

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 31st January, 1967

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

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., F.Z.S., (*Speaker*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Health and Community Development*); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; (*Minister of Trade, Tourism, Co-operatives and Fisheries*); Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Hon. N. W. BOXILL, (*Minister of Communications and Works*); Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD, (*Chairman of Committees*); His Honour G. E. SARGEANT, (*Deputy Speaker*); Mr. C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that there are no Minutes yet available for confirmation.

I also have the honour to inform the House that I have received a letter from the Caribbean Publishing Company bearing the date 28th January, 1967 which reads as follows:

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

Sir,

I have the honour to refer to a front page news story appearing in the issue of "The Barbados Daily News" for Thursday, January 26, in which a grave error of fact was made in that the report stated that the censure motion amendment was carried 11 to 7, and in which the "voting" was given.

On learning that there had been no division of the House, I immediately instructed that a correction and apology to you, Sir, should be inserted on Page 1 of the following day, and this appeared under the Caption "No division of Censure Motion."

This letter is now to submit my formal apology to you, Sir, and to the Honourable members of the House for the incorrect report, and to express my hope that the report caused no undue embarrassment to any Honourable Member.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient Servant,
E. L. COZIER
Editor.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. HINDS, Mr. LYNCH and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS entered the Chamber and took their seats.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Minister of External Affairs, I am commanded to lay the following:

Statement of sums of money paid over to the Accountant General by the Commissioner of Police for the Quarter ended 30th September, 1966.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Minister of External Affairs, I beg to give notice of the following:

A Resolution to place the sum of \$17,272 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1966-67 Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, 1966-67 No. 46 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

And on my own behalf I beg to give notice of the following:

A Resolution to place the sum of \$21,026 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1966-67 Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, 1966-67 No. 47 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I also beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to consider the money Resolutions of which notice has just been given.

QUESTIONS

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following question:

"To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

1. Will Government state the cost of erecting the beach facilities structure at Holetown, St. James, erected by the Tourist Board?

2. Will Government state if or when the said beach facilities will be open to the Public?

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16, 18, 19, 40 and 45 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am not objecting to the suspension of the Standing Orders, but I would like to ask the Hon. Minister whether, after he has finished Government Business, he would revert to Private Members' Business, in order that I may be able to deal with the Resolution standing in my name. It is not controversial and would not take long, and I would ask him to grant me this favour.

Mr. SPEAKER: Actually the hon. member is not objecting. He is agreeing with a proviso. Do I understand him correctly?

Mr. SMITH: I know the hon. member will try his best along those lines.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, whether or not the hon. member's Resolution is controversial, I think we will accede to that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let no controversy arise about that now.

The question that Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16, 18, 19, 40 and 45 be suspended for the remainder of the sitting was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken.

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Item under Government Business stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, the Hon. Leader of the House.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of Item No. 1 in the absence of the Hon. Leader of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Health and Community Development is asking leave of the House to deal with Item No. 1 under Government Business which stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House, and unless there is any objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted the hon. junior member for Christ Church to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Island.

Mr. St. JOHN entered the Chamber and took his seat.

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: 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. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

2.55 p.m.

RESOLUTION POSTPONED

A Resolution for the sum of \$5,146 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I propose to commence with the second Resolution first.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1966-67 No. 43

A Resolution for the sum of \$273,808 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution deals with a supplementary vote under two Heads of the Estimates and there are many items which have to be supplemented. I propose to take these Heads separately.

HEAD 38 - MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Head 38 - Ministry of Health and Community Development - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, the first Item under this Head deals with Health centres in respect of furniture and equipment for the Medical Officer's Quarters at the Health Centre, Six Cross Roads, St. Philip. The note to this Item sets out that the amount of \$1,422 is required in order that the Medical Officer's Quarters at this Health Centre may be properly equipped.

I should like to give the Committee some idea of what we have in mind at present, but which we would like to secure by virtue of this Supplementary Resolution, in order to provide the type of accommodation which will be required for the Medical Officer of Health and his family at Six Cross Roads, St. Philip. At present the furniture is not considered to be adequate in view of the fact that this Officer is on contract, he has a mixed family and he needs proper furniture in order to accommodate his family and himself during his term of contract, which we hope, is two years. He has some furniture, but it is felt that he should be given other furniture because of the difficulty which we have experienced in getting the services of Medical Officers over the past years. This Officer's proposed furniture consists of a china cabinet, radio, double mahogany Morris suite, four single beds, four mirrors, two bath room mirrors and Venetian blinds.

Mr. Chairman, when we consider the difficulties we have experienced over the years in securing the services of Medical Officers in order to maintain our health services, I think that this proposed expenditure of \$1,422 is a small one having regard to the service which this Officer renders to the community in the southern area. That being the case, I beg to move that Head 38 stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question that Head 38 stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 41 - THE QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

Head 41 - The Queen Elizabeth Hospital - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in dealing with this Head, I think it is incumbent on me at this stage, knowing that such a large Institution as the Queen Elizabeth Hospital will be subjected to scrutiny by hon. members, to give some information to this Committee as to what is going on at the Hospital and how it is that this substantial sum of money should be required at this stage to supplement the various items under this Head as set out in the Supplementary Estimate. I am expected, and it is incumbent on me, to give a brief resume of things not only to members of the Opposition, but also to members of the Government who may not be as well informed and who have not got the opportunity to secure all the necessary information as to the reasons for this supplementary vote, the largest amount of which is in respect of drugs and dressings. I will proceed to give a brief resume of the position and I trust that hon. members will give it some attention in order to pacify their thoughts and be able to bring their attention to this matter in a very reasonable way.

First of all, there is the growth of the Hospital. During the year 1966 the number of beds in use was increased to 540. I shall read this very slowly with the hope that the Reporters both within and outside of the House will get the points I am making clearly. During the year 1966 the number of Out-Patient clinics which dealt with 35,095 persons in 1965, dealt with 46,494 persons. In addition to that, the number of persons in the Casualty and General Practitioner service maintained a total of over 75,000. The cost of medical gases rose from \$27,000 in 1965 to \$54,000 in 1966. In 1961 the Ear, Nose and Throat Department was established and the Obstetrical Department came into full operation. The new Ante-Natal Clinic in December 1966 increased the number of prescriptions to approximately 500 per month with July 1966 being a peak month with over 1,000 prescriptions. The number of in-patients admitted in 1964 were 11,094; in 1965, 12,715; in 1966, 14,139.

In so far as the nursing services are concerned, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, like most Hospitals all over the world, suffers from a shortage of Nurses.
3.05 p.m.

I refer to the qualified nurses. The Ministry of Health has taken the following steps to deal with the situation:-

(1) Following an agreement with the World Health Organization, two highly qualified nursing educators have been made available to Barbados and, as a result, the course leading to the status of Registered Nurse has been re-organized and converted from a four-year to a three-year course.

Thirteen nurses were admitted to this course in 1964 and 24 more in January this year.

(2) It has been proposed to increase the establishment of Ward Assistants from 60 to 120 and train this grade as Nursing Aides along the lines of the State Enrolled Nurse in England or the Licensed Practical Nurse in Canada.

The first class of 20 has already now got a six-month course of training.

(3) The Tercentenary Ward has been converted into a school which we propose to call the Tercentenary School of Nursing, and the old Pay Wards A and E have been renovated to provide 22 additional rooms for nurses.

(4) The Barbados Government has co-operated with the W.H.O. in the training of the supervisory grades of nurses and the second Ward Sisters course is now under-way.

(5) We have also taken advantage of the new course of Nursing Tutors and Nursing Administrators sponsored by the University of the West Indies and World Health Organization in Jamaica.

(6) Letters have been sent to over 30 qualified nurses in England, the majority of them Barbadians, setting out the conditions of appointment and prospects generally.

In so far as medical staff is concerned, it has been easier to recruit consultant staff than the lower grades of medical officers during the past year although we have great problems in Anaesthesiology and Radiology.

It is considered that the position will be improved as the U.W.I. produces more doctors through the development of training here in Barbados, in Trinidad, and in Jamaica. Further improvements will come if departments of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital should gain recognition for the training of doctors towards the Specialist qualifications.

We have already had discussions in the fields of surgery and obstetrics. It is to be noted, too, that the University of the West Indies has also begun some training in this direction.

The University plans for the training of medical students are progressing favourably and already two lecturers have been appointed in medicine and surgery.

During the past year, Professor Cruickshank, Dean of the Medical Faculty, spent a full week at the Hospital, and three members of his medical staff have spent periods of two months each working at the Hospital.

While it is recognised that the Hospital, as being the centre of the Island's health services, would be also a matter of the highest concern to all citizens and residents of Barbados and while it is always useful for us to receive reports and hear suggestions for improvement, it is regrettable that at times an attempt is made to convert the Hospital in a political football. As a result, small incidents are magnified and the usual complaints which would be expected to arise where over 1,000 staff members congregate, are sometimes given the appearance of a crisis while there is no crisis.

In respect of shortages in certain departments at present, the University would not have been willing to bring certain medical students here if the Hospital was not satisfactory for the purpose. The medical organizations which are considering the recognition of the Hospital for the purpose of training must also see some reason for considering us. We have also had the benefit of visits and reports from W.H.O. consultants, and next month a group of doctors from the Montreal General Hospital, the Montreal Children's Hospital and from Canadian Universities will be coming to Barbados to hold an annual seminar at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. This would be the second such seminar.

Now, apart from the things which I have given, there are two or three things which I would like to draw to the attention of hon. members. There are new drugs; and these life-saving drugs, we feel, should not be denied to all ranks of the people. We feel that life-saving drugs should be given free so that all, irrespective of class and status, should be given assistance at the right time. In all these life-saving drugs, a quicker turnover and the number of points have increased terribly. The doctors have been putting in use some of these drugs over a period and we have had the advantage recently of seeing how they work. New dressings would be brought into play from the 1st April, this year, and we hope to affect a savings.

Another point which I would like to draw to the attention of hon. members is that a further substantial sum of money was committed last year. In other words, an old debt has been brought over from last year. There was a debt of \$109,000 which has come over to this financial year which was not budgeted for this year; so we have really \$109,000 - almost half - already being committed in the last financial year.

We can only function by placing orders in advance; if not we will have a crisis which we are trying to avoid and to see that the Hospital is conducted on proper lines.
3.15 p.m.

One must remember that the Hospital is a new institution, and it is the first time we have had so many patients; and as I have just explained there is a volume of work done at the Hospital which is still in its teething stages. If one wants to be unduly critical, one can always find fault with the Hospital. So if we are trying to do a good job there, and the shortage of nurses is worldwide, I do not think we can blame anyone for that. I am not putting up a defence, but at the same time if we have people coming from all parts of the world trying to assist us, we must in turn do all that we can. I am asking hon. members to look through the explanatory notes and read them along with the explanations which I have just given.

I beg to move that Head 41 - The Queen Elizabeth Hospital - stand part.

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

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Resolution for the sum of \$273,808 do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1966-67 No. 45

Head 11 - Pensions - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is to deal with Local Government Compensation and the sum of \$13,216 is being requested.

The Addendum sets out that as a result of the transfer of the control of certain highways in the Southern District from the Southern District Council to the Director of Highways and Transport with effect from 1st April, 1966, two offices of Assistant Road and Works Inspector were declared redundant by the Southern District Council and the Officers' services were terminated with effect from 1st June, 1966.

This money is to compensate the officers and the Southern District Council. The sum of \$13,216 is required to supplement the provision under this item for the liquidation of the Government's liability to the Southern District Council in respect of salary paid to the officers in lieu of notice and vacation leave.

This is really a straightforward Resolution. It is really doing justice and giving compensation to officers whose services were redundant on the take-over.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, in dealing with this Resolution which has to do with Local Government affairs, I want to use this opportunity to ask the Hon. Minister what is Government's intention with regards Local Government, because as we all know, under the Local Government Act, elections are certainly due at the present moment, and the Government has had sufficient time since the last elections in 1962 to make its mind up on the proposals for the future of Local Government. The situation at the present moment with certain functions at the Local Government, certainly in the Southern area in the constituency which I represent and which the Hon. Minister himself represents, is nothing short of scandalous, especially with scavenging, and I hope that action is taken from the Central Government level to deal with the terrible conditions which exist in Christ Church and the surrounding areas with respect to scavenging.

There is a dump above the Church in Christ Church which has been burning for days, because of the incompetent manner in which the Departments concerned have filled it, and the schools right next door to this dump have had to close their classes early. It is time that the Government makes up its mind. The position of the Councillors is that they themselves are uncertain as to their future, and they do not seem in a position to display that interest in this important aspect of Local Government matters.

Now, Sir, on the subject of the Resolution itself, never before do I believe was a greater amount of inhuman treatment meted out to staff as occurred on the so-called take-over of the Local Government services. It takes so long for people to have their compensation and their pension rates determined, and very often many of them die before they receive their pensions and things of that kind, I am very glad to see that this amendment is coming through, but there are still other gaps dealing with the question of compensation which I would like to draw to the Minister's

attention. It deals with the situation which arises when there is an abolition of office by the Council itself and not as a result of a take-over by Central Government, and the Regulations I am told need amending to deal with that situation. There are officers who opted under the old Pension Regulations and whose offices have been abolished, and according to the existing state of the Regulations they cannot be compensated for loss of office; they must depend on pension.

While giving support on this side to this Resolution, I draw these outstanding matters to the attention of the Hon. Minister, and we would be glad if he would indicate the attitude of the Government in these matters.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Before you put the question, Sir, I would like to draw to the attention of the hon. member and the entire Committee that scavenging, cemeteries, children's homes, nursing centres etc. remain the responsibility of the Southern District Council, because the hon. member is apparently giving the impression that scavenging is now done by the Central Government. The criticisms which the hon. member has made therefore fall on the Southern District Council and not on the Central Government as such. I will for the benefit of hon. members inform you that the Government is investigating this question of refuse disposal very carefully, and we are hoping to do a good job of it very shortly. A Committee has been set up to make a survey of not only refuse disposal as such, but as to the means of disposal by way of a Fertiliser plant or incinerator. We hope to do something very quickly on that although it has been hanging fire for some time.

Now the hon. member talked about inhuman treatment. I want to know how many people have died as a result of this alleged inhuman treatment when we are bringing money every year. I understand that they have got their salaries to June 1966, but this is compensation we are bringing here. I want the hon. member and the Committee on the whole to know that it is the Southern District Council which declared the services of these officers redundant, and in any case there is a lot to be said on this matter which should better be left unsaid, because in attempting to do the highways not only in Christ Church but in St. Philip, St. John and St. George and putting the tenantry roads in order, we want to try and effect savings and use the equipment of the Highways and Transport Department and the technical skill which we have to greater advantage, and to produce better tenantry roads and better main highways as we have done in other parts of the Island, and not fritter away the taxpayers' money.

3.25 p.m.

It is for that reason that the roads are being taken over by the Central Government and the services of some of the officers were declared to be redundant. That was declared by the Southern District Council itself. The Government is not at any fault; the Government is trying to re-organize the Highways Department of the South and to bring it into line as directed by the Central Government.

The hon. member spoke of people who have suffered, but did any of these people die as a result of this inhuman action? Unless you can say that some death took place, then I do not see that the case is very strong. Mr. Chairman, I think that the various points have been clarified.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1966-67 No. 44

TRAVELLING FOR MINISTERS AND PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES, DUTY ALLOWANCE FOR LEADER OF THE HOUSE

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is one to place the sum of \$5,146 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1966-67 Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, 1966-67, No. 44 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution. This amount of money is required for the purpose of providing

for travelling for the Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries in the amount of \$4,186 and also for the purpose of providing a duty allowance for the Leader of the House in the sum of \$960 in accordance with the recommendations of a Select Committee of this Chamber which recommended that this amount be made available from the finances of the Island, I therefore beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: 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 separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, the Resolutions passed in Committee were read a first and second time and agreed to.

STATEMENT *re* APPOINTMENT OF NEW GOVERNOR-GENERAL

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, before the next Order is proceeded with, the Hon. Prime Minister wishes to make a Statement.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the Hon. Prime Minister make his Statement.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, correspondence with Buckingham Palace recently states that "the Prime Minister of Barbados presents his humble duty to Your Majesty and has the honour to submit for Your Majesty's approval, the proposal of Your Majesty's Ministers in Barbados that the Honourable Arleigh Winston Scott, B.Sc., M.D., L.R.C.P., L.R.C.S. (Edin) L.R.F.P. & S. (Glas.) O. et A. Chir., a member of the Privy Council of Barbados, be appointed as Governor-General of Barbados on the departure of the present Governor-General, Sir John Montague Stow, K.C.M.G., K.C.V.O., from the Island."

I have been instructed from Buckingham Palace to make the following announcement:

"It is announced from Buckingham Palace that the Queen, on the recommendation of Her Majesty's Ministers in Barbados, has been graciously pleased to approve the appointment of Doctor the Honourable Arleigh Winston Scott as Governor-General of Barbados in succession to Sir John Stow who is due to leave the island on 15th May, 1967." *(Cheers)*

RESOLUTION *re* SALARY AND TRAVELLING ALLOWANCE TO THE PERSONAL ASSISTANT TO THE PRIME MINISTER

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister:- To move the passing of the following Resolution:- A Resolution to approve the rates of salary and travelling allowance payable with effect from 1st April, 1966, to the Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister as set out in the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, in May, 1963, provision was made by Resolution No. 30 for the engagement of a Personal Assistant and Public Relations Officer to the Premier to be paid a salary at the rate of \$6,600 per annum and travelling allowance at the rate of \$80 a month.

Consequent on the general revision of salaries, since the provision of this post, it is now proposed that the rates of salary and travelling allowance attached to the post should be revised with effect from 1st April, 1966, to \$8,640 per annum and \$1,080 per annum respectively, 3.35 p.m.

I should also like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the post was being redesignated to Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution calls for an increase in salary to be paid to the Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister now redesignated from what it was of Personal Assistant and Public Relations Officer to the Premier. We on this side of the House have no complaints to the redesignation. We observe that Public Relations Officer has been deleted from his duties and that he is now only the Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister and, therefore, we can quite understand this part of the duties no longer applies; therefore, there is some case for the redesignation of the post.

What we would like to know is what is the increased duties of the post to justify the salary being increased to a higher point in the salary scale than it was before?

The first point is that when the first Personal Assistant was appointed to the Premier, the salary was put at the rate of \$6,600 per annum, or \$550 per month. That was the old entry point on the G. 1 scale of the General Establishment. From the Gardiner-Brown report, the entry point has been raised to \$600 per month. If this was the general rise in salaries agreed to on the rise in salaries to people of the Civil Service, the rise would have been to the same point as was given to the Civil Servants. The Civil Servants were raised from \$550 per month to \$620, but by this raise it means that the Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister is raised to \$720 per month which is \$100 more. The Personal Assistant is raised from a salary scale of \$6,600 to \$8,640 per annum.

The travelling allowance is the same rate as Parliamentary Secretaries.

In the absence of some explanation as to whether the duties of the Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister have increased to such an extent that he is to have a rise and a bonus which Civil Servants have not got, we on this side of the House would have to divide the House on that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there any other hon. member who is desirous of speaking before the Hon. Prime Minister replies?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: There is no real reason why Your Honour has to make a statement before a reply.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no real reason, but I do so out of tolerance to the other side.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who has just sat down, true to kin, talks about taking somebody out of their class. What "class" is he talking about?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of explanation, if the Hon. Prime Minister would give way, I would be glad to explain.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I did not ask him to explain.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member rose on a point of explanation.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The Hon. Prime Minister asked what I meant by "class". I meant 'the Civil Servants grades by classification.'

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member has walked straight into the trap. I asked what he meant by "class", what he meant by taking somebody out of their class. He said in explanation that he meant the Civil Servants' grades by the classification. The hon. member is not aware that the Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister is not on the Civil Establishment.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Specific reference was made during my speech to the fact that the Personal Assistant and Public Relations Officer to the Premier was classified according to Grade G.1 of the Civil Establishment, and how you could compare him with a person on the Civil Establishment of that grade. That was in the early part of my speech.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Every time the hon. member rises, he puts his foot in his mouth. He just got up and said that he was at pains to say that you must be compared to somebody in the Civil Establishment. Officers of the Civil Establishment have certain conditions of service laid down. They are appointed by the Civil Service Commission. After they get to a certain bracket, they are entitled to Leave Passages to the United Kingdom. This is a qualification equal to 25% of their salary. Then they are entitled to pension rights on their retirement.

When the post of Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister was introduced in 1963, it was difficult to ascertain at that stage both the quality and the actual volume of work which would fall on the shoulders of the person appointed. It is known now that the person must have a strong constitution because we had one breakdown. The volume of work which has to be dealt with is very onerous.

It is difficult to find at this stage the level of the salary that would compare with that which was given in 1963. As I said, we have had one breakdown, and therefore we had to continue to look at what the holder of the post is called upon to do and the qualifications which we deem necessary for a person to fill this post and establish the right kind of relations. The person is not called upon to work from 8.00 o'clock in the morning until 4.00 o'clock in the afternoon. He is called upon to work at all hours and to go backward and forward between one Ministry and another and to establish the kind of relations which are so vital if the Ministry is to function properly.
3.45 p.m.

We do not have to think about taking anybody out of class or putting anybody into a particular class. The point is that we have to fix a salary level which is commensurate. You have to do an evaluation in fixing a salary that is commensurate with both the quality and the volume of work which we by experience know is to be performed, and if this is what the hon. member wants, it is not a question of taking or putting anybody out of class. There is no pension attached to this job. It is more hazardous than living in Barbados with members of the Barbados Labour Party sniping around. It is more hazardous indeed, because the gentleman occupying that post has to be the target of everyone's criticism and everything else, and therefore he has not only his own work to do, but the work of several Ministers in coordinating the work at the Ministerial level between one Ministry and another.

The fact, of course, that the particular appointee came from a pensionable job in the Government service of this island is irrelevant at this stage. The most important consideration is what work are you required to do, what kind of person do you require to do this work, what are his qualifications to be and what is the actual volume of work that is to be done. The natural comparison is that you look to the established staff to see what they themselves perform and you compare it with the work being performed by the Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister. That is the main consideration; but if we were to introduce personal consideration, of course the officer would be entitled to more money than we are asking the House to vote.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS rose to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I remind the hon. member that I not only looked around giving hon. members ample time to speak, but I asked if there was any other hon. member, so much so that it was suggested from the Government side that it was not necessary for me to ask.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Mr. YEARWOOD; Hon. J. C. TUDOR, Hon. E. W. BARROW, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Hon. A. DaC, EDWARDS; Hon. N. W. BOXILL; Mr. LOWE, Mr. CORBIN; Mr. SPRINGER, Mr. SARGEANT, Mr. WEEKES; Mr. HOPPIN and Mr. LYNCH - 14.

NOES: Mr. HINDS; Mr. CRAIG; Mr. ADAMS; Mr. HUSBANDS; Mr. SMITH; Mr. St. JOHN and Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS - 7.

THE MINISTERS AND PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES (REMUNERATION) ACT, 1967

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day, No. 3, stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister: to move the second reading of a Bill to repeal the Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries (Remuneration) Act, 1964, and to make provision for revised salaries for Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the remuneration for the unofficial members of the Executive Committee was fixed by the Executive Committee (Remuneration of Members) Act, 1949 (1949-30), and this was assented to by the Acting Governor on 21st July, 1949. Also the House of Assembly (Remuneration of Members) Act was assented to on 17th June, 1949. The rates of remuneration were fixed for the Leader of the House, members of the House on the Executive Committee, the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker, the Chairman of Committees and other members of the House.

On the 1st February, 1954, the Ministerial system of Government was introduced in Barbados and the rates of remuneration of the unofficial members of the Executive Committee were revised. When I say "unofficial members" it must be remembered that until 1964 when we made the final step under this Government, and completed internal self-government, the Attorney General, the Financial Secretary, the Colonial Secretary and His Excellency the Governor himself were members of the Executive Committee. During the whole period, therefore, of the tenure of office of the last Government, you had the spectacle of these officials being the official members of the Executive Committee, although after a time the Governor, the Financial Secretary and the Colonial Secretary did not attend meetings, but were all entitled to copies of the Minutes and of the Cabinet Papers which emanated from the Cabinet office; so when I use the word "unofficial", I mean unofficial in so far as members of the Legislature are concerned. Their salaries were fixed by the two Acts which I mentioned before.

In 1954 the rates of remuneration were revised in the Remuneration of Members (Amendment) Act, 1954-3, the House of Assembly (Remuneration of Members) (Amendment) No. 1 Act, 1954 (1954-4) and the House of Assembly (Remuneration of Members) (Amendment) No. 2 Act, 1954, (1954-5). The rates of remuneration were fixed as follows: Premier \$9,600 per annum; four Ministers at \$7,200 each per annum; the Leader of the Opposition \$2,400 per annum; Speaker \$2,880 per annum; Deputy Speaker, \$2,160 per annum; Chairman of Committees the same as other members \$1,920 per annum. In 1956 there was a salaries revision for the Civil Service. In 1957 the House of Assembly (Remuneration of Members) Act, including the Premier and other Ministers, was amended. I should like to make it clear that this was not amended by any Select Committee of this House, but it was a result of a Cabinet decision which was brought down here in that year, and the Act of 1957 (1957-26) was assented to on the 27th July in that year, and this changed the basis of the salaries from what I have

enumerated above to Premier \$12,000; Ministers \$8,640 per annum; Speaker \$4,800; Deputy Speaker \$3,000; Chairman of Committees \$3,000; Leader of the Opposition \$3,300; and other members \$2,640. On the 24th December, 1957, legislation was assented to in the form of the Act of 46 of that year, the Executive Committee (Remuneration of Members) (Amendment) Act. The salary of the Minister Without Portfolio was fixed at the same as the salary of the Ministers in that year.

3.55 p.m.

Again in 1959, as a result of the House of Assembly (remuneration of Members) (Amendment) Act, No. 13, the salary of His Honour the Speaker was fixed at six thousand four hundred and eighty dollars per annum plus a travelling allowance at the rate of seven hundred and twenty dollars. In 1962, as a result of the House of Assembly (Remuneration of Members) (Amendment) Act, No. 9, the salary of His Honour the Speaker was reduced to \$5,280 per annum and a travelling allowance of \$1,080 per annum. That was the position and it remained unchanged from 1957 until the recent decision of the Legislature when a Select Committee of this House was set up to consider and revise the salaries of members of the House in December, 1966. The new rates of salaries and allowances were fixed by the members of the House consequent on the report of that Select Committee. Certain innovations were introduced in that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and the Hon. Leader of the House were both, on the recommendation of the Select Committee, granted a duty allowance in respect of the additional burden and work which is deemed to have fallen on their shoulders in their respective capacities.

The present Bill, therefore, is the first attempt in this direction since we have had the two salaries revision, one in 1961 and another in 1966. Before the year 1961, the salaries of Ministers were higher than those of the highest officials in their Departments, which are the Permanent Secretaries. Since 1961, the Permanent Secretaries, with the exception of the Cabinet Secretary, have been enjoying salaries in excess of those which are now granted to Ministers. After the proposals submitted to the Cabinet by Mr. Gardiner-Brown on the remuneration of Ministers, to evaluate between the salaries of the Ministers and the salaries paid to Civil Servants, the following salaries have been recommended for the approval of this House as set out in the Bill itself.

I do not want to go into any further details on the matter. I have given a background in order to demonstrate that it is now a period of eleven years since Ministerial salaries have been revised. It must be remembered that we do not now have the quasi-Ministerial system under which Ministers were able to carry out their private business and try to perform their functions as Ministers. It is definitely against the Rules of the Constitution that any Minister should be engaged upon any private business whatsoever and therefore a Minister is now a fulltime Minister in the Service of the island. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS and Mr. CRAIG rose to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. James caught my eye before the hon. senior member for St. Thomas.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, hearing the remarks of the Hon. Prime Minister, I wonder if he is still the Chairman of the ruling Government Party. In 1961 the Hon. Prime Minister gave the impression to the electorate of this country that if he was elected to power he would not only reduce the salaries of Ministers, but he would also stop the lunch and dinners which we are now enjoying.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. Nobody countenances that kind of behaviour although we have to be.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member proceed with his point of order.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member makes that statement, I should like to say that I am not aware of the presence of the hon. member in the political field in those days, or that he could read and write. I would like the hon. member just to recast his remarks. I did in 1962 eliminate the vote which we had of \$1,440 for meals for members of this Branch of the Legislature, and with Your Honour's acquiescence and consent we reduced your salary. According to the Ministerial system of Government, a Government Minister is not supposed to work on anything other than his Ministry or hold any directorate in any Company, so that when the hon. member suggests that I gave the impression that I would reduce the salaries of Ministers at any time, I want him to be very careful as to how he makes his statement. As far as I remember, there was a tremendous deficit and I felt that we, as members of this House, should make a sacrifice. That is why the salaries of the Permanent Secretaries went further than those of Ministers. I did not invite hon. members to make any increase in the salaries for Ministers.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I do not cast any reflection on your authority, but I sat here and I heard another speech from the Prime Minister. Whether I can read or write I am an elected member of Parliament just like the learned Prime Minister who can read and write in 1966-67. That behaviour is suited.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think that there is a Standing Order which the hon. member is not aware of. That Standing Order states that debates have to be conducted in the English language. The hon. member used the expression "learnted".

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, it would be almost humanly impossible for me to use the word "learnted". Knowing the Prime Minister as I know him, he is likely to say anything at all. In so far as this Bill which is before the House is concerned, a Bill to repeal the Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries (Remuneration) Act, 1964, and to make provision for revised salaries for Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries, a Bill to increase the salaries of the Prime Minister and the Ministers, I may say that I am here with a full sense of responsibility which I am confident that I shall carry out as long as I have health and strength to do so.

4.05 p.m.

You will recall, Sir, that during the debate for the increase of salaries for the members of Parliament, I opposed it because I felt within myself that priorities were something of vital importance. I still do not believe in this idea that because the majority can rule that the minority view should just be respected. There are many things in this country which need to be attended to other than the increase of salaries to members of Parliament. There are things such as the full development of the community by way of sport organizations such as a football coach and things of that nature.

Jamaica has an annual income of \$176 million as compared with that of Barbados of \$42 million. The salary of the Prime Minister of Jamaica is in the vicinity of £6,000 a year.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The salary of the Prime Minister of Jamaica is £9,000 a year. I have the estimates right here. The Prime Minister of Jamaica receives a total of £13,200.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not regard that as a point of order. It can possibly be made in your reply in due course.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, I am going to challenge the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister by repeating that the income of the Prime Minister of Jamaica is £6,000 and he receives a duty allowance of £3,000. We are dealing with the Prime Minister's income. I challenge him that it is not £9,000.

Mr. SPEAKER: It would be better if the hon. senior member for St. James would not shout across the table.

Mr. CRAIG: That is my way of expressing myself. If it causes you to feel uncomfortable, I shall try and restrain myself.

I still challenge the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister that the income of the Prime Minister of Jamaica is £6,000 annually.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: If the hon. member refers to income, well, that is a different thing.

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Prime Minister of Jamaica's Personal Allowance is £9,000 per annum. Then he receives several allowances. We have no duty allowance for Ministers in Barbados. The Prime Minister of Jamaica total emoluments are roughly £13,000 a year. Will the hon. member stop wasting time and get on with the debate?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has a right to talk. I refer to any member without distinction.

Mr. CRAIG: This Bill deals with the Prime Minister's salary. I am not concerned with the duty allowance, the entertainment allowance or any other allowance of the Prime Minister. He must not mislead the House that the salary of the Prime Minister of Jamaica is £9,000 per annum.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw to the attention of the House that I cannot feel good within myself to know that hon. members can sit down and bring before the House a Bill asking for an increase in pay for themselves when there are so many things to do in this country. We want specialists at the Hospital. All these things are required in the country. We have need for a coach in football and table tennis, but we are not dealing with that. The first thing in the five weeks that we have been returned here with which we are dealing is a raise of pay for ourselves.

We have 17,000 souls in this country who work for less than \$10.00 a week and the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister is asking the House to vote a difference in salary to him of \$400 more, and his stool pigeons.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask the hon. member to withdraw the word "stool pigeons".

Mr. CRAIG: In the last debate, the Deputy Speaker ruled the word "stool pigeon" as not being unparliamentary.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not have the opportunity which the Hon. Deputy Speaker had in hearing how that remark was used in relation to the context, but in the present context I do not take it as parliamentary. I ask that the hon. member withdraw that remark.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to follow the example of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy. I definitely withdraw the word.

In this country we have at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital doctors who earn approximately \$600 a month and who are working some sixteen hours daily.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member is attempting to mislead this Chamber when he says that there are doctors at the Hospital working for \$600 per month, sixteen hours a day. If a doctor or doctors work overtime, they are paid for overtime at the rate of \$25.00 a day, 4.15 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid it is not a point of order.

Mr. CRAIG: It is a point of nothing.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not agree it is a point of order.

Mr. CRAIG: It is a point of nothing. He is capable of doing that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Every member is capable of doing something. One cannot decide whether a matter is a point of order unless and until it is made and completed. Let the hon. senior member for St. James proceed.

Mr. CRAIG: I am going to read and I hope the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister is paying attention. I learned to read in 1937 and I am going to read properly now. I am reading from the Official Report of the Second Session, 1966-71, page 10, the fourth paragraph on the right hand side, and this is what the Hon. junior member for Christ Church said:

"I am not going to sit here and allow the hon. member to get away with this sort of thing. I have represented the parish of Christ Church for many years, and I will be here for quite some time; so whether or not the people of Christ Church know I am talking for money, they would be glad to know that I get money to give them a bigger drink at election time."

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I do not know if that is how it appears, but I said that the people of Christ Church would be glad I got an increase in salary in that I could give them a better drink out of it - not at election time, but during the five years.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I am convinced at this stage that the hon. member for Christ Church said that Hansard is accurate, I am saying that according to this it says here "a bigger drink at election time."

Mr. SPEAKER: Irrespective of the quantum of the drink, may I draw to the hon. member's attention standing Order No. 26 (11) which reads:-

"No member is to allude to any debate of the same session upon a question or Bill not being then under discussion except by indulgence of the House, for personal explanation."

I take it that the hon. member is alluding to a debate of this present Session upon the question which is now under discussion; so may I suggest to the hon. member to proceed.

Mr. CRAIG: I crave such indulgence.

Mr. SPEAKER: I said except by indulgence of the House for personal explanation.

Mr. CRAIG: I figure this is a personal explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER: No. A personal explanation would be by the hon. member who made the statement in the House craving its indulgence personally to explain what he said or what he intended to say. I would ask the hon. member to proceed with the speech on the second reading of the Bill without alluding further to any debate of this same session.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, at all times I am prepared to be guided by you, unlike others. Mr. Speaker, on this Bill which is to increase the salaries of Ministers, I heard the Hon. Prime Minister make mention of a Select Committee which was set up for the purpose of going into the income of members of Parliament, and further - I am speaking under correction - that in 1957 or 1958 the then Government fixed their own salaries. What I would like to say

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order, the hon. member said that a Select Committee was set up to go into the question of members' income. This is not so. The Select Committee was set up to make recommendations for the staff and members of this Assembly, not their incomes.

Mr. SPEAKER: The word used was "income". I take it was a slip of the tongue.

Mr. CRAIG: I meant salaries of the members. But this is what I would like to say, Mr. Speaker: in 1957 or 1958 when the then Cabinet fixed the salaries for members of the House, they in no way discriminated; they fixed the

salaries for Ministers and for Members of Parliament, but on this occasion we had a Select Committee set up to fix the salaries for members of Parliament, and then the Cabinet decided upon their own.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, it is simply not true to say that in 1957 when the salaries of Ministers were revised it was a joint operation by a Select Committee of this House. The facts are as follows: the House appointed a Select Committee to make recommendations about members' salaries and the Cabinet brought down its own proposals for Ministers' salaries. There is at least one member of that Cabinet present in this House, and if he chooses to he can speak the truth about it.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I understood the Prime Minister to say that the Cabinet fixed the salaries, and what I am saying on this occasion is that there is no reason to differentiate between a Select Committee to go into salaries of members of Parliament while the Cabinet sets about to fix its own. Mr. Speaker, we are not going to sit here and fail to carry out the duty which the electorate of this country sent us here to do. We are prepared to do it as well as we can, and I shall quote the late Lord Rudolph Churchill when he said "We are not here to oppose the Government for the sake of opposing, but to offer any constructive opposition that we can offer".

The Hon. and Learned Prime Minister at all times makes reference to members on this side of the House as "those people" and "the people over there", but I am used to that type of thing by now, and I feel personally that the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister is nothing else but a National Liability, and that is why the Hon. Prime Minister can walk into this House, because they have the forces behind them, and hope to ram the increase of salaries down the throats of members of this House.
4.25 p.m.

Day after day you find a tremendous rise in the cost of living, and I do not hear anything said about increases for the Old Age Pensioners; but I can hear about an additional \$400 a month for the Prime Minister and an additional \$200 a month for the Ministers. Mr. Speaker, I have made a comparison with Jamaica with its national income of \$100 million odd and Barbados with its national income of \$46 million, and I am asking the Prime Minister to take time in dealing with this matter. He has to answer to this country for this. In the first Session, the first thing that the members on the other side of the House can think of doing is to come in here and ask for more money for themselves. That is why, on the last occasion, we resented the idea of having an increase in the salaries of members of Parliament. Let us think of the things which the poor unfortunate persons should have in order to enjoy a comfortable way of life. Let us do that rather than look after ourselves first. I warn the Hon. Prime Minister that there is plenty of time to finish our campaign.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, there are a few questions which I should like to ask the Learned Prime Minister, and I will ask those questions whether I get the answers or not. What the Prime Minister has said about the Personal Aide is that among his arduous duties he has to see after the coordination at the Ministerial end. I thought that that was the duty of the Prime Minister and the Secretary of the Cabinet who should coordinate the work of the Ministers. Is this too much for the Secretary of the Cabinet that he must have a salary increase? I have been asked to vote for a special duty allowance for the Hon. Leader of the House because of his duties as such. Does that mean that the Prime Minister has so much to do, but he cannot do it and that the Hon. Leader of the House and the Secretary of the Cabinet should also have this increased salary? Later on is there going to be a Secretary to the Personal Aide? It would appear that there is more work and therefore increased salaries; when is this going to stop? I have given my reasons for asking simple questions; there is the statement that the Personal Aide has to see after the coordination of this work in the Ministerial Offices.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition must be aware of the vote of the House which was passed by Resolution. Therefore to develop the point about the personal Aide is closed history.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I have been at the Bar long enough and in Parliament in order to know how to construe the Rules. The Rule says that it shall be out of order to reflect on any vote of the House or to attempt to reconsider any specific question upon which the House has come to a conclusion during the current session except upon a substantive motion for rescission. This is not a motion before the House to rescind the vote. We have voted an increase for the Leader of the House and the Prime Minister, and we are now told that the Personal Aide to the Prime Minister needs an increase in his salary because of the arduous duties which have fallen on the Hon. Leader of the House and the Prime Minister and we are told what arduous duties the Personal Aide to the Prime Minister has to perform.

Mr. Speaker, I am not in any way criticising the vote; I am merely referring to it. It is a question of looking at what we have done and what we are now being asked to do. I do not think I should pay any compliment to hon. members who have been engaged in these matters. Of course one's sympathy is aroused when duties are increased, but what is the excuse in each case?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, on a point of explanation. There was a time when you could allow a thing like this to pass. I was at pains to point out that 1957 was the last time during which there had been any revision of Ministers' salaries. Since then there have been two salary revisions in the Government Service, both of them justified - according to the hon. member's remarks - on the ground of the rise in the cost of living. Apart from that, there was a time when Ministers of the Government were remunerated outside of their public duties. That is not allowed now. The last person who attempted that is no longer a member of the Government.

When the hon. member talks about increased duties, of course duties are being increased every day. We were collecting \$21 million in Government revenue. I am not saying that my duties alone have been increased. I am justifying the salary increases because duties have been increased. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition is drawing £200 a year duty allowance from the public of this island and also an allowance from the West Indies and how much money would he pay to the Prime Minister and the Leader of the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Prime Minister has made his point of explanation and has proceeded beyond it.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, I sat and listened attentively to the remarks made by members of the Opposition, but when we consider that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is receiving the sum of \$800 a month as a pension and \$530 a month from this House, that brings the total a month to \$1,330 per month.
4.35 p.m.

After all if the Prime Minister of this island is given a salary of \$1,400 per month and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is relaxing with a pension and salary amounting to \$1,300, I do not see any reason why the Prime Minister should not get that. I fail to see any reason why hon. members on the other side should oppose these increases in salaries for the Hon. Prime Minister and other members. They are only doing so because they want publicity and because they want to give the people the impression that we are doing something which is wrong. However, again I must remind them of the big salary and pension which their leader is receiving.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I am glad of this opportunity to speak on this Bill. This is not the time for criticism; this is the time for us to consider. Here, we have before us a Bill for an increase in salary for the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries.

I think, Sir, when the member who first introduced salaries for members of this House of Assembly, did so, he did so because he was suffering. I recommend him for his high spirit. In days before, members of this House of Assembly never used to accept a salary because the members in those days were comprised of merchants and the property class and, as a result, they could make their own payments. The factory owners could give us whatever they chose for our canes because there were no regulations for the price of canes. As regards the merchants, they used to buy and sell as they chose. It is only now that we have restrictions on the prices of goods. Merchants would sell their cloth, their rice, cornmeal and flour and other commodities at whatever price they chose. They would sell half and let the other half remain in their bond house and then tell you that it was scarce and they could not get it, and, after a time, sell the other half at a higher price. That was one of the ways they had of getting their salaries.

The member who introduced salaries for members of this House at that time knew that the members were not merchants and they had to get something. I think it was a wise thing to do at that stage. We know that many a man has refused to come forward to represent the people because he could not do so for nothing.

There was once a great big fig tree which the people asked to represent them and it said it could not. The people then said that they asked the fig tree and he said "no"; so we have to turn to the brambles. They asked the brambles and they said they would if the people let them. So that is what is representing us. It is the brambles that are representing us today; therefore, the brambles need support, and we should support the brambles.

The down-trodden man rules here at this stage. The Hon. and Learned Prime Minister has arisen from Premier; so he must have an increase in salary. The members of this House had an increase last month. The Ministers and the Parliamentary Secretaries also need an increase. Do you think what it calls for to be a Member of Parliament today? We have to face all kinds of criticism. Sometimes we lose our lives. Have you ever thought of that? Sometimes the people carry their representatives from home and imprison them. Therefore, Sir, it is an important job which we are doing today.

I am going to say this, Mr. Speaker. We should be getting more. When you think of it, we have to go and face the tyrants of today. When we are in this House of Assembly, the Prime Minister, the Ministers, the Parliamentary Secretaries, back-benchers and members of the Opposition, all of us, have a great responsibility. Why? Because we as members of Parliament may lose our lives.

Let the Opposition along with this Government educate the people as to the responsibility which we have. Do you think it is fun? There is no criticism to this Bill. The people would never be able to pay us for our duty because of the responsibility which we have. As I said already, we may lose our lives. I do not know who is waiting for mine now. This Bill contains nothing that you should criticise. Tell the people that we are receiving our just recompense. I do not see any reason for members of the Opposition to resist this, and I am asking members to be cautious and reasonable and to try and conduct themselves in a noble manner. You should tell the people of this Island that we have a hard duty to perform. I believe the Opposition is going to do that.

Mr. Speaker, you must tell the people that we are not getting sufficient money for the duty which we are performing for them. We have a great responsibility. I feel that all hon. members should support a Bill like this.

Mr. SPRINGER: Mr. Speaker, one of the fortunate disclosures in this debate is that the Opposition has shown some moderation by not claiming that the holder of the position of Prime Minister is not entitled to \$1,600 per annum.

When we examine, Mr. Speaker, the position as it was in 1956, we had a Chief Justice drawing the same salary

as the Premier of this country. In 1961, there was an increase in the salary of the Chief Justice. He did not remain too long in the Civil Establishment afterwards. At that time he was getting \$1,320 per month and the Premier's salary remained at the same level which it was before. In 1966, there was another increase and the Chief Justice's salary went to \$1,600, which was then \$3,600 more than the Prime Minister. What is even worse, Mr. Speaker, in the last salaries revision to Civil Servants, the Financial Secretary's salary moved higher up, further than the salary of the Prime Minister of this country, yet the Financial Secretary is still entitled to all the other emoluments which he gets.
4.45 p.m.

Anyone who thinks that a Prime Minister is not worth what is contemplated now, \$16,800 per annum, would be lacking in ambition and not being fully appreciative of the responsibility of the post. Besides there has been a lot of talk about duty allowance. When the increase of salaries came before this Legislature for members and the Leader of the Opposition, there was not one voice saying that the Leader of the Opposition was not entitled to \$4,800 a year and a duty allowance of \$960 per annum as well as a travelling allowance of \$720 per annum. What makes it worse, Mr. Speaker, is that when just one week ago the Opposition found out that the salaries revision for Ministers was not coming on that day, they were so satisfied that the increase contemplated for the Governor-General was quite in order that they left without one dissenting voice, and I would say that if for one moment they thought that the successor would have been a Barbadian, I know that there would have been objection.

There are some people in this community who think that salaries are only good for expatriates. What makes it worse is that I heard from the other side talk about 17,000 people working for less than \$10 a week. I know that, but I say that 90 per cent of these 17,000 people are domestic servants employed by the now-come middle class whose only claim to society is to employ one of their people and put them to parade all day in a cap and uniform. If they set the standard by paying good wages to the people they employ, then and only then can they talk about a low wage scale being paid. What makes it worse, Mr. Speaker, - I can go on on this for a very long time - is that you find people who think that to run down people is the only way of proving that they themselves are going up. That is a false idea, because you can only run people down by running yourself down too.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that whenever the progress of this country is talked about, you get people referring to what happened in 1937, and that this person was hounded down and had to leave the country. It is strange that in Jamaica the Jamaicans took one from among themselves in Bustamante.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

As I was saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Jamaicans took out Bustamante; in Trinidad Uriah Butler; in St. Kitts Bradshaw; in Antigua Bird; but the Barbadian snobbery only allows people who are in the forefront and calls on one of the middle class. It is part of the Barbadian's idea that as soon as one enters public life, he wants to know where he went to school, who is his father and that kind of thing. But you will notice that in Trinidad, the Government has given a worthwhile pension to Uriah Butler despite the fact that he opposed Eric Williams in the elections.

In our midst, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are still living people who because of exuberance in those days of 1937 when people had the wherewithal to run them out, stood like the boy on the burning deck, and I am looking forward that this Government would see fit to reward those people who, because of the Barbadian snob value, never obtained a job although they were willing to work.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I heartily endorse the Government's attitude towards the increase in salaries, more so

because I am satisfied that you cannot have a Prime Minister who has to live on the whims and fancies of somebody down Broad Street, whether they give him credit or not; and unless people are prepared to give respect to the choicest of their people, they themselves may never become leaders. There are some people on the other side whose ambition surpasses their ignorance, and it would worthwhile if they temper their ambitions with some ability. It is said that commonsense is not a common thing. With this I heartily agree. It might find itself among what we call common people, but it is not at all a common thing.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have heard, I may say, some charming speeches, notably the one from the hon. junior member for St. Andrew, and I am sure that nobody after hearing his speech would disagree with the salary now proposed for Parliamentary Secretaries, and indeed despite the contribution made by the hon. senior member for St. Philip who is unfortunately not in his seat, we on this side of the House are not disagreeing with the salaries which Parliamentary Secretaries are to receive. Indeed, much of the eloquence of the other side has been wasted on positions which no one is occupying, particularly the speech of the hon. senior member for St. Michael. He has trained his gun carefully on targets outside this House. These targets may be occupied by many members of the public, but certainly were not occupied by me. There are one or two things which the hon. member in his speech forgot. With regard to the \$720 allowance for the Leader of the Opposition, he got his figures wrong, but perhaps he was called on to speak at a moment when he was not expected to do so and was taken a bit by surprise. Anyway, we can forgive these small coincidences.
4.55 p.m.

There is one thing which I would like to correct. The hon. member said that no voice was raised against the salary proposed for the Governor-General, which was perfectly true. The hon. member went on to make the extraordinary statement that we would never agree to it if we thought for one second that it would be a Barbadian occupying the post. I do not know exactly in what ivory tower the hon. senior member for St. Michael resides. I do not know if he thinks that he was the only person in the Prime Minister's confidence. I do not know if he thinks that he is the only person on that side who knew that the Hon. Dr. Scott would have been the new Governor-General. I do not know if he knows that Dr. Scott was one of the first persons appointed to the Privy Council; he gave no significance to the fact. I do not think he seriously believes that the Prime Minister's announcement of the appointment of Dr. Scott as Governor-General of Barbados would surprise anyone. Speaking for myself, I would say that it was with a full knowledge of the intended appointment of Dr. Scott that I attended the debate on the raising of the emoluments of the Governor-General. We did not know what would have happened between our acquiescing to the appointment and the final date of the appointment.

The hon. senior member for St. Michael urged on us that a good reason for introducing this Bill is that the Financial Secretary was getting more than the Prime Minister. That to me is only a fact. It is a simple, ordinary, every-day fact. There are numerous examples in this country and in others where a person who is in a position to take decisions and to control the actions of others may not get the salary which the others get. I think it is valueless to suggest that the political head must get more than the subordinate. Governments are so unique, and you may expect that the Lord Chancellor gets more than Mr. Harold Wilson. I observe that persons who were responsible for others getting paid were not perhaps getting more than they. There were newspaper series run by employees who earn salaries above that of the Director. I do not think that the Prime Minister must necessarily be the best recipient of Government funds in Barbados. We do not regard this as something automatic. Why does the hon. senior member for St. Michael not suggest that the Prime Minister appointed the Governor-General and therefore he must receive more money than he?

The hon. senior member for St. Philip is not now in his seat and therefore I will not deal at any length with his

speech; but there is one point of his argument which is another fallacy, that is, that you must take a man's income into account when you are assessing what he is to be paid for a particular job. His argument might be followed if it had been suggested that the person was paid for other services. We are not going to go around and say that the hon. senior member for So-and-So has an income and a property which brings him in so much a month and therefore he does not need any more money. We are not suggesting that a Minister has racehorses and therefore he does not need any money. We are not suggesting that a Minister has property and therefore he must not get more salary. We are not interested in what a person's private property is as it affects the payment of salaries.

In the United States of America, there was a millionaire who was such before he successfully ran the Government. I am quite sure that nobody was so impertinent as to say that he does not need it because he is a millionaire. Those are our views. Those arguments are the type of arguments which have been adduced by hon. members on the other side of the House and there are arguments which we do not hesitate to ignore. However, we do have a very significant point to make. A great deal has been made of the absence of a salary revision for Ministers since 1957, but nothing has been said about certain other emoluments which came to the notice of Parliament and of the public and which are being drawn by Ministers. Here today not one word has been said about the Government's Hospitality Vote which is referred to in the Estimates as being under the control of the Prime Minister with reference to the Cabinet. (*Asides*) It is not because nothing has been said about it that I will cancel it. I want to say something more about it. In the year 1961 the Government's Hospitality Vote was \$6,000 a year. In those days it was used for Government hospitality. Vouchers were issued against it, entertainments were paid for out of it and, as far as we know, it was not used for the purposes for which it is being used today.
5.05 p.m.

This question of Minister's salaries has been known for some time. Indeed, from what we know, even in the last few days, a Writ Server had to go to one of the Ministers; so you can see that if a Minister received a call from a Writ Server - perhaps, people go to them daily - we can therefore say that in these days a Minister may need more money. I am surprised that we did not have that argument. But we must not think that this is like a salary, and this is salary to cut down to a particular duty.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let us look at the figures for Government Hospitality. It rose from \$6,000 in 1961, 1962 and 1963 to \$10,000 in 1964, 12,000 for 1964-65; \$20,000 for 1965-66 and now, it stands at the figure of \$33,000 a year - five times what it was when the Democratic Labour Party took office. You now have it divided up. It has been suggested that the Premier's emoluments had been \$1,000 a month, and \$400 a month was taken from the Hospitality vote. This has been already referred to by many members in here. You have to date, five full increases in the Government Hospitality vote to what it was during the days of the B.L.P. This is so; therefore, do not come into the House and say that there is no salary revision for Ministers.

I would say that the cost of living is an average rising expense and, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is for this reason we on this side asked for Ministerial salaries to be considered at the same time as members' salaries. This is something which, we feel, called for a Select Committee because despite the Prime Minister's coming here and saying he can do business or something like that - this was some intervention - he is still a member of this Honourable House. He is the senior member for St. John just as we are senior or junior members for our respective constituencies. That is why we feel Ministers' salaries should be open to the views of this House and especially since the Prime Minister has control over nearly \$3,000 a month of the taxpayers' money.

The hon. junior member for St. Philip, the hon. senior member for St. Michael and the hon. junior member for St. Andrew have been discussing this Bill. Those of us wonder why was the hon. junior member for St. Lucy is-

suing his instructions across the Table as to which point of the debate such and such a member was to intervene. Why bother to do dirty work if you have colleagues to do it for you?

We should be very much happier if you gave us a full and frank disclosure of the Prime Minister's emoluments and Ministerial receipts. If it had been laid before the House, we would have been in a much happier position to discuss whether the Hon. Prime Minister was adequately paid. It is true, with the increased responsibility in Barbados and in the world, it must necessitate the Prime Minister entertaining a great deal more out of the Government's Hospitality. He also spends a considerable amount of money abroad and his travelling has increased. I have not seen the Prime Minister's income tax returns and it would also be interesting to know whether the Income Tax Commissioner receives a return on the basis of quarters. It would be interesting to know what indeed the Prime Minister's income tax amounts to.

This is how we feel about the lack of disclosure and the lack of frankness. Perhaps, this has caused a lot of unnecessary debate and caused members on this side of the House much disquiet because we are not in a position to estimate what the true emoluments are.
5.15 p.m.

In closing, I would just suggest to the hon. senior member for St. Michael when he talked about people being big enough to give Mr. Butler a pension that he could not condemn his own Party more, because he at one moment gets up to talk about Mr. Butler in Trinidad getting a pension, and the hon. senior member for St. Philip gets up to quarrel with the Leader of the Opposition here getting one. I thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, I never quarrelled about the pension which the Leader of the Opposition is receiving. I only mentioned the amount.

Mr. SPRINGER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, I very much regret that the hon. senior member for St. Thomas is putting the hon. junior member for St. Joseph in the same vein at an early age as Mr. Butler. I never had that intention.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I take it that all the contributions on the other side have been made, because I intend to reply on behalf of the Government.

Mr. St. JOHN: If the hon. member wants to speak, let him speak, but he cannot say whether or not we have finished our replies.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is amazing that hon. members on the other side do not understand how this House works. I am the Leader of the House; I elect to reply for the Government; and out of courtesy to the other side I am saying through you that if they have made their contributions, I propose to reply, and naturally after I have replied, that is the end of it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, some of us, perhaps all of us, on this side of the House when we listened to the speech of the hon. senior member for St. James felt at that time that he has tried his best to bring the debate down to a level which perhaps he could not comprehend. I would not pursue that matter any more, because the hon. member is not now in his place, but I mentioned that to say this: that we were very much mistaken when we were thinking so then, because it was left to the hon. senior member for St. Thomas to give us an example of bringing the debate down to a level which cannot be comprehended and which can only be deplored. I am reminded of the story of King George II walking over Wimbledon Common with his brother, and his brother said to him, "But you know, Sire, you should not walk about like this unattended and without protection", and the King said "but I can afford to do it; nobody would kill me to make you King". And when I

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, the Hon. junior member for St. Lucy has his quotation hopelessly and catastrophically wrong. It was Charles II, and it was not Wimbledon Common.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I think I can stand corrected with respect to the place, but the hon. member is well aware of the circumstances because he understands the implication. When therefore hon. members opposite make flattering remarks about the Leader of the Opposition, and even sometimes on our side from time to time expressions significant of best wishes to him, I am certain that in these flattering remarks they make they do not wish to see the hon. senior member for St. Thomas gain any further prominence either in that Party or in public life, and therefore by comparison they always see the Leader of the Opposition in a flattering daze.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, I hope that the Hon. Leader of the House is not suggesting that we attack the Prime Minister in order to make him King.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: As I was saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, first of all with respect to this debate, let me make my first point. It is really astonishing that the Opposition Party and the Official Opposition Party at that - could make any protest when the question of its own emoluments was under review, but could safely walk out and leave the majority Party in charge of their own increases, well knowing that however much they talked, however much they walked out of this Chamber, the majority Party would see that their increases were made good. When they walked out of this Chamber and with some of them outside of this Chamber, the hon. senior member for St. James who, I am sorry to say, is not in his place asked "Are we going to get the money tomorrow? Is it going to be \$500 a month?" When their own Leader would have prevented them from getting their increases agreed upon in Select Committee, some of them got outside and said he was an old idiot, he did not know what he was doing, and were sending messages to me saying not to mind him, but to press on with the thing.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will tell you this: the reason why it was possible for this side of the House to challenge the Leader of the Opposition then and to say that if he could get every single member of his Party on that side to sign his Report we would withdraw our proposals, was because we knew that if he had talked from then until Doomsday, he could not have got unanimity. Do not mind how much they walked out or criticised us afterwards; do not mind how much they pranced up during the debate of this House at other times, we know that they relied on us to do justice to the Report which represented the feelings of the whole House. And even when we challenged them to the effect that if the Leader of the Opposition had reservation about what the Committee had recommended not to receive their salaries, I want to ask anyone over there whether his reservations were so monumental as to prevent any of them from going into the Treasury now for the second month and drawing their increases.

Now when also we considered on our side that we would give support to the increases recommended by Select Committee, we did not do it on any attempt recounting that if you support one side the other side must support you; we did it on the basis of the work which has been done inside Parliament and inside Government Headquarters by the people who are elected and who sit in both Houses of Parliament to do the work which has to be done inside of Parliament and inside of Government.
5.25 p.m.

The \$400 a month which we approved of, and readily agreed to, for the Leader of the Opposition taking into account the status which the Constitution of this country gives him, had nothing to do with our personal opinion of him as a politician or our disagreement with him in political life. The Constitution makes provision for the Leader of the Opposition by legislation passed in this House. He has certain administrative and other duties to perform and we said that he would be Chairman of the Public Accounts

Committee and therefore he must have his salary which is commensurate with that responsibility if he agrees to do the work. He has a lot of work to do. If you care to go back from 1962-63, you can do so. We have there a bad situation which reflects the changed conditions of parliamentary development - the changed conditions of parliamentary life and service in this Island. When we were in the Opposition, we never took issue with them on matters like these. We never took issue with them that because he happened to be Head of the Government he should not have this or he should not have that. If he felt so diffident about his own office, if his prestige was so small that he did not know what a Premier deserved to have and he did not see that the people of this island provide him with it, then that is a matter for him.

We are now in 1967, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and the people whose salaries are now being reviewed by this House are people who have been in the Government service for five years or more. I was a member of this House on the 19th March, 1961, when the then Premier, Dr. Cummins, stood up in introducing the Estimates - there was no Budget before we came into power - and prophesied that the General Revenue Balance would be depleted by the end of 1961, and therefore there would be nothing left for the rest of the financial year. That is the situation which we found when we took over the Government. Do you mean to say that a group of Ministers who have had to work so hard in order to develop this island and found the current revenue at some \$21 1/2 million and who have brought the revenue to something like \$44 1/2 million and who within that period had generated some \$55 million of Capital Development in this island, should not be compensated? Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have done three times as much as our predecessors have done for schools. They have left many things on the files which we have managed to do. I ask you this in all seriousness. Do you think that such a Government has any need to be shamefaced or to be wishy-washy in its attitude or to be apologetic in its attitude? The people themselves are the best judges of what has been done within the last five years. If they had any power to judge what was done between 1956 and 1961 and what was done between 1961 and 1966, they should be able to pronounce a comfortable verdict in favour of this political Party.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am now going to inject a line of thought which is personally my own; I do not hold my colleagues to it. I think that the person who is the Prime Minister of this Island is a bit too shamefaced in this respect. If I were the Prime Minister of this island, I would tell the people straight the quantity of work which I have to do, how, in any one day I have to put at their disposal some 20 or 21 hours of my time, that this is a daily task without remission or stoppage; and I would tell them quite plainly, if I were in the position of the Prime Minister, what I think I am worth; and I would say that for the work which I do for the promotion of this country's welfare and interest, I should be paid more than the Governor-General. That is how I feel about it and I do not bind my colleagues to that. What we have to battle with in this Island is this; that as a group of people do not represent any significant portion of Barbadian thought, what we need to fight more than anything else is the heritage of colonialism. Nobody thinks that the Prime Minister, because he is a Negro, is entitled to anything more than what they would grudgingly afford him.

When the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister was practising at the Bar - this is a question of arithmetic and fact - he could not have had the financial worry which is thus placed or thrown on him now. His earning capacity would have been conditioned by the number of cases he could do and the satisfaction which he could render to the greatest number of clients. I do not wish to embarrass him, but I have to say this. He is not going to say it for himself, but the people have to understand that so long as they can see that services are being rendered, and so long as they are satisfied with the people whom they have elected to high office and who, in the last five years have been carrying on Government in this country, have deserved the emoluments

they get and that should be the end of the matter. I do not have to apologise for the line which has been taken on the other side.
5.35 p.m.

Now, the hon. senior member for St. James thought he had a point or that it would be of political interest to the people; so he made great play of disclosing the Government's Hospitality Vote. He said it was \$6,000 and it was now \$32,000.

(A VOICE: Whom did you say that member was?)

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I withdraw that. It was the hon. senior member for St. Thomas. Has the hon. member reflected that the volume of visits from overseas has increased one thousand fold? I, myself, have been responsible for bringing about \$5,000 of educational development to this Island. Do you want me to tell you how?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, wherever you pass, you see the development which is taking place with what the hon. member claims is the phenomenal rise in the Government Hospitality Vote. Further, the hon. member tried to make out that Ministers have gone into the Treasury surreptitiously for everything, while everything which we are drawing is voted for in Parliament and, before it is sent to Parliament is carefully scrutinized. It is true that political parties differ in their attitudes to their Government. Members of this Government would prefer to get theirs from the Treasury than otherwise.

The hon. member said that he would like to see the Prime Minister's tax returns. Everybody knows that the Prime Minister must by law have his returns deducted. He is not above the law. The public should know that the increases in Minister's salaries are by law subject to taxation. I do not know for other people, but the Income Tax Commissioner is going to get some 52% of what my increase is. Why should it not be so? He should be glad to pay it if he has what to pay it from.

As the hon. senior member for St. Thomas may be thinking that some of us may be accepting the Hospitality allowance which is to be spent on public business and in the interest of furthering the development of this country

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I said, that the allowances to which I referred - the \$400 for the Prime Minister and \$100 for the Ministers - are paid irrespective of whether they are spent or not. Many have the view that it is paid to them for entertainment.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The hon. member does not seem to understand that what he is talking of is in the Estimates. It is there. First of all, there is nothing which comes to us which has not been submitted to and approved by this House. Secondly -

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, the Estimates states:
"\$32,000 - Government Hospitality - to be spent by the Premier on Hospitality - " There is nothing in that to say how the money is spent. This is a block vote.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: There is the second point. I got his admission that they are talking of what is submitted and approved by Parliament.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. There is no point of admission. I simply referred to what was quoted in the Estimates.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The hon. member made the admission that the Government had gone into the Treasury without Parliament's authority, thus to make it appear that the Government illegally went into the Treasury to do something which was contrary to law and without the approval of Parliament.

The second point is this. If you are in the Government, that Government has to do a certain amount of hospitality.

You must realise that when you see Government Hospitality a lot of people get the impression that only Ministers entertain people. A Permanent Secretary is entitled on behalf of the Government, and not only entitled but frequently too, to entertainment. Therefore, the Government's Hospitality Vote is at the disposal of Ministers and Officers. That is the point on entertainment.

We found out that there were bills continually coming to the Cabinet from time to time quite frequently covering a vast range of entertainment and instead of week by week, or as often as the Cabinet had a meeting, vouching a half dozen or two or three, we decided that the thing to do was to allow a Minister so much for entertainment allowance and also to make it clear that all entertainment costs up to \$25.00 were to be borne by the individual Minister himself. It is, therefore, not true to say, as the hon. senior member for St. James has said, that you get this \$100.00 a month whether you spend it or not.

Mr. CRAIG: I never made any statement about any \$100.00.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I know. The hon. member is right in this instance. I called his name, but I meant the other one.
5.45 p.m.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, who is the other one? Does he mean the hon. junior member for St. James? Secondly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Hon. Leader of the House is saying it is just not true to say that as I said you get this money whether you spend it or not. I challenge the hon. member to get up and say if he made a return to the Treasury last month for his \$100.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was at the point at which I was explaining how this works to the satisfaction of most hon. members except those who wish to make something of it. When this matter was before the Estimates Committee last year, the then hon. senior member for St. Philip who well knew the circumstances, but who, because of changed circumstances with him at the time, wanted to make something of it in order to appear to put the Government in the wrong, asked about it and we had a lengthy debate and explanation on this matter. It is true that only two of the hon. members sitting opposite there were in the House at the time, but this matter was gone into and it was explained then that when you say something is under the control of the Premier or the Prime Minister, you did not mean and could not mean that the Premier spends it. What you mean is that naturally there has to be some person in the Cabinet, and preferably the Minister of Finance and Head of the Government, who must authorise expenditure. That has to be so, and both before and after, because our practice - I do not know what went on in former Governments - has been, since we have had this Government, for each Minister or each Civil Servant whenever he proposes to entertain Mr. X or Mr. Y, to say to the Cabinet before hand: "It is proposed to have a Cocktail Party or Luncheon or Dinner; does the Cabinet approve?"

What we have tried to do with some success is this: if three or four Ministers or Departments are having visitors in the same week, or the same time span running for over three days, we try to rationalise and economise by saying instead of Government giving two or three Cocktail Parties in the space of twenty-four hours, could we re-arrange them so that one Party could serve both Ministries, and this is frequently done. But outside of this Ministers are frequently called upon to offer entertainment when meeting people at the Airport, entertain people at lunch or dinner officially in connection with their own Department or Ministries and the Departments under their control. It is astonishing that you can in a situation like this misunderstand the whole purpose of hospitality. If you have a Cabinet and you have a Civil Service, Government Hospitality must spread over the whole range of activities. You cannot ask a Minister or a Permanent Secretary every five minutes what he is going to spend; but instead of having numerous bills coming in for \$2.50 for this, \$10.50 for that and \$1.75 for something else, you look at the range of expenditure over a period and rationalise it (a) by giving Ministers an

allowance and (b) by making sure that they do not do the very thing that the hon. member thinks can be done, because up to a certain amount they must meet that expenditure.

I am grateful to the hon. member on my right for reminding me of this, and hon. members opposite should reflect on this. You are allowed to spend up to \$25.00 on any particular item of entertainment, so that it is perfectly possible - and frequently has happened - that a Minister in the course of a single day has gone into his own pocket, for the simple reason - I do not know why they are laughing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, except at themselves - that in computing the hospitality allowance, no Cabinet is going to waste its time trying to work out to the last cent how much a Minister or a Civil Servant should spend for entertainment. You have a fairly valid experience over a three or four months' period of how the thing works, and you allow a Minister up to \$2500 for any one occasion. Beyond that you start to claim. On a single item a Minister could conceivably spend \$10 or \$18 or \$20.

I remember myself during the Independence celebrations that Ministers of Government frequently had to attend in turn at Seawell to receive guests. Between us we had to receive probably about 400 people. If in a ten minute break you invited somebody to drinks when you go to receive or see somebody off, and you are doing this in the course of a year without reckoning the number of times you go into your own pocket, without reference to Government entertainment, you will find, as we have found, that you can spend many times more than the allowance which is put at your disposal. Now there is another point, and it comes right to this.
5.55 p.m.

Nobody in this Country is willing to appreciate the fact that you cannot fully compensate people in public life. What you find on the same level of allowance you have to relate to something, and in some cases anything you fix is arbitrary. The Governor-General receives a duty allowance of \$9,600 a year. When the last Government was in power, quite a tremendous amount of hospitality fell on Government House; but since we have come into power, the rules were reversed, and that before we had acquired an official residence for the Prime Minister, four times as much Government hospitality is now offered at Culloden Farm, or outside Government House, than is offered in it. Since this Government has come into power we had thought that it was most inappropriate that the cost of their reception given at Government House for the Queen's Birthday should fall on the Governor and we have taken over that. Nobody suggests that with the reduced responsibility which fell on the incumbent of Government House, there should be a reduction in the duty allowance but you look at the Official residence which the people have provided for the holder of the office of Prime Minister!

You could not ask such a question as if the Income Tax Commissioner takes into account a rent-free house. You are prepared that, in the Colonial days, an Englishman could live in a free house, and the Colonial Secretary or the Auditor General or whoever he was, saw that he was living in a rent-free house or in a Government house, a subsidised house which the people of this country would have to pay for; but when you come to a person who is elected by the people and who has the highest responsibility of bringing satisfaction to the country, you are saying that \$1,400 per month is too much for him. That is why I say that the hon. member, the Prime Minister, is different from me. I would say that I deserve as much from the people of this country in discharging their responsibility creditably - I would say that the same duty allowance which the people of this country are prepared to pay to the Governor-General they should pay to the Prime Minister. I would do that on grounds of principle so that when I cease to be Prime Minister I would have made my successor in office secure in the status and responsibility.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the last point which I would like to make is this: do not think that because we have been talking about salaries and allowances and about this, that and the other that the debate must remain at this level. It

is not an arithmetical connotation; it is the whole outlook of life. The people on the other side believe that so long as Mr. Pile, Mr. Chandler or Mr. Thorne has the Government of this country, anything that they did was all right; but when their own people are running the Government of this country and performing the services, the case is somewhat altered. There is a necessary connection between universal adult suffrage, the payment of politicians and the progress which a country has made. Whenever any of us go outside, we can be approached by any elector with grievances, we are told that there is water wanting somewhere and a house is falling down somewhere else because the people have put us here to do their business. Because they have been paying us since 1949, they have got infinitely more service from the representatives of the people than they had from the Piles and the Chandlers because those people used to pay themselves and they did not care one hang about the people whom we have to care about now.

Let us not try to make cheap politics out of matters such as these. Fortunately, this Government can justify the salaries for Ministers on the basis of solid achievement of what we have done for the people of this Island. If the people on the other side were in power, it is possible that such a justification could not have been made. We have not taken out of the Public Treasury any money which is not deserved; as a matter of fact, we have put more money in the Treasury than anything which comes to us, anything which we have received; and we can appeal to the common-sense of the people and to their fair-mindedness in seeing that the elected representatives of the people are compensated not as fully as they should be compensated, but as reasonably as the level of their services direct and as they are prepared to work for the people.

The question that this Bill be now read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative.

A division was taken as follows:—

AYES: Honourables J. C. TUDOR, E. W. BARROW, C. E. TALMA, G. G. FERGUSON, A. DaC. EDWARDS, N. W. BOXILL, Messrs. W. R. LOWE, J. W. CORBIN, R. St. C. WEEKES, C. A. E. HOPPIN, L. E. SMITH and H. B. St. JOHN - 12.

NOES: Messrs. W. C. B. HINDS, L. S. CRAIG, J. M. G. M. ADAMS, K. N. R. HUSBANDS and Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS - 5.
6.05 p.m.

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

Clauses 1 to 6 inclusive 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, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

THE BANK HOLIDAYS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1967

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade and Fisheries: Second reading of a Bill to amend the Bank Holidays Act, 1905.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to amend the Bank Holidays Act, 1905, (1905-3), in order to remove from the Scheduled list of Bank Holidays the 9th November and to add thereto the 30th of November.

Mr. Speaker, the 9th November, has always been kept as a bank-holiday in celebration of Peace Maker's Day. With Barbados becoming independent, it has been decided to delete the 9th November from the list of Bank Holidays in order to celebrate the anniversary of the independence of Barbados which will be kept on the 30th November, the day when Barbados became independent. There is no need

to have the list of Bank Holidays cluttered up with Bank Holidays; so the Government has decided to eliminate the 9th November from the list in the Schedule to the Act and insert the 30th November in its place.

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

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

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

On motions of Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

6.15 p.m.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

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

On the separate motions of Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1967

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1967.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, this is a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment Order made on the 19th January, 1967 by the Cabinet, and this Civil Establishment Order is in respect of the Public Works Department to make provision for the establishment of a post of a Tracer and Clerk at the salary set out. In the Ministry of Education there is also to be the establishment of an Assistant Librarian and an Operator, Bookmobile; and in the Ministry of Health and Community Development the establishment of the post of Nurse for the Ophthalmic Service and a Staff Nurse and one Stenographer in the permanent establishment of the Ministry of Health for the purpose of the B. C. G. service in connection with testing for Tuberculosis. The Staff has to be increased in the Laboratory by a Senior Laboratory Technician, a Junior Laboratory Technician and a Laboratory Attendant in place of a general worker; and the bracketing of the posts of Laboratory Technician and Junior Laboratory Technician ensures that on obtaining the prescribed qualification, the Junior Laboratory Technician may automatically advance to the higher bracket.

In the Meteorological Service, Mr. Speaker, we are making an adjustment in the salary scale of the post of Meteorological Assistant to remove one of the Efficiency Bars and provide other conditions for advancement in the scale.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Bill entitled an Act to amend the Marriage Act, 1904, and the Marriage of British Subjects (Facilities) Act, 1916, was circulated only today, and in view of the fact that there

is nothing particularly pressing, as far as I can see, about the provisions of the amendments which are proposed in the Bill, I do not intend to proceed with this item today; but I will serve notice that on the next occasion that the House meets that Bill will be dealt with in all its stages.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Item, No. 7, also stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to provide for the discharge, modification and interpretation of certain restrictions affecting land, and for other matters connected therewith.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the same thing applies to this Bill which was only given notice of on the 24th. It has been printed and circulated, but I will ask you to defer this and deal with the next item.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, this concludes Government Business, and we had earlier, I understand, given an undertaking to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph that some Private Members' Business would be done. We wish to honour that undertaking.

I therefore beg to move that Private Members' Business be now taken.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now time for Private Members' Business.

RESOLUTION re HOUSING AREA AT LAMMINGS PASTURE, ST. JOSEPH

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave that Item No. 2 standing in my name be the first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Joseph is asking leave of the House to proceed with Item No. 2 standing in his name under Private Members' Business as the first Order of the Day, and unless there is any objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted the hon. member to proceed to move the passing of a Resolution relating to the necessity for the establishment of a housing area at Lammings Pasture, St. Joseph.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is very short and is asking this Honourable House to negotiate the purchasing of Lammings Pasture for the purpose of establishing a housing area.
6.25 p.m.

This particular pasture is a pasture which, at the moment, is not arable, it is not what we would call suitable for sugar cane growing, and it is in close proximity to these people who are living in danger. As you remember, Sir, in the month of November, we had such a heavy rainfall that some of these people had to remove their houses immediately. There are a lot of people who are now living in the same area and they are facing the same danger, and there are people who do not want to go too far away out of the parish. Some of the members of the Government, including myself and my colleague, have already visited this area and we have given it our approval. Sir, the people are very anxious to know if the Government is going to come to their rescue immediately by buying this particular pasture.

The guardians of this particular area of land are only too willing to turn it over to the Government as soon as they see fit to negotiate for it. There are people who are living in a place situated near to a pond called Kendal Pond, and when we get a heavy rainfall the flow of water can make it

very embarrassing for residents around that pond. The water carries away some of their animals sometimes. There was a woman who lost her belongings because of the flood area around there. I feel that the Government should be doing their duty if they will make an immediate effort, if they have not done it already, to own this particular pasture. Mr. Speaker, I will not go so far as to prolong the debate any further, because I can quite clearly see the expression on the faces of the members on the other side of the Table, that they are ready to give the green light to this Resolution. This is a deserving cause and I appeal to the Government members to relieve these suffering people. The members of the Government should remember the people and forget the introducer of this Resolution, because it is the people whom we are out to help, and not the introducer of the Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, without any more ado, it gives me very great pleasure to move the passing of this Resolution. In fact, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I beg to second that.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, as a result of the recent heavy rains in November and December last year there has been a lot of land slipping in the areas in St. Joseph. We paid visits to the various sites and we have come to the conclusion that it is expedient to remove the people from the places where they now live. On the question of resiting the people to a definite spot in St. Joseph where they will not be too far removed from their places of employment, this Government is not opposed to that; however, I should like to let the hon. member know that we could not bind ourselves down to acquiring this particular person's property now. What we are doing, Sir, is investigating the entire area. If Lammings Pasture is the most suitable site for the purpose of resiting these people, then the Government will take that into consideration. If we find another site which is nearer to the majority of residents whose houses are affected by the land slides, then the Government will take the decision to acquire that site; but the Government will acquire a site in the parish of St. Joseph for the proper development of a housing area. I do not know if the hon. member will give the Government an opportunity to see what is the best available site. At this stage, rather than allowing the passing of this Resolution for the acquisition of this pasture, I would move that the further consideration of this matter be postponed.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand the reasons for the postponement of this debate because the Hon. Minister visited the particular site, and he saw that the people are in danger. There is a man called Frank Forde in whose house I would not even go if I happened to be travelling there and the rain started to fall. As I say, Sir, I would not even go into that house, far more to sleep in it. The danger is under these people's houses at this moment still. If the Government does not pin itself down to the acquisition of Lammings Pasture, then they should be in a position to tell me whether there is another site under consideration.
6.35 p.m.

The Minister should be in a position to tell me or the House if there is another site. I am sure that Lammings will not hold all the people's houses which want removing from the danger site. The people have to look for another site for their houses.

When it comes to the houses at Mellowes, Edgecliffe and the Spa, you have as many houses there as Lammings would accommodate. You have to get another site for the houses on the other side of the parish, Vaughan's Land, Surinam, Hackleton Cliff and Church Village. Mr. Speaker, you must have heard or read that quite recently a rock broke away from Hackleton Cliff where, as I said, some people are living. The owners of Malvern plantation, which is good land, are not going to allow the people to remove their houses from the danger zone to land on that plantation.

As a matter of fact, there are still some people who are waiting on the Government. I asked the Government the other day if they knew that Lammings was for sale. The owners of Lammings are not prepared to sell a spot or two, but they will sell if you buy a large area of land.

St. Joseph is strictly agricultural land and the people there are not going to give up the land. Tamarind Hall is not sufficient to accommodate all. We may get another rainfall before Government decides to do something and, so far as Lammings is concerned, I know that the owners would allow the people to remove their houses there before the Government does anything.

I would say, if the Hon. Minister knows that there is another site which they can buy to house all those houses, that is alright. Tell us; but do not ask us to agree to a postponement. I just have no word to press for the postponement of this Resolution. I do not know, unless you can tell us where this other site would be. I called the names of two sites which are available - Tamarind Hall as well as Lammings. You only have to begin negotiations and the people would be able to move on the land.

What may have actuated the minds of some members of the Government is that they may feel that by passing this Resolution tonight, and then they buy Lammings, all of the stars would be taken out of their crown and would be placed into mine. They feel that they would be doing me a big service, but it is the people to whom they will be doing a big service - not me. I am not asking the Government to remove me; I am asking the Government to protect those people. You might hear in the morning that Frank Forde's house has gone under the gully. That man is still looking around for a spot. Lots of people would like to get a spot. The people cannot get anywhere to put the houses which they have from the Housing Authority. Wherever they can get a bit of land, they would move on it as soon as possible. What is the use of telling people to get a home and then when they get one, they cannot get any place to put it? I know a man who is now only waiting to get a spot. Everything is done already as far as the Housing Authority is concerned.

The Government must work quickly. They will have to buy Lammings and Tamarind Hall. Tamarind Hall would be able to accommodate the lower part of St. John. It is not only a question of removing people's houses from the danger zone. The owners of these places would not rent out the land for house spots because you have to give them a long time before you can get them off. You have passed a law committing them to renting out their land for a long time before you can get the tenant off; so they are saying that you have given us too much trouble to get a tenant off. The Government has protected these tenants by making the owners give them a long notice. You have to protect them by buying land for them. The Government will have to make up its mind to buy Tamarind Hall and Lammings. The Government is here to do that because I cannot buy the land. I will tell the people from today that the Government is helping them. Therefore, Sir, I am asking the Government to carry on and do not loiter in their legal department. Let us know what is their intention and do not keep us dilly-dallying.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I want to speak quite shortly on this Resolution. I have heard the hon. senior member for St. Joseph and the hon. senior member for St. Andrew. It appears that there is a serious problem in St. Joseph. I heard the hon. senior member for St. Joseph say that even Lammings and Tamarind Hall together cannot accommodate all the people, and I hope in due course that on your information satisfactory use is being made of the Housing Areas to which mention is made for the transfer of these people.

6.45 p.m.

I wonder if full use is being made of the Housing Areas to which persons have already been transferred, because a great deal is heard of how these housing areas must be in the same parish, but I observe in my own constituency of St. Thomas that many people have been transferred there. It is to be hoped that, when this Resolution is carried,

either now or some time in the future, the Minister will also take note that at least one member expressed his concern that proper facilities be made available at whatever housing areas may be used for the persons who have to be removed from the Melvins Hill district and the other districts which are threatened.

At the Bagatelle Housing Area in St. Thomas to which many persons have already been removed, I understand, from St. Andrew and elsewhere, the cricket ground is still uneven, the pavilion does not have a caterer, and the people in Redman's Village are crying out for facilities in the housing area proper. There is a well known cricket team, the Redman's Village Cricket Team, and with more people coming in, the Housing Authority can be directed to introduce better facilities both for these housing areas and for any other covered by this Resolution and to be covered in the future if the amendment is carried. Proper attention should be paid to the persons who are transferred to these housing areas, and I hope that all the Ministers concerned - and after all St. Thomas is represented by a Minister as well, will now make some effort in these matters where new housing areas are going to be brought into effect to see that they have proper facilities at all times.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting to the House not to agree to this amendment for the excellent reason given by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, more especially since it is impossible for the Minister to say that this is not a suitable spot in St. Joseph for people who have to work in St. Andrew or St. Thomas. I do not want to say it in any spirit of feeling that there is some reason for the Minister and the hon. senior member for St. Andrew to be doing something which we do not expect of them. I am not saying it in any critical way of either Minister; but it is remarkable to me who came away feeling that we were getting co-operation between the Government and the Opposition, that those of us who were there including the Civil Servants could not have examined the position in a more cultured light: there was no question of Government or Opposition or of Civil Servants. Everyone who went there saw the appalling danger of some people and we all agreed without the slightest moment of hesitation. I will pay tribute to the Hon. Minister by saying that he was as reasonable, sympathetic and willing to help the people in danger as we, the two members for St. Joseph, were. It is to me just amazing that this property has not yet been bought. I remember hearing some talk about how long it takes and all that. It does not take five minutes for the Government to say they are going in.

Mr. Speaker, Lammings should have been bought the morning after we visited that spot. They should go in and say: "We as Government are taking this spot over; we will negotiate the price after;" and promptly move the houses on to Lammings. There is no excuse for postponement. I have just paid the two hon. members to whom I referred the compliment of saying that they gave the impression of admitting it was a very suitable spot, with a road on the site, and with water and electricity passing by, and as the hon. senior member for St. Joseph has said, we know that the owners are not putting any obstacles in the way of Government. I have not paid them that compliment for the sake of flattering, but I am merely stating the facts. From the conditions they saw, they felt no less strong than we, the two members from St. Joseph, felt. They saw the appalling situation and also approved Lammings as a suitable site. Why wait, as the hon. member has asked? The extraordinary and abnormal weather, the rain falling in January to the extent that it has, all these things point to the necessity of going ahead. The necessity is there, the willingness of the owner is there; why delay? For that reason I am asking hon. members not to postpone this matter, because this is not a Party matter. If it were possible for the Minister in charge of this to say he is not too sure this is a suitable spot and he wants justification, of course we would say "yes". It does not matter what the price will be now, since with the ease with which you can get the land, you do not have to wait to see whether it is reasonable. You can buy it now for the people and then argue about reasonableness or unreasonableness, and if they were unreasonable, you

come in here and say what you are going to give for it, I suggest to the Hon. Minister not to give the impression that there is some reason unadduced, because what he said is no answer to our asking him to go on with this. As the hon. senior member for St. Joseph has said, you want Lammings and you want more land.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister must know that obviously people in St. Joseph do not want to go to St. Thomas if they can get land in the parish. I do not know that any hon. member would care to leave his parish for any other parish as long as he is comfortable where he is; but if necessity makes him move away from his work plus his old home, of course he will make a great fuss about having to leave his home and having a greater distance to go to get to his work. I do appeal to the Hon. Minister. You are bound to buy Lammings because you want land. The owner tells you that you can have it, and whether or not the owner says you can have it, you can acquire it because you are Government and there is the Land Acquisition Act.

6.55 p.m.

I hope that my appeal to the hon. member in charge of this portfolio will bear fruit and that he will see about this matter in view of what the two representatives for St. Joseph have said. After all, hon. members must know that the people who have to remove out of the parish are protesting against it. I believe my senior colleague has quoted an instance where he will take no risk. I appeal strongly to hon. members.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that you will remember that not so long ago I was appointed as Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Health and Community Development. When I was given that appointment, the Hon. Minister of Health and Community Development instructed me to concentrate on housing. Consequently, I am prepared to reply to members of the Opposition. I would like to say that the Government has a comprehensive plan in dealing with all aspects of housing. We are not here to accept the advice of the members of the Opposition because we are capable of planning for that particular area. It is my duty to remind the members of the Opposition that we are quite willing to listen to them attentively and to do our utmost at all times for the benefit of the community. It is true that the members of the Opposition are playing to the gallery, but we are.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us stick to the Resolution for acquiring Lammings.

Mr. WEEKES: Very Well, Sir. The Government will deal with Lammings in due course, and we are prepared to do all that lies in our power for the people of this particular area; and not only with respect to Lammings but also for the people in other parishes who own houses. The members of the Opposition have come to the conclusion that Lammings Pasture is a suitable site to which these people should be removed, but the Government will, in due course, decide where these people should be domiciled in the future.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that some hon. members want to place the houses of people who happen to live under frightful conditions as obtain in St. Joseph and other parishes in the same category as they will place something which can be collected in their pockets. That is not the case, Hon. members on the other side of the House do not seem to realise in the proper sense the plight of the Hon. Minister who moved the postponement of this Resolution. I fully appreciate his plight. I also fully appreciate the plight of the Parliamentary Secretary. This Resolution, simple as it appears, applies the test of the sincerity of the Government as to the question of helping these poor poverty-stricken people whose homes have been affected by flooding and landslides in the St. Joseph area and elsewhere. I say further that this Resolution is also a test to the ability of Government Ministers and the Government, so to speak. What we have seen here this afternoon is evidently what appears to be dangerous and threatening to life in the view of the two hon. representatives of the parish of St. Joseph and of the people whose lives happen to be threatened, but it may not appear to be dangerous in the eyes of the Government Ministers. They have seen the site, but it does appear that when some of the Ministers see, they do

not believe. I am willing to say that what has happened in the parish of St. Joseph and the adjoining parishes might well have happened in St. Peter or in any other parish of this Island. What has happened in St. Joseph may happen elsewhere at any time. It is either that the Government is satisfied that these people are in imminent danger, that their lives stand threatened and the Government mean to do something about it and not toy or fiddle with it, or, on the other hand, the Government are disregarding the lives of the people down there and they will deal with this matter in their own good time. I heard the hon. senior member for St. Philip say that the Government will deal with Lammings Pasture in due course.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of explanation, I did not say that the Government would deal with Lammings in due course. What I said is that the Government has a comprehensive plan.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. senior member for St. Philip said both things. He said that the Government has a comprehensive plan and that they will deal with Lammings in due course. Do you know what the trouble is, Sir? I am of the opinion that the hon. senior member for St. Philip does not appreciate what a comprehensive plan is.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I have said already and I repeat that the Government has a comprehensive plan and we will deal with it in due course. (Laughter).
7.05 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: I am too wondering, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. senior member for St. Philip wants us to understand that Lammings is not in that comprehensive plan. What we have to concern ourselves with is this. As the hon. senior member for St. Joseph said, we have to consider the siting of working class people as reasonably close as possible to their place of employment. This is a point which must not be forgotten.

What I want to appeal to hon. members on the other side to do about this Resolution is this. I understand the plight of the Minister and his moving a motion for the postponement. I appreciate his position. He would have gone and seen the condition of these people; but when he comes back to his Cabinet, is he in the position to stand up in Cabinet and say: "The people in the area referred to by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph are in danger and I feel today this Cabinet should take some decision to give these people some measure of relief?"

This is not anything which is worth postponing for any reason whatsoever. I have every confidence in the hon. senior member for St. Joseph as to his ability to choose and see what is good for the people who now stand in danger in the parish of St. Joseph; and I appeal to the Hon. Minister to do all that he can, in other words, to take some action today. The longer you keep these people waiting, you are endangering them and preventing them from having a comfortable night's rest. Let me know that Government is doing something and that the people would not live in danger any longer than tomorrow or the day after.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I have to speak on this matter. In the recent rainfall, we had plenty of landslides in the parishes of St. Andrew and St. Joseph. I understood that the Minister concerned and Officials were coming up to look at the immediate danger. I associated myself with the Minister of the Government and all the other persons. Along with us were the two hon. members for St. Joseph. All of us went around and visited the various places and saw the danger of the people and we have made preparations to help those who were in immediate danger. This was our Chief purpose for going around.

We have made provisions to resite these people at Bagatelle or any other suitable site. Some of the people say that they are not going to this place; they do not want to leave St. Joseph. We asked them: will you show us a suitable place where you want to go if you do not want to go to Bagatelle or any other housing area? We were trying to save those who were ready to die. That is what we are here to do.

We then told the people that we were giving them whatever help we could to re-site them. Some agreed to that and some did not agree. That is as regards the immediate help.

We then decided to look around for a spot for them and we went to a place called Lammings. We all agreed that the place which we went and looked at was firmer than where these people were living. However, the important point is that we were willing to help these people with another spot on which to live which is firmer than where they are. Up to now only negotiations are being made with the various owners with whom we want to purchase their land.

I am assured according to what I understand that they are going to other places. Maybe some of these places are better than Lammings. The only thing I do not like to hear is that the people do not want to leave St. Joseph to go to other places. If other estates want labourers, I do not see any reason why these people in St. Joseph cannot go and work at these other estates. The St. Lucians would not come up as they are accustomed doing; they would not be allowed to come up until they have proper examination. A lot come up without having examination and they spread diseases.

I am sure that the Government is going to purchase somewhere to help the poor people of this island. The Government is not sitting down or lying down, and I am sure that Government is willing in the near future to remove all these people who are suffering. We have people at Rock Hall in St. Andrew who are in worse condition. I can assure hon. members that negotiations are proceeding to re-site these people.
7.15 p.m.

I am saying, Sir, that the people must make up their minds. I heard the hon. senior member for St. Joseph say that there are people who may tomorrow morning go down into the gully. I believe that these are some of the people who have been asked to move, but they do not want to move to go to Bagatelle or other places. When you are in distress and places are provided, you should accept the provision which is made. If they do not want to go, we cannot move them because they are free. I trust, Mr. Speaker, that in the very near future provision will be made for the people in those dangerous places in St. Joseph and St. Andrew to relieve them of their plight.

Mr. HUSBANDS and the Hon. G. G. FERGUSON rose to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: Immediately prior to the hon. junior member for St. Andrew rising, the hon. junior member for St. Michael rose. It is his turn now and then the hon. senior member for St. Peter, if he still desires to speak.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, the whole situation rests with the technical people in these areas. I was Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries, before my colleague took over, when this disaster took place in St. Andrew and St. Joseph, and within a day or two after the heavy rains, I visited areas in St. Andrew and St. Joseph and reported immediately to my other colleague here, the Minister of Housing, the serious situation that existed. As a matter of fact, Sir, I would not have taken the chance sleeping in some of these houses another night. Large areas of soil and trees were completely removed from some of these areas and left some of the houses actually exposed, and it was fortunate that some of them did not move. We on this side realise that people growing up and living in an area will always be reluctant to move, and this is one of the main problems.

Too many people in Barbados can only appreciate the necessity to move when there is a direct need or emergency, and I think this is one of the things that has been brought to the people in the Soil Conservation area. Some of the people in the most desolate positions were removed to areas which the Government has. The hon. senior member for St. Philip made mention of preparations being made within certain areas for housing. That may be a normal plan, for carrying out housing, but this is a matter of

emergency, which is something completely different. You have got to change your plans from an emergency to one of day-to-day operations, and I should like to draw to the attention of both hon. members for St. Joseph that the Minister who has taken over from me in agriculture is as much concerned as they may be with respect to the danger surrounding the people in St. Joseph and St. Andrew. I would not like any person on that side to think that the Ministers sitting over here are inhuman or neglectful of the people regardless of constituency, class or race in this country, and I should like to assure them that in a very short space of time preparations will be made to have these people as close as possible to where they formerly lived. This is a soil-moving area, and since the area was visited on the first occasion, there have been heavy rains and many other areas have shown up defects; so we have to depend on our technical advisers before we can move people to a specific area. It has to be an area on which a test has been carried out to certify that it is not within the zone in which slipping has been taking place.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the motion for postponement, in Parliament every member, subject to the rules, has a right to speak. What I remind myself of is this: that when a Resolution is moved by a backbencher, that backbencher is actually seeking the assent of the House in order that the feeling of the House will be transferred to the Government, and the Government ultimately decides. The Government need not make speeches on this Resolution at all; they merely have it in hand if and only if it passes the House; so on postponing the Government does not make the same speeches that we have made among ourselves. What is the purpose of postponing? If it passes, they are not even committed. If this Resolution passes this House tonight, Government is not committed to buy the land. This is a sheer waste of time, because the Government is absolutely under no obligation. When Ministers talk on Private Members' Resolutions, they are talking to themselves, and I hope somebody will teach them that. You know that from your experience, and that is what I have been listening to here today on something Government will decide on in our absence. It is ridiculous and trivial. They are political infants and babies in arms. I do of course appreciate the speech made by the Hon. Minister who has just sat down, the hon. junior member for St. Michael. He made a speech of some substance, and I hope he makes a speech like that in Cabinet which ought to be very effective there where it can bring about results.

Mr. Speaker, a Resolution is something resolved in one body to be transferred to another body, and in making speeches on this Resolution, the Government has been speaking to itself; so the postponement is really unnecessary. This House can pass this matter with or without Government, and if it is decided on one way or another, this House cannot commit the Government even if it passes. I hope the Ministers know that we are only saying that the feeling of the House by a vote is that this Resolution should go to Government. That is all.
7.25 p.m.

We cannot commit them. We only say that we feel that the House by a vote should send this Resolution to the Government. With those remarks, I do not think we should waste any more time on this matter. Talking to the Government is a sheer waste of time, in my opinion.

The question that further consideration of this Resolution be now postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative.

A division was taken as follows:-

AYES: Mr. YEARWOOD, Hon'bles J. C. TUDOR, C. E. TALMA, G. G. FERGUSON, A. D. C. EDWARDS, N. W. BOXILL, Messrs. LOWE, SARGEANT, WEEKES and HOPPIN - 10.

NOES: Messrs. LYNCH, HINDS, HUSBANDS, SMITH and Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS - 5.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am advised that five hon. members have voted "No" and ten hon. members have voted "Aye". Accordingly, I declare that the "Ayes" have it and the further consideration of this Resolution now stands postponed.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS CONCLUDED

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw two things to your attention. On today's Order Paper dated 31st January, 1967, there is Order No. 3 under Private Members' Business, which was actually disposed of last week, has still been reprinted. That is, a motion standing in the name of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition:-

To move the passing of a Resolution deploring the conduct of His Honour the Speaker in accepting, without reproach on his part, a gross contempt of the Chair by the junior member for St. Lucy and Leader of the House when on December 15, 1966, he disobeyed a ruling by Mr. Speaker and further that His Honour the Speaker was himself guilty of conduct unbecoming the dignity of the Chair and is deserving of the gravest possible censure.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have discovered that and I pointed it out to the Government Printer. Likewise, the Hon. Leader of the House will notice that Private Members' Business should have been placed on the Order Paper before Government Business.

SELECT COMMITTEE DISCHARGED

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if Your Honour would discharge the Select Committee which was appointed on 13th December, 1966, to consider and report on the Salaries and conditions of service of the Officers of the House of Assembly and the salaries of the members of the House of Assembly.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank the Hon. Leader of the House for reminding me of that. I was contemplating doing a similar thing during the day. I take this opportunity to thank those hon. members who were associated with me on that Committee for their labours and I also take this opportunity now of discharging them with my gratitude and the gratitude, I am sure, of the whole House.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, you will also recall that one of the recommendations of that Select Committee was that another Committee should be set up in due course to go into the question of pensions for members of the House and Ministers. I do not know whether there is any particular hurry about that, but as this kind of Committee will have to do a long spell of detailed work, perhaps Your Honour will appoint a Committee representative of the whole House, and perhaps also Your Honour will wish to give attention to that matter for some weeks.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will give the matter due thought.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 21st February, 1967, at 2.30 p.m. of the clock.

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

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 21st February, 1967, at 2.30 p.m. of the clock was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

7.35 p.m.