

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Friday, 16th February, 1968

A Special meeting of the House of Assembly was held today at 10 o'clock a.m.

PRESENT

His Honour G. E. SARGEANT, (Deputy Speaker); Mr. E. ST.A. HOLDER, J.P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (Minister of Health and Community Development); Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A. (Leader of the House); 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); Mr. C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P. and Mr. J. B. SPRINGER.

Prayers were read.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS, Mr. HINDS and Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON entered the House and took their seats.

MOTION OF PRIVILEGE

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Before the Business of the House begins, I draw Your Honour's attention to the fact that the notice summoning this meeting does not contain as one of the Orders the debate to be resumed on the motion of breach of privilege. I asked the Clerk to draw to Your Honour's attention the authority of "May" which could not be clearer. In May's - the Clerk has a later edition and I think Your Honour has seen the page in Your Honour's volume - the Sixteenth and Eighteenth editions it states:-

"In view of the requirement that a matter of privilege should be raised at the earliest opportunity it is generally brought on without notice. But provided there has been no undue delay, the claim to priority of such a matter is not prejudiced merely on the ground that it has been possible to place a motion dealing with it upon the Notice Paper".

In short, the fact that it has been on the Order Paper before does not prejudice the fact that this is the procedure - that you should take it first.

"The same treatment," May's goes on "is accorded to a matter of privilege if through the adjournment of the debate on the motion in which it was embodied, it becomes an Order of the Day."

Again, that is the Order of the Day and even if it is pushed farther down, it has to be taken first. "The priority of a Notice of Motion or Order of the Day relating to a matter of privilege is not prejudiced by the fact that the day on which it is to be raised is a day on which under the orders of the House, Government Business has precedence."

If I may say with respect to that, the law gives us as clearly as possible that, under both of these sections which I have read, the debate on a motion of privilege takes precedence over Government Business. I would read the sentence again for the benefit of those members who may not have heard it or may not have comprehended its full significance.

"The priority of a Notice of Motion or Order of the Day relating to a matter of privilege is not prejudiced by the fact that the day on which it is to be raised is a day on which under the Orders of the House, Government Business has precedence."

It is an order to the Speaker according to the Standing Orders. Government Business has precedence. If there was no matter of privilege, no debate on a motion of breach of privilege, you would deal only with the Orders as set out in the letter sent to hon. members.

I therefore ask Your Honour to call on the Clerk of the House to call the Order for the resumption of the debate on the matter for the breach of privilege.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am deeply grateful to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition for having drawn to my attention, before this sitting began this morning, page 388 of the Sixteenth Edition of May's; but I would like to say that this meeting has been summoned under Standing Order, No. 5, which reads:-

"If during an adjournment of the House, it is represented to the Speaker by a Minister that the public interest requires that the House should meet on an earlier day than that to which the House is adjourned, he may give notice accordingly and the House shall meet at any time stated in such notice. The business set down for that day shall be appointed by the Government and notice thereof shall be circulated not later than the time of the meeting."

Now the passage to which the Hon. Leader of the Opposition referred reads in part:

"The priority of Notices of Motions or Orders of the Day relating to matters of privilege is not prejudiced by the fact that the day on which it is to be raised" - and here I would like to say that emphasis is on "to be raised" - is a day on which, under the orders of the House, Government Business has precedence."

To that I would say that the motion of privilege to which the Hon. and Learned Leader of the Opposition has referred, has already been raised. I would also at this stage like to draw to the attention of the hon. and learned Leader of the Opposition page 248 in May's Seventeenth Edition in respect of which the head note reads:

"Right of Speaker - Duties of Speaker under usage"

The paragraph reads:-

"A Speaker's ruling whether given in public or in private constitutes precedents by which subsequent Speakers, Members and officers are guided."

My interpretation of that is this. When this matter was raised by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition - I think it was on the 9th of this month - the Hon. and Learned Speaker who was in the Chair ruled that under Standing Order 5 ((9), there was a day set aside for Government Business only.

Accordingly, I rule that this day is now set aside for only Government Business as set down on the Order Paper.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On a point of order. Your Honour read only half of the paragraph which deals with it, and said that you differentiate the fact that the point to be raised is not an issue to be raised because the point has already been raised. You exempted the first part of the paragraph which deals with it. The first part of this paragraph says:

"The same treatment is accorded a matter of privilege if through the adjournment of the debate on the motion in which it is embodied, it becomes an Order of the Day."

If Your Honour leaves that out and reads only the second paragraph which equally applies, but makes a differentiation by saying that this is not to be raised, but that it is a point raised already. Since Your Honour raised that, you put yourself right plumb into the first half of that sentence which is that if the debate has to be adjourned, you take it on the adjourned date, that is, as the first Order of the Day.

"The same treatment is accorded a matter of privilege if through the adjournment of the debate on the motion in which it is embodied it becomes an Order of the day."

And then it goes on:

"The priority is not prejudiced by the fact that the Government has set aside a day for public business." Your Honour reads this and then refers to the general duty of a Speaker. The Speaker is to see to it when the Orders of the Day are called and that there is proper order and so on. How can that general dissertation - if you call it so - on the duty of a Speaker, how can that properly overrule - I have the authority here - the rule?

It gives me no pleasure in doing what I am doing. Where is the dignity of the Chair? Let me put it this way. If Your Honour was in Court and an opposing lawyer read a case to you absolutely on all fours, what would you think of a Judge who said "I am not going by that; my general duty as Judge is to see that the Court is conducted. Call the case." It is the dignity of the Chair that members of the Opposition are anxious to preserve, and when you get an overruling of a plain, ordinary direction in "May" whom are you bound to follow, what will the outside public, what could members of the Opposition think of the Chair?

10.20 a.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have listened very attentively to the Hon. and Learned Leader of the Opposition after I have given my reason. It matters not whether I had referred to the particular passage at page 388 in whole or in part. My decision is based on page 248 of May's where the Hon. and Learned Speaker has already ruled on this point, and to quote the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, I do not intend to overrule him.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On a point of order, Your Honour will remember that when His Honour the Speaker.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the Hon. Leader of the Opposition questioning my Ruling? I have already ruled.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I have already drawn to your attention, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that Mr. Speaker was wrong and that has been drawn to his attention, because I said last Tuesday that I did not want the Speaker to look small, to use an ordinary expression, by correcting him and drawing his attention to page 388, and therefore I expected that the Speaker would have told Mr. Deputy Speaker that that Ruling was wrong and not to follow it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Again I refer the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to page 248 which reads as follows:-

"A Speaker's Ruling whether given in public or in private constitutes precedents by which subsequent Speakers, Members and officers are guided".

I am being guided by the Ruling of His Honour the Speaker.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On a point of order, I wonder whether His Honour the Speaker has noted, read and digested the fact that Speakers' Rulings can be questioned. I will question it in the proper way. I give notice now that I will move a vote of censure against Mr. Speaker and Mr. Deputy Speaker for ignoring the Standing Orders.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker,.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On what is the hon. member about to address the Chair?

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that any hon. member.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. member please sit?

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order,.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: What is the point of order? There is no business before the House at this moment. The Hon. and Learned Leader of the Opposition raised a point on which I have ruled, and there is nothing now before the House on which the hon. member can rise on a point of order. Please sit.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:

A Resolution to place the sum of \$3,250 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1967-68 Part I Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1967-68 No. 52 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to place the sum of \$72,465 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1967-68 Part I Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1967-68 No. 53 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to place the sum of \$4,032 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1967-68 Part I Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1967-68 No. 54 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

With respect to Resolutions 2 and 3, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to deal with these Resolutions in all their stages.

With respect to Resolution No. 1 which has been circulated with the permission of His Honour the Speaker, it is my intention to deal with this Resolution in all its stages at today's sitting.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move the suspension of Standing Order No. 5. The purpose of this is that since we are meeting now and

the ordinary recess period comes at 2 o'clock, I think it proper that we should take lunch at 1 o'clock instead of 2 o'clock.

I beg to move that Standing Order No. 5 be now suspended.

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

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I take it that is only for the purpose for which the Hon. Leader of the House said.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply, and that it be an instruction to the House while in Committee of Supply to deal with the Resolution for \$3,250 of which notice was given earlier today.

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have not even got a copy of the Resolution yet.

The question that His Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of supply, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1967-68 No.40

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, in view of the House's rejection of Head 16, I am asking leave to amend the amount to read \$3,000 which would cover Head 3, Item 22 - Payment of Substitutes. Therefore the Resolution as amended would read "Resolved that the sum of \$3,000 be granted from the Consolidated Fund and placed at the disposal of the Government, etc."

I beg to move that this Resolution as amended do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1967-68 No.46

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave for the hon. Minister of Communications to take charge of this Resolution.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave for the Minister of Communications to take charge of the Resolution, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted,

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, hon. members on the opposite side will have noticed that the Addendum is set out quite clearly. An amount of \$14,250 is required to supplement the allocation of \$50,325 included in the provision of \$287,690 under Head 35, Item 32 - Maintenance of Government Buildings - meet the cost of maintenance of Military buildings including Government lettings.
10.30 a.m.

"2. The allocation provided proved inadequate to meet the scheduled programme of work due to additional expenditure incurred as follows:-

- (a) repairs to Iron Barracks in preparation for the International Cadets Camp;
- (b) preparation of Drill Hall for Heads of Governments Conference;
- (c) transfer of tenants from one flat to another.
- (d) preparation of vacant flats for occupation.
- (e) carrying out of emergency repairs.

Item 33:

An amount of \$7,791 is required to supplement the provision of \$13,570 under Head 35, Public Works, Item 33, "Maintenance of Government Property other than Buildings" to meet additional estimated expenditure under the item, to the end of the financial year.

2. No provision was made for -

- (a) clearing the storage compound of the Ministry of Communications and Works;
- (b) the payment of wages of the Caretaker and Watchman employed at "Clarendon", "Farley Hill" and "Roseneath".

3. In consequence of the commitments at (a) and (b) above, supplementary provision of \$7,791 is required."

Hon. members on the other side would be well aware that the Government owns almost all of the buildings around the Garrison such as the Married Women Quarters, the Iron Barracks, the Drill Hall, and so on. Since some of these buildings are used for letting and some for the Army, it is necessary that we keep them in a habitable state until it has been decided how to dispose of them. That is the reason we are asking you to approve this Resolution.

On a closer examination of the Resolution, you will find that the calculation is slightly wrong. Instead of \$21,000, it should be \$22,041. This is just a slight amendment, which I am asking the House to accept now before the Resolution is passed. I beg to move that this Resolution, as amended, do now pass.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I will have to admit my fault. I took up the wrong paper in a hurry. This Resolution reads like a Supplementary Resolution, but on going further it appears to me that the Minister is asking for money to effect new repairs. In other words, the money has run out on Government. Lower down I notice that we are dealing with some other buildings for the first time. I hope the Minister will correct me right away and stop me from rambling.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I do not know what the hon. member is speaking about. If he will make himself more explicit, I may be able to help him. There are no new buildings involved. All of the buildings are Government buildings, and they have been there before any of us came on the scene. These are buildings around the Drill Hall and the Iron Barracks, and all of them are included in this matter. I do not know if the hon. member is referring to the payment of the Caretaker and Watchmen employed at "Clarendon", "Farley Hill" and "Rose-neath". I hope this explains what he wants. I will be willing to help him.

Mr. SMITH: The Hon. Minister understands me all right, but he wants to start me up. I am not so ignorant as to think that he is dealing with new buildings. When I used the word "new", I meant that you were repairing a building for which you did not budget and, so far as the others were concerned, the money was running out. He should have enough sense to understand that I did not mean a new building being constructed for the first time.

Now, take for instance, "preparation of Drill Hall for Heads of Governments Conference". This is a question of preparing a hall. As I understand it, I feel that you are now going to prepare this hall for the first time, and that is what I meant. Well, knowing the Minister as I do - he cannot help; he says he is willing to help me, but it does not seem as though he can help me this time, because he does not know about the matter.

I will make myself clear. Now, the Government's financial year ends next month at the end of March. This Resolution may be passed in this House today, and you may be able to get it passed in the Other Place next week; so you will be running into March. If you are going to prepare the Drill Hall for a Heads of Governments Conference, I want to know how many Heads of Governments Conferences will be held before the end of March? I was not going so far, but the Minister started me up. I am like an old model B Ford, very hard to start, but when you start me up you cannot get me to stop either. If he had given me the reply that I wanted, I would not have gone so far. I am getting down to business now.

I am wondering, and I hope the Hon. Minister will be able to tell me, how many Heads of Governments Conferences will be held at the Drill Hall, after it has been repaired, before the end of March? In Resolutions of this sort when you are going to enter

into new work - work that has not been budgeted for in the old Estimates, and you are so near to the end of the year, why can't you wait and bring everything at one time in the Estimates to be dealt with? I think you have a lot of items like this one here today. The year is going to end very soon, and you are asking for money. This is where I am getting suspicious now, Mr. Minister. If the money is not spent already, I am sure that it cannot be spent by the end of next month. I feel that I am being taken for a ride now with these Resolutions asking for such large amounts when the money cannot be spent.

10.40 a.m.

The Addendum does not state that the money has been spent or that the work has been done. If the Addendum had said that the work has been done and you now want this money to okay it, I would not say anything; but the Addendum reads as follows:

"The allocation provided proved inadequate to meet the scheduled programme of work due to additional expenditure incurred as follows:-

- (a) repairs to Iron Barracks in preparation for the International Cadets Camp;
- (b) preparation of Drill Hall for Heads of Governments Conference;
- (c) transfer of tenants from one flat to another;
- (b) preparation of vacant flats for occupation;
- (e) carrying out of emergency repairs.

Now, Sir, this is a handsome amount of money that they are asking for. It is something like \$22,041. Can all of this work be done and the money spent before the end of next month? That is what I want to find out. I have already warned the Minister to see to these Addenda, read them for himself, and whoever is responsible for writing them, ask him to get them right so that the Minister can understand them and make us understand when we are asking the questions. I have already hinted to him that it is all right for these people to sit in their offices and do these things, but when he comes down here, he is responsible for them, and if there are any lashes to be given, he can get them. He is not the Minister of Education; he is the Minister of Communications. The only Minister whom we cannot lash is the one whom we cannot see, under the name of the Minister of Education; but the Minister of Communications is here with us today, and he will always be here as long as his Government lasts.

I want some more information on this Resolution because I feel that this money cannot be spent, and, in the other way around, the job might have been done and they are now asking for the money. I have not been told so either here in the Addendum or by the Minister, and that is where I feel that I need help, and he will be able to help in this matter. Where were you holding these Conferences before? I think

that we had a Heads of Governments Conference already, and where was it held? Not under a cellar, not in a garage or in a workshop. If you are going to have one before the end of next month, then you can have it in the same place. Speaking under correction, I think I read that the last Heads of Governments Conference which we had here was a successful one - I do not know if a fruitful one - reading from the newspaper. If it was so successful, making preparations for it now might cause it to be not as successful. It may be that the room might be made so comfortable that those members might drop to sleep. I suggest that you carry it back to the same place where it was so successful and bring back down all you want in the Estimates next month, and we will not say "No" to it. Of course, even if we say "No" it will be "Yes" for the Government. But, in this case, I do not think it would be necessary to press for the Heads of Governments Conference - I doubt if the Minister knows how many they will have for the whole year, far less for one month. However, this does not look good to me; it arouses my suspicion when you are preparing for this Conference. We have some buildings all around; I do not know what has become of the one at "Sherbourne". I do not know what has happened with that; there are other buildings, and why should you jump to this hasty conclusion as to make these arrangements?

I would like to have the explanation of these flats. You are going to prepare some vacant flats for occupation. They are vacant now and you are going to repair them; you are going to apply some paint to them and so on, I believe; but how much can you do? The Standing Orders of this House would not allow me to put it in the way in which I feel it should be put, and how I feel about these small Resolutions coming down here before us so near to the end of month. The money cannot be spent and therefore why do they bring down this Resolution? I hope that the Hon. Minister will be able to help me as to why he brought it down.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, as the hon. member who has just sat down has made the point, the expenditure under this Head seems to have averaged just over \$5,000.00 per month for, let us say, the past ten months. You would have imagined that, in the event of unforeseen circumstances, there should have been a stepping up of the work and, consequently, an increase in the rate of expenditure; but, Mr. Chairman, it has got to be borne in mind that whatever one might set out to do, you cannot accomplish more or do more than a day's work in a day. Now we have before us an Addendum to this Resolution, and the Addendum gives us information which tends to border on the dangerous. Why do I say so, Sir? The Addendum tells us, and if I were to be permitted to read it, Sir, "The allocation provided has proved inadequate to meet the scheduled programme of work due to additional expenditure incurred." In other words, this Addendum conveys to me that this money has already been spent.

10.50 a.m.

Why do I say so? I am sure the Minister of Communications is absolutely in authority and I am sure

he would not take it upon himself to enter into any contract to commit the taxpayers of this country to any expenditure which has not been approved by this Hon. House. Therefore, if we find that the information in this Addendum is correct in that the expenditure is already incurred, we are entitled to ask on whose authority was it permitted.

We are willing to admit, Mr. Chairman, that work of the nature involved might have been started if an estimate had been given the Minister or the Ministry, and after entering upon the work, it might have been found necessary to undertake additional work. But what we ask is this. It is not a case where the Minister has told us that this additional expenditure which had been incurred is of such a nature that when they, let us say, opened a hole in the floor, they found that the sleepers, or some other part of the building were defective, or when they removed the floor board, they had to get it re-sealed, or whatever term you might apply, for the safety of anybody and then you come to the Legislature as soon as possible to let us know that you had to undertake this additional work.

In such a case, the Minister would certainly get the support of all members from this side of the House. But that is not the case at all. The Minister has come here and would have us believe that the expenditure on an item such as this which at the average pace at which money was spent on it was \$5,000 a month for the last ten months is going to step up at an average of \$7,000 a month in the last two months of the financial year.

We know this could not be really correct; something would have to be wrong. We feel that we are growing to know the Minister much better and better each day, and we have confidence that he would give us that little bit of information which he neglected to give us in introducing the Resolution. He ought to have put a little bit of information before us so that we would have been able to get on with the work.

Now, Sir, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph enquired on the point as to how many Heads of Governments Conferences are likely to be held during the next two months. As I have said, expenditure has already been incurred. So what do we find where these conferences are concerned? You do not mind what degree of success has been achieved so far as the work or whatever it is. That is not the point at issue at all. The main point is that here is a case where expenditure of the taxpayers' monies has been embarked upon without prior sanction of the Legislature of this country. That is what we are concerned with; hence the necessity for this request for a supplementary to the amount which was originally voted.

You will find, Sir, that there is an amount involved for the transfer of tenants from one flat to another, preparation of vacant flats for occupation and for carrying out emergency repairs. Now, Sir, the Government owned these buildings for many years. I would prefer to say that the supervision, care and protection of these buildings have been entrusted to Government for many years - and it must be known

that the Ministry of Communications and Works will carry out surveys periodically. They have their Engineers, their Architects, their Works Foreman and whatever else such undertakings may demand.

Therefore, what is important now, Sir, is this. Exactly when did the Minister first know that this amount of money would have been required to supplement the amount originally voted? How long ago was it? Is it a case where the delay was due to the Ministry, or a case where the Minister delayed the bringing of this Resolution before this Hon. House, well knowing that he has his numbers on which to rely? Did he undertake to go ahead with this expenditure, well knowing that he could come here and care little of what the Opposition may think or have to say? He has his numbers: therefore it will pass. But if it is so, it is not right.

All we are saying is that if \$287,690 is voted already under Head 36, before the last dollar has been expended, the Minister must have been informed that the amount as voted would be inadequate and that it would be inadequate at the end of this week or at the end of next month or the next few months, as the case may be. You have your staff of Accountants. They keep their Vote Books and they must know under which Head to look to see how the money is being spent so as to see what you have remaining after each week's expenditure, or what you have remaining at the end of the month, as the case may be.

We are relying on the Minister in future to tell this Hon. House a little more on the Resolution, and we know that the Minister will not sit back and allow the Civil Servants in his Ministry to put him in the predicament in which he might find himself on this occasion. It is time, Sir, that expenditure, however small it might be, as long as it involves the taxpayers' money, should not be embarked upon until it has the prior approval of this Hon. House.

Mr. HOPPIN: Sir, I would like the Minister to give me some information on Item 32 (c) transfer of tenants from one flat to another. I am wondering if these tenants are Government officials because if someone rents a place and they want a transfer, I presume the transfer fee rests on the tenant, not on the Government.

11.00 a.m.

That is my reason for asking under Item 32 about the transfer of tenants from one flat to another. We do remember that some time ago in one of these Garrison flats there was a school. Probably someone may see the necessity for keeping something else and would like to go to a more convenient flat, and I am wondering if the taxpayers would have to pay the burden of the transfer.

I would also like an explanation under Note 2 (b) to Item 33 as to where "Clarendon" and "Roseneath" are. I know Farley Hill, but I do not remember hearing that the Government owned these two places, and I would like to know what use is made of them by the Government. I do realise that all Government build-

ings should have a caretaker and a watchman, but I do not know where these places are and that is my reason for making the queries.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I am extremely surprised that members on the opposite side for some reason or another think that they can make something difficult for me. I want it made explicitly clear.....

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, I am appealing to the Minister not to start that. Nobody is trying to make it difficult for him. It is our duty to ask questions, and if he does not want to answer them, he can say "no" and have done with it.

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

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph seems to be rather touchy this morning. He did not allow me to make my point. What I was trying to say is that any time I bring a Resolution, Bill or any matter before the House, he must understand that I am fully *au fait* with what I have brought before the Chamber, and I do not want hon. members on the opposite side to use remarks to the effect that I am trying to get away with something or do not understand something, because I consider these remarks to be offensive.

In reply to the hon. junior member for St. George who enquired whether the Government has to pay for the removal of these tenants, the answer is "yes", but not in every case. We remove the tenants mostly if we are going to carry out major repairs to the house that the tenant is occupying. Some of the tenants are Barbadians, and some we have recruited from overseas and they have taken their appointments under these terms, because they cannot get a house when they come and it is difficult to buy furniture at the beginning of their appointments. This arrangement came about from the old Colonial days when we had to offer these plums for people to come here. When we are going to carry out major repairs, we have to remove them to another place.

With regard to the question re "Clarendon" and "Roseneath", "Clarendon" is the house in Black Rock at the corner of the new Cave Hill Road. The land belonged to a Mr. Morris and we bought it in order that the road could be erected. "Roseneath" is the house across Culloden Road opposite Dr. Manning's house, or at the corner of St. Paul's Avenue, and is now used as the Public Service Commission Office.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of explanation, I should like to ask the Minister whether the house in Black Rock on the corner of the new Cave Hill Road is not the property of the Jackman family and not Mr. Morris as he said.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member might be correct. I know there was a house belonging formerly to Mr. Morris, but I do not know

which Mr. Morris and whether it was the first or second house. I hope the hon. member will understand that there was no deliberate attempt on my part to mislead the House. Apparently he knows the area better than I do because he lives in the area, but I used to see Mr. Morris hanging around there. I thank the hon. member for that.

In reply to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, everybody knows that the Government's financial year ends on 31st March. Everybody knows that Governments throughout the world must at some time or other come in with Supplementary Resolutions. Sometimes you come in to deal with the Estimates and you have to bring a Supplementary Resolution prior to dealing with the Estimates to pay off debts, because we may have local and overseas commitments. We use the word "Estimates", but the real word should be "Guessimates" because they are not a true figure of your expenditure. There is nobody, no matter what he is doing, even if he is building a pig-pen, who can give an estimate and say it is going to take exactly so much, because at some time or other you have to allow for rain, somebody taking ill, Bank holidays and so on. The hon. member knows as well as I do that these things are allowed for. In March 1967 he as well as the hon. junior member for St. Peter were members of this Chamber who passed the Estimates, and at that time the amount of \$287,690 was voted for the upkeep of Government Buildings. I happen to know that when you go to repair a building as old as the Barracks or the Drill Hall, you have to do more than was anticipated. Even when you call in a carpenter to repair your own home and he tells you what repairs are necessary and you agree to them, as soon as he takes up the floor or opens the ceiling, he discovers that instead of the one sleeper or the one rafter he has calculated for, that you have to change nearly the whole roof or all the sleepers. All these unforeseen circumstances take place, and the sum of \$287,690 allocated by the House of which the hon. junior member for St. Peter and the hon. senior member for St. Joseph are members, is almost expended. If this money is not available, it would mean that the workmen whom we employ to do this kind of work would have to be laid off.

The hon. senior member for St. Joseph is always talking about the poor people, but he must remember that it is the poor people who work with the Department of Communications; so it is the poor people whom we have in mind. He should fully understand that it is not a question that we have spent the money already and have come now to ask for it, but that we have not got enough and there are things earmarked to be done before the end of the financial year.
11.10 a.m.

We do not want the financial year to finish before the work is done; therefore, we are asking the House to approve the voting of this money. He asks if we can spend \$22,000 in a little over a month's time. Yes. If I know that that question would have been asked, I could have brought down the number of people that we employ in the Department, so that he could get an idea of things. In the Highways and

Transport Department alone we employ over 1,500 workers. I refer to casual workers - people working on the lorries, patching the roads and so on. The Public Works Department employs about 800 people; carpenters, masons and labourers. You will see that this money can be spent. If you want a list of the things earmarked to be done, I can give it to you.

We are not spending money and then coming here and asking you for approval. A matter goes to the Financial Secretary first to make sure that there is money in the vote to take care of a particular matter; then it goes to the Auditor General for his approval. The Auditor General is going to make doubly sure that the money is spent correctly. You cannot spend the money as you like. That is why we mentioned "For Government Buildings and Lettings". If you said that it was money for the Drill Hall and later you wanted to spend money on the Iron Barracks, the Auditor General would not allow you to do that. He would tell you that the money had been voted in the House of Assembly to be spent on the Drill Hall, and you cannot spend it on the Iron Barracks. That is why we have mentioned "For Government Lettings and buildings other than Government Lettings."

Sometimes the necessity arises for some sort of diversification, as you will see set out in the document. We might have to pay somebody for the upkeep of the gardens; we might have to pay a Watchman at Sandy Lane, or a cleaner for somewhere else. All of these things are dealt with under this Head. I do not want hon. members on the other side to feel that we have anything to hide. We on this side have agreed that a lot of the Addenda were too skimpy, and we have tried to give you as full an Addendum as possible. There is nothing more that you can ask of us, unless you really want to see the Cabinet Papers. It is known that we are sworn to secrecy, and we cannot allow you to do that.

I hope that the hon. member appreciates fully what I have said. If he wants a breakdown of the expenditure, I can give it to him. This is not money that we have spent already, and so we have now come here in an effort to pull wool over anybody's eyes. When you are dealing with members on this side of the House, and especially with me, please do not use such epithets. It really is not fair to accuse me of hiding anything. My life is an open book, and I run my Ministry similarly. I have nothing to hide. If I find something is a bit difficult, I will wait until I gather all of the facts before bringing it before this House. Do not accuse me of trying to pigeon-hole anything, because I have no intention of so doing.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I must ask him this: How does he reconcile his last statement by telling us that this money is needed to pay Government debts? How can there be a debt, unless you got somebody to build something for you, you owe him, and you do not have the money to pay him?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I am sorry that the hon. junior member for

St. Joseph misinterpreted what I said. I never said anything about Government debts; I said Government lettings. I do not remember saying anything about debts.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: As soon as the hon. member said "debts", I turned to my colleagues and said, 'We have him.' I felt at first like interrupting him.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I have been told by one of my colleagues that I mentioned the word "debts". If I said that, it is one of the words I do not remember using. It might have been an over-exaggerated statement, and I am asking that that word be withdrawn. I know that I said "lettings", and I do not know anything about debts. I am sorry, if I gave him that impression.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I must ask the hon. member to explain things carefully. He has given some explanation about something which we all know: the Auditor General sees the matter first, and you cannot shift from the Drill Hall to the Pine pasture and so on. A child ought to know that by now, if he is taught, as he should be taught, what is the practice of the Government. But what I want to ask the hon. member to make specifically clear is: How does he explain "preparation of Drill Hall for Heads of Governments Conference" if the money has been paid to the people who did the preparation? In short, is this a genuine case of something remaining to be done, and therefore you need more money? Is this a case where your money will run out if you do these things, and therefore you have to come to the House to get the money first before embarking on them? Has not the Heads of Governments Conference at the Drill Hall taken place months ago?

I repeat in simple language that you can only come here with Supplementary Estimates saying that "We have certain things to do and the money has run out, or will soon run out; therefore, vote us the money so that we can go on with these things." How can you go on with an item "preparation of Drill Hall for Heads of Government Conference" when the Conference has already taken place; or an item stating "repairs to Iron Barracks in preparation for the International Cadets Camp", which has already taken place? To a simple question this side would like to hear a simple explanation.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member will give way - it is so simple that I am surprised to find that he does not understand it. At page 2 will be seen the words: "The allocation provided proved inadequate....." I have pointed out to the House that when money goes into the Estimates it is for Government lettings, buildings other than for lettings and other buildings. There is no specification indicating that it is there for the Drill Hall, the Iron Barracks, the Married Women Quarters, or any place. It is put there for Government properties to be repaired. By the way, when you have to repair a Government building it will have to come out of this money.

If the hon. member had read paragraph 2 - apparently he did not - he would have seen:

"The allocation provided proved inadequate to meet the scheduled programme of work....."

That is what I said at first when I read from the Addendum. I do not see that it is anything so hard to understand. I would like to keep the debate at a proper level.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether the hon. member thinks he is speaking to children. As the hon. member for St. Peter has pointed out, the word "incurred" has been used; therefore, you owe this money. You have already done these things, and you want the money to pay for them. It states:

"The allocation provided proved inadequate to meet the scheduled programme of work due to additional expenditure incurred as follows....."

Not expenditure to be incurred. You are not talking to idiots over here.

You are saying that you have already spent some money: you have already done these things; you have prepared a Camp and the Cadets came here and used it; you have prepared the Drill Hall for the Heads of Governments Conference, and they came. All of that has taken place. You say that you incurred expenditure in doing these things. Are you now asking us to believe that these are things to be done?

I am going to put this matter directly to the Attorney-General. It is absolutely unconstitutional. I am going to see what the Government is going to say when he gives his opinion. It is unconstitutional to incur expenditure not provided for in the Estimates, and then come here and ask us to vote for a Supplementary Resolution to pay the bills you owe to people like Teddy Jones and so on.

You ate food, at least those who feel that the Dining Room of the House Assembly is not too low a dungeon to enter. That is the next question I will be dealing with later: the last stupid letter by the Leader of the House to the President of the Senate.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. junior member for St. Joseph still on a point of order?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: What point of order? I am speaking in Committee! I wish you would attend, Sir.

11.20 a.m.

I warn the hon. member that it is not going to rest here. It is unconstitutional to spend money which you have not got. You spent money, on your own showing, on things which have passed. You have incurred expenditure and now you come and ask us to pay, just as you came and asked us to pay for refreshments for the House of Assembly the other day. Money incurred, debts incurred. I am not doing anything without pre-

vious warning; just as I drew to the Deputy Speaker's attention this morning that what we are doing now is out of order, I am giving notice that I will draw to the Attorney General's notice that this is an unconstitutional attempt to undo something which you should not have done.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to see that the Minister has taken the questions in the spirit in which they have been asked, and that he is behaving himself like a Minister today. No one over here wants to make it difficult for him, not me. I want him to be a crack Minister.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would just give way for one moment, I cannot sit here and hear him say that I am behaving like a Minister today. Is he saying that yesterday I behaved unlike a Minister or the day before? I do not think that that is fair to an hon. member.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, he does not always behave like a Minister. I take him sometimes for a grave-digger because of the way in which he behaves. That is why I said that he is behaving like a Minister today. (Laughter) He is definitely behaving himself today. That is what has happened. I want him to call upon whoever is responsible for writing up these things to write them properly before he brings them here. As to the questions I am asking here now, if I were a Minister, whenever these things come before me, I would question them up there or down there, so that when I come in here, I would have whoever is asking the questions clean bowled. I can clearly see that the Minister has a lot to do. He has one of the most important portfolios in the Government - Communications - a very big job. If you had even given him the roads in St. Joseph and St. Andrew alone, they would have been sufficient for him; but with buildings and so on, I know that he has got it. However, they must put these things in a more explanatory way. As I have said, you have to answer all the questions, and whoever is responsible for writing these things is somewhere else.

This is what I am going to tell you now. You are doing buildings and you have put all in a lumpsum. You should say that you want so much now to finish this. If you are a workman and you are keeping a close watch on the amount, in other words, every week in which the money is being spent, you should be bringing it forward so as to know that you have so much for this building, or that this building will take so much, and before you are finished, you should have an estimate. When you come here you say: "At present we are repairing a building; we had budgeted for \$10 to do it and now we have seen that it will take \$5." In that case, I would not ask any question; but when you are telling me here in this note about the preparation of the Drill Hall for the Heads of Governments Conference, you arouse my suspicion. That is the thing. If you had things put in the right way, you would take all the wind out of the sails of the Opposition. You know what I will do; you know me already. Now, Mr. Minister, I am speaking to you, and you are speaking to your colleagues and you are disre-

...garding me. I want you to listen to me now, and after I am finished, then you can speak to your colleagues. I want you to take me right. If it were the Hon. Leader of the House, I would take a different view because he comes from all the way up yonder educationally, but you are like me. *(Laughter)* That is why I want you to work your own commonsense and show them that, because all of them went up there - I do not mean the Minister - they have the idea that we are nowhere. Therefore, let us always be on the alert to expose them. I want you to do that. Don't think that I am against you; I want you to straighten up and fly right. You have an important office. You will find that the people who are working with you, your Secretaries, or some of them, can be snobbish too, and make it hard for you because you did not go where they went either; but you show them that when you come down here you can measure up. I am sorry that I have not got the Minister of Education in here to lash him, because he went up too. There are a lot of lashes in this, but I will not do it with you. If it were the Minister, the Leader of the House, I would beat him up and see if he could beat me up, but not you. *(Laughter)*

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. junior member for St. George enquired from the Minister as to the use to which "Clarendon" and "Roseneath" would be put. I do not think that the Minister gave any reply to that.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: That is not so, Sir. The hon. junior member for St. George asked me where is "Clarendon" and where is "Roseneath" and I can explain where these places are - not what they are used for.

Mr. HOPPIN: Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister to realise that, if he did not hear it, I did ask what use the Government made of these places. He did not reply and I did not query it any further.

Mr. HINDS: I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, if I would be asking the Minister too much if I were to ask him, hearing of the expenditure they had - the Minister went on to tell us in the first place that when he brings his figures before the House, they are "guessimates" and not estimates - and hearing that when you go to a building and you remove one beam, you find that you have to take off the whole roof, and so on, I am wondering if the people who carry out the surveys of these buildings before the purchases are actually made, take all of these things into consideration - the age of the buildings and so on - and if the Minister would be able to tell us what they paid for these buildings.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I guess that I will have to answer this question. "Roseneath" is being occupied by a doctor. Some new doctor came in.
11.30 a.m.

"Clarendon" was to have been occupied by the junior member for St. George's brother-in-law, but I do not think he occupied it eventually. It was given over to the A.D.C.

Now, you are asking if the building is going to be inspected.

(A VOICE: Repaired.)

Mr. HOPPIN: I did not ask if it has been inspected; I asked if it is inspected with a view to determining the price which you would have to pay for it.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Oh yes, Mr. Chairman, but I must make this explicitly clear. When the Government is seeking to buy a building, neither the Minister nor the Parliamentary Secretary has anything to do with it.

There is a Committee set up by the name of the Standing Valuation Committee which is comprised of experts. These experts go and examine the building, inside and outside, as far as I know - the area where the building is situated has a lot to do with it - and then they come and tell the Government secretly that the building should be valued at so-and-so. Then it is submitted to the office of the Minister who is interested, and if the Minister feels that it is worth the money, he says all right. If he does not agree on that price, that does not mean that the Government might not still buy the building because the Minister may not be an expert on buying land. I am not one; I can tell you that much. I can tell you how it is being done.

These experts go and look at the area. They examine the building and it is quite likely, as the junior member for St. George may know, when a building is newly painted, it may look so nice that you do not get time to push your hands in all the little places. Then after you have bought it, two or three weeks after, you find out that it may not be what you expected it to be.

But generally, when the Government buys buildings, it was on the land value that they were buying it, and not on the structure itself because a lot of them were bought only for the sake of getting the site. We generally have to demolish the building.

(A VOICE: He has not told us the price.)

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I do not know the price.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I would like to ask the Minister in connection with this purchase if he realises what he was saying. The implication of what he was saying was that the owner would not sell a portion of the land. He wanted you to buy the whole thing.

Has the Government forgotten that there is such a thing as compulsory purchase for Government purposes? Because he had a house to get rid of, the Government bought it from him. It is no wonder that you have to go so often for Supplementary Estimates. You want only a small portion of land. He says "No". If you want to buy any, you will have to buy what I say; I am selling". The Government does not tell him to sell them what they want. What sort of Government is this?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Government can tell a person to take off whatever land they want, but we have seen on more than one occasion - take, for instance, at Eagle Hall Corner where the Government bought land for the widening of the road - not this Government. The Government bought land for road improvement, as far as I have been told, but they just bought this land in such a way that they cut the man's land in half or they took off part and the little piece which they left for the man was absolutely no use to the man. He could not do anything with it; he could not build on it.

Now, all this I consider to be unfair, because no matter who is in power, the Government is not a dictatorial Government. But here it is that you are going to buy a man's land. You are discommoding him of the land, but you are leaving him now with as much land as to hold a penny stamp - not even a big penny stamp, because some of the penny stamps are too big to put on it. He cannot do anything with the land; so here it is that you are leaving this poor man - whoever the man is, whether he be poor or rich - you are leaving the citizen of Barbados with land that is absolutely no use to him. He cannot build on it because it is too close according to the Planning Regulations.

He cannot do anything with it, but you take off what you want and you leave the man with the rest. How can this be fair whether it is done by arbitration or otherwise? You are the Government in power, and you talk about there was nothing secret about business being done with the place down there.

Therefore, do not tell me about 'Government can do this'. We the Government can do this. I am aware that the Government can do this. I would say this now. As long as I am a Minister and we want land for improvement, I will not go and deliberately rob a man of his land and leave him, say, with a perch or half yard with which he cannot do anything when you can take the whole area and improve it. It is unfair to the man because he cannot do anything with the remainder. What do you expect him to do then? Are you looking for this man to cut off somebody's hand?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: The hon. member is bent, whenever he gets up, on trying to say something nasty about the members of the other side or the previous Government. Not very long ago he made some personal references - utterly wrong, the matter is out of order - of the junior member for St. George's brother-in-law. I refer to the nasty implication that he introduced in the point he made to a simple question which the hon. junior member for St. George asked.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I am trying to keep this debate up to a certain standard. I think the same parliamentarians have had to appeal to you already for protection. I really do not want this amount of protection because, as the junior member for St. Joseph has said about being nasty, I can really be nasty; but I do not want to be nasty.

I did not say anything to imply anything. I am not going to ask him to withdraw the remark, but I am going to ask Your Honour to ask him to moderate his tone of language. He went to College; he went to a University; he knows better language to use to me. If not, we both would start a slugging match and I would be really nasty.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I do not know if the member wants me to thank him for his advice and warning. I say again, why in the name of heavens did he have to tell the Committee that the occupier of the house was the brother-in-law of the member who asked the question - the hon. junior member for St. George? If that was not a smear, what was it? But he goes on, always anxious to throw bricks at a previous Government, and waxed warm and said that this poor man had his land cut up and not enough was left for him to put on a penny stamp.

Is the hon. member pretending that he does not know that in any valuation in which you have to divide a man's land, you take into consideration the fact that what remains to him is completely diminished in value, or partly diminished in value, or somewhat diminished in value and, therefore, you add that to the ordinary price of the land? Does he know that every valuation in this world in a civilized country takes that into account? Of course, he may have been to countries which are not civilised, where taxes of that sort does not take place.

But in order to hit at a previous Government he has to tell you: "Look what a previous Government did! It bought this land at Eagle Hall and left the man with nothing." He is particularly unmindful of the fact that that is only throwing mud, but there is a provision in the Act that no valuation can take place without taking into consideration that the rest of the land is diminished and it therefore has to be added to the price.

Mr. HINDS: I do not want to delay the passing of this Resolution or anything like that, but, Sir, arising out of this question of Government buying properties here and there, as the Minister made reference to Eagle Hall Corner, although Eagle Hall Corner is not before this House, this reference was made to it. I think I know the case referred to.

I want to explain that it appears to me that all was not well or cannot be considered to be well with the present owner of the property, but as regards this matter of Government buying properties here and there it should take into consideration land buying in a proper sense;
11.40 a.m.

road improvement and building improvement in a broader sense where Government is concerned; and at the same Eagle Hall, I am sure the Government would be doing the taxpayers of this country a great good if an attempt is made to remedy the situation referred to by the Minister. It does not matter

which Government created this. I am not suggesting that the Government should take money and go and spend it on a useless property, but I am sure if it were for not more than beautifying the corner with wayside gardens or something of the sort at Eagle Hall corner, we could have some of these Art Shows there from time to time. I feel that if the Government bought the property concerned for that purpose, it would be doing this country a great good, and I promise the Minister here and now that whenever he considers the matter, he can rest assured of the support of this side of the House in this particular matter.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am still awaiting an answer to my question. If it is suggested as regards this supplementary vote, and it must be suggested because it is a fact that it has happened that these things were not taken into consideration when the Estimates were being prepared and when they came before the House, what items have suffered in consequence and there is no money for them, because these things unexpectedly took place? What remains to be done that this money is to be spent on, if what was there to be spent on these remaining items had to be spent on the Drill Hall and so on. What items now have to be paid for, have to be constructed, have to be repaired?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is.....

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, you seem to forget that the minority has as much right as the Government. I have asked a question and without waiting to see whether the Hon. Minister was going to answer, you are putting the question. I have asked for perfectly legitimate information. We are being asked to vote taxpayers' money, and we ask on what. All we are told is that unexpected things have arisen and we have not got the money to pay for expected things. What are the expected things?

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1967-68 No.50

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, Item 21 of Head 3 deals with Reporting. The sum of \$21,696 was provided. However, in the course of the financial year by a Resolution of the House it was decided to provide retrospective pay including increases of salaries to the Reporters and Typists for the period of the previous financial year, and this was met from the vote for this financial year. I think the House is well aware of this. It therefore becomes necessary to supplement this amount by the sum asked for.

Hon. members may also like to note that the Debates Committee has recently made a submission designed to improve the production of Hansard about which we have all been complaining, and quite rightly so. The submission has been generally approved and it is proposed very shortly that the House will be asked to provide the supplementary funds required

for the re-organisation of the Reporting Staff; but this will be made known to the House in the proper form. Meanwhile as the House can see, this supplementary is justified because of the inroads made on the vote in this year to make the salary adjustments arising out of the decision of the House from the previous year.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, obviously nobody is going to object to this. What we would object to is that it is too paltry. Unless the *Official Gazette* or a separate Hansard is available to the general public within a very short time of the debates, it is useless. Everybody in the Committee knows that if you hear a debate in the House of Commons at midnight or 1 or 2 o'clock, you can walk into a shop next morning and buy the Hansard. It will take money to do that; but what I think is that not enough money is being spent on reporting and not enough Reporters are being employed, and this side of the House would be perfectly willing to vote for any sum of money sent down to cover a proper reporting and publication of Hansard. If you make a proper estimate of what is needed, we would cheerfully vote it, because we think the present delay in getting out reports is deplorable and has gone on for too long. All previous Governments are to blame. In the old days some members did not seem to know what an *Official Gazette* was, because nobody cared about reading it. Members of the public are asking why they cannot get reports of the debates earlier; so I am sure that the Leader of the House would be glad to know that he would get no trouble from this side of the House if he makes it possible to see that Barbados is absolutely up to date as regards the reporting of debates. (Cheers)

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1967-68 No.51

Head 16 - Prime Minister's Office - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I know that it is customary for a Minister to say that a Resolution explains itself, and perhaps we overdo this when we say this in most instances; but certainly in this case I think it is justified.

Hon. members will recall the very sad and grievous occasion last year when Sir Frank Worrell very tragically succumbed to a very serious disease and died. They are also aware that with general popular assent he was accorded a State Funeral, and of course a Memorial Service was held after the funeral in Westminster Abbey. Obviously certain expenditure arises and did arise from the State funeral as well as from the Memorial Service. This is in effect negligible. What, however, the bulk of this expenditure is for is for the beautifying of his grave site and the setting up of a suitable monument around it

and landscape in keeping with the gracious and beautiful surroundings of the University Campus site. 11.50 a.m.

I have, I believe, a plan of the proposed memorial which, I am sure, hon. members would wish to see, because I know that they will support the proposed expenditure. I would just ask Mr. Clerk to pass these around, so that hon. members may see what is proposed. I beg to move that Head 16 stand part.

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

Mr. SMITH: Sir, I do not want other hon. members to misunderstand me, and I am going to make myself as clear as I possibly can. Now, I am attacking the principle of this Resolution. I am not against the person involved; I am not against what Government has done, but here it is this Resolution reads:

"Item 24 (New) - State Funeral

1. It will be recalled that in March last year the late Sir Frank Worrell was accorded a State Funeral. Also, a Memorial Service in his honour was held at Westminster Abbey, London, in April last.

This Resolution seeks the provision of funds for settling the expenses incurred for the two ceremonies and for meeting the cost of beautifying the site of the late Sir Frank's grave at the Cave Hill Campus of the University of the West Indies, including the erection of a simple memorial the design of which has been agreed to by Sir Frank's Attorney, the University authorities and the Barbados Government."

Now, you are going to meet the expenses for the Memorial Service in London. Why are we going to pay for that in London? You are doing your bit here in Barbados. You have provided the site and so on. Do you mean to tell me, in view of Sir Frank's services to the world as a cricketer, that the British Government could not have paid a small amount for the Memorial Service for him in London? Do we have to pay for the Memorial Service down here and the one in London, too? I am sure that there are a lot of cricketers on both sides of this House. I do not think my colleague will be glad to hear what I have to say now, because he was a big cricketer. This Government is certainly telling the outside world and Barbados that it cares more and pays more regard to a cricketer than to a representative of the people.

Now, Sir, let us compare a cricketer with a representative of the people of Barbados. When one catches the judge's eye and finds oneself in here to represent the people, one has done a great job. If money could bring you in here, none of us, or only a few of us, would be in here. Money cannot do it. It means sacrifice or service to the people, for any member to find himself occupying one of these chairs. The sacrifice, what you have to do to be a representative of the people, what you have to tolerate and swallow, the things you have to do to be a representative of the people are much more than what a cricketer has to do. No cricketer at all has to do these

things. The qualifications one needs to get in here are great. To be a cricketer, I believe that good foresight, good aiming, keeping your eyes front, keeping your eyes on the ball and hitting it for six instead of hitting it in the other man's hands, and so on, are necessary. Doing those things cannot make you a representative of the people.

Here this Government is giving a State Funeral for Sir Frank. It had a Chairman of Committees who was a member of this House, a representative of the people and a member of its Party, and he departed from this world. What has been done for him? I am talking about the Chairman of Committees; I am not talking about a back bencher. The Chairman of Committees gave his service to the people of this country and, in my opinion, giving his services might have been the cause of his death. What did the Government do for him? Comparatively speaking, as far as the Government is concerned, he was buried like a dog. I do not mean that he died like a dog.

This Government has put Sir Frank in a place where I do not think anybody else will go. I saw copies of a plan being passed around to show how nice things were done for Sir Frank. In view of the Prime Minister's attitude to the Leader of the Opposition, I do not believe that if he were to depart from this world that the Government would give him a State Funeral. I would bet my life against a pinch of snuff on that. Here we had the late Mr. Victor Vaughan one who came here at a time when you had to have grit and guts to get up in those days and fight the capitalists of this country to become a member of this House.

12.00 (noon)

You could not find them in those days. Why? Because of no pay, no nothing but victimisation and spite, two things which you would have to look for in those days in order to become a member of this Hon. Chamber. That man fought a good fight for his people, and, I believe, as a member of the Federal Government. I believe that through that, speaking under correction, he died in the Almshouse, poor man. I am not saying it by way of ridicule; I am only showing you, after you have done a good job for your country, how you end up. And a Government closed its eyes completely to that! No State funeral, no nothing. I believe that his family had to bury him at their expense, and I believe that they are poor people. The Government did not see fit to do anything to help that man who gave up all to the country. In those days when he was thrown into the arena - the Prime Minister was here at that time when he took such a chance. It was a big chance. How dare him to come in here to represent the poor people among the big shots in this country? And for his courage, the Government, if they are talking about State funerals for statesmen and for other men, should have started it by showing to this country and the outside world that representatives of the people are regarded as being among the highest people in any country.

We will get up in here and we will attack each other; we are doing the people's business; but when

it comes to something of this sort, we should come together as one. We are all representatives; we all passed through the same hornpipe, and we have all got to do the same thing. It is not that the Prime Minister just says: "Put me in the House", and they put him in; it is not that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition just said so; he had to go and beg for a vote too. He had to sit down upon a fire rock and talk with the people. You had to go into the people's houses and sit down, and if they offered you anything, you had to take it even if you did not want it. You had to do a lot of things to show the people that you are with them. You even had to bring a little "knapsack" basket in here and show the Government how some people had to exist. You have to show your qualities so as to show that you are a representative of the people; you had to do that in order to be a representative of the people. I feel that when you are a representative of the people of any country, there is no higher for you to go. You have reached the top, and we should be treated with that honour which the people have given us, and do not let us go down. Even if we lose our seats and you see one of us going a little lower than what should be expected of a representative, the twenty-four of us should come together and give him or her something to keep either of them to some standard. But what has happened with poor "Victor"? What do you call it? "Beckles Almshouse"? That was a representative of the people! That was a disgrace to this Chamber, and now today, you are asking us to vote \$6,000 or \$7,000 whatever it is, for a State funeral for one who did nothing in comparison with a representative of the country. The new ones who have just come in here now two years ago, have done more for their country than he ever did, comparatively speaking, educationally speaking. When you are a representative of the people, or when you are representing people, you are doing a lot.

I am not against this; if you pay twelve thousand million dollars for the State funeral, it is okay. I am not objecting to it; but I want the country, the world and the Government, to know how I feel and see how they are looking at hon. representatives of the people in this Chamber. This is a high office although the Government, not only this present Government but my Government too, look at the others in the Other Place to be more important than we in here. Mr. Chairman, I look at it from this point of view; when we have to go to various functions, the members of the Other Place sit in front of us. I see it, not with this Government and not with the other Government, but they sit in front of us, whereas we should be sitting in front of them. Comparatively speaking, they are boys-in-the-yard to us. They are nominated, but we have to be nominated and elected, so that we should be more than they when we go to any function. If there is an invitation to Government House, look and see who will be there; you will see more Senators than backbenchers of the House. All of that I want the present Government to look into and cut it out; let them treat us with respect that we deserve. There is no higher for us to go. We are sitting in the same place as the Prime Minister; we are more than the Governor or Governor-General;

but the Government does not look at it in that light. You take up any old thing and name it and they have gone along up top in front of us. I am not standing for this any more. I am glad for this opportunity to let the Government and the country know how I feel in this matter. We have to be respected even if we do not respect ourselves: we have to demand it. You will hear a Governor or Governor-General nominate anything for the Senate. You wait until some people leave their homes and mark "Politics" on their doors and they do not get back into their homes. They are so far from politics that they hate them. People will tell you: "I cannot be a politician; from what I see politicians have to do, I will never be one." But then you will hear their names called for one of the highest and biggest posts in the world. As I have said, you will have to wait until some people go out, and do not let them see that you are marking "Politics" on the door, because they will run back in quickly; but let them leave and then mark it on the door, and they will not get back in the house, far less in here. Yet they can be above us; we look like nothing in their sight and who are to be blamed for it? The Governments, and this Government now.

I had to complain the other day. I was invited to attend a function at the Garrison and they had some very soft cushions on the hard benches for Senators, and poor me, a member of this House of Assembly - even the Speaker had to "rough" it on the hard bench whereas a Senator had something soft spread for him to sit on. They are looking at us like ten-cent boys. It is an honour to represent people; it is an honour to be in here through the people, and that is why I will stand for so much now.

12.10 p.m.

Even in some Government offices, there are some Civil Servants who look at you as if you have leprosy. Some of them do not even know you. All of that would have to stop. If I were a member of the Government, I would see to it that all of this is stopped. We must be respected. We are no more than one another; we are the same flesh and the same blood, but let it be a difference.

You are now making these Senators Quarter-master-Generals over us and all that kind of thing. Cut it out. Everybody can be a Senator. It has such a big name, Senator this, Senator that. Anything with two eyes can be a Senator. You can go up Hindsbury Road now, and so long as you can pick out what gap it is, you can be a Senator. But it is not so to get inside here, and yet you are putting Senators in front of us! We should take the front seats in everything, whatever it is. Do not let the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister be put to the front, then Senators and then us. If you are to do anything, well, put the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister with us and put the Senators in front. Well, you are putting them all up to the front, and that is why you will find me not joining in all these things. Other people say when they see where we are put to sit: "Look where these boys are sitting down; they would not even go up to the front."

The Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister and all of us belong to the House of Assembly. We will have none of that. All of us should be put to the front, Senators behind us. They have done nothing. Senator is only a name. Sometimes when you nominate them, you say to yourself that you are sorry; "I made a big mistake when I nominated him." Sometimes you go and knock them off the Senate, and they do not even know until it comes out in the newspapers.

Well, Mr. Chairman, you can do that to them; but you cannot do it to us in this Chamber. If you could treat us inside here in that way, your humble servant would not be in here; I would have gone long ago. If you could knock me off just as you knock off the Senators, I would not have been in here. In other words, there are very few of us on this side who would be in here now.

Well, you can knock off an Ambassador because that was only a name. That is responsible for all the trouble we are facing today. This ambassadorial thing can be promised out inasmuch as you did not mean to give. But you cannot promise a member a seat inside here. No Prime Minister can promise anybody a seat in here. A member has to show himself. There is such a saying: "Show yourself a man."

Now, as regards a State Funeral, do you think that I would get a State Funeral? Do you think if I were to pass away now that I would get a State Funeral? No, no. It may be a "stake" one with a grabber. You know that you stake down something with a grabber. If the hon. junior member for St. Joseph were to pass away, nothing doing; he would not get a State Funeral. If the hon. junior member for St. Peter were to pass away - nothing so. But a crematorium is being considered; so we can burn him up. They would be able to get rid of him quickly. That must have been the reason why you are getting a crematorium.

Now, the Hon. Introducer of this Resolution must assure me that all hon. members, when they pass away, would be given a State Funeral; if not, I am going to move a reduction of this vote by one dollar. He will have to give the assurance that from now, members of the Hon. Chamber would be given a State Funeral. In other words, do not try to keep out me now because it may be my turn next. Of course, I am not going in haste because undertakers do not die - not particularly - so you will not get a chance at me too easily. But let us get it straight; give me the assurance that you will consider it. You cannot say "yes" now because you have the Cabinet and so on to deal with it; but let me know, Mr. Introducer, Mr. Leader of the House, your feelings in this matter.

If you cannot let me know your feelings and you cannot commit yourself to anything, I am going to move the reduction of this vote by one dollar as a mark of protest. I cannot sit in here and be a hypocrite. In other words, let us look at it this way. You have had a State Funeral for a commoner and I who

am a top notcher cannot get it. Well, I would not care anything what they do with me when I pass away because I would not see or know; but my family should be there. The same way as Sir Frank Worrell does not know what they did with him, it would be his family, I would not know, but I know how pleased and how nice his family felt with what was done for him. My family would feel nice in the same way. I dare say that every one of us inside here would.

Now, this is a matter which I will test the Government out on to find out if they are hypocrites or otherwise. This is no Party matter at all; this is more a dignified thing. I will sit now and allow the Hon. Minister of Communications to let me know his views on it and let us know what is going to happen.

All hon. members of this Hon. House should be given a State Funeral. I believe in my opinion that I am not alone in this. I do not want to be personal, but I want to bring forward points to bear out my case. If the Governor-General of this country were to pass away, you would have to give him a State Funeral, and you must do the same thing whenever the Governor-General of St. Joseph passes away. If you are not going to give him one, that would not be fair.

Let us get it straight. If I do not get some tangible reply, if I do not hear the Hon. Minister coming out of his shell, I am going to move the reduction of this Resolution by one dollar as a mark of protest.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this measure because I am aware that in other countries sport figures very much. In Brazil, the first question that is asked you is this: "Have you ever heard of Pelé?" You say "Yes". Then they reply: "We speak of Pelé first, and next we speak of the President."

12.20 p.m.

That is carried out also in the numerous stadia they have there, in that on the gates of the stadium will be found the football scores which were made by Cuba against other world countries when they won the World Cup some years ago. That is how sporting figures are regarded in a place like Brazil.

If you go into Cuba, already there are plinths erected to the memory of Figuerola, their famous sprinter who finished second in two successive Olympic Games. There are already stadia and plinths erected to this man, because he brought the image of Cuba over the whole earth as a sporting nation. Throughout the British Commonwealth also sporting figures are respected, and if we in Barbados have been elevated and dignified by the exploits of the late Sir Frank Worrell, there is no reason why we should not too honour him. "Let us now praise famous men, men who were honoured in their generation and were the glory of their times." Now that we have the opportunity to honour one such, Mr. Chairman, I will have to support this measure.

I happened to have been in England during the time the last West Indies team was there, and Mr.

Chairman, whenever one entered a taxi, the conversation between the taxi driver and the apparent West Indian was whether he knew Garfield Sobers. His name was rich currency in England during those months when the West Indies team was there, and many a West Indian walked tall, as we would say, and spoke loudly because of the exploits of the West Indies team.

Mr. Chairman, the health of Lance Gibbs' spinning finger during a Test is of more importance than the bodies of the Cabinet members of this Hon. House. The death of a famous cricketer will be of greater importance in the world, not only the sporting world, than the death of many a West Indian Premier or Prime Minister. That is well known to all of us. Those people who have distinguished themselves in the national game are regarded as heroes by the young people of our community, and it is well that it should be so; Mr. Chairman, because they have achieved eminence in a form of endeavour although it be a game which was introduced to us by English people. We cannot therefore be so picayune and so careful about spending not to support a measure such as this.

We who are in charge of the youth of the community must be aware that these great sporting figures who have passed on have left behind them a legacy which we now enjoy in that world-wide Barbados has gained a certain importance as a cricketing nation through their exploits and endeavours. I would therefore like very much, Mr. Chairman, to support this measure and to inform the hon. member who has just sat down that never in the history of Barbados will the name of a legislator vie for popularity with the name of a famous cricketer.

Mr. HOPPIN: Mr. Chairman, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph made some remarks which I do not feel fitting on an occasion such as this. Of course he wants to know when he passes away whether he is going to get a State Funeral. Well, only time will tell; but on this occasion we must remember that Sir Frank Worrell was a son of the soil, and Barbados is known in places all over the world mostly through its cricketers. Sir Frank was known throughout the world for what he could do and what he stood for. His name will ever be a shining beacon. He was one of those men whom we Barbadians were proud of, and I feel that the present Government has done a very good thing in according him a State Funeral. I do not agree, as was also stated, that he was a commoner. I think that was an oversight on the part of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, because Sir Frank was one of the greats. He has left us and he has left his mark. With reference to representatives being accorded a State Funeral, we will have to make our mark in this world. Sir Frank has made his mark, and I therefore agree wholeheartedly with the Government in supporting and paying for the Memorial Service and all the expenses that were incurred for his state funeral.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I cannot let the hon. member who has just sat down get away too quickly

because he is big. Now I wonder if both hon. members who have just spoken were sleeping. I said I was not opposing this Resolution and that they could give him £ 12 million and do whatever they like; but both hon. members spoke in a way as if I am against the Resolution. However, I cannot take it, as the hon. junior member for Bridgetown has said, that sport is tops. Could sport come before the representatives of the people?

Mr. LYNCH: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the point I was making is that sporting figures have always been, are and always will be more important than politicians in every country on earth.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is too right to be wrong, but I cannot blame him if that is how he is looking at sport. If this is so high and looked upon as tops, the hon. member should not degrade himself by coming in here with us. If you are looked upon in the outside world to be such a glaring and shining light, as the hon. member wants me to understand, he should not have come in here among us because we are nowhere at all. Cricket is all right but tell me now how many hungry people in the country benefit from cricket. Tell me the poor old ladies and poor old men who are knocking about who get anything from cricket! I am speaking for them and I am one of them. If the hon. member is up top there, let him stay up there; but I regard a member of this Chamber as more than any other human being on earth.

12.30 p.m.

We are up top. If we are going to think of ourselves like the hon. member thinks about us, then we are nowhere. The hon. junior member for St. Thomas is up top, too. He did not come in here on a wheel-barrow; he was elected. (*Asides*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I wonder whether the hon. senior member for the City remembers Standing Order 29 (6)? Let the hon. senior member for St. Joseph proceed. (Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not have big foot, Sir.)

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, you will note that everything was going well until he came in. Stand by to name him, Sir. We are up top; the people put us here. I could not put myself in this chair. As I said in my opening remarks, money cannot put us in here. We have to regard this Chamber and respect it. It is no sport for me when it comes to real, hard, representation of the people. I like sport after my belly is full. If you do not feed a cricketer, he cannot play cricket.

The hon. member for the City is a sportsman, and I do not know why he did not join Sir Frank. He was a dodger himself; just as Sir Frank might have dodged politics, he might have dodged the bat, because everybody cannot use a bat. I do not want it to be felt that I am against this matter. I am for it, but I must speak my mind. Give me a State Funeral, give the hon. member for St. Thomas a State Funeral, and give the hon. junior member for St. Andrew a State Funeral too.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, almost one year ago, Sir Frank Worrell passed away. To my mind, the heights reached by Sir Frank are not now under discussion. We have before us a Resolution asking for money to meet the expenses incurred in two Ceremonies, and for meeting the cost of beautifying the site of Sir Frank's grave at Cave Hill Campus. It is quite simple, and I am sure that no hon. member will oppose this Resolution. I want a little information about the Resolution. I want to know from the Hon. Minister, if he can tell us, what the Westminster Ceremony is going to cost us, and what the local Ceremony is going to cost us. Since the Addendum tells us that the money is for these two Ceremonies, since the information is that:

"This Resolution seeks the provision of funds for settling the expenses incurred for the two ceremonies, and for meeting the cost of beautifying the site of the late Sir Frank's grave at the Cave Hill Campus of the University of the West Indies, including the erection of a simple memorial....."

and so on, I am to wonder whether the Funeral Director has already been paid for the services he rendered in the interment of the body. That is what I would like to know. If these things have been attended to, and the points can be answered by the Minister, that is all we are concerned with on this side.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I support this Resolution. I believe that the common man, the middle man, and the top man thinks of Sir Frank Worrell. His contribution to the sporting world is such that I feel we are not asking too much, and should not make capital out of this matter.

Of course, the Addendum to this Resolution needs some further explanation. Although I was not here when the Hon. Minister got up and made his speech, I inquired from my colleagues whether they had been given certain information. The Resolution states:

"It will be recalled that in March last year the late Sir Frank Worrell was accorded a State Funeral. Also, a memorial Service in his honour was held at Westminster Abbey, London, in April last....."

I want to know who authorised this. I presume the Government of Barbados authorised it, because it was felt that we would have voted the money. The Government of Barbados, I presume, took it upon itself to incur this debt for Sir Frank.

I understand that the Government paid for his coffin, his turn out, and so on. I further say this: it would have been a disgrace to have buried him in the coffin in which he came from Jamaica. I can say that with authority, and I am very glad that the coffin was actually changed. I myself viewed him at Combermere School. But, surely the Hon. Minister must give this House certain information. The Addendum states:

"Also, a memorial Service in his honour was held at Westminster Abbey, London, in April Last."

I am at a loss to understand since when we pay for all of these things. If a man is a member of a Church - an Anglican Church as an institution and not as an organisation - he is given a memorial Service whether he dies here or in Timbuctoo, if he is so honoured. I cannot understand it, and I would like explained to me what are the expenses for the memorial Service at Westminster Abbey, and who authorised this Service. I read of this Service at Westminster Abbey. Did the High Commissioner for Barbados authorise this, or was it a voluntary thing among cricketing enthusiasts in London? If this were something done by cricketing enthusiasts in London, I am certain that they would meet this small expenditure.

What is a memorial Service? As I remember reading of it, the High Commissioner read the Lessons; the Dean of the Abbey gave an oration; then you had the Choir, the Organist and a majority of West Indians - not only Barbadians - all primarily cricketing enthusiasts in England attending the Service. I am not questioning one cent of the other expenditure. There is no breakdown here on this. You merely say in the Note: "State Funeral - \$6,825." I hope I am not asking too much when I ask: Tell me the expenses for the coffin, embalming and keeping the body and so on. Tell me whether you are paying some of the money to the Directors and Embalmers in Jamaica, and whether you are paying some of the money to the Directors and Embalmers in Barbados for Sir Frank's funeral.

I do not think that anyone can begrudge this expenditure, except, as I maintain, the amount which has been spent on the Memorial Service in London. 12.40 p.m.

There was a big Memorial Service in New York for Sir Frank Worrell; is anybody paying for this? This is a question of a cricket enthusiast, but what is the point of telling us here that a Memorial Service in his honour was held at Westminster Abbey? It cannot be in his honour if you have to pay all of this money. I am not questioning the expenditure for the turnout, the embalming, Undertakers, the movement, the Funeral Directors at Combermere, and so on; I am not questioning any of this. Of course, we know of the other services like those of the Royal Barbados Police Force, the Boys' Scouts, his colleagues at Combermere and so on; those are free, gratis and for nothing; but I do not understand this Memorial Service. Who authorised it? Everybody read in the newspapers about this Memorial Service; what is this authorisation for a Memorial Service? I would be at a loss to think that we should pay one cent for this Memorial Service. I want to know about every cent for this Memorial Service and I want to have a breakdown of this expenditure before I give my vote; otherwise I support the Resolution strongly.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that we have had to go so far on a Resolution of this nature. I have heard a lot about cricket and I have heard a lot said about Sir Frank Worrell, deceased. I want hon. members of this House and all the people of

Barbados to realise what is the meaning of cricket. It is one of the greatest national sports in the whole world. Through cricket we have a friendly relationship between Barbadians and other nations throughout the world. It has caused a great relationship between Barbados and Barbadians throughout the whole world. I remember some time ago in respect of the cricketers in the early days in England, that some of the English people said that they never knew that there was a place called Barbados, and when they found out that the cricketers were from Barbados and they were so up to date and knew the English language so well, it shocked their modesty. I may assure you, Sir, that cricket today is our national sport, especially in the West Indies. Sir Frank Worrell has risen to that great honour; I can assure you, Sir, that what we have done here in this House of Assembly, and all we intend to do, there is none of us who will establish such a warm friendly relationship with the Barbadian people throughout the world as Sir Frank Worrell has done. I do not want to hear any one criticise - I have not heard any criticism of this vote, but sometimes ugly words are spoken and I do not like to hear those words.

There was a time when members of this House died and they were not in a position to have a State Funeral as others have had, but it is not the body which counts so much; it is what is in the body that counts much. The flesh profits nothing after all. I am sure that there are some who have been in greater and higher positions than Sir Frank Worrell and they did not have State Funerals; on the other hand, there were some who were lower than he and they had State Funerals. However, the time has come when a Barbadian and West Indian has developed and has become a cricketer, and he has created a great unity among the Barbadian heroes. If it was a double State Funeral, Sir Frank Worrell should have it. I am not against any member of the House having a State Funeral. We have fought our political battles; we have met all our difficulties which have caused us to be here in this House. We have put up with a lot, we have had words, many nights we are grieved and many things have been spoken against us which have created grief in our bosoms. And what was all of that for? It was for bringing the people up to a certain standard of living. We will have ours in due course too; we will have what is coming to us, and I am sure that every hon. member in here is valuable for the work which he has done. I may be the least among the apostles. I have my portion to bear too. All the great ones who have better understanding and greater ability than I, have their grief to bear. They have done their jobs, but all have to pass through the same process as I. We may have men who go up to college and all over the world, and when they come back down here, they still have to pass through the same process as "Homie". I do not care how much education they have; their brains may be bursting with education, but they have to pass through the same process as "Homie". They have to pass through the same process before they receive this honour from the local bench. Unless they receive it, they cannot enter this Chamber and sit down. We have to mix with the people around in

order that we may win their affection, in order that they may give us their votes to send us into this Hon. House. We have great responsibility to carry out and we are doing it and when we come to our national sports (Mr. HINDS: Who can stop the current?) Only God can meet it. *(Laughter)* In relation to a national man like Sir Frank Worrell, I will bow my hat over his grave now for what he has done. We are doing our portion and we will get our State Funeral on one of these days in the same way as Sir Frank Worrell. Sir, this Resolution is worth passing.

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Chairman, I hope I will not be misunderstood because I do not think that any hon. member who is sitting around this ancient horseshoe would dare or take it upon himself to vote against this Resolution. As far as cricket is concerned, we all know that Sir Frank Worrell went to the top of it, representing Barbados and the West Indies. I am a little bit worried; why? It has taken so long to know about these expenses; it is almost a year if you were to take it and check it carefully. I thought that all of this would have been settled a long time ago. Having this State Funeral for Sir Frank Worrell and the surroundings, I do hope that these expenses will be covered soon. I was very glad to see I think it is the first time I have seen a plan passed around by the Government. This plan was passed around and I am very glad to see it, and I do hope that when this erection takes place, great care will be taken of it. I am not quite sure if I did see exactly the material that will be used. As the plan went around, I was interested in listening to the different speeches of hon. members. However, I do hope that great care will be taken of it, not just erecting something there and, as people do at Christmas time, go and dress up their graves. I do hope that it will be kept up to date.

As to the remarks made by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, I agree a whole lot with what he said. When we have a case like this, on the passing of someone, you do not like to bring up things. It is not a date to pass sympathy or write an obituary, but I certainly do agree with the salient points of fact which the hon. senior member for St. Joseph has dealt with.

12.50 p.m.

I would only say this. Unless you bring down a Resolution or motion to deal with it, that is the only occasion that he has to talk on a subject like that.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, in all my thirteen years in this House - the span has been divided into four Parliaments - I can not recall experiencing a more uncomfortable time, and it was uncomfortable mainly for this reason. I did not quite know how, I still do not know, how to answer the criticisms of this proposal raised by the other side.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I object to that. That is not an honest statement to make.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What is the hon. member speaking on?

Mr. MOTTLEY: He said: "I do not know how to answer the criticism made on the other side." If the hon. member was going to say the criticisms by A, B, or C, get up and say that and get the newspapers to say that; but not that the other side is opposing the question of the spending of this money on the State Funeral which was held for Sir Frank Worrell. That is not a statement which is worthy of honesty.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Point made.

Mr. MOTTLEY: He cannot make a general sweeping statement like that. He has heard what my colleague had to say on it. If the hon. senior member for St. Joseph made his point, say what the member for St. Joseph said, but do not say the other side.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I said, "Point made."

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: First, Mr. Chairman, I gather that nobody is opposing the Resolution. All that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph said, in order to impress upon the Committee how strongly he feels upon one aspect of the business, he informs us that he would be inclined to the reduction by one dollar of the amount.

I am very grateful to the hon. junior member for the City and the hon. junior member for St. George for the contributions which they have made because they have saved me the further embarrassment of defending something which in fact should be of no offence.

I would like to say this, Mr. Chairman, a State Funeral however organised or decided upon is always meant to be - and quite frequently is - an expression of a common consensus in a community about the deceased person. In this particular case, the Government of Barbados was not - at least it did not think so - acting unilaterally in respect of its decision of expression of the terms of the popular will of the community. So much so we were thinking that we were rightly interpreting what the community felt, it was made quite clear that the only person who could properly inhibit the community in respect to the funeral of Sir Frank Worrell was his widow. If she said that she did not wish it, well, then, that would be the end of the matter; but as long as she had no objection, we felt that we were rightly interpreting the feelings of the community in this matter.

As regards the ceremony itself, in order to emphasize that there would be no distinction among us in attitude on this matter, although the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was out of the country, his place was properly and fully taken by his Deputy who received the same sort of prominence which the Prime Minister received in order to emphasize, so far as we were concerned, that both sides of this Parliament were in full accord.

When next the House met, although the deceased person had not been one of its members, because of

his obvious distinction and because of his claim to belong to these parts, the House took upon itself the rare step of recording its tribute here one day before we began the business which was set down on the Order Paper and tributes were paid by both sides of the House without any dissentient voice.

I just like to refresh hon. members about these things because I think it is quite proper so to do as the hon. junior member for St. Peter and the hon. senior member for the City has requested that a breakdown should be given about this expense. But I do not think that this side of the House ought to be put to the difficulty of answering questions as to why X or Y would receive a State Funeral if X or Y die. The issue itself is a hypothetical one; and to press it upon us would argue an indelicacy which, speaking for myself, I would not like to see pressed because I would like to outlive almost everybody else. Therefore even to ask me if I should like to have one would not mean that I want any kind of funeral anyhow, as the hon. member said. So when I say that we have taken a certain turn in the debate, it has still raised some valuable points.

I am going to give a breakdown and it is a specific one on the question asked by the senior member for Bridgetown. The sum of \$7,600 is broken down as follows:-

The undertaker's services amounted to \$1,673. That was because, as the hon. member said, we rejected the arrangement made and we had to provide our own. Then we incurred the expenditure of \$133.78 for the installation of the floor lamps for the nine-day period immediately following the burial. The estimated cost of erecting this proposed memorial is \$4,776.58 and the cost of the Memorial Service in London is \$1,019.57. I should explain this. First of all, let me say that the Memorial Service in London was authorised by this Government owing to the fact that we have many thousands of Barbadians, and of course other West Indians, living in London who would have been glad for this special opportunity to join in tribute to Sir Frank's memory, and therefore we thought it proper to authorise the Memorial Service.

1.00 p.m.

Now it so happens, and I think hon. members would do well to bear this in mind, that Westminster Abbey though obviously a Church of England Establishment, is not a church in the sense in which St. Michael's Cathedral or St. Mary's Church or any other Anglican Church is a church. Westminster Abbey is what is known as a Royal Peculiar - the English have these peculiar designations for their institutions - and it is under the exclusive control of its Dean and Chapter, and at the request.....

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I think I am correct in saying that Standing Order No. 5 was suspended so that the hour of interruption would have been 1 o'clock instead of 2 o'clock.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The hon. member's memory is really not as good as it should be. Of course I said we should like to take the luncheon adjournment at 1 o'clock, and therefore I suspended the Standing Order; but do you mean, if I am replying, you would expect me to stop in the middle of my reply and report progress when by common consent there is nothing really controversial about the Resolution?

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, how does an hon. member on this side know that because a horse can drink five gallons of water today that it will only drink a gill tomorrow? The hon. member is addressing the House. I am not a mind reader. I do not have clairvoyant powers as the hon. member is professed to have had. How am I to know he is not going to address the House until 2 o'clock? It is my duty to draw it to the attention of the House.

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman,.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I am not giving way.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what has the hon. junior member for St. Joseph risen?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I have risen on a point of order and therefore he has to sit. How does he know that nobody else wants to speak? The Deputy Speaker should not be sitting back there. As soon as 1 o'clock struck, he should have gone to the Chair. When the time by the Standing Orders arrived last Tuesday, the Speaker promptly said there was no quorum and therefore the House adjourned. You do not have to send for the Speaker or the Deputy Speaker. We have agreed that lunch should be taken at 1 o'clock, and as soon as the clock struck 1 o'clock, the Deputy Speaker should have gone to the Chair or the motion should have been made by the Leader of the House. Does the hon. member think that I as Leader of the Opposition am going to be silent on this Resolution?

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, two weeks ago when I rose to intervene at five minutes to two to suggest to the hon. junior member for St. Peter then speaking whether he would like me to move the suspension of the Standing Orders in order that there might be greater accommodation in the debate, the hon. member would not even give way for me to make my point.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, that is the exact reason why I rose on this occasion. I do not take the hon. member's word at all.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Well, then, I must take his, obviously.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, that is why the Standing Order was suspended, and he is showing us that he has no intention of honouring it. That is why I cannot take his word, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I was on the very last point of my reply, and the longer they interrupt the longer my own contribution will be.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Again on a point of order, Mr. Chairman, that is a threat to the House that as long as the hon. member says he is going to stop when he feels like it, we have got to pay. The person I am blaming is not the Leader of the House, but the Deputy Speaker for not getting up or giving an intimation to the Chairman that the Committee should report progress. Suppose it was 2 o'clock and not 1 o'clock, would the fact that the hon. member was nearing the end of his address mean we must go on? Everything is out of order after the proper time has arrived. How could we go on until 8.35 p.m. when the hour of interruption is 8.30 p.m.?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I was not here, but I understand that Standing Order No. 5 was suspended. If the Standing Order is suspended, it is for you to consult the Clerk and not take advice from us. It is not yet 2 o'clock, but you have moved the suspension of Standing Order No. 5. I was inclined to let the Leader of the House finish, but the Leader of the Opposition says he is going to speak, and therefore you have to report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I made it a point to ask the hon. member if he was suspending Standing Order No. 5 in order that we might have lunch at 1 o'clock and he said "yes".

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to second the motion moved by the hon. senior member for Bridgetown.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, this is nonsense. I am on my feet replying for the Government.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the Standing Order has been suspended, and I have made a motion. With the greatest respect to the Leader of the House, I have been told by even a member of his Party that the Standing Order has been suspended.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The initiative to make the motion rests with me.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It does not. Does it rest with you if you go on to speak until 4 o'clock? Don't talk nonsense! Mr. Chairman, you should take advice from the Clerk. I am saying that we should adhere to the rules.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I take it that the hon. senior member for Bridgetown rose on a point of order and

has made a motion. That is out of order. As long as Standing Order No. 5 has been suspended, I will await a motion from the Leader of the House who is addressing the Chair that progress be reported and leave asked for to sit again.

Mr. MOTTLEY: With the greatest respect to your ruling, I just want to get something for future reference. Am I to understand that the Standing Order was suspended and the hon. member specifically said he would take lunch at 1 o'clock? The Building clock has struck 1 o'clock.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Since Standing Order No. 5 has been suspended, I have no authority to say when the sitting should be suspended. Let the hon. junior member for St. Lucy proceed.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Are you saying that since Standing Order No. 5 has been suspended the hon. member can go on talking until 4 o'clock?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let the hon. junior member for St. Lucy proceed.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not agree with that.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On a point of order, if we are going on breaking every Standing Order, why have a House at all? The Standing Order does not say "may suspend". There is no discretion. The Speaker at 2 o'clock shall suspend. The Standing Order is now amended on the word of the Hon. Leader of the House. It is true we are dealing with a great amount of hope that the Hon. Leader of the House will keep his word.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I have learnt it from you, because you have said things that up to now are not right.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There are two hon. members on their feet. I have ruled that I have no authority to say that the suspension must be taken at this time.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am making a point of order which I have not finished. Not only did the hon. member say he was suspending the Standing Order for the purpose of having lunch at 1 o'clock because we started at 10 o'clock, but that was moved and approved of.
1.10 p.m.

In short, the House changed two o'clock to one o'clock. The minute the House changed two o'clock to one o'clock, it is the duty of the Speaker or the Chairman to suspend the House at one o'clock, and there is no question of discretion. *(Asides)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: May I remind hon. members of Standing Order 5(3) which states:

"At 2.00 p.m., Mr. Speaker shall suspend the sitting until 2.30 p.m., and at 7 p.m., he shall again suspend the sitting until 7.45 p.m. provided that if, in his opinion, the business of the House could be

concluded by a short extension of the sitting, he may suspend the sitting at 2.10 p.m., or 7.10 p.m. respectively."

Since this particular Order has been suspended, I have absolutely no authority to say when this sitting will be suspended. I would like hon. members to bear in mind that we are working by Standing Orders.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: If Your Honour understood simple English, you could never have made that remark. Even under this Rule, if you go beyond two o'clock and you go only for ten minutes, you will do that if the Speaker feels that the business of the House could be concluded. I have intimated that I am going to make a speech too, and it would be impossible, therefore, for that 10-minute Rule to come in. A child knows that.

What I am pointing out is this: On the sacred, and in his case certainly sober, word of the hon. member, that Rule was suspended, because we agreed to change two to one. To make sure, after Your Honour, the Deputy Speaker announced that it was carried, I got up and asked: "Are we to understand that the only reason for suspending Standing Order 5 is in order to stop at one o'clock instead of two?" He gave his word: "Yes". Look at the time now! It is nearly a quarter past. He gave his word. Are we to say that we cannot trust the word of the Hon. Leader of the House?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Point duly made.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Please do not interrupt me; I am not doing anything wrong.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Point duly made; let the hon. junior member for St. Peter proceed.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, you are reducing this House to a farce. Do not interrupt me; I am doing nothing wrong.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I am not quarrelling. Now, the Hon. Leader of the House gave his reasons for the suspension of the particular Rule. He said that instead of adjourning at two o'clock, it should be one o'clock. Now, Sir, you are right. With the Rule suspended, you could run wild. I am asking the Hon. Leader of the house to honour his word as we would expect him to honour it.

Mr. Chairman, he gave the reasons, and we agreed to adjourn at one o'clock. I am appealing to the Hon. Leader of the House to adjourn the House; otherwise he will cause me and others to lose faith and confidence at any other time when he is giving an assurance. I am appealing to him to honour his word.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, that would be because they wish to lose faith in any assurance given. Tuesday was their day. I have not been able to do a scrap of Government Business; this House has not passed any Bills since the beginning of this

year. I made no attempt on Tuesday to interfere with things, and I accepted the consequences of what was taking place.

We started at ten o'clock this morning, it is true, and I did give the assurance; but, by the time the House went into Committee, it was twenty-three past ten. This did not matter; I could still have finished by one o'clock. I got up to speak at two minutes to one. I even had to cut out a lot of what I would have said. (*Asides*) (Mr. MOTTLEY: Finish it.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. senior member for the City allow the Hon. Minister to proceed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, they are talking about finishing it, when they themselves are taking away the very time for which they are asking. I was explaining, Mr. Chairman, that Westminster Abbey is what is known as a Royal Peculiar, and it is under the exclusive control of its Dean and Chapter. Therefore it is always at the request of some organisation that Services such as Memorial Services or other Services are held. Consequently some expenses do accrue to the Dean and Chapter when such Services are requested. In this case the expenses are as follows:

	£	s	d
Choir, organist, vergers,			
Cleaners and other officials ...	150	0	0
The Bell-Ringers ...	6	17	6
Printing of the order of Service,			
the invitations and Place Cards ...	35	4	6
Press Notices for the <i>Daily</i>			
<i>Telegraph</i> ...	10	0	0
Press Notices for the <i>Times</i> ...	10	16	0
Total ...	212	18	0

Mr. Chairman, that is the breakdown of expenditure on that item. I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I do not suppose there is any point in asking the Hon. Leader of the House when he is going to allow a suspension to take place. I could not, as Leader of the Opposition, apart from the fact that I knew the late Sir Frank Worrell for quite a long time and was interested in his career - I had not the distinction of ever playing in a cricket team either with him or against him, but I certainly followed his career as keenly as any other Barbadian followed the career of a famous cricketer, and for the same reason that all the rest of us would follow his career with interest.

We would all have liked and we all do like today and will doubtless in the future continue to like to

see, to use the trite phrase, a son of the soil can perform in any aspect of human activity by comparison with persons born in happier circumstances, or having greater opportunities for their activities, either in ordinary life, or in sport.

In short, if the name of Sir Harold Austin and Mr. George Challenor were held in high esteem in Barbados, we Barbadians look forward to the day when someone born in humbler circumstances would be held in just as high - or even higher - esteem. I think we all will admit that that sort of thing operates in the hearts of all of us and operated in the case of Sir Frank Worrell, as it is operating now in the case of Gary Sobers. He was a great cricketer, an eminent cricketer. The world of cricket - as well as the world outside of cricket who understand what cricket means - without exception, has hailed him as, at the time of his death, the greatest cricketer that Barbados and, perhaps, the West Indies has so far produced. It is probably that the same honour that has been paid to Sir Frank as a first-class cricketer and, above all, a first-class captain, will also be paid to Gary Sobers as a first-class cricketer and a first-class captain.

I do not agree with the junior member for the City that, generally speaking, let alone universally speaking, the name of a famous cricketer will be held in higher esteem than the name of a politician. 1.20 p.m.

All of us who saw W. G. Grace and all of us who read about him, will feel what a wonderful cricketer he was. I, personally, have never ceased to think that he was the greatest cricketer that the world has ever seen up to now. Worrell, Sobers, Bradman - anybody who says that he was the greatest cricketer would consider that we only once, so to speak, have seen in a Test Match the cracked wicket that Sabina Park produced, but W. G. Grace used during all his life to have to bat on that kind of wicket. People got out to shooters in the old days regularly. If you read old cricket history, you will see that the thing which people fear today, the bouncer, did not exist in those days, but the shooter existed and men were very scared about getting out with a shooter. It is for that reason I am saying that you can find a world which appreciates cricket saying what a hero A, B or C is; but I say this to the hon. junior member for the City; nobody would place W. G. Grace above W. E. Gladstone. Nobody would think that the greatest cricketer or footballer in England was greater than the greatest politician or Winston Churchill; nobody could possibly put W. G. Grace above Sir Winston Churchill. Similarly, a man by whatever bloody means he may have fought - I am thinking specifically of Napoleon - nobody would think that any French Sportsman was ever as great as Napoleon and so on. Therefore, to that extent, I do not agree with the hon. junior member for the City. But I do say this, and I think that we all agree with this, that in the realm of sport in Barbados, cricket is highest and therefore, he who is greatest in cricket is greatest in the realm of sport in Barbados.

Therefore Sir Frank Worrell will go down in history as, at any rate, the first super-great man in Barbados and West Indies cricket. I say that because Sobers may conceivably outshine him in glory. He still has some years to play.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot and without regretting that in a debate of this sort which normally should have been confined to two speakers - one on the part of the Government and one on the part of the Opposition - circumstances arose which caused differences and the sort of thing which we have seen. It should never go out to the public that in a debate honouring the memory of this man, we should be referring to something which brings anything else to our mind. Our duty is to honour the memory of a great man without any sign of acerbity arising in any speech. I can only say that we are as anxious to pay the tribute which we should pay on an occasion of this sort, even although we are not unconscious of the fact that the expenses for the Memorial Service were incurred in an unconstitutional way. The House had not voted for them before they were incurred. The fact that it is a Memorial Service for anybody is the only justification for our getting it out of our minds. We suggest to the Government that they should not do this thing again. It is unconstitutional and the Attorney General will tell them that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that I do now.....

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, just now I appealed to the Hon. Leader of the House to honour his promise and let us get along. He did not do that. Now, Sir, I am in sympathy with the hon. member. I know he wants to get along with his work, and I am willing to help him to get along with the Government's work; but a principle is a principle. He made me a promise, he made this House a promise and he has fallen down on it. He should, as soon as it was 1 o'clock, without our having to remind him, move the adjournment of the House and we would come back in here and do some work. That is the mistake.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If the hon. member will give way, will he allow me to do it now? (Mr. MOTTLEY: Do what?) Report progress.

Mr. SMITH: No, Sir, let me make my point. I appealed to you. I had my reasons for appealing to you because I know that we would have adjourned and come back inside here and we would get through our work fast enough. I drew your attention to the promise, Mr. Chairman. When I am in here and you are right, you are right; and when you are wrong, you are wrong. You want to get through with some work, but is that the way you want to get through with it? Do you know that I would get up here and talk until 6 o'clock on this Resolution and nothing more will be done? Do you know that I am capable of taking up this Resolution and nothing more can be done? That would be so only through your failure to honour your promise to me, and this is not the first time. You have a long memory. You can remember things for long enough. I think it was the Federation or the Independence Debate when you made me a promise and

the Kiaki King got there and said; "No, do not adjourn. He is playing that he is a bully, let him stand there and die." You were practically, I would not say "bribed", but you, too, fell from your promise to me. Somebody had to bring in something for me and I did not even use it. Do you remember that? If you make a promise (Asides) Mr. Chairman, can you not make the hon. senior member for the City keep quiet? Are you afraid to name him? This is the third time that I am warning the hon. member. To make a promise and fall down on it is a serious thing. That has got us in trouble today with the sugar industry. (Laughter) Is that the policy or principle of the D.L.P. to fall from their promises? That is the wrong policy. You assured us that you would adjourn the sitting at 1 o'clock and you should have done it. I will give you a break now, but I got up with the intention to go on until 10 o'clock. I can do it, but I will not do it; but do not do that again.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, when I was speaking just now, I omitted something. The Hon. Leader of the House is acquainted, I think, with what I am going to suggest, because we are both members of a Committee which is dealing with this matter. 1.30 p.m.

Now that we are asking for this memorial to Sir Frank Worrell, it would be well if the hon. member would suggest to his Government that we remove the remains of Samuel Jackman Prescod from the corner of St. Mary's Cemetery and place it near to the spot where Sir Frank Worrell is buried at the University. I do not think that I have to acquaint hon. members who was Samuel Jackman Prescod and what he did to the community of Barbados.

This is where I part friendship with my colleague about talking of politicians, because the history of Samuel Jackson is such that the hon. member knows that there is a Committee which is sitting now that would like to do things in this respect; but I think the remains of Samuel Jackman Prescod should be removed from that corner and placed next to Sir Frank Worrell. This I am sure, hon. members would gladly support.

I throw this out for the hon. member's consideration. Let us remove the remains of Samuel Jackman Prescod from that corner at St. Mary's and put it at the University as a shrine that posterity would be able to see and know and read. It is in a small spot now, and I think the hon. member knows that we are working on this and there were certain suggestions of members of that Committee.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I will certainly bring this to the attention of the Government.

The question that Head 16 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

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

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER who resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until three o'clock.

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

Mr. SMITH: Until when, Sir? It looks to me by the clock that it is twenty-five minutes to two o'clock. I wonder why you should say three o'clock. I would like to get along with the work and get back home. Is it that he has to go up at the Hilton now to take lunch and leave us here? I wonder if it is playing for time along that line. It must be somewhere where he wants to go now, Sir. Am I in order to move an amendment?

I respectfully beg to move that this House now be suspended until two o'clock. We do not want any more time.

(A VOICE: No, that is just half an hour.)

Mr. SMITH: Well, Sir, the members say until 2.15. I now beg to move that this sitting now be suspended until 2.15 o'clock p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

The question that the sitting now be suspended until 2.15 o'clock was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Mr. MOTTLEY, Mr. HINDS, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. SMITH, and Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS - 6.

NOES: Hon. J. C. TUDOR, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Hon. N. W. BOXILL, Mr. LOWE, Mr. CORBIN, Mr. SPRINGER, Mr. SARGEANT, Mr. WEEKES and Mr. HOPPIN - 11.

The question that the sitting now be suspended until three p.m., was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting now stands suspended until 3 p.m. of this day.
1.38 p.m.

On resumption:

HOUSE RESUMES COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: When the sitting was suspended, the House was in Committee of Supply. Automatically it resumes.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1967-68 No.51

Head 35 - Public Works - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, this sum is required under Head 35 - Public Works - to meet the cost of wages for additional staff engaged at the Treasury Building - which was opened, as hon. members know, two months ago - for the remainder of the financial year and it is for one male and one female General Worker.

I beg to move that Head 35 - Public Works - stand part.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Resolution for the sum of \$7,910 do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1967-68 No.52

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave for the Hon. Minister of Communications to take charge of this Resolution.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave for the Hon. Minister of Communications to take charge of this Resolution.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I did not hear which Resolution we are dealing with.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Resolution for \$3,250. If there is no objection, leave will be granted.

Hearing no objection, leave is granted.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, as the Addendum clearly sets out, the sum of \$3,250 is required to supplement Head 40, electrical installations, as follows:-

Item 12, Upkeep of Vehicles	\$250.00
Item 15, Maintenance of Electrical Installations	\$3,000.00

Under Item 12 - Upkeep of Vehicles, the amount provided in the Estimates is \$500. Since the transfer of "Maintenance of Electrical Installations" to the Electrical Inspection Department, the van has to travel much more in transporting electricians and material to the various jobs.

At the end of October, 1967, expenditure under the item was \$501.14. The remaining balance is inadequate to meet the cost of upkeep of the vehicles until the end of the financial year and consequently

the Government Electrical Engineer has been unable to keep apace with the department's work programme. The amount of \$250.00 is required to meet estimated expenditure to the end of the financial year.

Under Item 15 the sum of \$7,000 provided in the Estimates under this item is inadequate to meet the cost of re-wiring and repair work which is required during this financial year. I will say something about this later.

The Electrical Engineer has observed that the wiring in certain Government buildings constitutes fire hazards. It is essential therefore, that funds be provided to meet the cost of re-wiring these buildings and for carrying out normal repair work. The cost of the work to be done for the remainder of this financial year is as follows:-

	Approx. Cost \$
The Fire Station (Probyn Street)	450.00
Two Garrison Flats	600.00
Two St. Ann's Court Flats	500.00
Residence of the Officer in Charge, Mental Hospital	150.00
Jerusalem Agricultural Station	150.00
Post Office, St. James	75.00
Post Office, St. Philip	75.00
Minor repairs	1,000.00

I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, that the reporters from the Press are not here, although I am fully aware that they never print anything I say. Quite a number of houses and business places in Barbados were wired some years ago and have never been re-wired, and after a certain time the insulation is broken from heat and so on, and this can cause not only a fire hazard, but people can become electrocuted. We do not want people to have themselves electrocuted or have their homes burnt. There are several buildings especially in the town area which need re-wiring, and that is why I said what I did about the reporters because I would like people to be warned. If you go into one of the provision stores, apart from the wires running here and there, you will see a connection put on with a piece of tape tied around it to bring lighting facilities to people. This is dangerous and the Electrical Inspector can call on these people to have these things fixed. I am throwing this out as a warning to the general public that in case this happens, it is not an imposition that has been put on anyone, but this is for their own safety and for the safety of our country, because if a fire starts in Broad Street or in High Street, you know how we may end up.

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.
3.10 p.m.

Mr. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I am glad of this opportunity that we have here of dealing with the Estimates regarding the Electrical Department, because it gives us over here a chance to question the Hon. Minister about the tardiness of the Street-

lighting Programme. (Asides) The Minister says that this has nothing to do with street-lighting. The Department deals with street-lighting. We do not have an opportunity, very often, to get certain matters before the House. If we put Questions on the Order Paper, financial year after financial year will come and pass before we get a reply to them.

We want to find out what is the reason that, in the Southern Area in particular, no new street lights have been installed. Why is it that since Government has taken over the responsibility for the installation of street lights, so few have been erected in those areas? I believe that either of the hon. members for St. George, and more particularly the one who is the Parliamentary Secretary to this Ministry, will agree with me that fewer street lights have been erected in that period than in the previous period when the Local Government was responsible for this work. Now this is not a state of affairs that any one of us over here can accept happily. We are looking for an explanation as to what are the difficulties. Maybe it is a fact that they do not have enough vehicles, and they could not go around to inspect the areas. The demand is there, and the problem is becoming more acute now that a number of road surfaces have been improved in Barbados.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the Minister regrets that a representative of the Press is not here. I wonder if he does not see the Editor of the *Truth* here? I do not think he should want everything he says published in the newspapers, because sometimes it can make him very unpopular. Now this Addendum looks as though you are cooking with gas and learning fast. So far as the Fire Station, Probyn Street, is concerned, it is stated:

"The Electrical Engineer has observed that the wiring in certain Government buildings constitutes fire hazards."

Now, the Fire Station is not too old; it was recently erected and the wiring can last for 50 years. The Fire Station at Probyn Street, I take it, is the one over yonder. How long was it built? Ten years is not a long time, and wiring can last longer than that. Mr. Chairman, I am telling the Hon. Minister that something is wrong. The building was either not wired properly, or it was not wired at all. If the building was properly wired, then the wiring should not have gone bad so quickly. The Fire Station is a brand new building; it is not a building that was converted into a fire station; everything new was installed in it. Ten years is not a long time for wiring to go bad and become a fire hazard. Go in Roebuck street, and in Swan Street, and you will find buildings that were wired before I was born. Those buildings were wired longer than 10 years ago.

This building, in my opinion, was wired longer than 10 years and the wiring is still going strong. Something is certainly wrong. The Hon. Minister is shaking his head. I say that either good materials were not used, or a tailor, or a mason, wired the building instead of an electrician. If it is true

that after 10 years wiring becomes a fire hazard, then the whole City will be a fire hazard. I believe my place was wired longer than 10 years. The Minister's place was wired longer than 10 years. Is his place a fire hazard? I would question this matter.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I will answer the hon. senior member for St. Joseph first. I am not sure, but I think under the Regulations to the Electrical Inspectors Act, the Government Electrical Inspector can call on a householder, after a period of ten years, to have his house re-wired. We do not want to bring these impositions on people, because we do not want to create a problem.

With regard to the Fire Station at Probyn Street, that building was wired over 10 years ago. It may be true that the wiring was not done properly, but that has nothing to do with it. Do not let us forget that the Deep Water Harbour was opened in 1961, and I had to come to this House on more than one occasion to get money to pay electricians to repair the wiring. Wood ants ate out the old junction boxes and so on.

This is my personal experience: I saw some black ants one day running on my place, and I sprayed them with Gammalin. Apparently, the ants went mad and ate the insulation off the wires. These things can happen. We are dealing with machinery, Mr. Chairman, machinery is almost like a woman. You agree with her tonight, and in the morning she gets up making a noise. You put your car in your garage tonight with the engine working good, and tomorrow morning it refuses to start. The same thing can happen to a radio; tonight it will play and tomorrow it will not play at all. The same thing can happen with a light or an electric iron. Don't you see how many cords your wife buys for her electric iron? The heat burns out the plug and so on. It is not a question of these things not being made out of good materials. It is a question of fire in the wire. So long as you have fire in the wire, you will get these things taking place.

As I have said before, I believe that within 10 years the Electrical Inspector can call on a householder to have his house re-wired. He does not stick to the letter of the law, because it will create great hardship on a lot of people. As the hon. senior member for St. Joseph has said, my house has been wired for some time. The reason the wiring stood up so well is that I did the job myself.

3.20 p.m.

He did not question anything about the van, but I would like to tell him the reason why the extra thing came in for the van. The van has to service more places than before. The Police Department used to look after the traffic lights, but the Electrical Department now looks after the traffic lights, and so on. It would be a sad thing to see that, instead of the Fire Brigade attending a fire in some other area, they have to attend a fire at themselves because of faulty wiring. I do not think that the hon. member would object too strenuously, but I hope that he is satisfied with the answer which I have given. I do

not think that there is anything else which I have forgotten. Another thing is this: I believe that the hon. member is well aware that when you have a fire which is caused by electricity, applying water is of no use. You have to get the fuse and break the circuit.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I agree with everything that the hon. member says, but I hope he will agree with me that the Fire Station was not properly done. I had my place wired; it is a wall building; but I saw to it that the wire was put in a lead shield so as to protect.....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I hate to interrupt the hon. member, but there is a point which I forgot to mention. I believe that one of the faults at the Fire Station is that it is overloaded at this stage. He might not know this, but I know a little bit about wiring. If you wire a place with one type of wire, you might carry a very light fuse. You might only have ten lamps working at the time which is the standard thing; but if somebody decides to do a little cooking at the place, he puts in another plug and it means that you have to carry a heavier fuse and you carry more load. It might not be that the place was done by bad workmanship or anything like that. It might be that as soon as the fire services are up to the standard at which they are today, they are carrying more people who probably come from the out districts, and they have to do their little cooking including, I hope not, of course, roasting a potato in a kettle. (Laughter) But these extra things come along and that has thrown an extra load on the wiring, and it may be that we have to take out one type of wiring and put in a three phase wiring.

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

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of five Resolutions 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 Resolutions passed in Committee were read a first and second time and agreed to.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE LEASE OF LAND WEST OF FONTABELLE

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House:- To move the passing of the following Resolution:- A Resolution to approve the leasing of land situated between Prescod Boulevard and the rear boundaries of properties on the West of Fontabelle Road as described in the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, hon. members will recall that this portion of land is on that side of Prescod Boulevard - they know from their knowledge and they will see it from the Plan - which is not under the control of the Development Board. Conse-

quently, a decision had to be taken as to whether or not it should be leased by the Government for industrial and commercial purposes, and this decision was taken. It was further decided that it should be leased on certain terms renewable at the expiration of the given period and for further terms at negotiated rents. The matter therefore arises because the Government has received applications for the purchase or lease of land in this area from several firms and business interests including Motor Services Ltd., Tartan Metal Company, British Paints, Collins, Courtesy Garage, Wilkinson and Challenor, Rocklyn Bus Company and so on. It has been decided, therefore, in the light of the desire to develop that whole area, so far as this is practicable, as a thriving industrial and commercial centre, that these leases could, with propriety, be entertained, and they only require that legislative authority should be sought and given.

3.30 p.m.

Hon. members would see if they look at the plan and read the first Schedule the delineations and delimitations of the various pieces, and if they look at the Second Schedule they would see the divisions with respect to the terms and conditions under each lease which when approved are to be enjoyed.

I do not know if there is any thing more hon. members would wish me to say, but, if so, if raised in discussion, I should be glad to answer any question which would then come up.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

THE PENSIONS BILL, 1968

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands under the name of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister: To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Pensions Act, 1947.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave of the House to take charge of the Bill.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I believe that some hon. members opposite, particularly I think the hon. senior member for Christ Church and the hon. senior member for St. Thomas - the two that spring most readily to my mind - will recall that it was agreed in principle at the Constitutional Conference in London prior to Independence that the terms and conditions of service - and this includes retirement benefits of overseas officers and members of Her Majesty's Overseas Civil Service in Barbados - should all be modified at Independence.

Consequently, in accordance with this agreement it is proposed to amend Section 6A of the Pen-

sions Act of 1947. The purpose of this amendment is that regulations may be made to provide for the retirement and compensation of certain officers who are appointed to pensionable offices in the Public Service after the 1st January 1961 if these are or may be affected by the constitutional changes at Independence.

The opportunity is also taken to provide that compensation payable under Regulations which, of course, consequently will be made by the Governor-General should be exempted from Income Tax. We thought that this is reasonable because a gratuity payable on retirement to officers holding permanent pensionable posts is exempted from income tax, and pensions payable are considered to be not more than increased gratuity. We are not unique in this respect because this kind of provision, I believe, is made both in Trinidad and in Jamaica Pensions Regulations of 1962.

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

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

Mr. St. JOHN: I do recall and I do remember that this was one of the commitments which was given at the time of the Constitutional Conference, and from what I have been able to state about it, it seems to be a commitment which every newly independent country gives. But the Hon. Minister should know, and the Government should know that there is at the present moment a disturbance in the minds of some overseas officers, particularly overseas officers from what one might call the Caribbean South American area who feel, because of certain draft Regulations put to them, that they are discriminated against.

Now, this is a very serious matter. This Bill does not deal with the Regulations, but I just would like it to be drawn to the attention of the Government that certain draft Regulations are in existence whereby British officers are being given better privileges and better rights than certain Guyanese officers who all came here as overseas officers. It is amazing because, as I understand it, if there is any country in the Caribbean area and the South American area with which this Government professes to have good relations, it is the Government of Guyana.

I also want it to be known that the Guyanese Regulations were not discriminatory against a Barbadian who was an overseas officer there and who came out of the service on the attainment of Independence. As a matter of fact, we have in this Chamber an officer who has been able to come back on retirement and who was treated in exactly the same fashion as other British officers.

I hope and trust that this matter would be given consideration, and that the Regulations made as a result of this Bill will not seek to perpetuate or to create a distinction based upon the national origin, particularly of British overseas officers as against

other overseas officers who all came here and gave their services in Barbados.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I must say that I am very grateful to the hon. senior member for Christ Church for raising this point. I must tell you, Sir, quite frankly that I am not well seised with respect to the intricacies of this kind of problem.
3.40 p.m.

The points which the hon. member raised I regard as so very valuable that I can give him the undertaking that I will draw the attention of the appropriate authorities to them, and to say only at this stage that since this Bill does not itself give any hint as to what will be in the Regulations, it might perhaps be a better opportunity when the Regulations are laid for them to be examined in greater detail to see whether what the hon. member fears has in fact come to pass. But I have no reason to suppose, Mr. Speaker, that they will be in any way discriminatory, though as I said, from the Bill you cannot tell what the Regulations may be, because these are going to be made by the Governor General. I will certainly, however, convey to my colleague the Attorney General and the proper agency of Government the concern which the hon. member has expressed.

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

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

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and 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 DIPLOMATIC IMMUNITIES AND PRIVILEGES (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1968

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am also asking leave to deal with this item.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is seeking the indulgence of the House to deal with this Item in the absence of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted the Hon. Leader of the House to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Diplomatic Immunities and Privileges Act, 1967.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, by one of these most embarrassing and unfortunate occurrences, the Diplomatic Immunities and Privileges Act, 1967 was so full of typographical errors as to render it entirely useless as legislation. It has, therefore, been thought proper to bring in this amending Bill to make good those typographical deficiencies. Perhaps through you the House might wish to instruct Mr. Clerk to remind the Printers that certain words appearing in the Schedules of the Bill, though spelt like English words, are in fact French words and carry the appropriate accents with them and require that this be done in printing.

For instance, on page 4 even in this Draft Bill, in the first Schedule, substitute the word "attachés", this has been printed without the acute accent falling on the "e". If it were to appear so again it might require another amendment. It is this sort of thing that went wrong in the original Bill. Nothing very important from a certain point of view, but extremely important in so far as semantic and linguistic accuracies were concerned.

As I say, the Bill merely seeks to correct the the typographical errors, and I should like the attention of Mr. Clerk to be drawn to this matter so that we will not have a repeat performance perhaps in the amending Bill.

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

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I think it is only fair at this stage to mention in respect of the Clerks-at-the-Table, Mr. Cumberbatch and Mr. Thomas, O.B.E., that when this Bill was passed, neither one of them was here. One was on three months' leave and the other was on three weeks' leave.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, if the House may hear me just for another minute, I would not like to be thought to have been putting any strictures on the Clerks. I was merely trying to hint that the Clerks and the Printers should get together a bit more closely on it, because the text might go from the House in its proper form, but somehow suffer in the printing. That is what I meant, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I was merely pointing out that hon. members of the House know that both the Clerk and the Deputy Clerk are men of some linguistic ability and that the fault is not to be laid at the hands of either of them.

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

3.50 p.m.

Clause 1 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 1 stand part.

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

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

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

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

The Schedule was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this be the Schedule to the Bill.

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

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

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

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

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

The CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER who resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Mr. SPEAKER: To me the Chairman of Committees has reported the passage, in Committee, of one Bill.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

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. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill do now pass.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this now concludes Government Business. The next sitting of the House will be on Tuesday next, which has already been fixed, this being an Emergency Sitting.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the House last adjourned it was to next Tuesday at twelve o'clock noon. All of the Business on today's Order Paper has either been concluded, or not proposed to be dealt with today.

Accordingly this House now stands adjourned, as it did last Tuesday, until Tuesday next week at twelve o'clock noon.
3.55 p.m.