I hope that the Hon. Minister will get everything working the right way and with the same speed.

I agree with the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown when he said that the children should be entertained too but I cannot understand if you are going to open the new Hospital the reason why you should carry the function up at Government House. Are you opening the Hospital at Government House? I thought that you would have allowed the function to remain at the same place where you were opening. It is because of the opening of the Hospital that we have to assemble there, therefore, everything ought to be there. The yard of the Hospital is there and it could be used for the purpose. I do not think that the 2,000 people invited will be going into the wards where the patients and sick are to interfere or to interrupt them. I do not see the reason why you should be going to Government House but if you are going there, well then, you are having the spree there.

I am not saying one word at your opening of the Hospital. There are a lot of us who are poor who have to play rich at the same time. Therefore, in this case, we are playing rich. Therefore, I am going to join in the line.

Sir, I am appealing to the Hon. Minister and hoping that next Tuesday he will bring down a Resolution in the same manner as this was introduced today so as to help those people who are now out of work, rather than giving them a little pittance at Christmas time. The Minister can take up the matter with the Highways and Transport Department and see how many people there are out of work.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am sometimes a bit ashamed that I am a Barbadian when I hear this type of microscopic arguments and more so when I hear them in this Chamber. It is true that this is a small Island, yet still, when we are dealing with this sort of Resolution to

make provision for someone whom you are expecting to come as a guest, you would not expect to hear that kind of argument which you have heard today and there is no need for your making that kind of speech.

The Government is in power and I do not agree with the view of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. If he were having a reception and he had to choose where he should hold it, what would it matter if the reception was at the Hospital, or if it was at St. Michael's Infirmary, if you symbolise the opening of something and you say that it coincides with the function which you are going to have. The hon. member also said that when the Prince of Wales was here that you had a function for little children. That is the way how you demonstrated your loyalty at that time. I remember some time ago when some member of the Royal Family came here you had a function at the Garrison. There is no royal way how you should demonstrate.

I will say that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has reduced this debate to the lowest basis. There are sometimes when you have to rise above taking a political line on something. The hon. member has this idea that because you are spending \$20,000 on the visit of His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh, therefore, you should bring down a Resolution to give workers out of employment something to do for Christmas. When will you ever get the idea that there are other days than Christmas! If you are expecting a royal visitor here and you are voting money for that purpose, you can reduce every sort of argument to that. You can say that you are spending this money on that and you have all this money to spend on that, therefore, you can give some of it to those starving people. You can say that this money should be utilised in a sort of way to help those starving people. But why reduce the argument on this Resolution to that sort of low basis of trying to link the people who are out of work with the spending of this \$20,000.

That is a racoon speech. If we are out of the jungle instead of looking for racoons, mongooses, rats and all that sort of species, let us get down to this Resolution and deal with it in the element which this Chamber deserves, and do not reduce it to the racoon level. That is a racoon speech. What is laughable to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is not good enough for his own mind and conscience. Some day the hon. member will grow old and when he reads some of these melodramatic speeches of his, he certainly will not feel edified by them. A parliamentarian is to edify others. We are not here for jokes, we are here for edification and the sort of speeches which are being made on this Resolution are unnecessary.

We have a royal visitor coming here. We have to treat them and have a reception in accordance with the person whom you are expecting. You cannot take H.R.H. Prince Philip in a back alley and offer him a bottle of rum. You cannot take him somewhere to show him your worse spots and say: that is how the poorest live. Royal visitors go to all parts of the Commonwealth and when they are accorded a reception, they are accorded a royal reception in accordance with the dignity which they hold. Similarly, if we send a parliamentary delegation anywhere, do you think that that parliamentary delegation should not be accorded the dignity which should be accorded to it? We have to treat the delegation in a way they should be treated. Do not tell me that you are going to treat them in the same way as when a cousin of yours come to your home to spend an evening. How you treat that cousin is your business. Similarly, I do not think the visit of His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh should be reduced to this level of making this odious comparison of people at the Highways and Transport being laid off.
1.25 p.m.

These people will be laid off whether you have a Royal visit or not. Because of the number of people we have in Barbados and with our economy, we cannot keep all the people at the Highways and Transport Department working every day. We know that. We do not have enough money to do that, but because you cannot keep everybody working everyday, that does not say that when a Royal Visitor comes here you should not entertain him. The very people

at the Department of Highways and Transport whether you like it or not, and the type of people whom we have in Barbados, whether you like it or not, like to have these Royal Visitors coming here. They will go to the highest mast top in order to see the welcome and we have to prevent disasters from taking place. His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh is one of the young generation of men who would add to the Crown his wide experience, and the speeches which he has made on scientific matters are revelations to people outside of the Royal Family. He has a keen interest in technical matters also. I attended a conference in England in 1958; it was the first Duke of Edinburgh's Conference and I found him to be a lovely personality. This community will be seeing one of the younger generation and we are not having the older members of the Royal Family.

I feel that if we are going to have Royal Visitors we should attempt to accord them a welcome in keeping with the warmth and dignity which appear to be sincere and not the sort of welcome which will make our visitors feel that we are having a welcome and we are receiving people and making criticisms. Whether it is a question of having this welcome on the site of the General Hospital or not, there could be no real objection. I have found on my return here that there has been much objection to the name of the Hospital. I myself would not have chosen that name, if I had to make the choice, but I am among those who would ask: "What is in a name". I see that there are some streets which are called after Barbadians. I want to say, Sir, that I am not anti-realist or anti anything so that a name would mean anything. If the Hospital is going to function well, it is an institution which will rehabilitate the sick and bring them back well. I think that we make too much out of small matters.

I regret to hear the Hon. Leader of the Opposition regard the Hospital as an improper place to have this reception. I do not think that Government House should not be the place to have the reception because receptions are held at Government House. I would say that the question of where you are having the reception is purely a question of judgment. I do not believe that the Government would have been keeping the reception at the Hospital if it had not been for the fact that the Opening Ceremony was taking place there. The Duke of Edinburgh will not be here for any long period so that there is not much leeway. I would say that it would be superfluous to have another reception because I see that the City is going to give His Royal Highness a Golden Key. I would not say that you should not have any reception, but to me, having a reception in the morning by the City Council is superfluous. Nobody could complete a programme in two days; nobody could bring forward a programme and say that you should do this instead of doing that.

As to the technical fields, we know that the Duke of Edinburgh is so interested in technical matters that it is a pity that he was not afforded the opportunity of visiting the Technical Institute because when we had a Technical Week in Barbados, a special programme was arranged. Somebody could say that the Duke has a deep interest in Technical Education and some of us feel that it would be a good thing if he could visit the Technical Institute. It may well be too that the people at the Polo Club would feel that the Duke should have a game of Polo because he is a good polo player. The Duke is also a first class yachtsman and the people at the Aquatic Club could ask why he could not come there too. On this question of the Royal Reception, I do not think you would utilise the Hospital as a place for a reception per se, but the Hospital is used for this purpose because of the opening ceremony and the number of things which will take place. You have the incumbent at Government House making preparations for a State Dinner and all of these things are to take place within two days; therefore you must have all of these problems presenting themselves. (ASIDES) All of these things are considerations which we have to take into account. How do we know that these things are things which have not been considered beforehand? When you have planned to have a civic reception involving 2,000 people, I am submitting that this is something in connection with which you have

to go into many details. As I have already said, I do not think that I would be holding this reception at the General Hospital.
1.35 p.m.

In my view holding the reception at the hospital is purely a matter that it coincides with the opening of the hospital. I will say that so far as Barbadians are concerned, they like the idea of going to the hospital on evenings anyhow, and so many people want to go to the hospital that you would believe it is a cinema or television station. It is true that they are not being ordered there, which is a different thing from people going to prison. Everybody likes to extend sympathy, but they do not like to receive sympathy on the other hand. When the hon. member makes the point about the Highways and Transport workers, I should like to ask him how many people he thinks \$20,000 can put to work at the Highways and Transport Department at the rate of \$20.00 a week. After all, we are not passing a Resolution for \$200,000. I had no intention of entering the debate, but it has been dragged into such racoon areas that I felt somebody should at least attempt to lift it from the area of the species of the racoon up to the human species and to the level of Parliament.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, when the hon. junior member for St. Joseph spoke on this Resolution before us for the sum of \$20,000 to make the necessary provision befitting a Royal visit, he attempted to relate it to the present temporary unemployment of a certain few in some of the Works Department. The hon. member has been in this Chamber for almost twenty years, and would be very au fait and familiar with the procedure of this Chamber as to how provision is made from time to time. I think he was actually present when the last Estimates were considered and knows that a substantial sum was included by way of capital expenditure for the various Works Departments. Speaking from memory, that sum exceeded \$5 million. Now I am not saying that the hon. member is playing cheap politics, but when he attempts to relate this Resolution dealing with the visit of H.R.H. the Duke of Edinburgh at this Special Meeting to the unemployment of a certain number of regular Works Department employees, he knows that by virtue of their work that it is almost impossible in some cases that they would not be laid off for some time.

I should like to draw to the hon. member's attention that it is not merely a lack of funds for various projects, as all the projects for which provision has been made have not been completed, and in some cases have not been commenced for one reason or another, whether it be that we have not completely secured a suitable site as in the case of the St. Elizabeth School which is in the hon. member's constituency of St. Joseph, whether it is a shortage in one or two cases of qualified engineers or for some other reason. Up to this morning I did my best in trying to get matters going faster in that we have a big works programme operating at present, and for the hon. member to say that the works have slowed down is certainly not in order, in that in the Highways and Transport Department there are more people employed at present than were employed during a similar period last year. We have just stepped up on the East Coast Road project, and more people are employed there now than before. That was as a result of a policy decision given out just last week. Then there is the roads programme on which the Highways and Transport Department is going full pace in spite of shortage of engineers. There are also the tenantry roads which are being seen after; so to say that the Highways and Transport Department is not employing a full complement of workers is certainly a misstatement of fact.

Mr. Chairman, more people are being employed now than ever before in so far as the Public Works Department is concerned. In spite of the shortage of qualified engineering staff, the Public Works Department has a good record in that the number of schools and the number of extensions to schools as well as the projects which have been completed within the last two years or thereabouts are certainly very significant. The hon. member knows that at present we are in the process of constructing a new financial

building which is within sight of this Chamber, and which will in all probability be one of the most spacious and outstanding buildings in time in this City. Then there is the Hilton project which is not being done by the Works Department, but which is a big project that is being undertaken currently at this time, and there are many other projects and extensions to schools which are being undertaken.

Now as the hon. member would know, at certain stages of building operations certain people would have to be laid off. For instance, the workmen who were employed on the new hospital are being taken on gradually in batches on the Hilton project, but with the laying of foundations you cannot take on 500 men. You take them on at various stages of the work to effect savings and to provide employment and ensure that Government receive the *quid pro quo*. You cannot shift 500 men bodily from the new hospital project because you know you have to employ them and they deserve employment. We are just as sympathetically disposed towards the employment of these people as the hon. member is, but at various stages of the project these people will be employed, and their names have been forwarded to the various works projects so that they will be sent for and given employment.

As far as the Waterworks programme is concerned, that is going full pace, and with the extensions and new mains on an island-wide basis, it is evident that the Waterworks Department is doing a record job and installing many more mains and standpipes and services than was ever done in the history of this island. If the hon. member is trying to smear the Ministry of Communications and Works, those are only a few of the items I have mentioned, but the same Ministry of Works is going to assist in the construction of the various buildings which have to be done for the Royal visit.

1.45 p.m.

That is only one of the items mentioned in this Resolution for the sum of \$20,000. It is a provision to cover stands for the civic reception by His Worship the Mayor. This Resolution is for the sum of \$20,000 and that is the only item which the hon. member commented on. I want to assure him that the Works Department carries its full complement but in some cases a temporary lay off of some of its staff is inevitable. In one way or the other it is impossible to employ the full complement all the time. When a job is near completion, we try to shift them from one place to another. As a matter of fact, I interview from day to day about 20 or 30 people who come to me although that is not my function. I can say that I happen to be more intimate with those people than the hon. member. Day by day, I interview those people. I have not seen many of them in the last two weeks but the hon. member must realise that I am au fait with this matter. I want to assure hon. members that ample provision is made for them but many projects have not been completed. Work on them had to cease through no fault of the Department or of the Minister. In some cases, the matter is still being looked into by the legal advisers. However, in any case, if the hon. member happens to know any of those people who are laid off temporarily, he can send them on to the Works Department and, as you know, they will find their way to the Ministry and they will receive the same sympathetic hearing as is occasioned to all.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to comment on the statement made by the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown when he referred to the disturbance at the Hospital as a result of the reception being held there. I would like to point out that the reception will be held on the roof which is two stories high. The only disturbance which any patient can have is when the Governor and His Royal Highness visit the two wards where there are patients at present. Those two wards are the Maternity Ward and the Eye Ward, and I do not think that the patients will be in any way disturbed when it is taken into account that they will be visited by a distinguished member of the Royal family. As has been pointed out, there will be 500 guests at the ceremony and the greater disturbance would come from the ceremony when it is being broadcasted.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I would prefer the Hon. Minister not to use the word "disturbance". This is a visit of royalty and when the Hon. Minister refers to "disturbance", that word carries a single meaning. If the Hon. Minister would take my suggestion, he would not use that word. You cannot tell what our newspapers would write. They may come out with the headline: "Minister says that there will be no disturbance" I know he does not mean it in that way.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, what I tried to point out was that there will be no noise at the Hospital which will in any way disturb patients other than that which comes from the loudspeakers when the actual ceremony is going on. They will be nearer to the patients than the 2,000 guests who would be on the roof of the Hospital. The reason why you are having the reception there is because His Royal Highness has got to be away from the Hospital by 5.00 p.m. and there will be enough time to have the reception put there. The people who are invited to the opening ceremony will not in any way pass where the patients are to cause any disturbance to them. The entrance for them is elsewhere. The patients will be quite at ease when this reception is going on.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I really did not intend to speak on this Resolution but after hearing the speeches of certain hon. members it hurts me to think that those members who have understanding would sit down here to criticise this sum of money after understanding that it is for the purpose of providing for His Royal Highness who will be visiting this country for a specific reason. I never thought that we would have to comment on this Resolution so much. When you think of it, look who is visiting us? His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh is visiting us. It is not John Wesley Corbin, it is not "Homie" Corbin. This Resolution is brought down to make provision for the visit of one of the Royal family. We do not know what we are going to gain by his visit.

Mr. Chairman, it shocks my modesty to hear hon. members criticise this Resolution. If we invite someone to our home, I am sure we would try to provide the best we can to meet that individual. Sometimes, we kill the fattest calf. I never thought that hon. members would criticise this Resolution at all. This Resolution should have been debated on a higher level. Sometimes, we sacrifice the fattest calf to meet a guest. How much so when this guest is His Royal Highness, the Duke of Edinburgh.

This Resolution is to meet the cost of various engagements, various ceremonies and various programmes and not only for His Royal Highness. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition said that the reception should not be at the Hospital. I say that this is an institution and we should not invite His Royal Highness there for a reception, we should invite him at Government House. We should do the best we can. If we have some great friend coming to us from any part of the world, we would do the best we could. We would invite him in our bedroom or in our best chamber. We Barbadians have a high prestige and we would do the best we can. When you heard the hon. junior member for St. Joseph you could not believe your ears. I would have to look at him different from today because he is looking down; he is not looking up. I trust that God would tender his affection so that he would offer the best he has to this community.

Sir, this Resolution calls for the sum of \$20,000 and I am going to vote for it wholeheartedly and I am certain that it will be spent in the best way.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

(Mr. SPEAKER took the chair.)

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

On re-assembling,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

Mr. LOWE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is no quorum present, and I am therefore asking that the bell be rung.

On the bell being rung, a quorum was obtained.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: At 2 p.m. of the clock when the sitting of the House was suspended, the House was in Committee of Supply.

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

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY
SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1964-65 No. 35
VISIT OF H.R.H. DUKE OF EDINBURGH

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Just before the suspension of the sitting, the hon. junior member for the City was about to address the Chair.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, lest it be thought that my colleague, the hon. member for the City, was alone in his view, I would like it to be known that I, too, am in agreement that more emphasis on the entertainment of youth could have been employed with respect to the visit of His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh to this Island. He was a famous man, Jean Paul Richter, who said that the greatest reverence should be paid to the young people; but it does not seem as if the claims of young people are always recognised in this present era. Mr. Chairman, how much more lasting would the impression be if young people were brought from the country areas into the City of Bridgetown so as to have a youth rally either at Kensington or at the Garrison Savannah! That would have been an everlasting memory for them; it would have been a memory for them for the rest of their lives. After all, it is upon the young people that the responsibility of citizenship must now fall; it is on their shoulders that the mantle of leadership will also eventually fall. Therefore, on occasions of this sort, when Royalty is paying a visit to this island as in the past, I hope that a great deal more consideration will be given to the young people of this island. That should be so when it is remembered that youth is one of the chief interests of His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh. We have been told that his over-riding interests are in young people, in sport and in scientific pursuits; if therefore it is not possible for the Duke to be initiated into the mysteries of the internal combustion engine at the Technical Institute, it should be possible to bring the youth from the country to meet him in a metropolitan area so that they will have a lasting memory of a visit of one who is not a member of an effete Royal House but a contributing member of a society, whose views are worthy of the greatest respect.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Actually, Sir, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is responsible for what I am going to say now, because in my introductory remarks earlier today, I endeavoured to declare the nature of the expenses involved in the visit of His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh and I expressed the view that I felt the amount required was appropriate and the best we could do in the circumstances. In actual fact, Sir, in respect of this visit by a member of the Royal Family, the Government is actually performing a miracle. There has never been any arrangement for a visit to this country, during its entire history, by a member of the Royal Family, which has ever been carried through as cheaply as this one, and I say that without in any way detracting from the dignity and the significance which will be attached to it. If you were to look at this matter in its true perspective, the visit of His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh is costing us \$5,000. That is all. Not even in respect of the visit of the Duke of Clarence nearly a century ago were the gentlemen of that day able to entertain him at so cheap a cost. Let us compare this sum of \$5,000 with the sum of \$30,000 which the Party to which the hon. junior member for St. Joseph belongs, spent for the entertainment of Princess Margaret;

they spent the sum of \$1,900 for fireworks alone and you did not hear one whimper from the hon. member about employing public works people with that money.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the Hon. Minister has misunderstood me. I did not criticise the amount of money at all; I did not say whether the amount is too much or too little. In my opening remarks, I said that I am in favour of the expenditure, therefore what is the hon. member getting on with? If he wants to be heard, then let him talk; but I have not criticised the amount of money.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The hon. member did criticise it and he criticised it in the worst possible fashion. He criticised it by implication. If the hon. member had come right out and attacked this expenditure — well he knew he was on indefensible ground. He is suggesting that if we can find this money so easily in connection with the visit of the Duke of Edinburgh this week, then next week let us find it just as easy for the employees of the Department of Highways and Transport or those of the Public Works. The uninitiated electorate will have been provided with the opportunity of placing those two things in juxtaposition and they will come to the conclusion that if you can find this money in connection with the visit of Prince Philip then you can also find money for the workers, just because the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has said so. The Party to which the hon. junior member for St. Joseph belongs has frittered away \$30,000 including fireworks for the visit of Princess Margaret while we are only asking for \$5,000 for this visit.

It is fortunate, Mr. Chairman, for this country that we do have at the head of affairs today, the group which we have, because we took advantage of a concatenation of circumstances to reduce this figure to what we are now asking for. We had to open the New Hospital; whether Prince Philip came here or not, the Hospital would have to be opened. You cannot erect a \$9 million structure like that without having some official opening of it, Sir, even if somebody builds a little hotel somewhere or a new building is erected in Bridgetown or even a gasoline station somewhere, he will have a little opening ceremony. I am sure that when the hon. junior member for St. Joseph extends the Fix-it-Right Garage he will have the honour of inviting us for the opening and we shall have the pleasure of attending the function. The opening of the Hospital will account for \$12,000 of this money and this expenditure would have to be undertaken whether or not Prince Philip or any other member of the Royal Family was coming here.
2.50 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, there is also the sum of \$2,000 which really should be regarded as an expenditure by the municipality, but the Central Government is providing it; so between these two items, you have nearly \$15,000 and part of it is recoverable and usable again, because the material which is going to be used for the construction of the stands at the Deep Water Harbour for the Civic Reception will be used again, I understand, for part of the pavilion at the public stadium; this is not expenditure thrown away. If you take \$12,000 for the opening of the Hospital and \$2,000 for the construction of the stands which we are going to use again from \$20,000, you will find that the visit of the Prince will cost the country about \$5,000. If the Government is not to be commended for that and regarded as Solomon-like in its decision to utilise the advantage of his visit to coincide with the opening of the hospital, I do not know in what other light it could be regarded. If any hon. member in this Chamber after perusing the records of this country can suggest one example in which a Royal visit has ever cost this country so little, I am willing to detract everything I have said.

In 1955 when Princess Margaret came here, we sat in this Chamber and saw the Barbados Labour Party Government fritter away \$30,000 entirely on the visit which was nothing to do with the opening of any institution. They had in \$1,900 for fireworks, \$3,000 for decorations and spent \$5,000 on police requirements. They were so afraid of the people of this country, and they had a right to be — subsequent events showed that this apprehension was completely justified — that they spent \$5,000 for police requirements.

Police requirements on this occasion are costing us \$215 for subsistence and \$100 for transportation making a total of \$315. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph should be the last member to have said a single word on this Resolution. In addition to that, they had in another \$2,000 for unforeseeable expenses and \$2,500 for contingencies; in other words, \$4,500 for contingencies. What is the difference between unforeseen expenses and contingencies? Only they would know. They got away with it because they had a majority. For sundry works and services at Government House, they included \$600, and this is a place that is kept and maintained normally from the public purse.

Mr. Chairman, it was not my intention to harp on re-cremations in the past, but sometimes we have to bring these hon. members in the Opposition, especially the Barbados Labour Party Opposition, to a sense of the fitness of things, and their recollection to the manner in which they have mismanaged the affairs of this country over the long and unhappy period in which they were allowed so to do.

The only other point I want to make is in reply to the point made by the hon. senior member for Bridgetown repeated by the hon. junior member for Bridgetown with regard to entertaining children on these occasions. We appreciate the significance of youth in the community, but maybe our approach to this matter springs from an entirely different conception and from our anti-imperialist convictions. It does not matter whether 50 years from now a little child remembers that the Consort of Her Majesty the Queen came here in 1964 when Barbados was still a British Colony. As a matter of fact, Sir, in our opinion, 50 years from now the children in this country will not want to be reminded of that at all. Nationalism is a principle which is today winning unanimous favour all over the world, Sir, and it is a matter not for pride but for regret for colonialist people to look back into the colonialist past. What we envisage is this: Prince Philip is a man in his own right; he has demonstrated his interest in technology, industrial matters and in welfare services, and he is also the husband of the Head of the Commonwealth, and if he feels that the people in the community should meet him at a cocktail party or reception, it will be so. In the main the list of invitees to this party represents people who have distinguished themselves in varying walks of public life, and people who in our opinion should be accorded the distinction of meeting Prince Philip.

It is not a matter of moment to us at all whether a ten-year old school boy now can recall in the year 2000 that he saw a representative of the Imperial Power in Barbados in 1964. We want to meet H.R.H. the Duke on equal grounds, not because he is part and parcel of the Imperial Power, but because he in our opinion presents in his own personality a picture of the type of person whom we feel the country should honour, and this is the manner in which we feel we should honour him best. I make no apology for the fact that on this occasion we have not followed the old colonialist mentality of sticking up a lot of children in the sun feeling that this is the best way to perpetuate the memory of the Royal visit or that the impact is something of importance to provide for the future of the children of this country. If the municipality felt that this was the way in which the memory should be honoured, it is a matter for them. They have done it, and there is no reason why we should do it too, and it is a question, I suggest, of the manner in which you approach the question of your colonial past. I do not think I need say anything more on this Resolution other than to repeat that the community has been well served by the Government in this matter, and that we have used the coincidence of the Royal visit and the opening of the hospital to be distinguished by a single occasion. 3.00 p.m.

In so doing, we then would be able to entertain the Prince in a manner befitting his dignified position at a cost of a mere \$5,000 and the other part would go to the opening of our \$9 million Hospital.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, it is not the right thing to speak after the Government replies, but I think that it is one of the principles of democracy to agree and disagree and we have the right to disagree. The first thing

I would like to say is that I did not hear the Hon. Leader of the House but one thing must go down in the record, and it is, that at no time did anybody from this side - and I am speaking for even the other members of the Opposition - speak in opposition to the spending of this \$20,000 on what I consider this important occasion.

Mr. Chairman, I say that because you will agree with me that the hon. senior member for St. Andrew unpardonably considered when he referred to the fact that he was somewhat surprised to hear me criticise the Resolution or to cause a debate on this matter. I do not think the Hon. Leader of the House or any member would say that any remarks which I made in my speech was in opposition to the spending of this \$20,000. I did not quite agree with my friend, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, in making the comparison which he made and there is where I agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter when he said that whatever you do, you can always make reference to poor and unemployed, but I am saying that nobody can accuse any member of my party of saying that we did not agree to the spending of this \$20,000.

I will say that the Hon. Minister of Health and Social Services did throw a different light on the picture when he spoke. I was given to understand that you were having a ceremony with 2,500 people in attendance at the opening of the Hospital with the Prince doing the honour. Well now, in the speech of the Hon. Minister for Health and Social Services he made it abundantly clear that the ceremony as such will be only for 500 people. He made clear what was not made clear at first and that is that they are killing two birds with one stone. You are having 500 people in attendance at the opening of the new Hospital by His Royal Highness and then you are having to coincide with that the same evening a reception for another 2,000 people. As the Hon. Minister puts it, there would be no interference or interruption with the sick or ill. That was not made quite clear to us at the beginning. However, I still maintain that it is one of the principles of democracy to agree and disagree and I still maintain, despite what the Hon. Leader of the House said that in his opinion twenty years from now if we had voted money for the entertaining of children that they would not want to hear of inviting royalty and giving them a treat, that my way about it is that that would not be the feeling of everybody. What I would say is this. Whether you are a colonialist or not the next fifty years, whatever happens, you are still a Barbadian and the Government has a right to do things in their way but I also have the right to express my view as to how I feel about it. Do not say that I criticised it because I suggested that I would prefer on an historic occasion like this - and it is an historic occasion because a member of the reigning monarch is visiting Barbados - to give opportunity to children being entertained. Far from my saying that I oppose the spending of this \$20,000, I said that you should even give opportunity on this memorable occasion to children by entertaining them so that they would remember the occasion. And in so doing, I would not be opposed to the voting of more money.

Someone mentioned that this is not a tour visit but that His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh will be staying on board the H.M.S. Britannia and that the Prince would be only coming ashore to perform these functions and then would be going back. He will not be sleeping ashore therefore, he is not visiting but that this visit is only a forerunner of what we may expect in the not too distant future. I give the Government 100 per cent our support and loyalty to his Royal Highness but I repeat that we have the right to differ, not to His Royal Highness opening the Hospital but on the matter of the reception accorded. What I said was my view. I said that I would not have the reception there but I did not know that there were two separate and distinct things altogether. 3.10 p.m.

When my friend talked about preparing a Dinner at Government House and having a Civic Reception, I would like to ask anybody in this House this question: where do you think we could accommodate 2,000 people the better? - On the grounds of Government House or on the grounds of the new Hospital? It is democracy that we agree or disagree, but it must be recorded that the hon. senior member

for St. Andrew has misrepresented to this House what hon. members of the Opposition have said, because there is not one single member here who opposed the spending of this \$20,000 - not even the other members of the Opposition who are not members of my party. We should not allow it to go down on record that this expenditure was opposed; in any case, we are entitled to say how we would spend this money.

As has been said by some hon. members, His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh has shown a tremendous interest in youth and in sport. Intelligible as he is in matters of this sort, the Hon. Minister of Education must know about them and the decision of the Cabinet must be ratified by this House. If it is said that we are following up something which, 40 years ago, was done in this way, we are following what happened when Princess Margaret came here, I am saying that the youth of today must be the men and women of tomorrow. This is a British Colony and whether it will not be a British Colony in time to come is another matter. You read history and you can take it for whatever it is worth; you can take human beings for what they are worth. If we were to say that we do not like human beings of a different pigmentation where would we be? The youth of a nation knows what happened yesterday and such is the history of the country.

I do not agree with the hon. junior member for St. Joseph in all that has been said. Without making the reference to the workers of the Transport Board, nobody on this side of the House said that he was opposed to the spending of this \$20,000. We, on this side, offer the Government 100% co-operation in this matter and we do hope that the reception of His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh will be a great success.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is....

Mr. LYNCH: Before you put the question, Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that I was interested to hear the number of references and the trite bifurcation of thought, the schizophrena which was uttered by the Hon. Leader of the House in respect of the children not taking part in the celebrations in connection with the visit of His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh, which might be regretted 50 years hence, and he would yet try to perpetuate the name of the new Hospital as the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know at what time today did the hon. member hear me say anything about perpetuating the name of the New Hospital?

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

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

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

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

Mr. 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 Resolution passed in Committee was read a first and second time and agreed to.

ADDRESS re. JOINT SESSION OF THE LEGISLATURE

Mr. SPEAKER: The next and final Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House:- To

move the passing of an Address in Reply to a Message dated 22nd October, 1964, from the Senate inviting the House to agree to the holding of a Joint Session on Saturday 14th November, 1964.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker; this Address is self-explanatory. It reads as follows:-

THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY TO THE HONOURABLE THE SENATE

The House of Assembly have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your Message of 22nd October, 1964, inviting the Honourable House to agree to the holding of a Joint Session of the House of Assembly and the Senate in the Senate Chamber on Saturday 14th November, 1964, for the purpose of receiving an address from His Royal Highness Prince Philip.

2. The House of Assembly agree to the holding of the said Joint Session and will await the pleasure of the Honourable the Senate to attend at 10.25 a.m., on the said date. 29th October, 1964.

SPEAKER:

3.20 p.m.

This Resolution, Sir, is the reply from this Honourable Chamber to the Other Place in connection with a message sent to us from the Other Place with reference to the holding of a joint session on Saturday, 14th November, at 10.25 a.m. to receive an Address from His Royal Highness Prince Philip.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no other business for today. When this House previously met last Tuesday, we adjourned until Tuesday of next week at 2.30 o'clock p.m. and to that day and that hour this meeting of necessity will be automatically adjourned.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful for your indulgence, but I reflect that when we meet next Tuesday, His Honour the Deputy Speaker, the hon. senior member for St. James will have gone off to Jamaica to attend the Tenth Annual Meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association as our delegate. I think perhaps now would be the first occasion on which the House will be meeting as a House, and I should like on behalf of all of us to congratulate him on his selection as a delegate and to wish him all the best and give him the assurance that we think that he will represent us well and truly on that occasion.

While I am on my feet, we are honoured these few days by the presence of certain other members of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in this island, delegates from other branches of the C.P.A. It is a great happiness and pleasure for us to have them here, and I am wondering subject to the approval and wishes of the House, if Your Honour would like to convey to them a welcome from this part of the Barbados Branch.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I too should like to associate myself on behalf of the Opposition with the remarks made by the Hon. Minister of Education with respect to His Honour the Deputy Speaker who is to represent us at the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association

meeting to be held in Jamaica. I, like the Hon. Minister of Education, feel that he will do justice to this Honourable Chamber through his selection.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the Minister of Education on behalf of Her Majesty's Government of this island, and with the Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition in wishing all the very

best to His Honour the Deputy Speaker whilst he is representing the Barbados Branch of the C.P.A. in Jamaica during next month. I am happy to be associated with the tributes which have been paid to him and the good wishes which have been offered.

This House now stands adjourned.
3.25 p.m.