

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Friday, 2nd February, 1968

A Special Meeting of the House of Assembly was held at 12.10 p.m. o'clock today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., F.Z.S., (Speaker); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. 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. J. W. CORBIN; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister of Trade, Tourism, Co-operatives and Fisheries); Mr. ST.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Hon. N. W. BOXILL, (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. J. W. YEARWOOD, (Chairman of Committees); Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (Minister of Agriculture, Labour and National Insurance); Sir G. H. ADAMS, C.M.G., Q.C., B.A., D.C.L. (Hon.) (Leader of the Opposition); His Honour G. E. SARGEANT, (Deputy Speaker); Mr. C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P.

OBJECTION TO PROCEDURE re ORDER PAPER

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, before the meeting begins, members on this side of the House are objecting to the Order Paper today, or what should be the first Order of the Day; the continuation of the debate on the question of privilege. The question of privilege takes precedence over all Public Business. Automatically the first Order of the Day would be the continuation of the debate on privilege, and it is trying to get around the Standing Orders of this House by invoking an application to you. According to the Standing Orders, a Minister says it is a matter of urgent Public Business and calls for an early meeting.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday last this matter could not possibly be less urgent than it is today. On Tuesday notice had been given of these three Resolutions. If this matter is so urgent, why could not the Hon. Leader of the House on Tuesday last adjourn the House until today? He has done it in a roundabout way; he adjourned the sitting of the House for two weeks. The fact that we are sitting here today indicates that he must have known then that the matter was so urgent that the House should not have been adjourned for a fortnight.

I repeat that Your Honour is bound by the fact that the Minister has made this declaration to you, and you have summoned this special meeting. It is up to any

hon. member of this House to point out that we must not break the undoubted practice and the Rule. May puts it as strongly as possible. The Rule is that all questions of privilege should take precedence over all public Business. This is a deliberate attempt to avoid the continuation of the discussion on the breach of privilege motion.

Everybody must see that if this is a matter of Public Business, so urgent that we must come here on Friday of the same week in which the House was sitting and notice of these Resolutions were given, how in the name of Heaven can notice of these Resolutions be given without the Government knowing then that the matters were matters of urgency? To make their case worse - if they wanted to put up a case, they could have got somebody to put up a better one - they adjourned on Tuesday although they had an indication from this side of the House that we would be willing to come back on Friday. They did not adjourn to Friday; they adjourned for a fortnight, and that is nothing but a dodge.

I repeat for the benefit of certain hon. members who may not have followed it the first time. If it is urgent to come here today, it was urgent when the matters were lodged and notice was given of them. Therefore, I suggest that the first Order of the Day today should be the continuation of the discussion on the breach of privilege.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I hope that I will be in order now. I am speaking on the Agenda that I have received before you started with the Business of the Day, and it reads:

"Sir,

It having been represented by a Minister to His Honour the Speaker that the public interest requires that the House should meet on an earlier day....."

I would not go any further, but I am making this point; "It having been represented by a Minister". A Minister of what? A Minister of Food? A Minister of Religion? A Minister of foolishness? This is an Hon. Chamber. Here it is you are summoning hon. members to this Hon. Chamber, and you are starting off by saying: "It having been represented by a Minister."

You have the Leader of the House as a Minister, and I cannot understand it. What is meant by a Minister? This really and truly is ignoring hon. members, having no regard for this Hon. Chamber at all, or its members. How on earth can you be summoning members here and saying: "It having been represented by a Minister"?

Mr. SPEAKER: I can explain that matter, if the hon. member will be good enough to give way. Standing Order 5 (9) reads as follows:

"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 meeting."

When I received this representation from a Minister of the Government of Barbados, I directed Mr. Clerk to send out notices for this meeting. After reading the notice, I pointed out to him that I had thought he would have stated in the notice that this meeting was summoned by virtue of Standing Order 5 (9). That was unfortunately omitted, and for that omission I apologise to every member of the House. When it would have been clear, having read 'by virtue of Standing Order 5 of the General Assembly', that the Minister referred to could only be the Minister as mentioned in Standing Order 5 (9). I have already spoken to Mr. Clerk about it and deprecated the absence of that important phrase.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I have listened very attentively to your reading of the Standing Order. The Standing Order states "a Minister". At the time when these Standing Orders were being printed they could not state the Minister of Communications, the Leader of the House, or anything. They could only state a Minister. Well, as soon as a Minister approaches you and you give him the green light, it should be that that same Minister's name ought to be mentioned to us, so that we would know who is the Minister responsible for calling us out today.

In other words, Sir, the Hon. Leader of the House adjourned the House to the 13th February. Really and truly, Sir, I thought he had said the 3rd February. I did not hear him so well when he said the 13th February; otherwise I would have got up as usual and spoken on the matter, because I feel that until the 13th February would be too long. If the Hon. Leader of the House adjourned the House tonight and came back tomorrow calling us back here, we would be able to jump on him. Here it is: somebody is trying to cover up this matter in some way, and I do not know who is the Minister responsible for this. I do not know the Minister who has approached you, Sir, in accordance with the Standing Orders. In writing the Standing Orders, it was not possible to name the Minister. I would understand that to mean a Minister of the Crown.

Here it is, Sir, you are the only person, in my opinion, and, I suppose, the Clerk who knows who is the Minister responsible for calling us here today in so short a time. We should know in the same way you, Sir, the Clerk and anybody else knows. I am not going to rest until some respect, or some regard, is being paid to the members on this side of the House. We are elected members; nobody pushed me in here on a stretcher, a wheelbarrow, or anything like that. We came here as a result of the people of the country electing us, and I am not going to stay here and allow anybody - I do not care who he may be; Speaker, Chairman of Committees, Minister or anybody - to deprive me of my rights and privileges in here.

I demand that the Minister's name should be mentioned in order that I may know the position. You are calling me out to a meeting. I am no 10¢-boy; I am not tied to any place where you can go and loose a rope and let me run down here. You are summoning me, and it is my duty to come here; therefore, let me know who is responsible for this and who is the Minister. That is all I am saying, Sir.

In future let it be known, and let everything be mentioned. Sir, I know a lot that you do not even know. Ten wrongs cannot make a right. Respect me, or do not respect me. I am nothing to do with any Minister. The most dishonest things you can meet up with sometimes are some Ministers. That name cannot change anybody. If you are a thief, calling you a Minister cannot make you a Minister. You will be a thieving Minister. You must have something within you. If you are full of hate and spite and malice, giving you a name cannot change you. In other words, if you dress a pig in silk, he will still go into the mud. I am not going to stand for it; I am demanding my rights from last Tuesday in here.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will say this: my interpretation of the requirement of this particular Standing Order does not make it obligatory to state the Ministry or the Minister. Irrespective of my personal point of view to that, reference to precedence in this Chamber, not only of myself, but of the predecessors, discloses that the name of the Minister, or the office which the Minister holds, has never been stated. I do not for one moment suggest that there is any objection to it being stated, or that there would be anything wrong in it being stated; but, in my view, it is not obligatory, or required to be stated, in order to make the summons valid and proper.

In respect of the point made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, I would say this.
12.20 p.m.

I gave that matter grave consideration, fully appreciating the speed with which a question involving a motion of privilege should be dealt with, and there can be no question that, so far as I am concerned, it is beyond dispute that at the meeting to which this House has been adjourned, that motion must be the first Order of the Day. Insofar as this meeting is concerned, it is my view after serious consideration, and I so rule, that the only business to be dealt with

today is the matter in respect of which representation was made by a Minister of the Crown in this Island that the public interest requires that the House should meet consider that business. It was an important decision to make and it was made after considerable research by me, and that is the decision at which I have arrived.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On a point of order, May I, Mr. Speaker, enquire whether Your Honour's research is to be found in "May"? Did that lead Your Honour to the conclusion which you have reached through the statement of the practice in "May"? May I say at this stage that where our Standing Orders are silent it has been a direction from the Speaker that we must follow "May"?

Mr. SPEAKER: As Mr. Sherlock Holmes would say: "It is elementary, my dear Watson, on matters of parliamentary privilege, practice and procedure to refer to "May". I referred to "May" and I made other references, and that is the conclusion to which I have arrived after careful and deliberate thought.

The Clerk called Notices.

Mr. SPEAKER: In accordance with precedent, only Notices can be given today. Nothing may be read a first time other than the matters on the Order Paper for today.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, not knowing until yesterday, and through the radio that this meeting was going to take place before hon. members could possibly have had any information except by chance - this is incidental - it would seem shocking to think that members of the House of Assembly would hear over the radio: "You have got to have a meeting tomorrow; come to it." I am asking whether it is permissible for me to read a notice which I handed in this morning, it being the earliest time which was possible to do that. In short, it was not possible to give two days' notice because this is a special meeting. I got my summons late yesterday afternoon about 6 o'clock and, obviously, it was impossible to comply with the Standing Order as to giving notices two days before Tuesday.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am instructed by Mr. Clerk that all of these notices in accordance with my instructions, duly went out on Wednesday afternoon. I received the request at 1.15 p.m., and I passed on the instruction to Mr. Clerk at 1.30 p.m. with a written directive that they be put out that same day without fail. I regret that the summons to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition did not reach him until yesterday afternoon. I regret that. I made it very, very clear, as I say, that hon. members should have the maximum of available time. In respect of the notice to which the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has referred, I am informed that this notice was not received until 12 o'clock today, the hour for which this meeting was summoned.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the Standing Orders say that notices must be given by 12

o'clock noon on Friday preceding Tuesday. When that Public Buildings clock began to strike 12, I looked for the Clerk and he was not in his room. I came in here and he was here and I handed the notice to him and drew to his attention that the clock had not yet stopped striking twelve.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am informed by the Clerk that this notice was not ready before 12 o'clock noon today, and it is therefore not on my file for today.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Does the Clerk dare to say that I am lying? I finished it a minute or so before 12 o'clock inside here. I looked for the Clerk and I did not find him in there and then I found him standing there by what that contraption is. I said: "Look, the clock is still striking twelve," and I handed the notice to him, and now he informs Your Honour that that was not before 12 o'clock? I have given you the exact moment when it was handed to him.

Mr. SPEAKER: In view of what Mr. Clerk told me and the fact that there is no copy of the notice on my file, I regret that at this stage, I cannot allow the notice to be given as it is not before me. Through whose fault I am not now expressing an opinion. I say that, at this stage, I cannot allow the notice to be given.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I have to thank Your Honour for accepting the Clerk's word rather than mine as regards the truth of what took place. I will guide my conduct in the future by this regulation.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not accepting the word of one as against that of the other. On the question of time it is seldom that watches or clocks agree. The Public Buildings clock does not agree very often with the Cathedral clock or with the clock in here. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition and Mr. Clerk, I have no doubt, are speaking what each of them believes to be the absolute truth.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I say positively that that happened. I say that positively and specifically, thinking that possibly it may be said that I did not hand in the notice in time. I specifically said: "Listen the Public Buildings has not yet stopped striking", and Your Honour says: "believes". This is the first time that my word has been questioned by any Speaker. 12.30 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I said, "Believe". One of the most important things to a Christian is belief. "I believe in God Almighty". But further when I said "believe" I had in mind, according to whatever clock was guiding either the hon. member who believed that clock to be accurate or Mr. Clerk who regarded the clock to which he referred as accurate. That is what I meant by "belief".

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: He referred to his watch; he did not refer to any clock.

GOVERNMENT NOTICE

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Minister of External Affairs, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of \$22,041 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1967-68 Part I Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1967-68, No. 46, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

It is my intention to move the House in Committee of Supply at its next meeting to deal with this money Resolution.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and this House go into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Island.

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

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1967-68 No. 43

HEAD 13 - CUSTOMS

Head 13 - Customs - was called.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the last occasion, I think the hon. senior member for St. Peter was speaking, who, I observe, is not now in his place.

The question is that Head 13 stand part. Hon. members in favour will please say "Aye". Those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

HEAD 29 - MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, LABOUR AND NATIONAL INSURANCE

Head 29 - Ministry of Agriculture, Labour and National Insurance - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, under Head 29, Ministry of Agriculture, Labour and National Insurance, supplementary provision is required under two items - Items 74 and 75 - Agronomy Unit and Plant Propagation. This is a vote to do with the increasing cost of operations at Graeme Hall Plantation. The House already knows that new facilities are brought into use there, as Codrington is being released for the construction of the National Stadium.

The other amount of \$25,000 is required in connection with the Irrigation system at Sayes Court and Bullens Agricultural Station.

I am sure that my colleague, the Hon. Minister for Agriculture, will be pleased to answer any ques-

tions arising out of this. I beg to move that Head 29 stand part.

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

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Chairman, reading this Addendum, it states that the sum of \$8,659 is required to meet increased operating costs of the Unit following the commencement of work at Graeme Hall Plantation, Christ Church, where new facilities are being brought into use consequent on lands at Codrington, formerly used for this purpose, being released for the construction of the National Stadium.

I will read to there.

Well, agronomy is such a thing that it is the life blood of the agricultural industry; but what I would like to find out today is, if there was not a change-over to Graeme Hall of the facilities, whether they would still be going on at Codrington. I know that the Minister would certainly give me an explanation why this extensive cost has arisen.

While I am on that, I was just wondering if the Minister would be able to let me know if there is an agronomist on the Department's staff at present, and how those things are going because they are the backbone to the agricultural industry which for all our years has been the chief industry of Barbados. I have been looking at a Civil List, but I have not got a recent issue. It is true that tourism is coming along as our second industry, but we must not lose sight of what agriculture is to us. Diversification is alright, but it will take years and years in my humble opinion to displace sugar cane.

At present we are having a crisis in the sugar industry. The crop season will soon be here, and I do not know whether this year we will have to bring Vincentians to Barbados to cut the canes; but whenever I read the daily newspapers, there is such a controversy going on - I cannot do without reading them daily - between the Workers Union and the Sugar Producers Federation that I am wondering and waiting patiently to see what is going to be the outcome of it all and what the Government is going to do. In this Island, Searles Factory generally lead off the crop season by starting in early February. There was a year when it started in January.

Having a smattering idea of the agricultural set-up in Barbados for years, I am wondering what the Government is going to do, and I do hope that Government will not stay back and let things get to such a situation that within the next few weeks there would be such turmoil and set-back with our chief industry, the sugar cane.

12.40 p.m.

I do hope the Minister will be able to give me some information and that he has made notes to those questions I have asked. Right around the country the crop is looking fairly good. It may not be as good in tonnage as last year, but I do hope we will have no suffering this year in the reaping of our crop. The

Department of Agriculture's laboratory is responsible for the production of all things where the agricultural side is concerned. The knowledge is passed on to the plantation owners and peasants, and after we have that knowledge and go all out to put a good crop in the Island, it is shocking to see what takes place. What I am saying is what has been published in the newspaper for everybody to read, and very often your friends write from New York telling you what they have read in the newspapers. I do hope that the medium that should set things right will come into play, and we will not see those conditions which we are accustomed to seeing at night in Barbados.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, this Resolution appertains to agriculture. Now I am very unhappy about the statements being made in the newspapers relative to the economy of this Island. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture has made a statement to the Press, and the boss of the Union has also made one. The statements are very serious, and when one considers the threat that is being thrown out to us that only the essential departments will be working and all the others will be closed to business, one can think of what is likely to happen. When the Union calls an Island-wide strike and the Union officials are saying that they do not have any confidence in the Minister and are not prepared to say one word to him, what is this Government doing about the matter? I feel that by now the Government should also make a statement to the Press. I feel that the Prime Minister of this country should take his duties more seriously and pat the Minister if he is right or kick him out if he is wrong, because this strike will take place as a result of the statement which was made by the Minister. Mr. Chairman, this is one time that I will back the Minister 100 per cent in his statement, because in my opinion he is right. What is the Government doing? Is the Government going to stand by and allow the Union to hamstring the Minister? I wonder what the Minister himself is doing. By now he should make another statement and not look at anyone's face to see when he is vexed or pleased.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that there is some hush-hush dealing in this matter, but I can only say what I heard. As the old people say, my mouth does not have any cover. I heard that the statements which were made by the Minister were handed to him in writing by the Prime Minister, and it is a matter for the Minister to get up and deny it. If we are going to allow one ugly man, and not even the Prime Minister, to destroy this country, that is a matter for the people and the Government. We should know what the Government is doing in the matter. There are people quite willing to start their crop and have their machinery ready, but they do not know if they are on their heads or their feet owing to the Union going all over the country and telling the people not to work. If the Union is telling people not to work, the Government should go behind the Union and tell the people whether the Union is right or wrong, and not stand idly by and allow this country to suffer. Last night I was going home and I saw the skies with a red cast. The fires have started, and I only hope that the people will light the fire the right place, because this is a

serious matter. Rather than coming in here to make a noise and make themselves look ridiculous, why don't they take their duties into their hands and save the economy of this country?

Mr. Chairman, the Union does not want to hear anything from the Minister; they have no confidence in the Minister. The Union employs the Minister now; so they have sacked him! I want the Minister to understand that his Party cannot bring him back here nor can it put him out. It is the people who can, and it is the people who are going to suffer. He has made a statement from his heart, and the Union wants to bring down the wrath of the people on his shoulders, and yet he has other colleagues and a Leader who are doing nothing in the matter. If they are doing anything behind closed doors, that is not the way to do public business, because the same way the Prime Minister can hold a meeting in the Market Square when the odds were against him and his back was against the wall and told every man to break for himself, he should do so now because he is not going to get another chance to get into the Market Square, because the fire will be too hot. The fire will be in the wire.

I feel Sir, that we should do everything possible to save this country. The plantation and factory owners and even the workers do not know what to do. They are confused. A few of them have come to me asking what to do. I have told them that I cannot tell them what to do because they are in the Union and will have to take the time from the Union. I told them that I can only represent them on the floor of the House; so I want to know from the Hon. Minister what he is doing in the matter. If the Union does not want him, he will have to give him a kick in the pants and bring in another Minister; but I think this should be the last time that the Minister should stand for a kick. If there is going to be a shift, he should be shifted and not let the Prime Minister knock him about like that. He has done his duty to the people, and I feel that the statement he made was honest; but now I can see from the actions of the Government and the same Minister that they are saying the Union is right. I do not know if the Union is right or wrong. The Government is in a position to know if the people should work or should not work or if there should be a strike where only the Waterworks, the Hospital and one other service will continue to work.

12.50 p.m.

I think three were mentioned; the Hospital, the Water Works and the Telephone Department, or something. I cannot remember which it is. They are going to shut down the Police Department, too, because that was mentioned and that would be more serious if the Police have to strike or were called on to strike. This is a serious matter. I see members of the Government on the other side who are responsible for things in this country relaxing. The crop will soon start, and nothing has been said to uphold the Minister's statement one way or the other.

In other words, the people do not know what to do. This is now the first week in February. As my hon. colleague has said, some crops generally start in

January, and the people are still waiting to know the position. The people are being told all over the country not to work. The Government should be telling the people the position of things. If they do not care, or if they are afraid to face the people, then they have the necessary equipment to broadcast over the air and let the people know what they should do. Let them know whether the Minister is right or the Union is wrong. Tell the people what to do, and do not keep them in the dark.

I want to hear from the Hon. Minister what is the position. This is a more serious matter than anything else. This is the economy of the Island, and too many mouths will be starved if action is not taken. This is not like going into the lunch room and snatching up two dishes and running out with them. That was merely a joke, but there is now too much at stake. Even lives will be at stake in this instance. I want to hear from the Government. Whether the Government replies or not, whatever they do will please me. If they do not reply, then I will have a little more ammunition to fight them with. If they reply, I suppose, they will be able to disarm me. I will not have to load my gun, if they reply. I will sit and await the Minister's reply to know what he is doing in his small way to effect a harmonious relationship between the workers and the employers in the sugar industry.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, before the Minister replies, it might help him if I made a suggestion to him. It seems to many of us, and, when I say that, I do not want that there is any difference of opinion on this side of the House. The Minister will know from his normal profession and his reading the history of threats of general strikes and general strikes taking place and so on. That is one aspect of the matter which I would not discuss now, because some of these things may reach the Law Courts. But I would like to suggest to the Minister, and through him to his colleagues in the Cabinet, that the time has really passed for continued silence on the part of the Government when the Minister made his frank statement.

If after that the Government is told in clear, blunt language by a man who is, if anything, over-zealous and forthright in his speech more than anything else - the Government has been told that the revolver is out; it is pointed at the Government, and the Government is told plainly to pull the trigger: that they are prepared to pull the trigger, the Government at that stage then has a duty to the community, threats or no threats, to save it from possible economic disaster.

To me the matter is simple. You have both sides saying: "We are going no further." Therefore there is a deadlock. The deadlock can be solved comparatively simply by having some arbitrator appointed; try to get him agreed on by both sides; try to get somebody outside of Barbados of a judicial nature, or a man accustomed to sitting on arbitrations, even if it means that you have to pay somebody from Canada or the United Kingdom; but it should be somebody with a judicial mind - and preferably, of course,

somebody with a knowledge of the sugar industry - and who could make a survey, even if it takes some time and some money to have it.

If a survey is made of the general economic position of sugar, of the wages offered and the wages which are refused, and the wages demanded, and tell both sides to maintain the status quo: you pay what you have been paying; you workers, receive what you have been receiving, and any recommendations by the arbitrator for increased pay will date back to the day when they started working. Could anything be simpler than that? The Government owes a duty, not to mind if the employers are annoyed, not to mind if Mr. Frank Walcott is annoyed, to hit on a solution that cannot possibly hurt the workers, if an increase is recommended by the arbitrator, and not to leave it in a way in which some employer or some workman might be dissatisfied and on the one hand not pay, and on the other hand not work. If the worst comes to the worst, come back to the House and make the arbitration legally binding on both parties. A child could see that, and I am surprised it has not been suggested by the Government so far! Now that I have spoken before the Minister replies, I hope that he will give it the consideration which I feel it deserves.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, dealing with the Resolution before us, because of our diversification programme, because of the fact that emphasis by the Government is placed on making as much use as possible of the available land resources we have, it is absolutely necessary to carry out intensified research not only in sugar, but in other crops. It has been discovered that the facilities at Codrington Station were not enough to carry out the research programme in our crops to meet the demand in the country, and it was, therefore, decided that the Experimental Station should be removed from Codrington to a more spacious area at Graeme Hall. This is what has occasioned our coming here for \$8,000 for the removal of equipment from Codrington to Graeme Hall.

The hon. junior member for St. James spoke of extensive costs. What extensive costs? Mr. Chairman, the position is this: agriculture is the mainstay of the economy of this country, and it will remain so for quite a while. All over the world you find that there is a food problem. This resulted in the establishment of the F.A.O., and a branch of the F.A.O., the World Food Programme in order to solve this problem of food.

There are certain countries in the world where there is over production of food, and there are other countries where there is under-production of food - with surpluses and deficits.
1.00 p.m.

It is the aspiration of any progressive - thinking Government of a country whose mainstay is agriculture, to improve, and continue to improve the standard of agriculture in the country to make it self-sufficient and self-efficient. That is the aim of this Government. If that is to be done, much money has got to be spent

in research. We have got to be in a position in another two or three years to produce the same amount of sugar on about two-thirds of the land which we have currently in sugar. We have got to be in a position to produce a better type of sweet potato today to last longer, and a better type of yam. We have got to be in a position to solve the problem of the internal spoiling of yams, and we have got to be in a position to produce more carrots, more cabbage, more potatoes etc., in order to make ourselves self-sufficient and self-efficient in agriculture. We can only do this by research. We cannot carry out all of our research on the small plot at Codrington, and therefore when we spend \$8,000 in removing equipment from Codrington to Graeme Hall, this is only a drop in the ocean of what is necessary to be spent if our agricultural production is to be increased; therefore it is nothing here that is expensive. I just want to get that point quite clear. I do not think that hon. members have any objection to this, or I will try to convince them of the necessity for it. We want ninety acres of land for our research at Graeme Hall. We carry out research in sugar at Groves, and the reason why so much emphasis is placed on the variety-testing stations is because we want to be able to grow a better type of cane, a cane which can even withstand fire because if, as I have said - and I make absolutely no apology for having made the statement which I made just over a week ago, and I will make it again. As to the statement I made, I could not care less what the Press reported me to have said. I know what I said, and I will let hon. members hear what I said. The question posed was what were my comments on the mechanisation of the sugar industry. I said that mechanisation of the sugar industry in Barbados is a "must". I said that the world price of sugar is not increasing; the cost of production of sugar is increasing. I was bearing in mind that the cost of fertiliser was going up, the cost of other equipment was going up and inevitably the cost of producing sugar in Barbados must be increased. We were faced with a situation in this country last year where plantations were spending an overall of \$18.00 to produce one ton of cane, and they received \$15.00 for the same ton of cane when it was produced. The Government estates in the Scotland district lost \$87,000 last year. The position is that mechanisation is the answer to an economic production. We are fortunate to be included in the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement where we have a price paid to us for some of the sugar which we produce at a rate of about \$20.00 a ton of sugar over what it costs us to produce a ton of sugar. In Barbados it costs us approximately \$200 to produce a ton of sugar and we get around \$222 or \$223 by virtue of the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement. In the year that we produce 200 tons of sugar, we have got a sale for this sugar or part of it on the World Market. We had a situation where, on the World Market, we were receiving as low as \$80.00 per ton for sugar. Can we afford in Barbados to produce sugar for \$200 a ton to sell any of it on the World Market at \$80.00 a ton? That was the basis of my argument and I made it crystal clear that I was not, in dealing with the increased cost of producing sugar, commenting at that time on any matters between the Sugar Producers' and the Barbados Workers' Union. I am quite con-

scious of my responsibility; but if Mr. Walcott wants a scapegoat and he tries to get one in me, there is something called backfiring, bouncing back. I can deal with Mr. Walcott; I was never afraid of a man in my life. The position is that he is not going to find a scapegoat in me. If he is experiencing difficulty, let him paddle his own canoe; but do not let him place the responsibility on me. Knowing what my responsibility is, I know what responsibility I owe to the people of this country, and it is for me, as Minister of Agriculture, to put the agricultural situation in the country before the people and give them as much knowledge of the agricultural situation of the country as my limited ability affords me to put to them.

On the question of mechanisation, I said that it must come. In our experiments in the Ministry of Agriculture at Codrington last year, we have been experimenting on the harvesting of sugar cane by a machine. We found that we had difficulty when we had to reap the canes by this machine without burning them. We found that we had difficulty after we burned them because some of them did not react favourably to the burning and they were not straight enough. This means that we have got to carry out further experiments and plant on the areas where we can use mechanical devices on this cane which can stand up to the heat. Those are experiments which have been carried out. I said that the Scotland District must inevitably come out of sugar, if we are to compete on the World Market and even on the Commonwealth Market for sugar, because with an increase in the cost of fertiliser and an increase in the cost of everything, we will soon find ourselves producing sugar even over and above the prices at which we are paid for the sugar even on the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement. In Australia and South Africa, these places are highly mechanised and they can produce sugar more cheaply than we can in Barbados.

1.10 p.m.

What is wrong with the statement I made? I did not even remember Mr. Walcott when I was making the statement. I was at the time looking at the agricultural situation in the country, and I consider that it is my duty as Minister of Agriculture to let the people see what their fate is and where we are heading: and as long as I am a Minister of the Crown, I am going to do it fearlessly. I do not care whose corns I may crush, my first duty is to the people of this country.

Now, the position is this. Mr. Walcott is talking about a general strike. I am not going into the merits or demerits of a general strike, but I am sure that the people of this country are aware that a general strike can cripple the economy of this country. It is therefore my duty, if they are not aware that it can cripple the economy of the country, to tell them now that at any time there is a general strike, you may be playing up to the wishes of one man in the country, but at the same time you are destroying your own self. Therefore, anybody who can come in the country and is talking about a general strike, I would not say what I think about him. Mr. Walcott asked for it; I would give it to him. I did not trouble him; I was commenting on the labour situation in the country.

Now, I am still Minister of Labour and it would only be a fool who is involved in labour matters who would say that he does not have any confidence in the Minister of Labour. Who goes and settle his disputes? Who settled the dispute at the *Advocate*? The same Minister that he does not have confidence in who did it. That is why the *Advocate* doors are open today. If the same Minister whom the Union does not have any confidence in did not intervene, the *Advocate* doors would have been closed.

I go around the country. I trouble no one until he troubles me: and when he troubles me, I can be like a snake in the grass. To have a general strike, you would have to be in a position to feed the people involved in a general strike. I know a little bit of everything. I want to make this crystal clear. Any time that the Union would have a general strike, it has to be financially equipped to feed the people involved in a strike because you have 18,000 agricultural workers besides another 90,000 involved in labour of some sort, whenever you call a general strike.

You say that you are keeping open the Hospital, the Waterworks Department and the Electric Company; therefore, it means that if you have an unemployment figure in the country of 20,000 and you are calling a general strike, you will have to feed 50,000 people. What are you going to feed them with? You have to have the wherewithal to feed them. It is all right to go on the streets and down St. Peter and tell the people that the Minister of Labour does not want you to get more money. He attempted to hold a meeting in Belleplaine. Why did he not hold it? Go to Belleplaine and see if you do not get some blows. Why say that you were going to have a meeting down there to say that I said not to pay the workers more money? I never on one occasion commented on the question of the payment of wages of the people.

We have held six meetings of the Sugar Producers' Federation and the Barbados Workers' Union. I listened to the views of the Barbados Workers' Union on three or four occasions as well as the views of the Sugar Producers' Federation trying to get this matter settled. I have been able to get the Sugar Producers' Federation to make the Union an offer. While the Union does not have any confidence in me, I have been instrumental in getting the Sugar Producers' Federation to make an offer to the Workers' Union on the question of pay for the workers. How could it be fair for one to go around the country telling people that the Minister of Labour does not want the workers to get more money? He has asked for it and nobody can keep my mouth closed. If he wants to fight with me, he will get a fight, if I fight with him alone.

The position is this. I told them that they must make an offer because the cost of living has gone up in this country, and an offer has got to be made to the workers. Is it fair that one should go around and say that the Minister of Labour does not want the Workers to get more money in this country? Go and ask the Sugar Producers' Federation. The fact that they made an offer was because the Minister of Labour said that they had to make an offer. But then, you will

find somebody going and saying that the Minister is not concerned with the economics of the industry; he is not concerned with whether the industry makes money or not.

I am not against him getting money. I said that the Sugar Producers' Federation said that they make, say, four million dollars on a capital investment of \$66 million. I said that the workers should get some of it. The Federation said that they are paying more money on behalf of the workers than four million dollars on National Insurance. I said that the workers will still have to get more money. An offer was made and I am sure that the offer would have been increased if the Union was willing to negotiate with the Sugar Producers' Federation because I am quite satisfied that the five percent which they offered was not what they were going to offer finally.

When someone is saying that he is not concerned with the economics of the industry, it is time that he would get me to say what I have to say. I do not interfere with anyone; but when they interfere with me, I am going to fight and we are going to fight to the end until somebody's neck is cut.

1.20 p.m.

On the question of the deadlock, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph mentioned the question of an arbitrator. I can only appoint an arbitrator if representation is made to me from both sides that an arbitrator is necessary to settle the dispute, and then the arbitrator appointed has got to be agreed to by both sides. If both sides do not feel they need an arbitrator yet, then they do not need one. I know that if the crop is not started soon, the economy of the country is going to be affected. The Sugar Producers and the Workers' Union are now negotiating wages which are in some cases retrospective from 1st July last year. They are negotiating out of crop wages, not crop wages, and I do not see why the economy of this country should be ruined by people working in the crops - not harvesting - when what is being negotiated does not directly concern the harvesting of sugar in this country. They can continue with the negotiations and whenever they are completed, the same workers for whom the negotiations are going on will be paid from 1st July last year.

Mr. Chairman, what nonsense are we hearing, therefore, about a general strike and not letting people cut the canes when you are not negotiating the price for cutting canes or for making sugar? You are negotiating wages for which the people have already worked. There are some of us who when we are drowning do not care whom we carry down with us. A drowning man catches at a straw. If Mr. Walcott wants a scapegoat, let him try and find someone else, but not me because I am not one to be pushed around. I interfere with no one, but do not interfere with me. If I do not interfere with your work or stop you from doing it, do not stop me from doing mine. I owe a duty to the people of this country, and it is my intention to make a contribution to this country as long as I am physically and mentally able to do so. Anytime I have got to make a statement, I give it careful considera-

tion before I make it. I was accused of being unfactual and of my statement being unfounded. All I said, Mr. Chairman, was that the cost of producing sugar is increasing in Barbados and the world price in sugar is not increasing; so how could that statement be unfactual or unfounded unless the person who says that it is unfactual and unfounded does not in truth and in fact know what is meant by unfactual and unfounded? Some of us use words we do not know the meanings of. I wonder sometimes if when people make the statements that they do not have confidence in somebody if they know what is confidence. Some of us have pass-words which we use. Some of us like to let somebody hear us use big words, but I like to use simple words. Even if I as Minister had made a statement with which the Union boss was not satisfied, he is one of the people in this country who always tells you that you cannot place confidence in what is reported in the Press, and the correct approach would have been for him to query me and find out if I really made the statement that was reported in the Press, and ask me in what context did I make the statement. In it I said absolutely nothing about wages. I was speaking on the general and overall cost of producing sugar in this country.

Now if the cost of producing sugar in this country is not increasing, I am a dead man. I saw nothing unfactual or unfounded about it, and I cannot see how it could affect negotiations which are going on between the Sugar Producers' Federation and the Union, and therefore, Mr. Chairman, I have absolutely no apologies to make either to the Union or to anybody at all. I have discharged my duty as Minister of Agriculture to the people of this country.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to rise again, but I would just like to correct one statement by the Minister who gave the impression that I was not aware of the ordinary procedure of arbitration. I can quite safely say that if the Minister or the Government cannot get employers and workers to agree on an arbitrator, he can appoint one by coming in here and passing a Bill. It is not the first time that a Government, though not in this Island, has passed legislation specifically to break a strike.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The only difference is that there is no strike. The crop is going to start next week at some places, and when you say that if the sugar workers cut the canes, the sugar is not going to be handled by the port, that is still to be seen. The position as far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman is that there is no strike. I will take action when a general strike is called; but do you think the people of this country are stupid to talk about a general strike? If you are dealing with sugar workers and want to call a strike, let them strike; but when you begin to deal with a general strike, you have to be financially equipped to maintain in food, clothing and everything something like 50,000 of the 90,000 workers in this country. The question is whether the Union can do it.

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Chairman, I just rise to remind the Minister that I made a query with regard to

the Agronomist. He has not replied to that yet, but I remember an old adage I heard years ago that the less you speak the more you hear, and the more you hear the less you speak. In asking this question here today with regard to agronomy we have got a whole history. I personally am not going to touch the last part of the Minister's speech. I am only going to deal with the answer made, and I must thank him very much. When I mentioned the \$8,659, I think he is safe in replying that I said it was extensive, but I think he misunderstood me. I used that word to get some information, because if all the works from Codrington have gone to Graeme Hall, I personally would know that it is going to cost more money than that, but he has told us, though it was not in the Addendum, that that has been strictly used for the removal of things. I have got some information with regard to the variety of potatoes and things of that sort. All of that I have passed through already; so I know what it would cost. The Minister also in replying said that we hope to have a variety of canes that will be fire-resistant. When Dr. Saint came to Barbados, that was his first motive; to use less acreage to produce more tonnage.

1.30 p.m.

All of those things that the Minister has told me with regard to what I spoke on, I am very thankful to him and glad to know that they are going to produce a cane that will be fire-resistant. I will also tell the Minister that it was never thought that in Barbados cane would be cut by a machine, but at the Guinea Plantation and a sub-plantation called Cliffden in one year we prepared a field in furrows and we planted just opposite each other one field in cane-holes and other things, and the other field in furrows. The field with furrows was planted with long canes, as started in Louisiana and other places; therefore, long before it was ever thought that machinery would come to Barbados, I can tell you from reading books that we tried out those things. When the machinery comes, it will be necessary to prepare the fields to suit the machinery.

The Minister also spoke about St. Andrew. I know how laborious St. Andrew is.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I spoke of the Scotland District. This does not only include St. Andrew; it includes St. Joseph, certain parts of St. Thomas, and a part of St. John.

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Chairman, I am very thankful that the Minister has corrected me, but as he was dealing with the cane crop and talking about the Union and so on it was just in my brain that he was referring to the reaping of canes and so on. I will sit and close my remarks by saying these few words: the Scotland Factory was in my mind. I have worked at Haggatt's Factory some time ago through the reaping season and everything; so I know a whole lot about the matter. It is now called the Scotland Factory, but I am referring to that Factory which was in St. Andrew and purchased by the late Mr. F. F. C. Gill - Haggatt's Factory. I have worked there as an Overseer, if you call it so now, but in those days it was an Overseer-Accountant. My brother was also working there as an

Overseer. I would like to remind the Minister to answer me about the Agronomist.

The question that Head 29 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1967-68 No. 45

A Resolution for \$135,828 was called.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, as hon. members on the other side will have seen - they are always complaining about brief Addenda - this Addendum is set out very clearly. It states:

"Because of the increase in the weight and frequency of air traffic at Seawell Airport over the last few years it became necessary....."

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. This Resolution stands in the name of the Prime Minister. I do not see the Prime Minister on his feet.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, as far as I know, no Minister has to ask for leave to deal with a money Resolution. This is something new. I am a Minister of the Government and, therefore, I can get up and deal with any Resolution because these things have been dealt with in the Cabinet. I do not know anything about this fancy idea about "in the name of somebody". A money Resolution always comes in in the name of the Minister of Finance, but that does not preclude another Minister from dealing with a money Resolution.

"Because of the increase in the weight and frequency of air traffic at Seawell Airport over the last few years it became necessary to strengthen and extend the taxiway there."

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Is the invariable practice followed by the Leader of the House wrong, and the declaration of the Minister of Communications correct?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Both are right, Mr. Chairman. When Mr. Speaker is in the Chair, and we are dealing with Orders, I usually ask for leave for another Minister other than the one under whose name it is to take place. But we are in Committee, and I think that any Minister can deal with a matter of Supply.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Does the section of the Financial Administration and Audit Act that says that the Prime Minister must present Estimates - the Minister of Finance must present Estimates to the House - mean

nothing? There is a Statute and not even a Standing Order.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I am at a loss to understand what is agitating the hon. member. If he does not want the Resolution dealt with, he can get up and object to it. I have no quarrel with him if he wants to object. That is his prerogative, but he will go on objecting until the time comes. I see absolutely no reason for the restriction which he is trying to impose.

Mr. Chairman, the Addendum further states:

"Provision for this project was made in the previous financial year and part of the amount unspent at the end of that year, \$680,000, was revoted in the current year's Estimates.

The project is not yet completed and the sum of \$135,828 is now required for its completion. This sum represents a revote of \$32,340 of the original estimated cost of the project and the supplementary provision of \$103,488.

The Supplementary provision is required to meet the cost of additional work which was found to be necessary after the start of the project and was also based on the advice from an expert whose services were made available by the United Kingdom Ministry of Overseas Development."

What led up to this, Mr. Chairman, is that Seawell has become, not now but for some time, an International Airport. Quite a number of planes land at Seawell and some of them are fairly big, like the D.C. 861. We are also expecting to get some JAMBO Jets coming here in the next year or so. Seawell only had one landing-strip which was being used for landing, taxiing, taking off and everything. The Government, after being advised, decided that it would be a good idea to build a taxiway, so that planes going out would not interfere with planes coming in. Another point in having the taxiway is that it prevents planes from standing in one spot and revving-up the engines, which can destroy the runway because of the amount of thrust that you get from these jet engines.

It was decided to build this taxiway. It was also decided that the material from the excavation of the taxiway could be used there again. As hon. members will see in the Addendum, we had an expert, Wing Commander Kelly, who came here to advise us, and we had to change our specifications. We also had advice from the Ministry of Overseas Development who are experts at building these things. We did not want a runway that would break up when the first heavy plane landed on it. It would mean that you would lose some lives, and that pilots of light and heavy planes would say that it is unsafe to land here.

As a result of that, the reason we had the extra expenditure is that the material we had excavated from the taxiway and thought we could have used it again had in too much clay and mould, and it was not good enough for the taxiway. As a result of that, Com-

mander Kelly advised that we should not use this material for the taxiway.

1.40 p.m.

As a result, this is why we are asking hon. members for this amount to finish the taxiway for the Airport. If there are any questions dealing with the runway which hon. members want to ask and I can answer them, I will be quite willing to do so. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, before I address myself to the Resolution, there are one or two things which I would like to make clear. This is something which is outside the Standing Orders; it is a little bit beyond your experience or that of the Clerk and certainly beyond that of the Minister. There is a thing in Barbados called the Financial Administration and Audit Act and it places on the Minister responsible for finance specifically by Section 4(4) the right to bring Supplementary Estimates before the House, and it states in Section 2(2) the definition section, this:

"Where any function is by this Act or by any subsidiary legislation made thereunder, required, permitted or otherwise to be performed by the Minister, or the Financial Secretary or the Accountant General, that function may be performed by some person authorised in that behalf by the Minister, or the Financial Secretary or the Accountant General, as the case may be."

Therefore, if the Minister of Communications and Works feels as he said, that any Minister has the right to come in here and move the passing of a supplementary Resolution, he is wrong. That aspect must be made clear. We would not expect him to do that, of course, but I am surprised that he could stand up and make a statement about the constitutional amendment when I do not know if he knows where to find the Financial Administration and Audit Act in the appropriate volume of the Laws of Barbados. He has to be specifically authorised and the Hon. Leader of the House knows that, because he specifically said that, on behalf of the Prime Minister, he is commanded to lay this Resolution. The Resolution bears this superscription on the back; that notice of this Resolution was given by the Hon. Leader of the House on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Finance. Therefore do not let the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works feel that he is right. He is hopelessly wrong at this particular moment anyhow. Nobody over here would, of course, challenge this expenditure on the ground that the Minister was not authorised by the Prime Minister to take charge of it, and that he did not ask the leave of the House to do so. Nobody would worry about that, but the Minister would do well to learn that a little courtesy even to the Prime Minister might be something which, if he learned it, would get him on better in life. *(Asides)* Mr. Chairman, if we are going to put up a zoo in Welchman Hall.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not see anything about a zoo in Welchman Hall in any part of this Resolution.

Let the hon. member continue to speak on the Resolution.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, it was the Minister I was talking about. It is since the beginning of 1966 that we have been worried about the taxiway at Seawell Airport. There is not enough room on the parking apron. What is needed, what the Minister has explained is needed, has been needed for several years now and it is: an adequate taxiway for the parking apron for aircraft. Barbados is fortunate in that the prevailing winds blow down the runway for three hundred days of the year and therefore we do not have to duplicate facilities at both ends, and we do not have to have cross runways because of cross winds. We are fortunate because it is a relatively simple problem. You have the wind blowing down for most of the year and therefore planes can take off in the same direction almost everyday of the year without the cross winds and without having tail winds and so on. You only have to carry the taxiway down to the parking apron of the runway.

For years and years the problems inherent in this have been neglected although they have been getting worse because of the increase in aircraft coming to Barbados all the time. There is not enough room at the Terminal Building yet. Last year there was an accident when a man with an air conditioner, an aircraft air conditioner, reversed the air conditioner on to an aeroplane belonging to a Venezuelan gentleman and broke off the wings, and that caused trouble because of congestion. The Venezuelan gentleman had his aircraft parked exactly where he was told to put it by the Air Traffic Control Office. Nevertheless, this still happened. What the Minister has mentioned is necessary because of the position at the end of the runway. That has been known to be necessary for years, and while we are now taking only about \$135,000, this will bring the total sum spent to over \$1.1 million just on this taxiway alone. Don't let us be deceived by the \$680,000, because \$350,000 and more dollars were spent in the year before that.

Mr. Chairman, as to all this talk about the clay and the mould in the filling, this should have been known long ago. This is not a new problem. We have heard about an expert, a Wing Commander who came down and reported on it. The gentleman gave his advice, and why is it that almost the end of the financial year has been reached before this money has been found necessary to be spent? It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that there has been the same waste and bad work in dealing with this taxiway as the Minister has recently complained of in other places. I understand that the Minister complained that we do not always get a day's work out of the employees of the Ministry. He has complained that they are shortchanging the Government and so on, and it seems to me that if this Resolution is necessary, the shortchanging has been the pattern of going all the time. You cannot blame only the workmen. If after ten years, work has been going on at Seawell and expert evidence has been obtained which has made this Resolution necessary, if that is the case and things are being discovered at the last minute, and this makes this Resolution neces-

sary, you have to blame the planners at the top as well. This is a project on which we have spent over \$1 million of the Government's money to build a taxiway at Seawell. Now that it is at the end when the expert has told us this and we have now discovered that this filling has too much clay and mould in it, it is bad work; it is a bad job throughout.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I should just like to explain something to the hon. member. What has happened is this. We cannot build a runway on a sandy foundation. A lot of drainage has to go on in this thing. That was not envisaged, and sometimes when you meet a solid rock formation, just as you have that formation, you find that you have a lot of mould to take out and you have to fill in that in order to make it strong to bear up the planes. All this accounts for that happening, and it is nothing that you could really argue down to the last cent. I hope that the hon. member accepts what I have said as being true. But what I really got up for is this; in his opening remarks the hon. member said something about my getting permission from the Prime Minister to deal with this Resolution.

1.50 p.m.

I did get that permission from the Prime Minister. That is the first thing. He then went on to say something in a sotto voce manner. If he means that I am an animal.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: An animal is not part of the Resolution.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: But it was part of his speech. Yes, I am an animal and I would be glad to go to a zoo. The only problem is that I do not see anybody on the opposite side that we can put in a Zoo.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1967-68 No.44

HEAD 3 - PARLIAMENT

Head 3 - Parliament - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution asks for supplementary provision, first in respect of Head 3 - Legislature - Refreshments and then Head 43 - Ministry of Health and Community Development - Barbados Arts Council.

With respect to Head 3, the matter speaks for itself. I beg to move that Head 3 do now stand part.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Head 3 -

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, you must first look around to see if hon. members are getting up. Now as regards to Head 3, Item 18 Refreshments, the Hon. Introducer, I am afraid to say, has said very little on it.

The Addendum states:-

"As a result of the unexpected large number of sittings of the House of Assembly as well as the unusual length of several sittings, the amount provided in the estimates for refreshments has proved to be inadequate.

The sum of \$5,690 is required to supplement the provision in the current Estimates in order to provide refreshments for the remainder of the financial year."

Now, Sir, the Hon. Introducer knows as well as I do that I like a breakdown on Resolutions of this nature. The Resolution is asking for \$5,690. This is the month of February and it appears, judging from the adjournment last Tuesday, that the Government is adjourning for two weeks; so it may only be that we have to meet one sitting more in February, and March is the end of the financial year.

Now, Sir, I would like to know how much money has been spent to date, and really how much more money would they need. You are asking for \$5,690 for less than four weeks. I would like to know how much that works out per sitting. I would like to know if the vote has been exhausted, and some of this money would have to make it up or if this \$5,690 that they are asking for now is to be spent by the end of next month.

I cannot understand it, Sir, and judging from the actions of Government last Tuesday, it is my belief that the Government wants this money to buy a separate dining room, or separate chairs, separate ware and a separate caterer. In other words, you must change the dining room and all of these things with this money.

The Hon. Introducer of this Resolution expects hon. members to say "yes" to a Resolution of this sort and that would be the end of the matter.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Will the hon. member just give way for a minute? This is the last Resolution, so far as I know, that we are doing. If it is envisaged by the other side that we should finish it so that we would not have to resume after lunch, I would just like to have some indication because I can take the appropriate measures to have a continuation of this debate after. I would just like to get the feeling on the other side.

Mr. SMITH: I do not know. Speaking for myself, we could as well finish it off and go out once and for all. Well, I am only speaking for myself. If the other hon. members are not in favour of that suggestion, well, I do not know: but that is how I feel about it.

(A PAUSE)

It does not appear that we would be able to accommodate you, Sir. We would have to carry on until the time for lunch.

Well, Sir, I am speaking on the Resolution. I want really to know what this money is needed for. I cannot

vote for this Resolution as it stands, because I see that the Government wants to segregate its members from the Opposition and take its members for lunch up at the Hilton Hotel and I believe that this money is needed now to pay for that. I have been told that the Prime Minister is taking the members up at the Farm, and their lunching there has been more costly than down here. I want to know if he was paying for that food out of his pocket or if we are now asked to pay for it.

THE SUSPENSION

Mr. SPEAKER: In conformity with the appropriate Standing Order, this sitting now stands suspended until 2.30 p.m. for lunch.
2.00 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION:

HOUSE RESUMES COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: At the suspension, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph was speaking.

Mr. SMITH: I was making the point, Mr. Chairman, when the sitting was suspended that the Addendum is somewhat suspicious in the light that \$4,800 was voted for the entire year, and now this Resolution is asking for \$5,690. It is impossible, if the Addendum is right that you could want or could consume so much money between now and the end of next month; so something is wrong.

While I was outside, I got a little information which the Minister should have given to this House; but if he does not know, he does not know. I think it was last week that I had to warn the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works about these Addenda, and asked him to make sure that they were worded correctly, so that he would be able to explain things more clearly to this House, but it appears to me that the Ministers only see these Addenda the same time that I do, and that is five minutes before I leave to come here. Knowing the Hon. Introducer as I do, I cannot call him anything other than an educated Minister. How could the Minister take for granted that the sum of \$5,690 is required to supplement the provision in the Current Estimates in order to provide refreshments for the remainder of the financial year? I do not believe the Minister read the Addendum, because this could not be right, and if it is right, then something is wrong.

As I was saying, Sir, I understood that the Ministers and Government members were taking their meals at Culloden Farm. At the Farm the meals would be more costly, because the pot would be a gold pot and the food is gold food and much better than

the one we get here. Since they are being chased out of the Senate lunch room and cannot come back into ours, they must be making provision to go to the Hilton, and this money could be for that, from what I see here. It is really too much money being asked for. I do not know when I am right or when I am wrong with these Addenda. This Addendum is worded incorrectly and in a way to fool me, because I am about the only fool in here. I do not think the Minister knows it, but I am going to tell him what the money is for. This money is to pay for arrears and not for the sittings of the House from now until the end of the financial year. It would appear as though I am near the Cabinet, because I have told the House what the Minister should have told it. I believe it is for this purpose, and I cannot therefore have any more confidence in these Resolutions because they are misleading.

I have a boy at home who is not too good at top. His parents were not able to help him; but I am sure that if I put this Addendum before him, I am sure he would ask if \$4,800 was voted for a year, how could you expect to spend \$5,690 for one month? If the Minister read this, then he tried to pull a fast one on me. He was very vague with it when he said that the Resolution speaks for itself and needs no more talk. It speaks for itself all right because it is wrong. The Minister should give me a break-down on how much of this money is for arrears. Regardless to how the Government feels about the Opposition, the Opposition still plays a big part when they have to vote money out of the Treasury. They do not care anything about us as men, but they have to care about us as Attorneys for the people. We have as much right to see that money is carefully spent and be responsible to the people as the Government members; so we have to ask questions. I understand what it is for, but I still expect the Minister to get up and say that we owe the caterer so much money and this is to pay him, because he should have had it ever since. He should do to the Government what the Government is doing to us. As soon as you do not pay your income tax in time, on goes the interest; so the caterer should charge the Government interest on that money, because he has to pay the Bank interest on money that he owes.

I understand, Mr. Chairman, that practically all of it is to pay the caterer, but he may be afraid to talk. He knows the hands he is in; he knows how much spite can be created and how you can be pushed around and that if he does not supply the meals they can get a new caterer from Pelican Village; so they are squeezing him because they have no right owing him \$4,000. I intended voting against it because I thought it was to pay the bill at the Hilton or at Culloden Farm, since it is impossible to want all this money for only four weeks. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Who told you?) you know I live near the Cabinet. I am nearer to the Cabinet in this Resolution than the Hon. Leader of the House, because he did not say it was for the caterer.

2.40 p.m.

He told us that it was for the end of the financial year. I know my facts, and I got them right, too. I

would not keep the House any longer, because the caterer should get his money. I am sorry that the Treasury is not open now, so that when we finish here he could go and get it. It is not fair to us. Do not try to mislead us on this side of the House with these Addenda. Call a spade a spade, and if the money has already been spent you should say so. We will still have to pay it; we will still have to vote the money for it.

When you bring Addenda of this sort in this House, you make the members on this side feel that you are afraid of us. You are telling us with your mouth that you are not afraid, but in your actions you are doubly afraid. You figure that if you come to us with the truth, we will give you trouble. The truth sets you free. Come clear; straighten up and fly right. You must always give us the breakdown and keep our mouths closed. I have nothing more to say on this Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I do not think any reasonable, thinking member would attempt even to vote against this Resolution, but might is not right. When I looked at this Resolution I wondered if in 1966 it took \$4,800; in 1967 it took \$4,800 and now, as it says:

"As a result of the unexpected large number of sittings of the House of Assembly as well as the unusual length of several sitting, the amount provided in the estimates for refreshment has proved to be inadequate.

The sum of \$5,690 is required to supplement the provision in the current Estimates in order to provide refreshments for the remainder of the financial year."

Either the man who wrote this is the damnedest liar in the world, or he thinks we are the blastedest idiots in the world over here!

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, what? How can anybody who read the Estimates of 1966 and saw that you spent \$4,800; in 1967 you also spent \$4,800 - as a matter of fact, I was surprised because during the year 1967 I could not see how the caterer could have charged the same amount that he was charging. Everybody knows that the cost of everything has gone up. How could he very well do it? How could you very well expect anybody to cater for the twelve months during 1967 for the same amount as he had been charging, say, in 1965, 1966, and so on? He just could not do it. How could anybody reasonably put down this? I do not attribute it to any attempt to fool members, but I believe that the Hon. Leader of the House did not look at it. He could not have seen it; he would not have encouraged it. It states:

"The sum of \$5,690 is required to supplement the provision in the current Estimates in order to provide refreshments for the remainder of the financial year."

The remainder of the financial year as from today for which we have been summoned to this meeting as an extraordinary meeting, a meeting of urgency and it would mean that you are going to pay from now to the end of March \$5,690! This is wrong. You should not put this sort of thing in front of hon. members. Come straight out and say what it is for. If you owe the caterer money, and I believe you owe him money, you would have to owe him money because he could not possibly supply the meals on what he had received.

Of course, we know that there are more sittings than years ago. There are more sittings now than 15 years ago. Some years ago there might have been four or five sittings a year. Then there were 24 sittings a year and 30 sittings a year and so on. All of this is true. Who is the Permanent Secretary that could have written this and sent it to a Minister? Could the Minister have seen this?

"The sum of \$5,690 is required to supplement the provision in the current Estimates in order to provide refreshments for the remainder of the financial year."

Well, these refreshments must be the type of refreshments that they serve at the Paradise Beach Club! The butlers come out and tell me that they have Napoleon Brandy in front of people. I cannot afford Napoleon Brandy. I go to some of my friends who are wealthy and well-to-do, and they cannot afford Napoleon Brandy. The average taxpayer is bound to believe that, if we are going to spend \$5,690 for the next two months of the year, it is reckless squandering mania. That must be a fact, because this is what the Addendum says. It says that we are going to spend \$5,690 for the remainder of the financial year, and this financial year ends on the 31st March, 1968. How can we do that? How could it very well be done?

I would never oppose the spending of any money, or a reasonable amount of money for refreshment in a year, although I could afford to oppose it because I am the one person in this House who has never taken a meal in the House. It is not that I would not eat, but I just cannot. Despite that, I suppose I would say 'friends' now, but I cannot because that is a plant of slow growth - friendship. Despite the fact that I have suffered an ailment in the stomach, some of us have suffered an ailment with other things that are unknown to us.

I would not be the person to come in here and say that I would vote against this, but I would vote against it today, on principle, for misleading us, unless the Minister gets up here and says that this thing is wrong and it should not be set out in this manner in the Addendum. If I have to vote alone, I would vote against it, because what I would be voting for is that we were going to spend \$5,690 for two months for food for members of the House of Assembly. Even if we also provided food for the Senate, it could not come to this amount. I am looking at what is going into the Hansard of this country. It will show that \$5,690 was voted in the House of Assembly on the 2nd February, 1968, to supplement the Estimates of \$4,800 for the

next two months. This is plain, simple, straightforward English. This is English that people like myself and the hon. member for St. Joseph can understand. This may not be the English for the ex-Oxonians and lawyers to understand. If we had food every day for the next eight weeks - and the Minister has not told us that - if we had food every day for the next eight weeks to the end of the year it could not cost us \$5,690.

I am going to be generous enough to say, unlike my friend the hon. member for St. Joseph, that it was not put in to mislead us. They would have to consider us as the biggest lot of fools in Christendom.
2.50 p.m.

You have the numbers and it is bound to be passed. I think you would agree with me. Do you believe that the twenty-four of us, including myself, eating lunch for the next eight weeks could eat out \$5,690? Do you believe so? Seven-hundred dollars! a meal! (Mr. SMITH: He will say "yes"). Why will he say "yes"? I am asking you Mr. Chairman, do you believe that we could eat this out every day for the next eight weeks? The Hon. Leader of the House has the absolute right to give a proper explanation of this matter. It is the duty of the Hon. Leader of the House to defend Civil Servants, but it is certainly his duty to give the House an explanation of the expenditure of the taxpayers' money. It would seem to me to be reckless to spend nearly \$6,000 on refreshments for eight weeks until the remainder of the financial year. Mr. Chairman, I am generous enough as not to say that it was put in here to mislead us; I do not believe that it was put to mislead us. It is just that somebody put it in; it is just somebody saying: "No matter, we will put it in." Despite the fact that the caterer is well known to me and I would not like to see him lose one cent in this whole matter, I will have to say: "No". Unless it is properly explained to this House, it seems to me that you will put this down and say: "We do not care what happens; they are bound to vote it, \$700 for every day."

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am not prepared to vote for this unless I know that it is an expenditure which has been rightly incurred, that the sum is right as well as an explanation. I have been too often willing to say: "All right", when in my heart of hearts it is felt that something has been done absolutely deliberately. The only reason for making anybody believe that it was done deliberately is the absolute stupidity of it. How can anybody knowing that it is down in the Addendum that the estimate is \$4,800 - it is not as if to say that he was merely asking for this, forgetting how much was voted last year and the year before. That is the only reason why you find it difficult to believe that it was not deliberate, because nobody could be so stupid as to ask for this sum of money for two months, which is more than the amount that we spent last year and the year before. The point I am putting, and I expect to have an answer to it is this: It is the Minister's duty to explain, not only to reply to the question put by my colleague, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph and the hon. senior

member for the City, but to answer all questions appertaining to how this money has been arrived at. We hear that sometimes members of the Government lunch or dine at Culloden Farm. I should not say anything about Tuesday, but surely, we are entitled to ask how many lunches or dinners or both were supplied last year, how many sittings they were, at what price these lunches and dinners are supplied and how many were supplied. That is in order, because if part of the Government members do not dine in here, you surely do not supply dinners for twenty-four people or if you supplied dinners for twenty-four people and you discover that at meeting after meeting members of the Government do not eat those dinners, you could cut down on those dinners. It would be the duty of the Government to find out how many of their members habitually do not desire to eat in here and cut down on the expenditure. The Government is not entitled to say that we have 24 members and each of them brings along a friend and therefore the Government should tell the caterer to supply 50 dinners; that is inconceivable. Many members in many Assemblies do not eat in the lunch room supplied by the particular Assembly. Everybody would be sympathetic with the caterer, whether we knew him or not, because if he had been supplying lunch after lunch and dinner after dinner, common humanity and common decency would tell us that he has been played upon, sat upon and treated unfairly by the Government. I am not now going into the constitutional aspect of the matter, and I do not propose at any time, especially since the Government's recent behaviour, to give legal advice gratuitously. They have an Attorney General. How can you go on taking the caterer's food when you have not got the money to pay for it? That is incidental. It is wrong, legally and morally; but nobody would believe that for the faults of the Government, the caterer should suffer, and that is why I might vote for this. (ASIDES) Most Assemblies which have got a different mentality from the interrupter over there on the other side, would feel that it is no fault of the caterer that this thing has happened. It is the fault of the Government for doing it and therefore the caterer should not suffer. But this is the wrong way to do it. The Government should have come and said plainly, by accident they could have said, that they have overspent the estimate, that they have got just that amount of money there for the caterer. If they have slipped over, they should ask forgiveness. If the \$4,800 had run out and the caterer was being paid regularly, then they should come and ask forgiveness; but they should not incur expenditure of this thundering kind and then come here and bring it in as a Supplementary Estimate without setting out the facts, and we have not heard the facts from the other side.

As I have said, Sir, I could not give an honest vote until I knew that this amount represents so many sittings at so much per meal and so many meals. Whether the sum is right or not, I do not know. As my colleague from St. Joseph has said, this money may be to pay for future meals not served in this Place. After last Tuesday, nobody should have any hesitation in thinking that anything could happen.
3.00 p.m.

We are entitled to know that; otherwise we are deliberately taking the taxpayers' money and using it in circumstances which the Estimates did not provide for. I do not know, Mr. Chairman, I repeat, everybody would want to know that the caterer does not suffer, but equally everybody would like to know that the taxpayers do not suffer. Everybody would wish to know that no attempt has been made to fool the House by the language of Addenda set down with supplementary Resolutions.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, the temptation will be very strong to fool hon. members. Of course, the pastures and meadows which they have been chasing seem very varied on the issues which arise out of this Resolution. I wish to resist that temptation and to state what I conceive to be the main issues of it.

Before I do so, there are certain disclaimers which I must emphatically make. Let me start with the one which arises out of the misconception with respect to some hon. members being entertained to luncheon at Culloden Farm on one or two occasions last year. If my memory serves me, it was during the Estimates on the two days, or on one of those two days and on a subsequent day, that certain other members and myself lunched with the Prime Minister at his residence at his own expense and at his own invitation. I know of no other occasion on which the House was sitting that hon. members on this side lunched there. There might have been, but I know of those two occasions last year and on each of those occasions we were there by his invitation and at his expense. No question could ever arise with anybody who knows the Prime Minister that entertainment given to us there on those two occasions was being charged improperly to a vote which has to do with the refreshment of Parliament.

The second disclaimer which I wish to make is this. To hear hon. members speaking, you would think that the House of Assembly is a Department of Government. The House of Assembly is no Department of Government although to hear some of the criticisms you will think that some hon. members believe that we think it is. But nothing could be further from the truth. I want to say something personal on my own account and something which I believe of what I know of it that my colleague would support me in.

I regard the House of Assembly and the final provision which is made for its maintenance and its upkeep as being quite properly within the competence of Parliament to arrange for itself. That is what I believe. I believed this before I was Minister of the Crown. I believe it now and it is a fundamental belief of mine in respect to Parliament. I would not - I repeat not sit in Cabinet and participate in any exercise which was designed to say that the House of Assembly was in some respects a Department of Government. I say this to emphasise something else.

The trend of argument on the other side would appear to imply that the preparing and arranging of the Estimates of expenditure of this House, its mainten-

ance, its upkeep and all of these things, are in some peculiar way under the aegis of Ministers of the Government. This is just not so.

For the purpose of these matters, the House of Assembly is treated as a Department - not a Department of Government - but as a Department. Its accounting officer is the Clerk of the House who exercises his functions under the control of Mr. Speaker; in other words, if for instance new chairs or new cushions were wanted for this Chamber, the Cabinet will only know of this when a submission is made to the Cabinet Secretary from the Clerk and the Estimates produced with the request. So too with the Refreshment vote.

Every year at Estimates time - and the Estimates Committee of Government is meeting at the moment - I believe that the Clerk of the House has already been before the Estimates Committee with the submissions for the next financial year. Every year this is done. Similarly, with respect to the vote for Refreshments, this comes to the Cabinet in the only proper way in which it should come, that is by way of submission from the Clerk of the House, presumably with Mr. Speaker's knowledge, to the Cabinet Secretary.

I have here before me in this file a submission which was made from the Clerk of the House of Assembly to the Permanent Secretary. Subject: Request For Supplementary Vote.

HEAD 3 - PARLIAMENT ITEM 18 - REFRESHMENTS

It is dated 30th October, 1967. I am going to read every bit of it because it is a matter which touches on the whole House and has nothing at all to do with the Government except that the Government is being responsible for introducing the Resolution.

It reads as follows:-

"The amount of \$4,800 was provided in the Estimates for the year 1967-68 but has proved inadequate owing to the unexpected large amount of sittings as well as the length of such sitting. In addition the amount of \$1,519.60 was expended from the current year's vote in order to provide additional commitments for refreshments provided during the last financial year.

3.10 p.m.

"2. Meals are provided for 40 persons at each sitting of the House, namely, 24 members of the House, 6 Officers of the House, 3 Reporters, 3 Typists and 4 policemen at the following charges:

Lunch	- \$3 per person
Dinner	- \$4 per person, plus \$20 for drinks
Tea	- a flat charge of \$52.

3. There remains now only the sum of \$50.40 in the vote, while commitments already incurred are as follows: a lunch served on the 13th September, 1967 - \$120; 3 teas - served presumably sometime

within that period - "on the 5th, 12th and 13th September - \$156; 4 dinners within that same time on the 5th, 12th and 13th September - \$540."

It goes on to say that: "No meals are at any time ordered except on the advice of the Leader of the House and with the consent of His Honour Speaker. It is estimated that there will be approximately 22 meetings of the House for the remainder of the current financial year, three of which will involve the ordering of lunch, tea and dinner, for example, during the consideration of the Annual Estimates, and the remaining 19 involving either lunch and tea or tea and dinner. The estimated expenditure will therefore be for lunch, tea and dinner - lunches on 12 sittings, teas on 22 sittings, dinners on 13 sittings. A breakdown for the estimated cost of the lunch for 12 sittings will be \$1,440; 22 teas - \$1,144; and the 13 dinners - \$2,340, making a total of \$4,924."

The supplementary of \$5,689 is arrived at as follows: an amount of \$4,924 to which I have just referred, plus the \$816 which represents the commitments outstanding, minus the \$50.40 which is left in the vote.

Now it was on this basis and on this basis alone without question that the Cabinet approved the request for a supplementary. I wish to make this very clear. I myself, when I had to deal with the matter as a Minister, felt some worry about the whole situation, but I did not, and I repeat "did not", discuss it with any other Minister, nor did I raise the matter in Cabinet, because I did not feel that anything to do with the House of Assembly should be the subject, unless in a general way, of any scruples or even undue scrutiny on behalf of the Crown. That is how I felt about it. On the basis of the submission made therefore, a recommendation was put up and it was approved. I think it is therefore unfair to talk either about the Government refusing to pay the caterer - and the hon. members must, I think, see the unfairness of that attitude - or of the Government doing in some unspecified way something which ought not to be done, and I must say, Mr. Chairman, that I bitterly resent the imputation that any Government, and certainly this Government, would be so callous and reckless not only of its own responsibilities as individual Ministers, but of its responsibilities as the guardians or part guardians of the public trust as to introduce or connive at the introduction of a Resolution ostensibly designed to supplement the refreshment vote, but somehow or other designed to enable some members of the House to eat more expensive meals elsewhere.

This is a most unfair allegation. I resent it; I deny it entirely, because the plain facts are against it, and I have deliberately made the House aware that the Government's action in bringing this Resolution was based on a submission made by the accounting officer of this Chamber, and that this submission was accepted entirely without cavil or question, and I further wish to emphasise something which might have escaped hon. members, and which to me would be a proper inference from the facts of the matter. It could well be, I am not saying that it is - and hon.

members, I think, would do well to look at this - that the refreshment allocation is less than it should be. I well remember when it was certainly more than \$4,800 - when it was \$14,000. I know that we cut it down in 1962, but there was a time when it was \$14,000. Up to 1959/60 it was, and this is a point which can be verified.

I wish to draw to the attention of hon. members that it may well be that a case can be made out for amplifying the provision on the basis of a proper estimate. I want to make one or two more comments on this matter. I think we ought in future to lay down some proper accounting procedures for these financial provisions which fall to the House. I should hate myself to see the House either give up or is deprived or through lapse for one reason or another lose the privileges which it has and has always enjoyed of ordering its own affairs, but I can sympathise with the attitude of hon. members opposite, because on the face of it, without knowing a little more of the background of the issues involved, it would appear as if something peculiar was happening. I am satisfied that there is nothing peculiar. I am not, and I speak now for myself, entirely satisfied that this presentation is the most rational or even the most sensible, but I am equally convinced that there has been no attempt to befuddle or confuse Parliament, or certainly no intention of so doing; therefore the supplementary which is asked for could, I think, be supplied by the House.

Another sensible suggestion - well I don't call it a sensible suggestion because this would be for other members to reflect on, but to me it is a worthwhile suggestion - is that matters connected with the expenditures or the financial arrangements of this House should be decided first in consultation between the two sides with Mr. Speaker, and then when agreement has been reached as to what the House really requires and what the requisition costs, then I think the submission could be made. This is a sensible arrangement for a lot of reasons. Obviously if both sides know what the House requires by way of financial provision, both sides will approve of it because they know that it is needed. If however the Clerk of the House draws his estimates up even with the best will in the world and neither side knows beforehand what is likely to be requested, there is always the danger that either when it comes up to Cabinet some query may be raised, or even if Cabinet approves it as has happened now, that there may be some questions raised about matters which members cannot understand.

3.20 p.m.

I believe that Parliament is paramount. This is my view, and its affairs ought to be arranged and handled in a dignified and proper way, and we ought to obviate this kind of debate by prior consultation and knowledge between us of what is required.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has skilfully, in a way, handled this matter. I think we appreciate the skilful way in which he handled it, but I am asking him about the Addendum. Is the hon.

member not speaking about the Addendum? (Interruption) Why don't you tell that ass to go outside (Laughter)

Mr. Chairman, I have had experience in here, and I said that the hon. member has skilfully handled this matter. The last suggestion he made, to my mind, is the right suggestion.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I do not know to whom the hon. member was referring, but what I do know is that the words used just now should be considered as unparliamentary. Therefore I am asking you, as Chairman, to ask the hon. member to withdraw those remarks.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I have been in here long enough, and you ought to know what you are ruling on in the Chair. Surely, you have not heard me referring to you as an ass, and, even if I had referred to anybody as an ass, it would be those who would draw the string to fit the cap.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. When the hon. member used the remarks he was on his feet, and he was either addressing you or another hon. member. If he was on his feet and he made that kind of statement, I am asking that he be made to withdraw the remarks. This is the House of Assembly, not the gutter!

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am addressing you, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I, honestly, could not say that the hon. member for the City was referring to any hon. member of this Chamber. If I could only believe so, he would have had to withdraw it immediately.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order. I am not saying that the remarks were addressed to you or anybody. I am saying that the remarks were uncalled for. This is the House of Assembly and not the gutterhole that some people are accustomed to, and we should keep our debates above that kind of language. Anybody else could come in here and use such language.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let the hon. member for the City proceed and stick to the Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I was just saying, by the way, how skilfully the Leader of the House handled it; but if you were to try to keep this debate above a certain level you would be really above the hon. junior member for St. Thomas. Zaccheus! Zaccheus! (Laughter)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I see no Zaccheus in this Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I thought I saw it on this, Sir, but you did not see it. I am sorry, Sir. I know that you take things in a good spirit, and you do not catch at every little thing that comes up. I was saying that I do not think any of us disagree with the last suggestion made by the Hon. Minister, but having handled

the matter as skilfully as he did, I am asking him...

(Interruption) What caused me to raise the point is that he seemed to have omitted to answer not by design, but he seemed to have forgotten to answer me. It is his duty to protect civil servants, but this he cannot deny.

Now that he has read a paper which was sent in in October and explained the matter - I think I know something about that - I must point out that this does not say so. This Addendum says:

".....to provide refreshments for the remainder of the financial year."

We are dealing with this Resolution today, and he did not explain the matter to us at first. How were we to know the true position? How were we to know that from today to the end of March the amount would not be what is mentioned here? The Addendum is worded badly, and, if the Hon. Minister admits that, it is finished. (Interruption) Do you see that, Sir? Do you see this mule? Do you see the mule they have in this Place, Sir? I am not referring to the Leader of the House. (Laughter) I am speaking to him about the Addendum.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. senior member for the City continue with the Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am sorry, Sir. This is the difficulty in here. The hon. Leader of the House seems to want to reply to what I have asked.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If the hon. member will give way, I will do so. I did not refer specifically to the Addendum because I saw myself that the Addendum would have misled even myself if I were not, from a certain point of view, already familiar with it. I agree with that.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the Hon. Leader of the House. I do not believe I have ever congratulated him before, because there was no reason for it. He has made a very good point which I had thought of before and others, I presume, too. I refer to the two sides of the House meeting. I congratulate him, because he is at last seeing daylight and realising that we are also part of the Assembly. I would suggest to him to move for the appointment of a Select Committee like the House of Commons Kitchen Committee that just sits and discusses what sort of food should be provided, how many people should be catered for, what would be a reasonable price to pay for it and so on. Let us have a permanent Kitchen Committee composed of members of the two Houses. But we cannot congratulate him on the characteristically clever way in which he tried to dodge the statement in the Addendum.

Mr. Chairman, what he did in the end, had he done at the beginning, might have softened some of the criticism on this side of the House. What went to whoever drafted this, is what the Hon. Minister read out, and it is as clear as daylight that we owe \$816; we have only \$50 in the kitty, and the amount is not enough.

I am sorry to add a personal note. In the old days I used to feel, when matters came before the old Executive Committee and later with the introduction of the Ministerial system, that members should pay for their lunch. That is one reason why we felt, though we never acted on it, that the sum was too high and should be reduced. I may say for the benefit of some members who do not know it, and doubtless some on the other side do not know it, that the Executive does not interfere with what the House sends up. It does not, and it is never done. The House say we want Champagne, and however hard the Government may feel - I speaking now of the old days when the Government could just say no - however hard it may be to add further to the taxpayers' burden by allowing Champagne to members of the House, automatically it was passed. We cannot interfere with the privilege of the House. They say that they are feeding themselves, and they ask the Crown to provide the money to pay for the food. So there can be no question of any left-over from the previous Labour Government that has caused the present situation. In fact, I am told that the \$14,000 which, it is true, was being spent in 1961, 1962 and 1963 was cut down by the Democratic Labour Party's Government and not by members on this side of the House. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I said that) I am sorry, I did not hear it.

I must repeat that the suggestion of treating members of the Opposition as human beings and as members of this Assembly is a very good suggestion, and I again repeat that we should appoint a permanent Select Committee called, according to custom, the Kitchen Committee.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I accept the hon. member's suggestion of a Select Committee of the House, but I hope he would not press me now to say yes, because I would hope that that kind of Committee would have other functions as well apart from looking after the future comforts of hon. members. I would like to answer him when next the House meets. I accept the idea in principle.
3.30 p.m.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to be long on this matter and without going over previous debates held on this subject on the motion of privilege, I should just like to add my congratulations to those of other hon. members on this side who have commended the Hon. Leader of the House for recognising the principle that the House of Assembly has two sides, and that they have to act together at certain times. I take it that that is a principle which he is recognising when he accepts the idea for himself and, no doubt, for other right-thinking members of the Government, of joint action on the matter of refreshments. But, sir, let there be no doubt that this is in clear contrast to views which we have all heard the Prime Minister express, because the Prime Minister says that we are not even to eat together. I really seriously and sincerely welcome the breakthrough of decency and commonsense in this matter. On an earlier occasion I said that January 30th, 1968, would be a significant day; well, I am glad to see, if indeed it proves to be such, that this was

the high-water mark of idiocy, not to say malevolence in certain respects. It would be hard to believe that only a few days ago the view was being expressed that we, on this side of the House, could not even eat with hon. members on the other side, that there was something good in that enemies could not sit together because poison and murder might take place.

Mr. Chairman, it is good to see that there is another principle which the Hon. Leader of the House has enunciated and we must all welcome that, today, we have retreated from that particular high-water mark in respect of this matter. There are no longer to be any arbitrary assaults on the House of Assembly's refreshment vote. There was \$14,000 in one year nothing at all in the next year, but Darnley Greenidge has his food out there for members to buy it if they want it. He could not get any custom because of the kind of fare that he used to put over according to reports, because I was not here at that stage; and this was followed up by \$4,800 - an arbitrary figure - one which has been overspent every year since it has been instituted and which is directly responsible for this Resolution having to be brought before the House today. This arbitrary attack, "do away with it altogether", "bring it back for too little" and so on, is exactly what we have to try to stop and what I hope that any Select Committee along the lines outlined by the Hon. Leader of the House and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition will deal with finally and for all.

I am suggesting that the figure of \$10,000 is much nearer what the House of Assembly needs for its refreshments every year. That is a much more realistic figure. It is true that there is wastage because the Government members do, in fact, absent themselves from the dining room. I cannot put it in any other way. I cannot remember, since I have been in this House, seeing the Hon. Leader of the House eat in the dining room. I do not recall having seen him. I have never seen the Minister of Communications and Works in the dining room except on the occasion when he had two plates of salad in his hands. (Laughter) . I cannot recall seeing the Minister of Trade and Labour there. (Asides) . I am reminded by the hon. senior member for St. James that we had, except the Prime Minister, of course, been sitting down in good fellowship at the dinner which was held in honour of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. With the exception of those who had been suspended from the service of the House rightly or wrongly, we were there. But, as I say, Sir, there is some wastage on that account.

I am suggesting that perhaps this wastage could be controlled even if there was a list for hon. members to sign saying that they would be eating. That is the way of controlling this sort of thing. As things are now, forty lunches at \$3.00 each have to be ordered whenever there is lunch, and forty dinners at \$4.00 each whenever there is dinner plus an extra amount for the purchase of drink and so on, whenever a meal has to be ordered because quite rightly the Clerk, His Honour the Speaker and the Hon. Leader of the House between them, I think, are responsible for the ordering of meals. They cannot discriminate against hon. members even although they know that the Prime

Minister and certain hon. members would not be partaking in the food. That naturally would cause some wastage. I am suggesting that some system could be devised to deal with this, and even if there are people who feel that their stomachs will turn at the idea of having to eat lunch with other hon. members, we must be tolerant even with that. I hope that all of these matters will be borne in mind by the Hon. Leader of the House. I take it as axiomatic that the Hon. Leader of the House and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition will both be members of any Committee which has to deal with this matter. I hope that all of these matters will be borne in mind by them. Bearing in mind the explanations which were given, I will support the Resolution. I am only sorry that it was not brought before the House before.

The question that Head 3 stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 43 - MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

BARBADOS ARTS COUNCIL

Head 43 - Ministry of Health and Community Development was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in moving that this Head 43 and Item 131, Barbados Arts Council stand part of the Schedule, I will say that the sum of \$600 is required in respect of this Item. The note sets out the reasons for which this money is needed, and this is what it says:

"The Barbados Government has been invited by the Government of Mexico to participate in an exhibition of cultural and artistic works to be held in conjunction with the Olympic Games, 1968. After consultations with the Barbados Arts Council, it is considered that Barbados should be represented in the event known as an International Exhibition of Choice Works of Art. It is proposed that the Barbados Arts Council should select four works for display at the Exhibition."

In addition to the note, this Exhibition is being held in Mexico and the Government of the United States of Mexico, the sponsor of the nineteenth Olympic Games to be held in Mexico City in October, 1968, has included in its programme for the Olympic Festival, major events focussing attention on the cultural contributions of all nations. In order to achieve its aim, the Mexican Organising Committee has concentrated its efforts on three events of world sport in which every Olympic Member Country is invited to participate actively and conscientiously, namely (1) an Olympic International Exhibition of Choice Works of Art, (2) an Olympic Festival of world folk ways which includes dancing, music and songs and (3) an Olympic Revival of Exhibition of world folk arts and crafts.

As I intimated already, the Barbados Government has been advised to participate in the first, which is the Olympic International Exhibition of

Choice Works of Arts. The Organising Committee in Mexico offers storage, insurance with the country, installation by expert musiographers, a printed catalogue to commemorate this event and to perpetuate a world record of Folk Arts. They will also take care of package transportation to and from Mexico repaid to the country, but Barbados will have to take care of its own transportation. The expense involved is \$600 and it has been recommended that four prizes for the four best works should be given to the participants and each prize will be \$100. That is to serve as some inducement to the ones who are participating, but the works of art will remain the property of the various artists in question. The cost of Barbados participating in this Exhibition is \$600; prizes will amount to \$400 and package, insurance and freighting will amount to \$200, making a total sum of \$600.

Mr. Chairman, I think that that is about all the information I can give now. This is a means of encouraging the Arts Council and of Barbados being represented at the Olympic Games to be held in Mexico in October this year. I beg to move that Head 43 stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this amount of money is very small and I do not propose to make its passage the occasion of a long debate on the relationship between the Arts Council and the Ministry. It is sufficient, however, to say that this has been decided and the Arts Council has gone ahead, on the basis which has been very ably outlined by the Minister in the terms of the Resolution, to proceed to select four works of art to be sent to Mexico to be displayed. But, Mr. Chairman, there is, to my knowledge, some body of opinion that questions whether selecting four works and giving the artists prizes of \$100.00 is the best way, culturally, artistically or otherwise, of encouraging painting in Barbados. It is suggested that the money might better be spent, and I know that it is a strongly held view on the Arts Council - that the money would be better spent by sending more works. That is one thing which can be done. It is also held by many artists including among them the artists who are actually represented on the Arts Council that the correct means to patronise and encourage a painter is by buying his works.

3.40 p.m.

They paint again until four o'clock and then go out. Painting is not for some people just a matter of casual inspiration. People who are painters would like to think that they can live by their paintings. In the same way carpenters make tables for sale, painters make pictures for sale; they do not paint pictures to win prizes and have them hanging in their houses. They paint pictures to have them sold to someone so that their work will be known. There is not a great painter who has a large collection of his own paintings other than Picasso perhaps who paints so many that he only releases a certain amount of work to the public every year.

But this is not the style of painting. The idea of prize-winning paintings being sent abroad and so on

appears, Mr. Chairman, to have been from the Secretary of the Arts Council who may have discussed this and got this agreed to by the Government so that it was presented as a *fait accompli* to the Arts Council itself. I ask the Minister to investigate himself and consider this to see whether or not he may find that this is the case. The painters themselves would prefer to think that one of their paintings is bought to hang in the Financial Building or Government Headquarters or indeed even to decorate the Hon. House of Assembly.

Many of the painters would prefer to think that their work is appreciated by being hung in places on public display than merely to know that their work is winning a prize of \$100 and would still remain their property. I mention that, as I say, Mr. Chairman, as something for the Minister to investigate.

However, we all should be glad that four Barbadian paintings are going to be represented at the Olympic International Festival of Arts to accompany the games in Mexico. As I say, we can only be sorry that it was not more. The vote for the Arts Council in any case, Mr. Chairman, is only \$3,000. I would suggest to the Minister to refer it to the Estimates Committee that is now meeting. I would suggest to the Minister that his Ministry really make an effort to find out, if the Arts Council had more money, if it could be usefully spent. The Arts Council is not a group of irresponsible persons. It is headed after all by the Chief Justice, a man who is universally respected and I am sure that we all can trust his judgment in matters such as this just as we can trust and respect his judgment in the Court.

Mr. Chairman, we will be supporting this Resolution.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, there is just a small point which I would like to make in contribution towards this debate. It is this. There are artists who have reasons to believe that the judging for these four pictures which will be sent to Mexico will not be accorded all that there is to be desired in matters of this sort. We must appreciate the fact that the Chief Justice is head of the Arts Council, but does that same measure of honesty, decency and fair play run right down the veins of each and every other member?

What has happened already is this. There have been art exhibitions about here. I think one was held at the Hilton Hotel quite recently, and what was found afterwards was that some of the exhibitors were also judges. They are exhibitors and judges at the same time. You can very well imagine for yourself then, Sir, what about the exhibitor who no matter how good his painting might be, cannot get on the panel of judges. That is the type of thing that causes, perhaps some of our best painters to give up. It discouraged them, so to speak.

Now, you will understand, Sir, that the Arts Council sent out a circular to artists asking them to have their pieces of art at Pelican Village in just about one hour from now, that is at five o'clock this

afternoon. They have got to be there at that time. This exhibition, as the Minister told us, is going up in October, 1968, but these pieces of work have got to be at Pelican Village by five o'clock today, 2nd February, 1968.

Now, why did I make mention of that? The stamp of the Post Office on the envelope containing the circular sent to some of those artists was dated the 31st January; so in other words some of the artists got their notice on 31st January to submit their work of art at Pelican Village by five p.m., of the second February. Are we looking to exhibit in Mexico original works of art or is it a case where some artists are going to turn to some wall or to his files or whatever it might be and pick up some old work which he had before? What we want is that the Arts Council should give every contributor an opportunity to produce something original as often as possible.
3.50 p.m.

From what I do know, a lot of the work that is exhibited about here at the exhibitions held, you can go, Mr. Chairman, and buy a postcard or a package of postcards and go to some of these exhibitions to find that there is on display what happens to be mere copies of what had been printed on postcards years ago. I do not think that is the type of thing that the Arts Council or Government would want to encourage, and we feel that if we are going to exhibit in Mexico or wherever it might be, the pieces to be selected should be judged fairly, and definitely not by persons who are themselves contributors of work and find themselves on the Judging Committee. I must tell you that the point I have just made seems to have struck some members of the Arts Council, because in one of the circulars they have sent out to these artists, one paragraph reads something like this, Mr. Chairman, with your permission:

"Work to be exhibited will be selected by the Hilton Art Gallery Committee. Every attempt will be made to make the judging as fair as possible. Any Committee member wishing to exhibit will stand down from the judging and be replaced by a temporary judge selected by the Visual Arts Committee of the Barbados Arts Council."

This shows, Mr. Chairman, that at some time previously people who had been competitors found themselves on the panel of judges making decisions which would affect other contributors who were not that much fortunate to be on the panel of judges. We have nothing on this side against the voting of the \$600 asked for, but we want to know that every artist, no matter how humble he may be, is given an equal opportunity, because you will find in this country some artists of very poor circumstances, but nevertheless the expression of their brush is something which Barbados can really be proud of, and that is the type of thing we want to encourage; so whenever Government asks for money to help the Arts Council, by all means we will be willing to give it, provided it is to encourage not only painting and drawing, crafts and sculpture, but that we have fairplay and honesty in all the dealings connected therewith.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this measure and to support also the suggestion made by the hon. member who has just sat down that there should be an extension of the time during which pictures, paintings, etc. are to be submitted for judging. I have a peculiar interest in this Resolution in that we are hoping - and I would like to serve notice on the Minister - to send not only artistic contributions to these Olympic Games, but also some of our youth from the now independent Island of Barbados. Often when we ask for money to send athletes abroad, we are greeted with sneering comments about having a champagne taste with mauby pockets. We are hoping that will have passed away with the old Colonial era. We do hope, Mr. Chairman, that we will be receiving the support of our Government in sending athletes - I use the term in its wider connotation because I am thinking specifically at the moment of weightlifters, one or two of whom have shown that they can attain to world standards - to these Games, and that they will receive just as much sympathetic consideration as the artistic exhibits are now enjoying.

We hope that the Minister who is now in charge will be minded to consider the points now being made, because we have had experience of other Ministers placed in the same position who were very willing to make promises of assistance until that assistance became due. So we hope that in this new era when we will be having a Barbados flag to fly and a Barbados National Anthem to play that at least our athletes will have the opportunity of hearing and seeing these things at the Olympic Games to be held in Mexico City in October.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I too would like to offer the same views which the hon. junior member for Bridgetown has just offered. I think you will agree with me, Sir, that all over the world sport is a very important factor in the life of a community. I remember when last the Minister was granting a request for some \$3,000 to send athletes to the Empire Games, the athletes at that time requested \$5,000, but according to Government they were supposed to give them on a dollar for dollar basis. However, the Government only found it possible to give the Barbados Olympic Association \$3,000 as against what they asked for. It is true that one is quite happy to see Barbadian society taking a wider interest in their choice works of art, and I am going to support this Resolution also with the hope that when the Barbados Olympic Association comes to Government for some assistance, - and I hope they will do it early so that Government would not find themselves in the awkward position of saying that they came a bit too late - the Government will be able to assist them.

4.00 p.m.

I am quite sure the Hon. Minister, at all times, is willing to assist, and I am quite confident that, if he looked at the matter carefully, he would have observed quite recently that we have some very outstanding cyclists and weightlifters.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If the hon. senior member for St. James would desist from bringing in new matter, I would be grateful.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, if you were to read this carefully, you will find that it says: "HEAD 43-MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT." It is under the Ministry of Health and Community Development that I am speaking on, Sir. I am talking about Olympic Games. What do you want me to bring in? Do you want to name me? Do you want to bring in naming me? Do you want me to talk about a truck?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are talking about the Arts Council. The Head to which he refers, refers to the Arts Council and not to cycling, racing, or any other form of sport.

Mr. CRAIG: I am dealing with the Olympic Games It says:

"The Barbados Government has been invited by the Government of Mexico to participate in an exhibition of cultural and artistic works to be held in conjunction with the Olympic Games, 1968."

Do you know what is meant by Olympic Games?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member persists in irrelevancy, I will have no other alternative than to do the duty which I am expected to do. Let him stick to the Resolution.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I expect you to do your duty as Nelson did his. The only thing he said, Sir, is: "Thank God, I have done my duty." I am quite confident that you are not capable of saying that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member continue with the Resolution.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, Head 43 deals with sport, the Arts District, the Barbados Arts Council, the West Indies Cricket Board of Control and all of these things, Sir. If I am speaking under Head 43, I have the right to mention any sport. I am not going to stand here and just talk about the Barbados Arts Council to satisfy you. It says "in conjunction with." Let me read it again for you carefully, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I need no reminder of what is before me, and I am asking the hon. member for the third or fourth time to proceed with the Resolution before the House.

Mr. CRAIG: The Barbados Government, Mr. Chairman, has been invited by the Government of Mexico to participate in an exhibition of cultural and artistic works to be held in conjunction with the Olympic Games, 1968. All I am doing, Mr. Chairman, is supporting this Resolution and asking the Hon. Minister that when the occasion arises he should support athletes from Barbados so that they may participate in the Olympic Games in 1968, which comes under Head 43. I am asking him to give them support. Now, Mr. Chairman, you are telling me to stick to this! What do you mean by "stick to it", Sir? I am sticking to it.

Sir, I hope that the Hon. Minister, as he has done before, and I am quite sure when the occasion arises again, will support the Barbados young athletes when they come to him in search of finance to assist them in going abroad to build the standard of this Independent country in whatever sphere of sport they set out to take part in. I am quite sure that, inasmuch as the Barbados Arts Council is asking us for the sum of \$600 due to the invitation to the Olympic Games in 1968, the Hon. Minister will give the same consideration to the young athletes on any occasion they come to him. I am asking him to give that consideration to the young athletes.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to assure the hon. members who have spoken that I have made notes of the points which they have raised.

As far as the last speaker is concerned, the hon. senior member for St. James, he got very aggressive. I know of his interest in sport, but he need have no fear in that ample provision is being made in next year's Estimates to cover the points which he has raised.

As far as the hon. junior member for the City is concerned, the time is being extended. We have asked for the time to be extended, so that the various artistes will have a little more time. They now have until the end of February and not the end of January as heretofore.

With regard to the point raised by the hon. junior member for St. Peter, well, his point is the biggest of all. He says that the contestants, or competitors, or the artists who are taking part are occupying a dual capacity. Some of them are not only participants, but they are sitting on the Council to judge. That is a bad state of affairs, and we will have that investigated. I will let him know the results of my investigation in due course.

The hon. senior member for St. James spoke and brought certain things to my attention, and I will have them investigated as to whether the best thing is to give a prize of \$100, or to buy the choice pieces of art outright. We have consulted the officers of the Arts Council, and this is their suggestion and not ours. This is what they want done. They are advising us on this, and that is the position.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, I would like to return thanks to the Hon. Minister for the consideration which he has given us, and to point out to him that already an invitation has been received when a gentleman from Mexico came down with it. They have not sent personal invitations, but they have sent couriers all around the civilized earth to every Olympic nation asking it to take part in these Games. We have already received a gentleman here bringing our in-

vation. I would like to thank the Minister for the consideration which he has extended to us.

The question that Head 43 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, 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.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move that the Chairman do now report the passing of three Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The Chairman has reported to me the passage, in Committee of Supply, of three Resolutions.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that these Resolutions be now read a first time.

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. Speaker, I beg to move that these Resolutions 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.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that these Resolutions be now agreed to.

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

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

4.10 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: This concludes the business of this meeting and this House, as is known, has been adjourned until Tuesday after next at 12 o'clock noon. This House now stands adjourned until that day and hour.

4.15 p.m.