THE
House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1961 - 66

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)
SECOND SESSION OF 1961-66
HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 5th October, 1965.

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

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., (Speaker); Mr. W. A. CRAWFORD, Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (Minister of Health, Housing, Local Government and Community Development); Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A. (Minister of Education); Mr. S. E. SEALEY; Mr. W. R. COWARD; Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; His Honour E. L. CARMICHAEL, J.P., (Deputy Speaker); Mr. G. V. BATSON, (Chairman of Committees); Hon. N. W. BOXILL, (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (Minister of Trade and Labour).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER:
I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the meeting of the 31st August, 1965, have been duly circulated amongst hon, members, and un- less there be any objection, those Minutes will be con- firmed, (After a Pause). There being no objection, I de- clare the Minutes of that meeting duly to be confirmed.

Mr. MOTTLEY and Mr. LYNCH entered the House and took their seats.

DOCUMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER:
I have the honour to inform the House that I am in receipt of the following Documents-

A letter dated 11th September, 1965, and received on that date, from His Excellency the Governor requesting me to inform this Chamber of his departure for London on Sunday, 12th September, 1965.

Mr. HUSBANDS entered the House and took his seat,

Mr. SPEAKER:
I also have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Auditors of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank a letter dated 31st August, 1965, which reads as follows-

31st August, 1965.

His Honour J. E. T. Brancker, Q.C., M.P.:
Speaker,

House of Assembly, Barbados,

Sir,

We are enclosing under separate cover a copy of the accounts of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank for the year ended 30th June, 1965, duly signed by Mr. A. B. Way, the auditor appointed by the House of Assem- bly for that year.

Mr. A. B. Way has, however, now retired as Senior Partner of this firm and has been replaced by Mr. J. Milliken who is prepared to offer his services as Auditor to the Bank under the same terms.

We should be grateful, therefore, if the House of Assembly will consider appointing Mr. Milliken as Auditor of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank for the year commencing 1st July, 1965, under Section 4 (7) (1) of the Act 1943-15 at a remuneration of £125,

Yours faithfully F1TZPATR1CK GRAHAM & CO.

As stated in their letter, they have submitted a copy of the Report and Accounts of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank to the 30th June, 1965.

I also have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following:-

The Accounts and Statements for the month of Decem- ber, 1964, as prepared by the Accountant General.

The Accounts and Statements for the month of January, 1965, as prepared by the Accountant General,

PAPERS LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I am commanded to lay the following-

The Diplomatic Privileges (United Nations and Inter- national Court of Justice) (Amendment) Order, 1965.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No.6) Order, 1965.

The Customs Duties (Materials for use in the manu- facture of Mattresses, Pillows, Divans and Upholstered Furniture) Order, 1965.

The Customs Act, (Prohibited Imports) (Fresh Fruit and Vegetables) Order, 1965.

Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for five months ended 31st August, 1965.

Statement of sums of money paid over to the Account- ant General by the Commissioner of Police during the Quarter ended 30th September, 1964.

On behalf of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries, I am commanded to lay the following:

Half-yearly Reports of the Registrar of Friendly So- cieties for the period ended 31st December, 1961 to the period ended 30th June, 1965.

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

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay a statement showing the sums advanced to the Post- master General for payment pf Money Orders, the amounts repaid to the Accountant General, and the amounts due by the various Post Offices to the 30th June, 1965.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. J. G. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, again, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve \"The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 6) Order, 1965.

On my own behalf, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the Compulsory acquisition by the Crown of a parcel of land at St. Simon\'s in the Parish of St. Andrew.

On behalf of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Fish- eries, 1 beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the Order entitled \"The Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilisation and Labour Welfare)

Order, 1965.\"

Again, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of the following:-

A Bill to amend the Customs Act, 1962.

A Bill to make provision for the orderly and progress- ive development of land in both Urban and Rural areas and to preserve and improve the amenities thereof, for the grant of permission to develop land and for other powers of control over the use of land; to confer ad- ditional powers in respect of the acquisition and de- velopment of land for planning; and for purposes con- nected with the matters aforesaid.

A Bill to amend the Executive Committee (Vesting of Property and Transfer of Functions) Act, 1964.

Again, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Fisheries Regulation Act, 1904.

Hon. A. Da C. EDWARDS:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Wages Council Act, 1955.

REPLIES LAID

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 55/1964, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, is now ready.

Hon. A. Da C. EDWARDS:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 43/1964, asked by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, is now ready.

PRIVATE MEMBERS\' NOTICES

Mr. MOTTLEY:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to repeal the West Indies Hospital Funds Limited, Act, 1964.

QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER:
Question standing in the name of the hon. junior member for the City

Mr. LYNCH:
Mr. Speaker,

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. Will the Minister state whether all the instalments payable by the West Indies HospitalFunds Limited have been paid into the Treasury?

2.

3. If the answer to No. 1 is in the negative, will the Minister state what are the instalments now remaining due?

4.

5. Will the Minister state what steps he proposes to take to enforce the payment of such instalments as may be still outstanding?

6.

Mr. SPEAKER; Question standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. John:

Mr. YEARWOOD:
Mr. Speaker- To enquire of the

Appropriate Minister:-

1. Is the Minister aware that on the 3rd September, 1965, a female corpse remained outside the doors of the Public Mortuary and could not be admitted thereto owing to the absence of the officer in charge of the said Mortuary?

2.

3. Will the Minister see to it that hours of duty at the said Mortuary be so arranged that the admission of dead bodies thereto may be achieved at any hour of the day or night if such admission be necessary at any time?

4.

Mr. SPEAKER:
Question standing in the name of the hon. senior member for the City.

Mr. MOTTLEY:
Mr. Speaker,

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. Will the Minister state what moneys have been spent upon the Hilton Hotel Project to date?

2.

3. Will the Minister state whether the loan to finance the said project has yet been raised?

4.

5. If the answer to No. 2 is in the negative, will the Minister state from what source of revenue the project has been financed up to now?

6.

2.55 p.m.

Mr. CARMICHAEL:
Mr. Speaker, I beg, to give notice of the following questions-

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

1. Is the Government aware that several anomalies exist in respect of the determination of the rateable values of properties in the Northern parishes of this Island, par- ticularly in the parish of Saint James?

2.

3. Will Government consider the advisability of obtaining the services of an expert to correct any such anomalies, and generally to revise the system of the valuation of properties throughout the Northern parishes?

4.

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

1. Is Government aware that many subsidiary and tenantry roads throughout the Northern parishes of the Island particularly in the parish of Saint James are in a very bad state of disrepair?

2.

3. Is Government aware that these roads accommodate properties of persons in the Northern parishes from whom the Northern District Council derives a considerable amount of income by reason of payment of their taxes?

4.

5. Will Government set about the repairing of these roads without further delay?

6.

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Is Government aware that the accommodation for legal practititioners at District \"D\" Court in the parish of Saint Thomas is very unsatisfactory and causes great Inconvenience both to the said practititioners and to the officers of the Court?

2. Will Government remedy this state of affairs as soon as possible?

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Is Government aware that there are too few cement stuffbins in the Thorpes Housing Area in the parish of Saint James and that the existing ones in the said area are im- properly sited, having regard to the proximity thereto of the homes of the residents of the said area?

2. Is Government aware that the Northern District Council has made representation to the Central Government about this matter?

3.

4. Will Government take steps to correct this state of affairs?

5.

Mr. BATSON; Mr. Speaker, 1 beg to give notice of the following question:-

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware that the Uniform long blue pants, tunic and helmet now worn by Policemen on duty especially during the Summer needs changing in this tropical country?

2. Is the Minister also aware that the present Uniform now worn by Policemen only suits Ceremonial Occasions?

3.

4. If the answers to the above are in the affirmative, will the Minister go into the matter with a view to changing the uniform of the said Policemen having regard to the tropical conditions in this Island?

5.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, a Bill to amend the Customs Act, 1962, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, a Bill to make provision for the orderly and progressive development of land in both Urban and Rural areas and to preserve and improve the amenities thereof, for the grant of permission to develop land and for other powers of control over the use of land; to confer additional powers in respect of the acquisition and development of land for planning; and for purposes connected with the matter aforesaid, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, a Bill to amend the Executive Com- mittee (Vesting of Property and Transfer of Functions) Act, 1964, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, a .Bill to amend the Fisheries Regulation Act, 1904, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, seconded by Hon. N. W. BOXILL, a Bill to amend the Wages Council Act, 1955, was read a first time.

Mr. MOTTLEY:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to repeal the West Indies Hospital Funds Limited Act, 1964, be now read a first time.

Mr. GODDARD:
I beg to second that.

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

APPOINTMENT OF Rev. F. A. CAYLESS AS CHAPLAIN

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Shaker, I believe it is true that the acting appointment of the Chaplain expired on the 30th September. I also believe that it had been the intention of the former Leader of the House to have consultations with representatives of the other Parties of the Assembly on this matter of the appointment of the Chaplain. I would like to say that the majority Party not only has no objection to the appointment of the Chaplain who has been acting, but willingly supports his nomination, and I therefore, formally beg to move that the Reverend F. A. Cayless be appointed as Chaplain of this House as from 1st October, 1965.

Mr. MILLER:
I beg to second the motion of the Leader of the House.

The question was put and resolvedinthe affirmative without division.

3.05 p.m.

Mr. J. MILLIKEN APPOINTED AUDITOR

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I now beg to move that Mr. J. Milliken be appointed Auditor of the Sugar In- dustry Agricultural Bank for the year commencing 1st July, 1965, at a remuneration of £125 per annum.

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

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

QUESTION TIME RETAIL PRICES OF GOODS

Mr. SPEAKER:
It now being Question Time, the Reply to Question No. 43, asked by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is, I am advised, now ready.

Mr. SMITH:
To enquire of the Appropriate Minister Will the Minister state

(a) what were the retail prices of goods imported from Canada into this Island just immediately before the fall in the exchange rate of the Canadian dollar in 1962?

(b)

(c) what have been the retail prices of the same goods since then?

(d)

(e) what have been the average handling costs of goods from ship to shore and delivery from shed, since the Deep Water Harbour came into operation?

(f)

(g) what was the average handling costs of goods from ship to shore and delivery before the operation of the said Deep Water Harbour?

(h)

(i) what are the retail prices of goods exported from this Island to other Islands of the West Indies and British Guiana?

(j)

(k) what are the retail prices of those goods in the Countries named above to which they are exported?

(l)

Hon. A. Da C. EDWARDS:
Mr. Speaker, the Replies are as follows-

\"It is not possible to provide information on the re- tail prices for goods imported from Canada....\"

Mr. SMITH:
I cannot hear the Hon. Minister.

Hon. A. Da C. EDWARDS:
The replies are as follows-

1. It is not possible to provide information on the retail prices of all goods imported from Canada immediately prior to and since the devaluation of the Canadian dollar. However, the prices of a number of articles are given as Appendix I to this reply. The information indicates that in some cases prices have risen or have been reduced or have remained the same.

2.

3. The average handling cost of goods from ship to shore covering stevedoring. (including tallying and watching) cargo handling and harbour dues vary between $11.25 and $12.00 per freight ton de- pending on the amount of cargo brought by the ship. Of these costs, handling charges are fixed at $6.00 per

4.

ton and tonnage dues are fixed at 30 cents. The stevedoring charges vary according to the size of the vessel, the type of cargo and the quantity. It has been established that the stevedoring charges tend to decrease as the volume of cargo handled increases.

There is no charge for delivery of goods to the consignee.

3.The average handling cost of goods from ship to shore prior to the operation of the Deep Water Harbour was $11.37 per freight ton.

It is not possible to give a break-down of this figure since the only static charge at that time was tonnage dues of 30 cents. The other charges represented stevedoring, lighterage, warehousing, overtime etc.

There was no specific charge for delivery of goods to the consignee.

It should be mentioned that despite increases in wage rates varying between 35% and 68% since the Deep Water Harbour commenced operations in 1961, the cost of handling cargo has not increased to any appreciable extent over the handling charges which existed prior to 1961.

4. Information on the local prices of commodities exported from Barbados to other West Indian

Islands and British Guiana is attached as Appendix II.

5.

6. The retail prices in the West Indian Islands and British Guiana of the items mentioned in Appendix II are not known.

7.

APPENDIX I
RETAIL PRICES OF GOODS IMPORTED FORM CANADA
(A & B)AB

Item

Unit

Retail Price before May 1962

Present Retail Price

HARDWARE

$ c

$ c

Paint Brushes \" \"

\" \" \" \"

\" \" \" \"

\" \" \" \"

\" \" \" \"

\" \" \" \"

\" \" \" \"

\" \" \" \"

\" \" \" \"

\" \" \" \"

\" \" \" \"

\" \" \" \"

\" \" \" \"

Wash \" \" \"

Arborite Sheets \" \"

Canvas \" \" \"

\" \" \" \"

\" \" \" \"

Duck - 6-oz. \" \"

\" 8-oz. \" \"

White Pine 1x10 ft. \"

\" \" 1x12 \" \"

Spruce \" \" \"

Fir \" \" \"

Shingles \" \"

1\"

11/2\"

2

21/2\"

3\"

4\"

1/2\"

1\"

11/2\"

2\"

21/2\"

3\"

4\"

7\"

22\"

44\"

\"

36\"

36\"

each

\"

\"

\"

\"

\"

\"

\"

\"

\"

\"

\"

\"

\"

\"

Sq. ft.

Yd.

\"

\"

\"

\"

Ft.

\"

\"

\"

Bundle

50

.63

.78

1.50

1.76

2.96

.36

.40

.52

.70

1.08

1.42

2.25

1.00

1.00

1.32

3.20

3.25

1.19

1.37

.35

.37

.30

.31

6.10

.55

.70

.90

1.60

1.90

3.20

.40

.15

.60

.75

1.15

1.50

2.35

1.05

1.25

1.25

3.20

3.35

1.25

1.50

.321/2

.351/2

.31

.33 1/2

5.40

APPENDIX I - Concluded

Item

Unit	Retail Price before May 1962	Present Retail Price
	$ c	$ c
DRY GOODS		
Shirts (Gents)		
each	9.00	9.00
\" \"	..	12.75
	12.75	
\" \"	..	13.35
	13.35	
\" \"	..	16.50

16.50

Briefs \" .. ..

pair

1.50

1.50

\" \" .. ..

..

1.90

1.90

Cotton Piece Goods ..

Yd.

.50

.50

\" \" .. ..

..

.52

.52

\" \" .. ..

..

.75

.80

\" \" .. ..

..

.84

.85

\" \" .. ..

..

1.48

1.44

\" \" .. ..

..

1.95

1.95

Footwear (Ladies) .. ..

pair

5.75

5.50

\" \" .. ..

..

6.00

5.75

\" \" .. ..

..

6.25

6.25

\" \" .. ..

..

6.50

6.42

\" \" .. ..

..

6.75

6.75

\" (Girls) .. ..

..

5.25

5.75

\" (Boys) .. ..

..

7.25

7.25

\" \" .. ..

..

7.25

7.25

Hate (Gents) .. ..

Each

6.15

4.80

Caps .. .. ..

..

3.95

3.65

Bedsheets .. .. ..

..

5.95

5.95

FOODSTRUFFS

Potatoes .. .. ..

lb

.60 to 11

.60 to

Oats .. .. ..

..

.10

.11

Pollard .. .. ..

..

.07

.09 to

Peas-Green Whole .. ..

Pt.

.16 to 20

.16 to

Pease-Yollow Split .. ..

Pt.

.18 to 20

.18 to 20

Flsh-Salted .. ..

lb.

.42

.52

Onions .. .. ..

..

.16 to .20

.14 to 20

Commeal .. .. ..

lb.

.111/2

.121/2

Serdines 31/4 oz tin .. ..

each

.19 & .20

.17

Eloaters .. .. ..

lb.

.28 & .30

.40

PORK-SALTED

Lips .. .. ..

lb.

.36

.35

Finns .. .. ..

..

.47

.42

Neckbones .. .. ..

..

.27

.24

Snouts .. .. ..

..

.52

.50

Riblets .. .. ..

..

.47

.50

Heads .. .. ..

..

-

-

Tails .. .. ..

..

.50

.50

Feet .. .. ..

..

.30

.28

Headskins .. .. ..

\"

.33

.30

CANNED VEGETABLES

Carrots 15-0z tin .. ..

each

.29

.31

Beet 15-oz tin .. ..

\"

.29

.31

Mixed Vegetables 15-oz tin ..

\"

.41

.43

Com 15-oz tin .. ..

\"

.39

.38

Peas \" \" .. ..

\"

.39

.38

Whisky 26-oz bottle .. ..

\"

7.50

7.00

APPENDIX II
DOMESTIC EXPORTS TO OTHER WEST INDIAN TERRITORIES AND BRITISH GUIANA AND PRESENT LOCAL RETAIL PRICES OF SAME

Item

Description

Retail Price

Lard .. .. ..

-

$ .51 per lb

Vegetables .. ..

Yams

.07 \" \"

\" .. ..

Sweet Potatoes

.05 \" \"

\" .. ..

Eddoes

.07 \" \"

Cigarettes .. ..

Bristol Pkge. of 10

.24 per pkg.

\" .. ..

\" \" \" 20

.45 \" \"

\" .. ..

Anchor \" \" 10

.22 \" \"

\" .. ..

\" \"

.38 \" \"

Gravel .. .. ..

-

$ 3.00 per ton

Crushed Stones .. ..

Size 1/2\" (per load of 31/2 tons)

$ 9.12 \" \"

\" \" .. ..

\" 3/4\" (\" \" \" \")

$ 8.00 \" \"

\" \" .. ..

\" 1\" (\" \" \" \")

$ 6.86 \" \"

Building materials ..

Asbenstos_4x8x3/16\'

(Corrugated)

$ 9.24 per sheet

\" \" ..

Asbeston_4x8x3/16\'

\" \" ..

(Flat)

$ 8.64 \" \"

\" \" ..

Fibrolite

$ 6.80 \" \"

\" \" ..

Everite - 6x21/2\' (Corrugated)

$ 4.77 \" \"

\" \" ..

\" - 7x21/2\' \"

$ 5.52 \" \"

\" \" ..

\" - 8x21/2\' \"

$ 6.20 \" \"

\" \" ..

\" - 9x21/2\' \"

$ 7.02 \" \"

\" \" ..

\" - 10x21/2\' \"

$ 7.77 \" \"

\" \" .. ..

Cement (Bag of 98 lb.)

$ 72.30 per bag

Coconut oil .. ..

-

.37 per pint

Casolene \" .. ..

-

.70 per gallon

\" \" .. ..

Permium Grade(coloured pink

Diesel Oil .. ..

-

.37 \" \"

Hydrogenated Oils & Fats

Soya Bean Oil

.35 per lb.

Cordials & Liqueurs ..

Falernum

$ 3.20 per gallon

\" \" .. ..

\" (Liqueur)

$ 9.50 \" \"

Ready to Wear Garments ..

Skirts (of knitted fabric)

$ 1.75 to $ 1.95 each

\" \" \" ..

Vests (Men\'s) \" \"

.95 to $ 1.35 \"

\" \" \" ..

Underpants (Mens) of

knitted fabric)

$ 1.00 \" $ 1.20

Hats & Caps .. ..

Hats (Ladies Straw)

$ 1.00 \" $ 3.50

\" \" .. ..

Caps (Cloth)

$ 1.25 \" $ 2.50

Stockings & Hose ..

Stockings (Ladies)

.75 \" . 85 pair

\" \" .. ..

Hose (Gents)

.85 \" $1. 05

Bags & Sacks for packing

Bags (40\"x20\")

.32 each

Crude Minerals .. ..

Limestone (per ton)

$ 2.50 to $ 3.00

China Ware. Porcelain &

Earthenware : Casserole

Earthenware.. ..

Dishes

$ 5.00 \" $ 16.00 each

\" \" .. ..

\" Ash Trays

$ 1.00 \" $ 14.00 \"

\" \" .. ..

\" Hanging

\" \" .. ..

Flower Pots

$10.00 \" $ 12.00 \"

\" \" .. ..

\" Vases

$ 1.50 \" $ 22.00 \"

\" \" .. ..

\" Lamp Bases

$ 7.00 \" $ 20.00 \"

Metal Fixtures & Furnishings

Furnishings: Table & 4 Chairs

$100.00 per set

\" \" .. ..

Chairs

$22.00 each

\" \" .. ..

Bath Stools

$20.00 & $25.00 each

Sugar .. .. ..

Unrefined (Durk Crystal)

.101/2 per lb

\" (White \")

.13 \" \"

DOMESTIC EXPORTS TO WEST INDIAN ISLANDS INCLUDING FRENCH GUIANA

AND DUTCH GUIANA

Item

Description

Retail Price

Poultry .. .. ..

Alive

.35 & .40 each

Sheep .. .. ..

\" for food

.26 per lb

Lambs .. .. ..

\" \" \"

.32 \" \"

APPENDIX II - Continued

EXPORTS TO THE WEST INDIAN ISLANDS

Item

Description

Retail Price

Eggs .. .. ..

In shell

.10 to .12 each

Honey .. .. ..

10 oz. Bottles

.5 ,, .54 ,,

Crustacea & Malluscs

fresh, chilled, frozen

Shrimp

$ 1.40 per lb.

Fish, fish products & fish

preparations in airtight

containers .. ..

Flying-Fish

.08 each

Macaroni .. ..

1/2 lb package

.20 ,,

,, ...

1 \" \"

.38 ,,

Spaghetti .. ..

1/2 \" \"

.21 ,,

Vermicelli .. ..

1/2 \" \"

.21 ,,

Noodles .. ..

-

-

Biscuits .. ..

Sweetened

.44 & .48 lb.

,, ...

Unsweetened

.31 & .39 ,,

Other Bakery Products

-

-

Beans

-

.45 per lb.

Peas .. .. ..

-

-

Vegetables .. ..

Yams

.07 ,, ,,

,, ...

Sweet Potatoes

.05 ,, ,,

,, ...

Eddoes

.07 ,, ,,

Sugar .. .. ..

Unrefined (Dark Crystal)

.101/2 ,, ,,

,, ...

\" (White Crystal)

.13 ,, ,,

Molasses .. ..

Choice

$1.00 per gallon

,, ...

Vacuum-Pan

.131/2 ,, ,,

Confectionery .. ..

Sugar

.56 to .66 lb.

Spices .. .. ..

-

$1.25 per lb.

Pepper .. .. ..

(Black)

$1.25 ,, ,,

Ginger .. .. ..

-

$1.02 ,, ,,

Hay and Fodder, green or

dry .. .. ..

Hay

.02 ,, ,,

Oil Seed Cake & Meal

& Other Vegetable Oil

residues .. ..

Oil Seed Cake

.15 ,, ,,

\" \" \" \"

Coconut Meal

.06 ,, ,,

Meal .. .. ..

Meat

.12 ,, ,,

,, ...

Fish

.12 ,, ,,

Food Waste & Prepared

Animal Feed ..

Animal Feed (Pig Starter)

.12 & .13 per lb.

,, ,, \" ..

,, ,, (\" Grower)

.111/2 & .13 ,, ,,

,, ,, \" ..

,, ,, (\" Ration)

.12 per lb.

,, ,, \" ..

,, ,, (Sow \")

.13 per lb.

,, ,, \" ..

,, ,, (\" Feed)

.111/2 ,, ,,

,, ,, \" ..

,, ,, (Hog Finisher)

.11 ,, ,,

\" \" \" ..

,, ,, (Dairy \")

.111/2 ,, ,,

\" \" \" ..

,, ,, (Balanoed Animal)

.11 ,, ,,

Margarine .. ..

-

.50 per lb.

Lard .. ..

-

.51 per lb.

Baking Powder ..

-

.40 per lb.

Aerated & Mineral Waters

Ju-c

.09 & 10 bottle

\" \" \" ..

Cooa-Cola

.11 & 12 \"

Other non-aloholic

Beverages

-

-

Beer .. .. ..

Banks

.25 per bottle

Rum (not exoeeding the

Rum

$ 9.60 per gallon

trength of proof) ..

Sugar Cane Brandy

$10.50 per gallon

Hum (not exceeding the

strength of proof)

Liqueur Rum

$10.20 per gallon

Rum (not exceeding the

strength of proof)

Re-distilled

$10.50 ,, ,,

Cigarettes .. ..

Bristol Pkge. 10

.24 per pkge.

,, ...

,, ,, 20

.48 ,, ,,

,, ...

Anchor ,, 10

.22 ,, ,,

,, ...

,, ,, 20

.38 ,, ,,

Gravel .. ..

-

$ 3.00 per ton

Crushed Stones ..

Size 1/2\" (per load of 21/2 tons)

$ 9.12 ,, ,,

,, ...

,, 3/4\" (,, ,, ,, ,, ,,)

$ 8.00 ,, ,,

,, ...

,, 1\" (,, ,, ,, ,, ,,)

$ 6.86 ,, ,,

APPENDIX II - Concluded

DOMESTIC EXPORTS TO WEST INDIAN ISLANDS INCLUDING FRENCH GUIANA AND DUTCH GUIANA

Item

Description

Retail Price

Bricks .. ..

Clay - Size 41/2x21/2x9\" (Solid)

.12 each

,, ...

,, (Perforated) according to

Size

.09 to 26 each

Crude Minerals ..

Limestone (per ton)

$ 2.50 to $3.00

Other motor spirits &

blending Agents -

Gasolene ..

-

.70 per gallon

,, ,, ..

Premium Grade (coloured pink)

.78 ,, ,,

Coconut Oil ..

-

.37 per pint

Carbonic Gas ..

Liquid

.22 per lb.

Other inorganic Acids

Nitric Acid

$ 3.00 per pint

,, ,, ,,

Hydrochloric Acid

.72 ,, ,,

Pure Alcohol ..

-

$ 2.64 ,, ,,

Methylated Spirits ..

-

.45 ,, ,,

Other Organic Compounds

Acetic Acid

.30 ,, ,,

Paints & Enamels ..

Paint - Emulsion

$ 9.45 to $10.00 gal.

,, -

$10.50 ,, $10.67

Other Prepared Paints

-

Bye Rum and other

Bay Rum

.45 and .55 bottle

Toilet Waters

-

-

,,

Citrolene

.36 to .90 bottle

,, ..

Limolene

.80 and .90 bottle

Cosmetics .. ..

Shampoo

.64 and $1.32 bottle

Hand Lotion

.64 ,, $1.20 ,,

Vanishing Cream

.66 ,, $ .90 ,,

Alp-Aire

.42 ,, $ 1.05 ,,

After Shave Lotion

1.53

Perfumes (Men & Women)

$ 1.80 to $3.99 bottle

Colognes (Men & Women)

$ 1.68 & $3.00 ,,

Hair Pomade

.60 bottle

Hard Soap .. ..

21/2 lb. Bars

.54 & .56 bar

Printing Paper ..

-

-

Bags & Sacks for Packing

Bag (40\'x20\')

.32 each

Bricks .. ..

Clay - Size 41/2x21/2x9\" (Solid)

.12 each

,, ...

,, (Perforated) according to

Size

.09 to 26 each

Metal Fixtures &

Fumishing ..

Fumishings: Table & 4 Chairs

$100.00 per set

,, ,, ,,

Chairs

$22.00 each

,, ,, ,,

Bath Stools

$20.00 & $25.00 each

Vests & Pants ..

Vests (of knitted fabric) Men\'s

.90 to $1.35 ,,

,, ,, ,,

Underpants ,, ,,) ,,

$ 1.00 to $ 1.20 ,,

Stockings & Hose

Stockinga (Ladies)

.75 ,, .85 pair

,, ,, ,,

House (Gents)

.85 ,, $1.05 ,,

Skrits .. ..

Of knitted fabric

$ 1.75 & $ 1.95 each

Underwear .. ..

Ladies Panties of Knitted fabrio

.60 to $1.05 pair

Shirts .. ..

Not of knitted fabric (dress)

$ 3.36 ,, $1.50 pair

,, ...

,, ,, ,, ,, (sports)

$ 2.80 ,, $6.30 ,,

Vests & Pants ..

Other than knitted

,, ,, ,,

Pants (Men\'s)

$ 1.00 ,, $ 1.60 pair

Underwear ..

Other than knitted:

,,

Panties (Ladies)

$ 1.50 ,, $ 1.75 pair

,, ..

,, (Girls)

$ .40 .65 ,,

Otherwear .. ..

-

-

Candles of Tallow

-

.60 per lb.

Biscuits (soda) .. ..

$ .29 per lb.

Animal Feed .. .. ..

.10 ,, ,,

Margarine .. .. ..

.63 ,, ,,

Soap .. ..

.56 per bar

Sugar confectionery ..

Beverages

JU-C .. ..

.11 per bottle

Coke .. ..

.08 ,, ,,

Rum .. ..

$2.30 ,, 1/2 pt.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that I could not hear the Hon. Minister quite plainly - and I take It that these Replies are very long - would I be in order to move that these Replies be set on the Order Paper for discussion at the next meeting?

Mr. SPEAKER:

Such would not now be in order, but the Replies will be printed and circulated and the hon. member may give notice of a motion to discuss any aspect of them which he may feel worthy of discussion.

Mr. SMITH:
Am 1 in order now or must I wait until the next meeting?

Mr. SPEAKER:
I would suggest to the Hon. member to await the printing of the Replies.

Mr. SMITH:
I think I am in order now to give notice of my desire to do so.

Mr. SPEAKER:
Will the hon. member indicate what he proposes giving notice of now?

Mr. SMITH:
I am giving notice that the entire Reply be set on the Order Paper for discussion at the next meeting of the House.

UNNECESSARY NOISE BY SOME MOTORISTS

Mr. SPEAKER:
The next is the Reply to question No. 55 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas.

Mr. BATSON:
To enquire of the Appropriate Minister

Is Government aware of the unnecessary noise made by some motorists in tooting their horns in the City areas where the bulk of business is being carried on.

Will Government initiate legislation allowing the blowing of horns only in cases where an accident might have occurred?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:
Mr. Speaker, the Replies are as follows-

(a) No Sir.

(b)

(c) Existing legislation contained in Regulations 55(2) of the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Regulations, 1952, as amended by Regulation 5 of the Motor Vehicle and Road Traffic (Amend- ment) Regulations, 1954, is adequate to control any unnecessary noise made by motorists in the city area.

(d)

3.15 p.m.

PRIVATE MEMBERS\' BUSNESS

RESOLUTION re SURGICAL FEES, etc. AT THE HOSPITAL

Mr. SPEAKER:

It is now the time for Private Members\' Business. The first Order of the Day under that Head stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition- To re- sume debate on a Resolution relating to the Surgical Fees, Accommodation and Treatment Charges as set out in the Schedule to \"The Hospital (Fees) Regulatons, 1965.\" On the last occasion when this matter was being discussed, on the motion of the hon. senior member for the City seconded by the Hon. Junior member for Christ Church, further consideration was postponed. Does the Hon. Leader of the Opposition propose to continue his address now?

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, this is a matter which has engaged the attention of this House for some time now, and we feel that we have aired our views and expressed them in respect of the Surgical Fees, Accommodation and Treatment Charges, and so on, at the Hospital. At least, I am happy to say that since the question has been raised here, the attempt to raise the fees in the Casualty has been abandoned. It was agreed that the standard was set by the

previous Government and a fee was charged to the people who received medicine and who were throwing it away. I should like to say that there are people in this community who, even if they have to pay for medicine, go from one doctor to another and have the medicine changed. It is not a question of people throwing away the medicine when people are ill and they do not feel any results when they go to one doctor, they will go to another doctor. I find that no longer has any attempt been made to charge the fee of 25 cents to people who go to die Casualty. On the other hand, I must still say here and now in reply to the Hon. Minister of Social Services, that I am not quite happy about what is happening at the Radiological Department at the Hospital from tile point of view that it is still very heart breaking to persons who are unable to pay, when they have to go for X-ray examinations, especially the type which would engage the attention of the Radiologist, these people have to wait for two or three months as against those persons who can pay for their treatment. I have been reliably informed that people who have the necessity for having these X-rays exam- inations immediately performed, have been turned back because of people who can afford to pay for their examina- tions, and who can wait a little longer.

I feel that a matter of this sort should engage the atten- tion of the Hon. Minister of Social Services and he should see that the matter is put right. I must mention this, be- cause I have been coming into contact with cases where people go into the Hospital and occuply these rooms where the medical men have to visit them and they have to pay these charges and they have been discharged from these rooms. I feel that this fee of five shillings per day has been existing for many years and that charge should be raised. When the argument is used about what is done in private concerns, and so on, that is a different matter. When the argument is used that people only go to this Department of the Hospital because they are snobbish, I say that a lot of people who go to these Wards do so because they cannot get attention in the

other wards. 1 drew it to the attention of the Hon. Minister that when people want to get beds, these beds are earmarked for doctors, and they have to get the fees changed. It is my duty to defend those people who cannot defend themselves in this matter, those people who have sent me here to defend them. I feel that while the fee of five shillings should be increased, this is not a pri- vate Hospital, but it is a Hospital which is run with the taxes collected from the people of this country. I feel that while this jump to $10.00 has been made, an amount of five dollars or $7.50 would have been quite adequate.

The Hon. Minister was courteous enough to show me the $3.00 a day Ward at the Hospital and 1 suppose that I could commend the Government for having done that. Since I have been debating this question here, there has been a lot of victimisation going on even among qualified men who have had the courage to speak out about things which were going on at the Hospital. I understand that the Government had an investigation of this matter which has been going on. can the Minister say now that it is not true to say that with the shortage of medical practitioners on the staff of the Hospital and the use of general practitioners on the staff, certain people at the Hospital, because they did not like the forthright and outspoken manner of certain young- sters at the Hospital, as soon as they are out, they tried to show that although you have a number of people who have to be turned back from day to day at the Casualty they will refuse to hire certain doctors? 3.25 p.m.

There are people who would like the Government to connive with them in this manner and refuse to give em- ployment, even though they would see that at 6 o\'clock or 7 o\'clock on evenings a number of people who had been waiting at the Hospital Casualty from 8 o\'clock in the mor- ning must be turned back. I do not think that is good enough.

I feel that certain views have been expressed on all sides of the House by hon. members since this matter has been debated, and while die Hon. Minister who was then in charge has been forthright and outspoken in this matter, we have no right to amend the Regulations, because when they come to this House we have to accept or reject them. As

has been rightly said, these Regulations need not have been brought to this House; so it would be out of order for me to move that these Regulations be considered null and void, and therefore I can do nothing about them. When Regula- tions are brought to this House, members must within forty days reject them or they become law. There are other Regulations which are only brought to the House as a matter of courtesy, and 1 believe that these Regulations were brought as a matter of courtesy; so lest anyone should think that it is just a matter of blowing hot air and not try- ing to do something about them, 1 must say that there is nothing that we can do because these automatically became law as soon as they were made.

We feel. Sir, that we have done our duty in this matter by expressing our views, and on another occasion when similar Regulations are brought up, we will have to ex- press our views. We hope that the Minister in charge will watch the working of these Regulations very carefully, and whenever hardships might be effected upon people, he would do whatever is possible to amend such Regulations, and re- lieve those persons in the category who would feel these Regulations the most, that is, those people who must try to give their families some measure of relief through Hospitalisation. Hospitalisation is something which every- one in this world must expect at some time or other, and therefore these Regulations at the Hospital must affect every living being.

This motion which is to resume debate on a Resolution relating to the surgical fees, accommodation and treatment charges as set out in the Schedule to \"The Hospital (Fees) Regulations, 1965, has been debated over a period of three months, and you would observe that I gave notice of my intention to debate these Regulations; so there is no ne- cessity to go further under the circumstances. I therefore am asking leave to withdraw the motion. I feel that the de- Hate on these Regulations has done a certain amount of good and has allowed the people at the Hospital to know that we are watching from the floor of this House in the interest of the entire community. As I have always said, the four walls of this lovely building do not make a Hospital.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, before the hon. member concludes the debate, 1 should like to draw to his attention the fact that although I only assumed this Ministry .....

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister re- plied to me already on this, and I am merely exercising the right of final reply.

Hon. C, E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, my predecessor in office was replying at the time when the time expired, and the hon. member moved the postponement. As far as I re- member that is how it went; so that he is perfectly right to speak now. Is the hon. member speaking on his right at this stage or on the wind up?

Mr. SPEAKER:

There cannot be a direct question to the Leader of the Opposition. The records disclose that the then Minister of Health spoke on two different after- noons; but if the present Hon. Minister of Health seeks to speak also on this debate, it is known that there are cer- tain Standing Orders whereby a Minister may reply to any- thing critical of the Government. I take it that the hon. senior member for Christ Church is opposing the request that leave be granted to the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw the Resolution, as the Hon. Minister wants to reply on a matter critical of Government before the Reso- lution is withdrawn.

Mr. WALCOTT:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make my position clear. I am entitled to speak on this matter, and 1 am going to exercise my right. I was not in the House when it was debated. I had no op- portunity to speak, and now that I have heard a speech on this matter, 1 am going to exercise my right, and I just draw that to Your Honour\'s attention. There is nothing in the Rules that precludes me from speaking.

Mr. SPEAKER:

As to the point made by the hon. senior member for Christ Church, Minister of Health, under Standing Order No. 27(2) he may speak even after the In- troducer of the motion has replied. As to the hon. senior member for St. Peter, he has no right of reply or to speak by reason of not being in this Chamber during earlier dis- cussion of this Resolution.

Mr. WALCOTT:

If a member is in the Chamber and does not exercise his right to speak, he may not speak after the

Introducer replies, but as this is an open debate and is not a motion to take a substantive decision, therefore whenever the hon. member debates the question before the debate closes, any member who has not spoken and did not have an opportunity to do so, is entitled to speak. It is not a Government motion or a motion to spend money. This is a motion to debate the Regulations, and it is not yet closed, and that is why I say I want to exercise the right to which I am entitled. I am in the House now, it is being debated and I am not responsible for the fact that it was debated and I was not here. I am here today and I want to exercise the right 1 have for the first time. I was granted leave of absence for two months, and it is quite clear from the records that I was not here during the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I do not agree that the fact that a member has been granted leave of absence and a debate starts before he was granted - or whilst he was on leave, automatically entitles him, If the right of reply has been finally exercised, to speak on the matter. I will say that, in this particular instance, when the Hon. Leader of the Opposition rose on the 24th August, he rose and moved that further consideration be postponed, and the motion for further consideration was duly seconded and passed; there- fore that may not be regarded as the final speech, so far as he is concerned. 3.35 p.m.

I do not however agree, nor do I accept what the hon. senior member for St. Peter has suggested; otherwise he would have the right to speak on his return simply because he has been on leave.

Mr. WALCOTT:

If you consider that an hon. member acted honourably, that is to say, that he did not have an opportunity to enter a debate, but it was a debate which was important and one which he considered he should speak on, then, it was in Your Honour\'s position to do anything which you could to accommodate the member.

I see from the Order Paper that the hon. senior mem- ber for the City moved that the matter be postponed. Now, today, the hon. member is big enough to say that it is within your discretion as regards the closure of the debate,

Mr. SPEAKER:

I do not regard it as discretionary on my part, but as a matter for the indulgence of the House,

Mr. MOTTLEY:

That is not correct.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Has the hon. member risen on a point of order?

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I was speaking when the Hon. Minister rose on a point of order. Why should I rise on a point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER:

As I understand it, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition resumed his seat.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I merely sat down because the Hon. Minister rose. Actually, what happened was this. I rose to reply on the last occasion after apparently everybody had spoken and the Hon. Minister had spoken too. I rose to ex- ercise my right to reply. During my debate, the time for Private Members\' Business expired and, as the time ex- pired, I merely moved the motion that further considera- tion of the debate be postponed. I could not go on speaking then, and as I had not finished making my comments, I moved that the debate be further postponed. I think Your Honour would recall that.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is correct, but I am not accepting that the hon. Leader of the Opposition is exercising his right to reply. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition said that on the last occasion after the time for Private Members\' Business had expired, he moved that further consideration of the debate be postponed. I am not objecting at all to that. What I am saying is this Under the Rules of this House, an Hon. Minister has the right to reply after any hon. member has spoken. A Minister has that right even if no new ground has been broken.

Rule 27 (2) states:

\"A Minister may conclude a debate on any motion which is critical of the Government, or reflects adversely on or is calculated to bring discredit upon the Government or a Government Officer.\"

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact. I tried to expedite the entire matter. I am not against any hon. member speaking but, as far as I am concerned, on the motion that I made, I only moved it at that time because 1 had not finished making my point. Your Honour would recall that I had a very short time to speak because the Minister had replied to me at great length. I then made the motion that the debate be postponed and it was seconded by the hon. Junior member for Christ Church.

I rose today and suggested afterwards that the motion which I moved be withdrawn. I now finally ask leave that the motion be withdrawn. I do not know if the hon. member now proposes to take an excursion into a new field. If that is so, then 1 would say that the Hon. Minister would have a right to reply. However, there was no new ground which I attempted to open - nothing which the Hon. Minister at the time did not cover.

Sir, I do not intend to waste any more time on this. I therefore ask leave that the motion be withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER:

May I point out that the question of a Minister rising in certain circumstances has no reference to the introduction of any new or old matter after a member has spoken? That right of reply is conferred by Standing Order No. 27 wherein it is stated

••A Minister may conclude a debate on any motion which is critical of the Government, or reflects adversely on or is calculated to bring discredit upon the Government or a Government Officer.\"

There is no reference to any new matter having been introduced. The position is that the Hon. Introducer of the Resolution is asking leave to withdraw his motion. If there is no objection, leave will

be granted the hon. member.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, before leave is granted, I should like to draw the attention of the Chamber to the fact that I have recently taken over the portfolio of Minister of Health, and although I am grateful to the former Minister of Health whom, I think, has satisfied the House as regards the criticisms made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, I should like, apart from the points which have been raised, to draw to the attention of this Chamber that the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is a comparatively new Hospital which has been established at the taxpayers\' expense in the vicinity of $9 million and which costs $10,000 per day, that the Hospital is now passing through its teething stages, and, in so far as Regulations are concerned, that the Regulations concerning it have been again considered and will continually be reviewed until such time as they are adequate and satisfactory not only to the Hospital, but to the taxpayers and the people who have to receive the necessary treatment there.

I do not want to dilate too long on this, but I do want to draw to the attention of the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown that the question of fees for private

rooms would again have to be examined because there were certain wards which are not properly equipped to measure up to Grade A. In other words, there are wards which are not up to the standard of Grade A, and I am telling the hon. member that certain things would have to be done and that is now receiving the attention of my Ministry. In other words, the arrangements are not satisfactory as far as those wards are concerned, in that all are graded as Grade A for which members of the public are asked to pay $15 per day. Therefore, those fees will be re-examined. 3.45 p.m.

The matter of the radio-therapy fees will also have to be examined, because it is based on the question of treatment. One treatment costs $5.00 if it happens to be a non-malignant one; where the treatment is fora malignant case, then you will have to pay $10.00. You cannot have a static fee of $50.00 for non-malignant treatments and another fee for the treatment of malignant cases. In the case of radio-therapy, because that is based on the number of treatments given, the cost of these treatments would be $15.00 for three of them and if you had five treatments, then the cost would be $25.00. That is for the treatment of non-malignant cases. Therefore, the fee is based on the number of treatments received and not on any fixed sum. You cannot have two static fees for malignant and non-malignant cases. I am not now taking any Cabinet decision; the Cabinet will have to consider what is a fair and reasonable fee for the taxpayers. These matters have received my attention and they are being examined. The question of fees in the Pay Wards will be examined more closely. If the fee was $2.40 in the past, we have tried to be as lenient as possible.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I understand that the hon. senior member for St. Peter is objecting to leave being granted for the withdrawal of this motion.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, my only reason for speaking or wanting to speak is that I was not in a position to exercise my right to speak in this debate. If I had been in that position, I would not have been entitled to speak now, because it would be unfair for me to speak after the introducer of the motion had made his reply. Moreover, I have done this because this is not a closed motion; it is not a motion that is asking the

members of this House to vote on something; it is a question where the motion was used as a debate. When the hon. senior member for the City says that I am speaking after him, I want to say that it does not in any way injure the matter, because it is not a motion which he intends to put before the House and therefore it would not sway the debate either in one way or in the other. There are only two points which I wanted to make and, in fact, one of them I have made already. The hon. mover of the Resolution has said that since he debated this question, it has been brought to his attention that people are being victimised at the Hospital.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I am not objecting to the hon. member speaking. Lest yon think that 1 am not aware of the Standing Orders of this House, does the hon. member rise on Your Honour\'s invitation to speak on his objection to the withdrawal of the Resolution? Do not let the hon. member think that 1 am not acquainted with what is being done; if the hon. member raises an objection to show the reason why a motion should not be allowed to be withdrawn, then he cannot enter upon the original motion. Can the hon. member do that?

Mr. WALCOTT:

That is sandside law.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

The hon. member says that that is sandside law.

Mr. SPEAKER:

When the hon. member objects to leave being granted for the withdrawal of the Resolution, it may be for the reason that the wants to contribute to the debate.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I bow to whatever ruling you make, but I expect such a ruling to be made in similar circumstances. I repeat, I am not objecting to the hon. mem-ber speaking now.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I do not needlessly create precedents, but it is necessary on certain occasions to do so.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, I gave the reasons as to why I wanted to speak. The hon. member has said that since he spoke on this matter something fresh has been drawn to his attention, which is now new matter. If the Hon. Minister replies to anything, he should avoid the new matter which has been raised. The hon. member spoke about people being victimised, but he did not say who was being victimised, I want to say. Sir, that I share some of the views of the hon. member, not that I believe that the fees as set out in this Schedule to the Hospital (Fees) Regulations are too high, but it is only a question of the psyches-logical impact of these fees. On a careful examination of these fees, I would say that they are not too high in relation to what is taking place; but, unfortunately, if you allow something to run on for 20 years, 25 years or 100 years and you suddenly make a change, then the psychological effect is that people will talk about these things.

I am the Secretary of a Trade Union and I deal with wages. As I said in another debate, I am a Socialist and I believe in Socialist medicine.

3.55 p.m.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition is not a Socialist, and that is why I say that the Conservative always hold on like grim death to the Institutions that the Socialists have implemented.

Mr. MOTTLEY:
I do not know what the hon. member means.

Mr. SPEAKER:
Is this purporting to be a point of elucidation?

Mr. MOTTLEY:
Yes, Mr. Speaker. No Socialist in this country implemented free medicine.

Mr. WALCOTT:
The hon. member does not know what Socialism is or what free medicine is. There was free medicine in Barbados.

Mr. SPEAKER:
Let the hon. member resume addressing the Chair.

Mr. WALCOTT:
The hon. member does not know what free medicine is. He thinks that because some people go to the Casualty and are given free medicine it is free. There are other people who go to the hospital and do not get free medicine. I believe in free medicine. When I talk about Socialist\', I mean the Socialist concept. The hon. member thinks that Socialism began in Barbados, but it did not.

Mr. SPEAKER:
In any event, Socialism does not form any part of this address.

Mr. MOTTLEY:
On a point of order, how could the hon. member suggest to me that I think Socialism began in Barbados.

Mr. SPEAKER:
That is not a point of order. I do not think the hon. member should rise and say \"on a point of order\" when he knows it is not a point of order.

Mr. WALOOTT:
If the hon. member does not knew, let him read. He may read, but not as much as I do on these subjects, not only as a Trade Unionist, but I have other interests. Free medicine is not a Barbados Socialist concept; it is a concept of making medicine free to the Communities because of what medicine

means to a community. I agree that the fees at the Hospital should be abolished like school fees to which the Conservatives in this country objected, and I would like to see the day when medicine would be free and built into your Social Security pattern; but it\' is a question of your costs and other priorities that you have to meet; so this Jar of carrying what it is will have a psychological impact, not that the fees as compared with other fees are too high. I would like the hon. Leader of the

Opposition to wait for what I am going to say now, and this will keep him in his Seat.

Mr. SPEAKER:

There is not obligation on any hon, mem-ber to retain his seat to listen to any other hon. Member.

Mr. WALCOTT:

It would not be fair for him to be out of his seat when I say what I am going to. The hon. mem-ber - I would not say unwittingly, I would say wittingly is conducting a campaign of fear and intimidation among some of the staff at the Barbadoa Hospital and he has carried it too far in my view. This fear and intimidation is not good enough. In one breath, he talks about victimisstion, and whatever the hon. Member said to do the former Minister took up this campaign of fear and news mongering, chea; gossiping and disloyalty of people who work in organizations coming out and trying to blackmail some of their other col-leagues in this manner which is below the dignity of professional people; and any member of this House should chase them out of their offices when they come with new, because a person who starts this campaign will sooner or later start other types of campaigns. It is unworthy of doctors and pro-fessional people in their own organization not be able to settle their own personal or local difficulties among them-selyes, because we have these difficulties in all branches and phases of life, and I do not like these campaigns of fear that are directed against a fe persons. I would say to the hon. Member that a person may not be his friend, and it is always easy for people to bring stories about people whom they know are not your friends.

Mr. Speaker, there are doctors in this Island working in an institution which comes directly under the administration of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition who is the Mayor for the City of Bridgetown. The St. Michael infirmary comes directly under his control and I have heard people who have been in this Instituion speak critically of the doctors at that Institution. But I have never heard the kind of castigations that would be very appropriate to his organization within the Mayoral office, and that is why he may think the Minister of Health has a right to do it that way. I hear people talk about doctors being stiff, and not being friendly, I know a doctor who is not a barbadian working in this Island who is the most unfriendly, unmannerly person you can meet, but it is none of my business if the man is an unmannerly, unfriendly, hoggish, priggish, or snobbish person, because I am northing to do with that in his personal capacity; yet I have not heard on word about him. Here is a non-Barba-dian working at the Hospital; nothing is said about this un-mannerly, snobbish or priggish man, but I have heard so much critcism about one Barbadian who is superior to the non-Barbadian as a professional man. I known that this cam-paign of fear can only originate from the inside, because the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is too busy a man to be within the confines of an Institution like the Hospital to know these things first-hand; so whatever he says would be from information which people who work there bring out, When this type of information comes out from Institutions, you have to be extremely careful when it is being used against another in one\'s professional capacity. It has been stated that people who can pay are given priority when they go for X-rays.

4.05 p.m.

I wonder if the Hon. Leader of the Opposition would not receive priority in illness as against other people in Barbados. I do not believe that can be something which can be said to be unfair.

Mr. MOTTLEY:
The hon. member has misquoted me. Mr. SPEAKER This would be a point of explanation.

Mr. MOTTLEY; Yes, Sir, If this debate goss on in this way, hon. Members on the floor of this House taking the right of making a closing debate on this matter, the debate is not going to end in this way.

Mr. WALOOTT:
You know you are wrong.

Mr. MOTTLEY:
You are wrong, What I have risert on is to say that the hon. member has misquoted me. What did I say about X-ray examinations! The people whose are the people, who cannor pey and, in similar circurn stences, the people who can pay are the people who do not go in other words, we gas more people going to x-ray examinations who cannot pay for them then these who can pay.

I hope the hon. member did not have the appertunity of bearing the reply which the Hon. Minister gave in reply to me. The Hon. Minister himself admitted what was hap-pening at the Hospital in this respace as regards persons who could pay and that there was not a question of having an emergency for X-ray examinations.

Mr. WALOOTT:
The hon. member has baited the Min-ister into a trip, but the Hon. Minister is a much mounager member in politics than I am. The hon, senise member for the Cit beited the Hon. Minister who fell into the traps which he set for him.

What I do say Even as regards what the hon. member said not age in ensper to me, I do not subseribe to these sort of statements as regards you saying that people came to you and told you se I doubt very much that the peo-ple who are sent are the people who canont pay. As a rest-ter of fact, I belive that many of these statements are exaggerated. They try to bring out certain things against certain people. The Hon. Minister said that the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is a new institution and it has now started.

I promise, the hon. member that I would not say any-thing more, but I cannot subscribed to the view of anyone trying to pull down these institutions which were cteated to be places for discipline, and your castigating the indi-viduals in them based on information which you have re-ceived from other people. You must have impartial inves-tigations but not by me or by any other hon. member com-ing into the House and making Statements. I can roise a matter, but I cannot investigate it. The hon. senier member for the City raised this matter and it was directed against one doctor or two; but it was personal. If other

hon. mem-bers in this Chamber are afraid to say so, I am not afraid. The one doctor against whom these criticlisms wre raised is in my view one of the best Specialists at the Hospital, and he is comparable to say other Specialist in the West Indies, What I would be tempted to say now, I would not say because the hon. member has left his sestand it would be unfair to say it behind his back. Therefrom, I prefer to say it on an occasion, when the hon. member is in the seat.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for allowing me the oppor-tunity to make these, comments.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The question is that this Resolution do now pass. Hon. members in favoun will please say \"Aye\" hon. members against will please say \"No\", Methings the \"Noes\" have it.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that I intervened when the Hen. Meyer of the Resolution asked leave to withdraw the Resolution by virtue of the fact that I had a perfect right to speak. However, I have not make any motion.

Mr. WALCOTT; Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I did not object to leave being granted to withdraw the motion. I said; \"Before Leave is being granted, as I had not spoken, I would orave Your Honour\'s indulgence Speak,\" I did not object to leave being granted. All it meant was that I was craving the opportunity to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER Was there say subsequent request after the original request?

Mr, WALCOTT:

Sir, you will have to take it that the hon. member;s motion was to withdraw the Resolution. The hon. member gave notice of that request. It was not ques-tion of my objecting. I did not object to leave to withdraw

the motion; I was asking for title indulgence to speak before the motion was put for leave to withdraw the Resolution.

Mr. LYNCH Mr, Speaker, I beg for leave to withdraw the motion.

. Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. junior member for the City has asked for leave on behalf of his colleague for the City for this Resolution to be withdrawn. If there is no objection, leave will be granted to the hen. Member. (A pause.)

There being so-objection, leave is granted the hon. member and the Resolution is deemed to be withdrawn, 4.15 p.m.

ORDERS POSTPONED

Mr. SPEAKER:

The next Order of the Dry under Private Member\'s Business stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter. To move the Third Reading of a Bill to authorize George Sngarman to extend and en-larege a parcel of land between Sand Street and the sea in the parish of St. Peter. That matter has been referred to a select Committee.

The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. junior member fort St. Philip. That is to move the Third Reading of a Bill to authorize the Southern District Council to pay Percival Easeome\'s gratuity and pension. That also is in the hends of a Select Committee.

The next Order stands- in the name of the hon. junior member for Chris Church. That is to move the Third Reading of a Bill to authorise Grace Taylor to errect a groyne and Seawalls at Four Aces, Dover, Christ Church, Likewise, that matter is in the bands of a Select Committee.

The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. Junior member for St. George:- To move the passing of a Resolution requesting a grant from Government to the Local Weight-Litting Association. I observe that the hon. member is not instantly in his place.

The next Order stands in the name of the hon. senior member for the City:- To move the passing of a Resolution relating the Customs (Amendment) Regulations, 1963. I observe that, likewise, the hon. member is not in his place.

RESOLUTION re ESTABLISHMENT OF CENTRES IN RURAL AREAS TO ASSIST

SMALL HOLDERS

Mr. WEAKER:

The next Order of the Day, which is Order No. 7, stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas- To move the passing of a Resolution rela-ting to the establishment of Centres in rural areas to enable small holders to dispose of their crops.

Mr. BATSON:

Mr. Speaker, 1 have observed that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture is not now in his place, and I am wondering if it would be unkind to move the passing of this Resolution in the absence of the Hon. Minister. I would like to proceed with the Resolution, but the Hon. Minister is not in his place. (After a Panse). However, Sir, I am going to proceed with this Resolution. Sir, this Resolution is a rather simple one. If is so simple that if any hon. mem-ber of this Chamber should vote against it, he would not be fulfilling the purpose for which he was sent to this Chamber. I do not think that this is any controversial issue. The text of the Resolution is as follows-

WHEREAS the smallholders of land in the ruralareas do experience much hardship in disposing of their produce profitably in the City of Bridgetown;

AND WHEREAS the major portion of the money they get is used for transporting the said Crops to the Marketing Corporation;

BETT RESOLVED that Government explore the possi-bility of establishing Centres in the rural areas, thus

enabling the smallholders in getting a better return for their crops.

Mr. Speaker, in travelling around the country, it is rather appalling to see the number of smallholders who are going to and fro and to Bridgetown in order to dispose of their produce. I believe that, as a representative of the people in this Chamber, it is my duty to draw this matter to the attention of the Government. Many of these smallholders of land can ill afford the amount of expenditure which they have to provide in selling their crops. At times the Marketing Corporation rejects some of the produce of these smallholders and that rejection is sometimes in the form of a major loss to these small holders. They use their money for the transportation of their produce and sometimes they have to return home with the produce. Some of these people lose a whole day\'s work in that process. I feel that these smallholders should be allowed everlastingly to sell their wares without anybody having to come to their rescue. 1 feel that this occasion is most opportune for these smallholders to be represented and be taken care of. Sometimes these smallholders do not know the commodities which the Marketing Corporation would be purchasing and there is, therefore, a lack of information as to the Item which would be most required, and therefore they have to experiment and gamble when they wend their way to Bridgetown..

Mr. Speaker, I do not think it would be asking the Government too much to establish centres in these rural areas. It is not necessarily a question of establishing these centres in all the parishes, but establish them in the best available places, so that the kind of produce which is required by the Marketing Corporation could be easily transported. The type of transportation for this produce is somewhat limited because people are unable to transport their entire amount of produce by the buses. The owners of these buses do charge exorbitant fares; but if the Government could initiate a policy of allowing their trucks to go to these centres and collect the produce of these smallholders, that would ease the financial burden and tension of these people considerably. I do not think that it is beyond the ability of the Government to permit their trucks to go to these various established centres and collect their produce from these people. That will go a long way in ameliorating the suffering of these people. It is true that the Marketing Corporation collects its produce, but the Corporation is not operating on a schedule whereby the smallholders are aware of the time of the collection of this produce. If the Government could place posters at these centres advertising that in a way that the people would be familiar with it, that, to my mind, would serve a useful purpose. I do not think that the markets in Bridgetown and in the country districts provide people with the type of information they require in disposing of their goods. Sometimes a dozen or more persons will sell the same item, and when people go to the Marketing Corporation for similar items, they find that these items are not there. That, in a large measure is responsible for the people not utilising the advantages which should be derived by selling their produce to the Marketing Corporation in a wholesale way, and they are therefore forced to go to the markets around so as to dispose of their produce. If a system were established so as to enlighten the people of the produce which is required, then they would know what they should plant. They would know if the Marketing Corporation requires tomatoes and other commodities and they would plant these commodities so as to suit the requirements. but as the position now is, the people in the country are at a loss to know what is mostly required by the Marketing Corporation. I believe that it is the intention of the Government to go to the rescue of these people. 4.25 p.m.

The Government is in my opinion very enthusiastic about the establishment of these centres, because

this is a matter that has been long overdue, and should have been implemented long ago, and the people in the country have been looking forward to it with a feeling of expectancy for some time, as it would be in keeping with the problems that confront these smallholders right now. By having these centres established, Mr. Speaker, the Government would be better able to make their selection. They would not have

to wait until these smallholders come to town to sell their wares and in some cases people sympathise with them and purchase a small portion, and then the remaining portion is returned and they are unable in some cases to dispose with them. Even if they are fortunate to dispose with, them, the margin of profit is very small, and when it is such, these people live with a very uneasy spirit. You know what it is, Sir, to have a small kitchen garden, having your crops well attended from a slender income and then to meet with a mishap in trying to get rid of the items. That is something that should be taken into consideration. Then too, some of the members of this House represent rural parishes and are often approached on this matter.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am afraid the time for Private Member\'s Business has now expired, and the House will proceed to the Orders of the Day under Government Business, the first of these being to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Island.

Hon. J. G. TUDOR:

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1965-66 No. 17

Head 24 - Premier - Cabinet and General - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, under Item 11 - Ex-gratia payment for compensation, hon. members will see from the explanatory note what this is all about. Mr. Stanley Rice who was a Security Officer during the construction of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital died at the Barbados General Hospital in early January last year as a result of injuries on 5th January last year while on duty.

Mr. Rice at the time of his death was not supposed to be entitled to Workmen\'s Compensation, and as an ex-gratia

payment the Government has decided to ask this Committee to grant $900 to his widow on compassionate grounds in view of the circumstances surrounding his death. Hon. members

may even recall that the circumstances surrounding his death was a matter for the Supreme Court of this Island. However the point is that he was not entitled to Workmen\'s

Compensation and we are asking for the sum of $900 to be

granted so that we can give his widow as an ex-gratia payment on compassionate grounds.

I beg to move that Head 24 - Premier - Cabinet and

General - stand part.

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

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

Head 31 - Printing Office - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Chairman, hon. members will see that Item 21 in the current Estimates makes provision for overtime payment in the Printing Office. The sum of $5,000 has been voted and we are now asking for Supplementary provision of $7,000. This is required to meet the additional costs for the current financial year resulting from the revision of overtime rates which became effective from 1st April, 1965.

I beg to move that Head 31 - Printing Office - stand part.

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

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

Head 41 - Ministry of Trade and Labour - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Chairman under Item 9 - Compensation and Charges under Workmen\'s Compensation Act 1943, supplementary provision of $7,600 is required. Two Government employees, Mr. Ralph Walthe and Mr. Clyde Daisley died as a result of accidents and the Govern. ment has become liable for the payment of Workmen\'s Compensation, amounting to $7,622. This is of course due to their dependants, and the Resolution therefore seeks supplementary provision of $7,600.

1 beg to move that Head 41 - Ministry of Trade and Labour - stands part.

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

Mr. WALCOTT:
Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that this matter has arisen in the Government itself so that I can raise this matter. You will remember that when we were amending the Workmen\'s Compensation Act, I pointed out to the Government then that the state should take over Workmen\'s Compensation. We are passing a Resolution now for $7,600 to pay two men who died as a result of accidents because the Government does not pay any money to insurance for Workmen\'s Compensation, but the Government acts as its own insurer and now will pay the full value of $7,600 for these two men. 4.35 p.m.

Now, Sir, 1 Would like to draw to the attention of the House that although the Government is paying out $7,600 in Workmen\'s Compensation it comes out of the taxpayers\' money; therefore, the Government can deal with it. This is unlike a firm or an individual paying out this money because the insurance company would be paying it out.

This is what I would like to draw to the attention of the Government. I know that the Government has under consid-eration a scheme for Social Security; but while the grass is growing, a lot of money is thrown away and it should be investigated. Thousands of dollars which we cannot afford to lose are thrown away in insurance premiums. A considerable portion of money leaves this country by way of insurance premiums.

Another thing which the people in this Island have got to realize is that they have to insure the people who work for them. 1 am in the industrial sector every day. We can employ a staff to carry out this function and make every employer insure his employees. I think that the present rates of insurance which we have in Barbados are wrong because they are based on the incidence of accidents. It takes a lot more to insure a man who is working on a plantation. There are 20,000 plantation workers, and I think that when you take the whole lot of them, you can spread them over the whole lot of other workers and you will find that the other line of workers would prove not so burdensome. Let the man who works on a plantation pay a little more, and the man who works in the dock pay a little less.

I say this. Every employer in Barbados ought to pay workmen.\' compensation for every employee of his according to the Act. We in this Island must get efficient like peo~ ple in big countries. We must get down to business and must not entertain any longer this type of inefficiency. There are lots of employers emplying people and trying to get off paying insurance for Workmens\' Compensation. You will find that these people insure their properties as high as ever, and they do not insure their employees against falling off a ladder; therefore, their property is valued higher than the human element. You can go to any of these business places and find that the business is insured, but the people who are employed are not insured and the employer is hoping to chance that something does net happen to the worker. If something happens to the employee, you find the employer asking an insurance company to back date insurance for him or the employer getting a death certificate of the worker to show that he died after he was insured. The legal boys then have to do the legal manoeuvres to justify the wrongs.

I am very serious about these matters, and I hope the Government would take me as serious as I am, because Workmens\' Compensation can be a vital pillar in our Social Security Scheme. There are about 80,000 people employed in Barbados; therefore, you can get some conception of the money which you

would be able to get in from that source. If that is the labour forcein Barbados, it would give you an indication of what you should get in and I would like to see this Government coming on the 1st January, 1966 with the machinery to implement this.

I also hope that now there is a new Minister of Labour, Workmens\' Compensation according to the Act would be run by the Government. I find that we in Barbados like to talk too much and do too little. The Workmen\'s Compensation Act was passed in 1943, and Workmens. Compensation is still being run by private insurance companies. Also the majority of people are not insured and lots of workers are going on Jobs when they are not insured. Therefore when something takes place, we get employers begging insurance companies to take out insurance for them.

I would like to see the Government bringing in a Workmens\' Compensation Scheme for everybody. If a national scheme was to be put into effect by Government where nobody is exempted from putting money into the scheme, it would mean that the scheme would be built up based on the number of people who you have. Now that we have raised the level of Workmens\' Compensation and the death benefits, I think I would be failing in my duty if I did not mention this.

I would like also to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister that I think a proper investigation should be carried out by the Government into the incidence of accidents. I am not satisfied about an accident which took place at Hay-mans factory recently where four people lost their lives. I still believe that factory inspection is below what it should be, and I still believe that we are working on a hit-or-miss basis. A lot of things could stop. You should stop this running board business on buses. You should make it illegal for women to work on any bus where they have to struggle across a running board. The days for that are over because too many excuses are brought up when people lose their lives.

Mr. Chairman, you have a member addressing the Chair and immediately besides him are honourable members carrying on a loud conversation.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. member is asking hon. members to desist from interrupting him.

• Mr. WALCOTT:
Sir, if they go on, I will disturb them so badly that they will go outside. When they are speaking so loudly, it shows that they are not interested in the debate and they should leave. At another time, they would say that they are interested in the debate. Now something is discussed in their interest, they are keeping as much noise as if I am an intruder.

1 feel that this question of Workmens\' Compensation as regards accidents taking place in factories should be investigated. An investigation should be made in circumstances surrounding those poor people who lost their lives at Hay-man\'s factory. Prior to that, some man was left in a boiler and was boiled down like syrup at the Spring Hall sugar factory. 4.45 p.m.

These gross acts of negligence cannot go on being unnoticed. I do not know what the powers of the Labour De~ partment are as regards Inspection, but if this thing had happened in England, this particular company might have been charged with criminal negligence in that a man is left in a boiler to boil like syrup and nobody could give any explanation to the effect that the factory had been started and that a

man was in there. That was a man who was put in there to work. The thing was so badly supervised that a man is put to do a Job which people do not like to do. Then you talk about automation. When a man comes out of a centrifugal he looks like a rat; but they want to have automation

for the jobs which people do not like to do. When it comes to a job like this, you find that a man is left in a factory and boiled; but when it is a question of soot going on somebody\'s floor, all the legal giants are brought together for the purpose of obtaining an injunction.

Unfortunately, the Labour Department does not seem to be able to institute any prosecutions in these matters. Under the Ontario Act, not only is the Board paying out the money, but they will investigate the nature of the accident. We would prefer people to die from natural causes, and if there is an accident it must be one which is pure and simple. There are some shoddy work methods in this island where the legislation must be tightened up so as to protect the workmen, and these things must be brought to the attention of the Government. It should be queried if anybody was to see that the man came out of this place when he should have come out.

Here we say that Workmens\' Compensation was paid into the Court and that is the end of it. A similar thing happened at Hayman\'s factory where four people were killed. From what I have said about this matter, I hope the Government will see the urgency of effecting state control as soon as possible. I do not think that we should lose any time in implementing these things, especially from what we said today about hospitalization. We should have the means at our disposal to meet these costs. I feel that Workmens\' Compensation should help in meeting many of the social legislation cases because in this cocial legislation we need security for the injured and we should have protection for the individual in all walks of social endeavour.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Chairman, I have heard the strictures levelled by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, in relation to this matter, and 1 should like to say that I am equally distressed over the complete lack of any sense of humanitarianism among the employing classes of this country. I agree that it is the duty of a Labour Department to ensure that a safe system of work is provided for all workers who work in dangerous trades and occupations. I feel that they are more concerned over petty matters which have no relevance to life and liberty than they are over the circumstances of persons who suffer fatal accidents. This Government has considerably increased the benefits received under Workmens\' Compensation. Prior to 1962 or 1963 when we managed to get this Bill passed. I would like to remind the hon. senior member for St. Peter that we would have had this legislation passed as far back as 1955 when I introduced the Bill; but if it had not been for one of the/representatives of St. Peter in the then Government Party, who was occupying the Chair.....

Mr. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The hon. Premier is referring to me, and saying that some Bill which he would have like passed was not dealt with and 1 was the Speaker of the House at the time, It was pointed out to me that that Bill would have created a charge on the Treasury and I considered it to be out of order for any private member of the House to introduce a Bill of that nature. I thought that I acted as I should have acted in my position of serious responsibility as Speaker of the House at that time.

I was not controlled by any Party. I was a member of a Party, but Party considerations played no part in my consideration of the matter at that time. I was informed that only a Member of the Government Party could introduce a Bill which would create a charge on the Treasury.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Chairman, I have listened very carefully to the hon. member. He said that he was Speaker of the House, which is known, and he also said that he was a member of the then Government Party, which is also known. He said that he acted on advice which was given to him, but he did not act on the advice of the Fourth Clerk at the Table in the House of Commons or on that of any other constitutional lawyer. He acted on the advice of the then Premier of Barbados, who came over and told him not to allow me to debate the Bill. I will allow the hon. member to speak in Committee. All these people have to be smoked out, and this is another illustration of some people\'s aspirations standing in the way of other people.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Chairman.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Chairman, did the hon. mem-ber rise on a point of order?

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I was listening to hear the point of order. 4.55 p.m.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

On a point of order.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I will listen to the point of order.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Did the hon. member rise on a point of order?

Mr. HUSBANDS:

The hon. member has again this time in no mistaken terms deliberately said that I listened to the advice of the then Premier and made my ruling accordingly. I here and now deny that, and I again say that the advice 1 listened to was absolutely non-partisan. I am saying for myself that the advice I then took was absolutely non-partisan and I challenge the then Premier or any member of his then Government to say otherwise.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Chairman. as 1 was saying, If you look at the records of the House, you will find that that Bill had been on the Order Paper for a considerable number of months; but in those days under the Speakership of the hon. member, non-Government members - in other. words, private members - were not allowed the privilege which they say they do not get now under a dictatorship, and therefore it was a number of months before it came up on the Order Paper. Now if the hon. member were concerned about the constitutional propriety of the introduction of such a measure by private members of the House, the time for him to set about investigation is the date when that Bill is presented to him. and not eight or nine

months later. and I am saying that when I got up to move the first reading and the second reading of the Bill in 1955 to increase Workmen\'s Compensation. Mr. Grantley Adams rose and told the hon. member not to allow me to debate this Bill. I protested; and the Speaker, as he then was, adjourned the matter for two weeks and came back and said that he had been advised after all those months that such a Bill imposed a charge on the Treasury of this Island. I wrote to the Fourth Clerk at the Table and he said that such a Bill was not a money Bill and imposed no charge upon the Treasury of this Island. To show what a dastardly act.....

Mr. HUSBANDS:
I object to that and ask the hon. member to withdraw that.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:
I am not withdrawing that, I said it was a dastardly act of cowardice on the part of the hon. Junior member for St. Peter against the masses of the people in this Island.

Mr. HUSBANDS:
Mr. Chairman, I have asked the hon. member to withdraw that reference to me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
I am appealing to the hon. Junior member for St. Peter. I will give you an opportunity to speak.

Mr. HUSBANDS:
Mr. Chairman, a word has been used reflecting on me who am a member of this Committee and of the House of Assembly, and 1 ask you to ask the Hon. Premier to withdraw that word.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
What is the word of which the hon. member is complaining?

Mr. HUSBANDS:
The hon. member said that it was a dastardly act on my part.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:
I said it was a dastardly act of cowardice on you as Speaker then, not now.

Mr. HUSBANDS:
The hon. member is saying so now. and I am asking you to have that withdrawn. It is going on

die records now, and it is going to be published in the debates now.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
If the hon. Junior member for St. Peter will sit, I will explain to him. The Hon. Premier has Just prefaced.....

Mr. HUSBANDS:
Mr. Chairman, you are Chairman of this Committee and you are responsible for decorum in here. The hon. member referred to an act on my part as dastardly, and I am asking you to have the Hon. Premier

withdraw those words now.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. Junior member for St. Peter is asking that the words be withdrawn. Is the Hon. Premier willing to change the words.

Mr. HUSBANDS:
I am asking him to withdraw the words.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:
Mr. Chairman, Just let us be calm on this matter. I want to repeat what I said and I want to repeat it so that there would be no mistake at all. 1 said it was a dastardly act of cowardice committed by the hon. member at that time as Speaker. The hon. member accepts that as what I said.

Mr. HUSBANDS:
Is the hon. member saying that I accept something?

Hon. E, W. BARROW:
What are the words I am supposed to withdraw?

Mr. HUSBANDS:
It was a dastardly act of cowardice on my part as Speaker then.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
I am asking the hon. member to take his seat. I will listen to the Hon. Premier now, and afterwards I will deal with the issue.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:
Mr. Chairman, I am not going to leave this issue, and I will repeat it seventy-five times if necessary because I want no mistake to be made. I know who my friends are and who are my enemies, and I know who are masquerading as my friends. I made a statement which the hon. member is asking me to withdraw, and you will have to check with May\'s Parliamentary Procedure on it if I say that ten years ago a dastardly act of cowardice was committed by him in his capacity as Speaker at that time. He is not Speaker now; so it is no reflection on the hon. member now.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
The Chair has to decide that.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:
I am only going by the Rules; so it is not for him or the arsonists around him to make the ruling. It is not for the self-confessed arsonists to rule it is for the Chair to rule, and I will abide by the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. HUSBANDS:
I am asking the hon. member to withdraw those words about the arsonists around me in Parliament.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. junior member for St. Peter is creating confusion in this Chamber.

Mr. HUSBANDS:
It is the Hon. Premier who is creating confusion.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:
I am warning him about the arsonists around him.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
I am listening to the Hon. Premier now and I will deal with the issue afterwards. I am appealing to the hon. member to sit and wait.

Mr. HUSBANDS:
I will sit and wait long.

Mr. BARROW:
As I was saying, I have made . statement, I have repeated die statement several times, and I

am prepared to repeat it again. The hon. member has objected to that statement. What I am submitting is that if you are in doubt as to whether the statement I made is unparliamentary, you can consult the Clerk who is legal adviser to the Chair in this Chamber, and therefore when you have been properly advised, you can rule and I will act in accordance with the wishes of the Chair. If you are in a position to rule, you can rule now. 5.05 p.m.

1 am submitting with all due respect that if I say somebody committed a dastardly act - somebody meaning the hon. junior member for St. Peter and anybody else - because he committed the act ten years ago, there are other things which he may commit too.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
I would like to remind the hon. mem-ber.....

Mr. WALCOTT:
Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I am making this appeal to the Hon. Premier. In view of the fact that the hon. junior member for St. Peter is still a member of the House and a sitting member at present, anything which you say, even if it were something which happened ten years ago, must reflect on him now and not only then. I would appeal to the Hon. Premier to withdraw those remarks and let us get on. We must not play into the hands of bait-catchers. If I were the Premier, 1 would not give the hon. junior member for St. Peter this type of bait.

I appeal to the Hon. Premier to see that those words reflect on the hon. junior member for St. Peter and to see that if those remarks reflected on him then, they also reflect on him now.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:
I have been searching matters and I cannot find a single precedent saying that if certain comments were made on a person for certain acts done in the past, they are applicable today. The Prime Minister of

Great Britain Mr. Harold Wilson last year referred to the member for Smethwick as a political leper in Parliament and the Speaker of the House of Commons did not deem it unparliamentary. Therefore. if the hon. junior member for St. Peter has begged me to withdraw that remark. I withdraw it and say that he is a parliamentary leper. That remark was used by the Prime Minister of Great Britain in Parliament and it was not deemed unparliamentary. In the absence of precedent, I would say that it was branded on him for all times and for posterity that he is a parliamentary leper.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I did not hear the Hon. Premier\'s substitution and I would like you to inform me what was the substitution. I would have to ask the Hon. Premier, if the substitution is in any way a reflection on me, to withdraw that too. I did not hear words. Since I did not hear them, I am asking you if in your opinion they are unparliamentary, to remind me of those words.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

The hon. member cannot ask the Chair if there are certain words which were said of him that were unparliamentary. He has to object and he has to object instantaneously.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

I am asking the Hon. Premier to repeat the words which he said in substitution since I did not hear them.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I am appeaking to the hon. junior member for St. Peter to let us get on with the Resolution.

Mr. HUSBANDS. No, Sir. I am appealing to the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Will the hon. Junior member take his seat. (Mr. Husbands sat down.) The hon. junior member for St. Peter cannot compel the Hon. Premier to repeat anything.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

I am asking that the words be read by the Clerk.

Mr. WALCOTT:

I rise on a point of order. The hon. junior member for St. Peter is now making this thing look very ridiculous because if he had not heard, he is at fault. He cannot ask for something to be read; he has missed the boat. You cannot ask for words to be taken down which you have not heard you can only ask for words which you have heard to be taken down. You cannot turn this House into a burlesque.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

The record will contain the remarks. Mr. Chairman, we are in Committee now. 1 was paying attention, but 1 did not hear the exact words which the Hon. Premier substituted. Suppose those words are nearly as bad as those withdrawn, I do not know. 1 was in my place all the time, and if I do not object to those words and those words were just as bad as those which were withdrawn, I would be made to look very simple indeed.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. member cannot object to what he did hot hear.

Mr. HUSBANDS:
Mr. Chairman, get it straight as 1 am giving it to you. I repeat myself. I would be in a very invidious position if I am in this Committee, and the hon. Premier in purporting to make a withdrawal of certain words. substituted something equally as serious.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. junior member for St. Peter cannot say that what is substituted is equally as bad because he has not heard the words.

Mr. HUSBANDS:
Therefore, 1 ask that the Hon. Premier repeat those words.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
You cannot ask the Hon. Premier to repeat anything.

Mr. HUSBANDS:
Will the Hon. Premier, in doing what he knows is fair, repeat those words?

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
I am appealing to the hon. junior member for St. Peter to let us get on with the Resolution because you have not heard the words.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:
I can assure the hon. junior member for St. Peter that the words which I have used were perfectly parliamentary because they have been used by no less a person than the Rt. Hon. Harold Wilson, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, in relation to the member for Smethwick, and the Chair has not found that those words were unparliamentary. That was in England. We have to abide by the Custom and Usage of the Imperial Parliament, in absence of precedent. Some previous member of parliament used those words, and the Speaker did not deem them unparliamentary. 5.15 p.m.

I am sure that they are not unparliamentary words. Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
I will listen to the point of order.

Mr. HUSBANDS. Whether the hon. member\'s reference to me is parliamentary or not, the words I used would be a compliment to him.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:
I thank the hon. member for the compliment; as far as I am concerned, that is quite all right. I congratulate the hon. member on being able to repeat what the hon. Junior member for St. George has been able to tell him. The hon. member is a trouble-maker in this House. I accept anything which he says is a compli-ment.

Mr. MILLER:
Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The hon. member on my left, the hon. junior member for St. Peter, needs no advice from me. He readily fits in with any problem; he can take care of himself.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:
Mr. Chairman, I will now demonstrate to the hon. member my authority as to the ruling which he gave. I asked the Fourth Clerk at the Table in the House of Commons whether it would be considered that a Bill to increase the amount payable to dependants of workmen under the provision of the Workmen\'s Compensation Act would be considered as a Bill which imposes a charge on the Treasury. The answer which I got back from the Fourth Clerk at the Table in the House of Commons is that in the United Kingdom such a Bill would not have been so considered. The Fourth Clerk at the Table in the House of Commons advised me to seek the advice of the Clerk at this Table on the matter if I was in any doubt about such a matter. I was in no doubt at all about it. I am saying that the hon. member, who was Speaker at the time, did not consult all the legal advice of the Chamber at the time.

Mr. HUSBANDS:
That is not true.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:
Both of the Clerks are here.

Mr. HUSBANDS:
I say that that is not true.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:
Well, the hon. member said that both Clerks were consulted.

Mr. HUSBANDS:
I did not say so; I said that that is not true.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:
Then neither was consulted.

Mr. HUSBANDS:
The hon. member said that I did not consult either of the Clerks at the Table and I replied that is not true.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:
The hon. member is saying that he consulted either one or the other or both of the Clerks. When I said that he consulted one of them, he said that that is not true, and when I said that he consulted both of them, he also said that is not true.

Mr. WALCOTT:
On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, this sort of behaviour does not become one who was the Speaker of this House. The hon. member is jumping up all the time and saying that what the Hon. Premier has

said is not true. I am submitting that the hon. member can speak when the Hon. Premier is finished speaking. If the hon. member were in the Chair, he would not have allowed any hon. member to get up like that.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Chairman, I want to get this thing clear on the record. The hon. member said that when he ruled that the Bill which I introduced for the purpose of giving increased compensation to the dependents of workers was out of order, it is not true to say he did not consult the Clerks at the Table in this House. I consulted the Fourth Clerk at the Table in the House of Commons and 1 showed the letter to the Clerk of this Assembly. Because he is the Fourth Clerk at the Table it does not mean that he is No. 4

in order and he does not know anything about this matter. Which one of the Clerks, I would like to ask, did the hon. member consult? He says it is not true to say that he did not consult them and, of course, he does not want to embarrass either of the Clerks. The hon. member was wrong when he contended that the introduction of a Bill by a private member for increasing the amount of workmen\'s compensation for a workman who was fatally injured or suffered physical damage, would create a charge on the Treasury Let me, as a lawyer and a member of this House with some experience in this matter, say this. The hon. member said that he acted on the advice of his advisers; he said that he was given certain advice or that he had certain advisers to advise him but it took him two weeks in order to give a ruling on the matter. His ruling was that a person, who is not a member of the Government, cannot introduce a Bill which imposes a charge on the Treasury. Therefore. Sir acting in your capacity, you could not bring forward a Bill in this House in order to vote money out of the Treasury to include the repairing of the roads in St. Thomas, much as you would like to do that. Such a Bill would have to be i\" troduced by the Government; but any member could come in here and introduce a Bill to increase the amount of

Workmen\'s Compensation, And it is the employers that the hon. member would be protecting, not the Government. We have had to come down to this House with a Resolution to provide a gratuity because the Government of Barbados does not insure its workmen. That is the answer to it. The Government is not under any obligation to pay one penny to any person who is injured or who suffers any fatal accident during the course of the employment of that person. The hon, member is like a bantam cock Jumping all over the place; he cannot keep quiet. In the case of the hon. Junior member for Christ Chuch, if anybody gets injured in his hotel, automatically he has to pay money into the court. The members of the Cabinet were shocked to realise that a policeman who had his fingers bitten off in the execution of his duties did not have any compensation for that injury. 5.25 p.m.

Furthermore every single case in which a policeman had been injured in the course of his duty during the past twenty years must now be done-up, and this man over there ••••••••

Mr. HUSBANDS:

I object to that. Who is this man over there? Mr. Chairman, the hon. member pointing to me said, \"this man over there.\"

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I am in the Chair, and I am tolerating no more nonsense from the hon. junior member for St. Peter.

Mr. HUSBANDS:
On a point of order, the hon. member pointing to me said \"this man over there.\"

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. member was addressing the Chair. The hon. member is creating confusion.

Mr. HUSBANDS Mr. Chairman, I object to the hon. member referring to me as \"this man over there.\"

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
There is nothing to object to and that is my ruling. The hon. junior member for St. Peter was Speaker of this House, and it is disgraceful that he does not know the Rules. The Hon. Premier was addressing the Chair and not the hon. Junior member for St. Peter. The hon. junior member for St. Peter was never referred to. Is the hon. member objecting to the pointing of a finger?

Mr. HUSBANDS:
Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. Will you hear my point of order?

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
I will listen to the point of order.

Mr. HUSBANDS:
The Hon. Premier was speaking when he pointed his finger to me and said \"this man over there\", and I saw it. I object to this reference to me, and I am within my rights.

Mr. Chairman, I hear the voice of strangers, and if I draw it to your attention, you will have to clear the gallery. They are only here on tolerance.

I have told you, Mr. Chairman, that the Hon. Premier, pointing to me said \"this man over there\", and I object to those words and ask to have them withdrawn.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
In my opinion there is nothing to object to.

Mr. HUSBANDS Any normal person would know whom he means.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
I cannot follow that.

Mr. HUSBANDS is it alright if I said that this man over there must sit down and keep quiet?

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
Will the Hon. Premier continue his address?

Hon. E. W. BARROW:
Has the hon. member for St. Peter finished his interruptions? There is an expression in

Barbados •••••••••• The hon. member wants noticing! (Mr.

WALCOTT:

He is unimportant.) I am talking about principles, and when we have such flagrant breaches of the ethics of Parliament, I must draw attention to the fact that the people in this country have suffered as a result, and it was the hon. Junior member for St. Peter who was bringing your attention to the downright callousness of the employing class in this country who have failed to provide a safe means of work. If they were in the United Kingdom, they would be prosecuted for criminal negligence. It is not only a failure on their part under the law of civil negligence to provide a safe system of work; it is a complete indifference and callousness on the part of the employers of this Island who spend a \'lot of money on their own organization, but do not see that there are safe systems of work provided for their workers, and it is the duty of the Labour Department to see that such a system is provided.

I would like to give a little bit of gratuitous advice to the hon. senior member for St. Peter, and I will come back to the hon. junior member for St. Peter because he wants noticing. The hon. member must allow me to speak without interruption unless he is on a point of order. The hon. senior member for St. Peter should see that his Trade Union employs people who are interested in the working classes. You cannot represent the masses and the classes at the same time in this country; therefore I am saying very seriously that down at Hayman Factory and Springhall and at the Barbados Distilleries these employers should have been sued for breaches of statutory duty and the Court has authority under the Workmen\'s Compensation Act, provided the case is lodged within twelve months, to award the full amount of Workmen\'s Compensation which we have introduced under the law, if the court finds that the employer was in breach. Therefore, in every single case where a worker is injured or killed, the employer in my opinion ought to be prosecuted because the worker has nothing to lose, and I am saying that without any fear of contradition, because the quantum of damages awarded for a breach of statutory duty is considerably higher than the amount of Compensation you would get here, in Canada, Australia or any of the other territories where this law prevails.

What I want to do is to expose the behaviour of the former Government on this matter when I was obstructed under the pious expressions of parliamentary ruling given by the hon. junior member for St. Peter from proceeding with a Bill in 1955. His ruling was to the effect that a Bill like this introduced by a private member imposed a charge on Government, and I am saying that if he was incorrect, he may have been misguided; but he is recalcitrant. Incorrigible and incurable in his persistence that he was right, because if that was so, we would not have to come to the Legislature to ask for a Resolution for this sum of money to compensate the relatives and families of these people. It is very simple because every employer has to pay the money into the Court automatically under the Bill, and the Barbados Government does not come under the provisions of the Bill; and up to now, although we are bringing down this Resolution and assessing the quantum of compensation to which they would have been entitled if it had been a private employer, there would have been nothing to prevent our awarding nothing at all. 5.35 p.m.

To treble or quadruple the amount of compensation or to multiply by ten the amount which a private employer would have to pay to a private employee is not an obligation by the Act. There is a legal sanction. Policemen are specifically excluded from compensation under the Workmens\' Compensation Act and this Government is taking steps to ensure that they are included. If I am wrong and if the hon.

junior member for St. Peter is right to rule against me, all I would say Is that he was tinder pressure at that time because elections were coming up. (A VOICE: What time was that?) That was in 1955 and there was some rumour being mooted abroad that the ex-representative for St. Thomas was going to supplement the hon. junior member for St. Peter. And so you had these politicians in Barbados whose principles are conditioned by their personal position and what is likely to be and is not likely to be. Therefore, I

would be lacking in my duty if 1 did not get up and invoke you to see that we had to introduce this legislation specifically because the Treasury of this Island is not bound to pay one cent.

Every employer because of his obligations had to pay Workmen\'s Compensation, but very few people in Barbados knows that. For instance, there are between 20,000 and 23,000 domestics in Barbados and 1 doubt very much that 2,000 people have ever taken the trouble to go to the insurance companies or to make enquiry at the Labour Department to ensure that they have been insured for Workmen\'s Compensation. When I say domestics, I mean the maids, the nurses, the gardeners, the chauffeurs and all the other people who work around the domestic side for other people. All those people should be insured.

I doubt very much that there are more than 2,000 of them who are insured today. 1 made sure that I was one of the first persons, after the Act was introduced, to go and insure the people who assist my family with the various duties around my house; but 1 doubt very much that more than three hon. members around this table have taken this trouble. Therefore, I advise hon. members, \"You had better set your house in order.\"

The Labour Department is called upon to do what it should have been doing all these years, and we are not at all satisfied that the Labour Department is organised in the way it should be organized - I am not speaking particularly against anyone - because apart from hearing some complaint from some lady in Belleville or the Navy Gardens and recruiting workers to the United States, we do not think that this Department is carrying out any of its obligations.

1, therefore, will not say anymore on that.

I want to stress that the hon. senior member for St. Peter ought to ensure that his Union is properly advised on this matter, and if you employ somebody to give you legal advice see that they give you the proper legal advice. Some of them would mention to you that they are entitled to go to the Supreme Court for this. They have nothing to lose by suing their employers because the Court has a duty to perform. Where there is an order for compensation it has to see to it that compensation is paid to those dependents who are entitled.

In 1955 I drafted a bill for Antigua. That legislation was passed although 1 heard that it was ruled out of order. It was for the sum of $5,000 if death resulted. Here in Barbados this legislation has been kept back from 1955 to 1963 and the people had to sit down and wait all that time. You would not think that the hon. member had the bulk of those people in his hands. There was a case of Mr. Foster at Trio Path and Mrs. Sealy. Her husband was killed in a tar-sand bed way back in 1951-52. The Clerk of this House represented the defendant. The deceased was a man who had about six children and a wife, and the Workmen\'s Compensation at that time was £200; but Mr. Foster spent about £300 resisting the claim.

We won the claim. The children of the deceased have now grown up and are working. Their mother who was young at the time and certainly eligible to be married again, in the twelve or thirteen years which elapsed eventually died of a broken heart. Mr. Foster was not unconnected with the Barbados Labour Party. Up to now that woman has not drawn a single cent although she won the claim because Mr. Foster has not paid one penny of it. Suppose I were like some of the people whom you have practising and had charged that poor woman fees. I would not be able to sleep at night. I would also say for the Clerk of this House who appeared on her behalf that he did not charge her either. At that time there was an identity of leadership between the Barbados Labour Party and the Barbados Workers Union. I wonder if the hon. junior member for St. Peter sleeps at night. However, Sir, I am not concerned if the hon. member chooses to go in court and make statements which are not absolutely correct. I would not be concerned over these things. Aperson goes in Court, and because of the conduct of some witness it is proved that person is a liar. That is not phenomenal to me. In every case in court, you have two different stories. In every single case, you have two

sides. Both sides sometimes may be making misstatements, far less one side; but it does not mean that the side that lost was not speaking the truth, so I am not distressed; that does not worry me. But what will always continue to worry me is that the Colonial system produced people who are so small that they would abuse their constitutional position and deprive people of the just rewards of their labour. I remember that the case of Foster versus Sealy set me thinking by the amount of charity which the lady and her family were given by neighbours and friends. I managed to induce the clerk of the House to assist me in doing this work, and he really did so and that is what set me thinking. And then to come into this Chamber and ask for an increase in Workmen\'s Compensation and to be distracted by people who are of the same class as the workers, that has set me thinking further. 5.45 p.m.

Those are the things which concern me. You can go into the Court and say that my car ran into yours, and not that my car was parked and you ran into me. It is only a question of your conscience. However, when you come to hold up the progress of the people of this island by sheltering under the cloak of constitutional authority, that is a different thing altogether. I would like to enjoin the hon. member to read the Scriptures and see if he is not concerned about the question of storing up treasures on earth. I remem-ber that on the occasion when we lost the hon. Junior member for the City a service was held in memory of him at St. Mary\'s Church - I refer to the late Mr. A. E. S. Lewis of sacred memory - and it was said that if you do right, that is acceptable to God, but if you do wrong you paid for it. You not only had the Almighty God to contend with, but your conscience and the masses of people who were not improved. We must have long memories of these matters because I know that this day would have come. I have had to wait for ten years for this improvement. Even if I had to wait for ten years I knew that the opportunity would have come while the hon. member was still in his place. The very fact that we have to push matters forward now means that we may not be doing it next time; but it had to be done while he was in here.

Another point which I want to make is this. The factory owners and the employers in this country are not providing a safe system for workers. The quarries are not fenced whereas the law says that they should be fenced. There have been so many grouses between employers and domestics that we have not been able to attend to all the things which needed to be attended to first, I have ordered an investigation into the structural organization of the Labour Depart-ment. I have extended the contract in order to allow that to be done. Up to now, we have not had any re-organization, but people\'s lives are at stake. I do not intend to allow this state of affairs to remain any longer. Another point is the failure of the Labour

Department of this country to be organized in a proper way. Their comprehension of their duties leaves a lot to be desired. I have dealt with the Department and the Legislature and now the Trade Union; I want to say that the Trade Union is not going to get anywhere as long as it continues to employ people who are not interested in the work~ ers, but in the employing classes. That is not any criticism of the leadership of the Trade Union; that is probably a kind of ingenuousness on their part to think that any person who is engaged in the profession of law could represent both sides at the same time. Sir Stafford Cripps and the people of that kind could not do it; you cannot have persons representing everybody at the same time. It is not like medicine where you take out somebody\'s appendix, and all you set is the person\'s organs and the rest is covered with a sheet. Where sociological issues are at stake, a man has got to make up his mind as to where he stands on these issues, but in industrial matters you have to be a Trade Union lawyer or a Company lawyer. You cannot be both at one and the same time. The Government and the Trade Union have to put their houses in order, and the Department and the employees also have to put their houses in order. If we have not carried out a re-organization of this Department, it does not mean that we have not got the material with which to enforce these provisions through the lack of observance by which people are losing their lives year after year. We have four people today, and you do not know how many there will be at Bulkeley next year, and all you do is to put on

your black suit as a representative of this House and say, you was there at the funeral for people to see, 5.55 p.m.

1 would hate anyone reading the debate to think that I had become affected by the syntactical errors of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph which can be contagious. The amount now is $7,622 for Mr. Waithe and Mr. Daisley. When I got up, I said I was making a swift calculation of what the families and relatives of these two workers would have got either from Government paying on the same scale or from the private employer, and proportionately I worked out that they would have got together about $1,170; so if the triumph of the hon. Junior member for St. Peter has been complete, the dependants of these workmen could have looked forward to $1,170 tomorrow morning instead of $7,622. There is, however, no amount of monetary compensation, reimbursement or whatever you chose to call it which could compensate for the lost of these workmen; and though we try to assess as accurately as we can all the needs and requirements of the survivors, it is almost impossible to make a mathematical equation in matters of this kind, because no one can calculate what the children of these dependants might lose in future years through not having their fathers\' hands to guide them.

What 1 have said, Sir, might sound serious; but the reason I have said it is that there is a long, slow process, but it is a process of retribution of things revolving and coming around to where they should be in the first place, and it has caught up with some of the hon. members in this House today; so let no hon. member think that he can make a bad ruling or make a mistake and get away with it, because he may not have to wait until the day of judgment. The hon. junior member for St. Peter has had to answer today to the nation/He has had his answer brought to him. 1 regret we had to bring a Resolution arising out of the death of workers who through the negligence of their employers were allowed to go under a vat which was full of boiling liquor with wrenches and spanners, and there was such slack supervision and the bolts were so rotten, that they were boiled to death. I regret it is not $70,000 that the employers are paying. The same owners of Haymans Factory were sooting up the clothes of the inhabitants and the people in Speightstown and the surrounding districts until wealthy people brought an action and they put in soot arresters, and immediately they asked the Government to introduce a Bill in this House to

prevent anybody from bringing an injunction to stop them from pouring ash and soot on anybody\'s clothes. You can go to St. Lucy\'s Parish Church during the crop season, but wear a black suit, black shirt, a black tie, black rubber shoes and black socks or stay home and pray. That is all right; but when weather Research is being done not only to the value of several millions of dollars in the Carlbbean but on the North Atlantic shores and the Eastern seaboard of the United Sates, certain people for their own reasons want to stop that research from being conducted which will revolutionise the whole theory of hurrican forecasting. They say this is an offence against the liberty of the subject and an infrinement of civil liberty. My view is that they can bring as many claims for damages as they like. When Haymans Factory gave off all that soot and people\'s clothes got soot, they said; \"All right; we will give you money to wash them, but you cannot stop the factory from working.\" That is more important to the sugar Industry than the lives of the people in the Eastern Seaboard or the 250.000 people in Barbados. I do not think there is any other question I have to answer on this. I regret that the Union at the time was not properly advised to bring a case of breach of statutory duty or failure to provide a safe system of work against the employers.

I would just like to say that it is also questionable that even in a civil matter the Government would have been liable, because these people were told in one case, as far as I remember definitely to sit down according to the statements which were made by the onlookers. Unfortunately he fell off the lorry. The Government is not going to fight anybody under any juridical niceties or anything like that; the Government will pay. But the Government is under no

obligation to pay, and the hon. Junior member for St. Peter ought to know that; and if he did not know of it, he has had a lesson today, and all I will say to him is go and sin no more, but I will make sure he is never in such a position in this House again to commit such acts of omission or commission.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Chairman, we are on this Resolution in Committee. The hon. senior member for St. Peter was striving to apprise the Government of its responsibility relative to certain shortcomings in their industrial legislation as far as workers and workers in factories and so on are concerned. The Hon. Premier thought it wise to get up and treat in sport the sentiments raised by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, but you can see that the Hon. Premier is very much more concerned with what he thought as regards an action of mine some time ago being an obstruction in the path of the workers who would benefit from Workmen\'s Compensation. 6.05 p.m.

Now, every man and woman in Barbados then and now would know I would never put myself in the way of being an obstructionist to benefits which would accrue to workers. The Hon. Premier could not go anywhere and convince not even my greatest enemy that I was ever such a man. The Hon. Premier said that he spend so much time then to help people of this country. That is not surprising at all.

Now, Sir, I made a Ruling some time ago. I have made it clear that I did not take the advice of any politician at all, whether he was Premier or Chief Minister or whatever title he was, but that I wgs guided by the best advice that was available to me, by my researches into May\'s Parlaiment Procedure and by examining the proposed Bill. That ruling I have seen today and after reading it, I do not think myself disgraced in this community; rather, I feel enhanced. I believe that I would not be given permission to read that Ruling now. I anticipate this. I believe that I would be given permission to read this ruling verbatim, but if I were, 1 would be glad.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
It is not necessary.

Mr. HUSBANDS:
Thank you Mr. Chairman. In fact, I said that I did not think you would allow me to read it. But in making that Ruling 1 made my researches first. Believe you me, anybody who ever sees a copy of that Ruling would see that I referred to Section 2 of the Workmen\'s Compensation Act.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:
Mr. Chairman, I am on a point of order. Is the hon. member reading from a document? If he is, that must be made a document of the House. The hon. member said that he was not going to refer to the Ruling he gave in this House. The only person who reads from documents in this House and get away with it is the hon. junior member for St. George, but we know that hon. member\'s difficulty.

Mr. HUSBANDS:
Mr. Chairman, let me inform the Hon. Premier through you that I have re-read the document today and this is in the document. Under Section 2 of the Workmen\'s Compensation Act 1943-42, anyone who reads that Act will discover that the word \"Employer\" includes Her Majesty in the Government of this colony. This is expressly written in the Act, and that is the first thing which I pointed out. I then further went on to quote from May\'s 15th Edition. I can quote the Chapter because that edition of May\'s is in this Chamber. That is what I was guided by. No Premier came across the floor of the House and told me this. I read that. No Grantley this or that told me that.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:
Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I want the hon. member to be given as much rope as possible. However, he was told what he could not do, but he knew he would be speaking on this and in order to do this he was given notes by the Clerk of the House and the hon. member for St. George and he is reading from those notes. I said that the hon. member\'s Ruling was wrong

then and it has been proved wrong today. But if the hon. member wants to go on, that is a matter for him.

Mr. HUSBANDS:
The Hon. Premier would not be the Premier if he did not make that remark. I was saying to you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee, that no Premier strolled across the floor of the House and told me what to do. What research there was, I did it myself from May\'s. I was accused of having been prompted by some member. If Your Honour reads my Ruling or anybody else, they would see that 1 began and stuck to two points.

Hon. E. W. HARROW:
Mr. Chairman, I am on a point of order. I said when I came to the second reading of the Bill to amend the Workmen\'s Compensation Act- I had moved the first reading of the Bill previously - that when I got up and started to speak, a former member of the House left his seat and went to the Speaker and asked him not . allow me to debate the matter. I protested and the hon. junior member for St. Peter, who was then Speaker, said that he would give a Ruling and he adjourned the matter and would not allow a

debate on it. Therefore, do not allow the hon. member to build up a case that somebody came and told him what ruling to give.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Premier has said that he remembers seeing some personality leave his Chair and come to me, and he heard him tell me something. I have no direct recollection of that and it is my word against his. 1 do not think that anywhere in Barbados his word is more valid than mine or is received anymore. That time has not come yet. I am not making a direct and emphatic statement as he, but I am saying that I do not remember that Sir Grantley Adams left his seat and came to me. I do not remember that. I must use parliamentary language. 6.15 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

On a point of order. The hon. member says that he does not remember; he is getting a little more careful with his language, but I remember and there is no issue between the hon. member and myself. It is not that the hon, member is not speaking the truth. I take it that he does not remember or choose to remember, and so my memory is better than his.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

When the hon. member says that I did not remember or do not choose to remember, I think that he has deliberately chosen to remember; that is all. There is no point of order in that. After consulting May\'s Parliamentary Practice it was made? clear to me that the proposed Bill was out of order. If you, Mr. Chairman, have read that ruling and the reference to that particular paragraph in \"May\'s\", you will see my reference to it. I did not cook up anything; I did that on due reflection after I had made my research. If that is so, how can I then have the finger pointed at me as being the one man in Barbados who had obstructed an increase in Workmen\'s Compensation? In my considered opinion, after looking at Section 2 of the proposed Bill and after consulting May\'s Parliamentary Practice which anybody can read, I gave my reasons for ruling that the proposed Bill was out of order. That is something which I remember distinctly; I do not know if the hon. member would choose to remember this. The then hon. senior member for St. James, Mr. E. K. Walcott, had brought forward a Bill in here. The Government rushed in with another Bill hoping to have precedence over the Bill brought forward by Mr. Walcott and I did not allow it.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I wonder if the hon. member would tell us more about that?

Mr. HUSBANDS:

The records will show it.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Chairman, I am asking what the Bill was about, and the hon. member is telling me that the records of the House will show that. The hon. member allowed a private member to have precedence over a Bill which the Government had brought in. I would say that for once in the hon. member\'s life he has acted reasonably.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Chairman, if there is any suggestion that I was in any way partisan, I am saying that it is Just the

opposite. The hon. member wanted to get something off and I may say that he has a lot to get off. The hon. member is being vindictive and is trying to besmirch me, but my conscience is better than his.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

The hon. member says that I am vindictive, but I would still like to know if the Bill to which he was referring was one for Workmen\'s Compensation. I cannot imagine Mr. E. K. Walcott introducing a Bill against the vested interests in this colony. It might have been a Bill to send a congratulatory telegram to Mussolini.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

The hon. member is paying me a compliment.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

On a point of order. I was saying that the hon. member considers for the workers\' interests, and if the employers\' interests were at stake we would not have had a different Ruling. I do not want to drag on with this debate.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I am appealing to both hon. members to get on with the matter of this Resolution. I think I have given sufficient latitude in this debate and I am drawing it to a close. I do not want to hear anything now but the subject matter of the debate.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Chairman, the sums of money which are contained in this Resolution are for the payment of compensation in respect of certain workers. We will always be in agreement to workers being paid compensation.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

You took a long time to do that.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

You had your time. I was saying, Sir, that a Resolution of this sort I will always support. I want to say that for the whole of my political career I have been voting for Resolutions of this sort. I have listened today . to what the Hon. Premier has said with regard to the responsibility of the Government Department which is known as the Labour Department, and from what he has said, I would like to see the Hon. Minister of Labour tighten up all the Regulations which apply to the safety of workers who are employed in the sugar factories of this island. I have no doubt that every hon. member of this Committee will back the Government one hundred per cent in this matter. This is not any controversial issue, and the part of the debate which has produced any sort of heat was not in any way related to the Resolution. 6.25 p.m.

First and foremost the Hon. Premier has injected seeds of discord, not on the Resolution, but on certain other phases with regard to personalities that he wanted to get off his chest. He has done that. and now he has done that, we all will vote for this Resolution with as much sincerity and ardour as he or any other of his colleagues.

The question that Head 41 - Ministry of Trade and Labour - stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

I - Annexed Estimates - Post Office - was called,

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Chairman, hon. members will see from the explanatory note that provision had been made in the last financial year to meet the cost of supplying the stamps which were originally scheduled to arrive in time to be put on sale on 1st April, 1965. Due to unforeseen cir-cumstances the stamps were not received by 1st April, 1965, and the amount lapsed. Supplementary provision is therefore now required for these expenses to be met in this financial year.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
I beg to second that. The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division,

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Resolution for the sum of $52,085 do now pass.

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. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

to. THE SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1965.

Mr. SPEAKER:
The next Order of the day stands in the name of the Hon. and learned member for St. John, and that is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1956.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:
Mr. Speaker, this is a very short Bill. It seeks to amend the Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1956, in order to make provision in respect of the termination of acting appointments as Judge of the Supreme Court. The new subsection (2) of Section 7 reads as follows-

\"Every such appointment may be for such time or for the trial or hearing of such causes or matters or otherwise as may be specified in the instrument of appointment, but save as so specified, a person appointed to act as Judge of the Supreme Court shall continue to act until the office is filled, or as the

case may be, until the holder thereof has resumed the functions of his office or the said acting appointment is revolted by the Governor after consultation with the Premier, (in the case of a person appointed to act in the office of Chief Justice) or acting on the recommendation of the Judicial and Legal Service Commission (in the case of a person appointed to act In the office of Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court):

Provided that the person so appointed to act may at any time by writing under his hand addressed to the Governor resign his acting office.\"

There is a certain defect which was considered to be in the drafting of the Bill, in that it did not anticipate certain situations that may arise from time to time, and so for the purpose of this amendment, subsection (2) to section 7 is to remedy that defect.

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

Hon. A. Da C. EDWARDS:
I beg to second that. The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

Clause 1 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment which we have to make to Clause 1. As it is printed it reads \"The Supreme Court of Judicature (Amendment) Act\", but it should read \"The Supreme Court of Judicature (Amendment) (No. 2) Act, 1965.\"

I beg to move that Clause 1 as amended stand part. Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 6.35 p.m.

Clause 2 was called and passed.

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, second. ed by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

JUDICIAL AND LEGAL SERVICE COMMISSION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965

Mr. SPEAKER:

The next Order of the day also stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Premier Second read-ing of a Bill to amend the Judicial and Legal Service Commission Act, 1961.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to amend the Judicial and Legal Service Commission Act, 1961, 1961 - 26. The proposed amendments will have the following effect-

(a)The number of appointed members of the Judic ial and Legal Service Commission will be increased from two to three.

(b)members of the Senate will not be qualified for appointment to the Commission and a member of the Com mission who becomes a member of the Senate will thereby vacate his seat on the Commission; at present the relevant provisions apply only in respect of membership of the House of Assembly;

(c)there will be in the Act express provision in respect of the termination of acting appointments in certain of the offices set out in the Second Schedule to the Act. Like provisions already exist in respect of the offices of Puisne Judge and Director of Public Prosecutions and consequently the provision in the Bill is not extended to those offices.

Therefore, the provisions in the Bill are and should be well within the comprehension of hon. members and I therefore 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 motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called separately and passed. On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

THE UNITED KINGDOM FORCES (JURISDICTION OF LOCAL COURTS) BILL, 1965

Mr SPEAKER:

The next Order of the day, which is Order No. 4, also stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Premier Second reading of a Bill to make provision for withdrawing the jurisdiction of the civil courts of the Island

to try members of Her Majesty\'s forces or of a civilian component of those forced for offences

against the law of the Island committed whilst on duty and for certain offences committed whilst off duty.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, on the 1st June, 1965, the Head of the Government of the United Kingdom made an Order-in-Council that the Jurisdiction of the Local Courts Act, 1965, should be valid, on certain provisions to the Visiting Forces. Members of the Opposition seem to be unaware that the Secretary of State for the Colonies has no right to recommend legislation for this House. 6.45 p.m.

Neither has the Queen got any right to pass any legislation for this country. If it is the result of any misguided information as to the Constitution of this country and the constitutional position which we now enjoy, if the Secretary of State for the Colonies followed the advice of the pronouncements on the other side of the House, then I would have to tell him in plain Barbadian language that he must know his place. There are people who are aware of the constitutional rights which formerly they used to boast of, but now they seem to deplore the fact that Barbados has any status at all and they would like to push it back into the dim recesses of history. Her Majesty\'s Order-in-Council cannot apply to Barbados and they have invited this country to

pass legislation by the Governor, the Senate and the General

Assembly of this Island.

We do not ordinarily put forward imperial legislation and so clutter up our Statute Book with it, but there are certain things which are more symptomatic of the contrac-tural relationship which exists. We have moved from a position of status, and even after malnutrition, a person who had been enjoying this freedom before still had a status in society. We have moved away from that.

I do not want anybody to get the impression that we are passing legislation for Her Majesty\'s forces, but we have done this for friendly nations who have spent money in Barbados such as the United Sates Oceanographic Research Station, It was a matter of great indifference to us until we were respectfully requested or asked whether this Government would consider passing legislation of this sort. This is a Bill which states that if you have troops of one country in the territory of another, if any offences are committed against any property belonging to the friendly power and not the host country, the jurisdiction should not apply to the Civil courts. These offences now are dealt with by the nation rather than the Civil courts of this island. If any serving member of the friendly powar commits an act against a citizen of the country, then the courts of this territory have full authority and jurisdiction to visit the commission of that offence with the full penalty of the existing law.

Mr. Speaker, that is all that this Bill seeks to do. What we seek to do therefore in this Bill is to waive the jurisdiction of the local courts in relation to offences which are committed against other members of the visiting forces and probably belonging to the Government of the visiting forces. In this particular instance, the visiting forces are those of Her Majesty\'s Government and not the forces of the United States Government for which provision has already been made in the Statutes of this Island.

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

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that you do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

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 on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 7 inclusive were called and passed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of one Bill in Committee.

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. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed. 6.55 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Speaker, this concludes Government Business. I wish to state, Mr. Speaker, that in accordance with what appears in paragraph 124 of the Federal Negotiations, 1962-65 and Constitutional Proposals for Barbados which were laid in this House by Order of the Cabinet, a Resolution will be introduced in this House next Tuesday and after that a date will be fixed for debating this Resolu-tion. Hon. members will therefore note that some time will elapse between the tabling of the Resolution and the actual initiation of debate on it.

STATEMENT re CONVENTION ON FREE TRADE AREA

Hon. E. W. BARROW:
Mr. Speaker, do I have permission to make a short statement?

Mr. SPEAKER:
Let the hon. member proceed.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:
Mr. Speaker, at the invitation of the Prime Minister of British Guiana, I intend to proceed to that territory towards the middle of next week with the Hon. Minister of Trade, the Financial Secretary and the Acting Director of the Economic Planning Unit. I will be accompanied by the Hon. V. C. Bird, Chief Minister of Antigua, and he will be preceded by two Minister of the Government of Antigua, and we will be discussing the Conven-tion which was drafted by the Government of Barbados on the Free Trade Area. At the termination of these discussions, the necessary Resolutions to implement the agreed proposals contained in the Convention will be brought before this House, and after approval will be submitted for registration both with the United Nations and with the Secretariat of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 12th October, at 2.30 p.m.

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

The question was put and resolved in $he affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

7.02 p.m.