THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

THIRD SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 8th June, 1971

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 2.45 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour Sir J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., F.Z.S., *(Speaker);* Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.;Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, J.P. *(Minister of Trade, Tourism, Community Development and Youth Affairs);* Hon. J. C. TUDOR, C.M.G., M.A. *(Leader of the House);* Mr. J. W. CORBIN, J.P.; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, *(Minister of Communications and Works);* Mr. R. ST.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P.; Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD, J.P., *(Chairman of Committees);* Mr. C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P.; Mr. L.S. CRAIG and Mr. ELLIOTT D. MOTTLEY.

Prayers were read.

Mr. HINDS entered the Chamber and took his seat.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, 11th May this year have been duly circulated, and unless there is any objection they will be confirmed. There being no objection I declare the Minutes of that meeting duly confirmed.

The Minutes of the meeting of 18th May have been duly circulated, according to my information, and unless there is objection these Minutes will be confirmed. There being no objection I declare those Minutes duly confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Finance, I am commanded to lay the following:

The Warehousing of Rum in Bond (Amendment) Regulations, 1971.

The Customs Duties (International Laboratories Ltd.) Order, 1971.

On behalf of the Prime Minister I am commanded to lay the Public Officers Loan and Travelling Allowances (Amendment) (No. 2) Regulations, 1971, and on my own behalf the Registration of Electors Regulations, 1971.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:

Statement showing the sums advanced to the Postmaster General for payment of money Orders for the month of November, 1970.

Statement showing the sums advanced to the Postmaster General for payment of money Orders for the month of December, 1970.

Statement showing the sums advanced to the Postmaster General for payment of money Orders for the month of January, 1971.

Statement showing the sums advanced to the Postmaster General for payment of money Orders for the month of February, 1971.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Flat Rock, St. George, for the purpose of constructing a Communal Bath and Latrine.

Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Charnocks, Christ Church, for the purpose of constructing a Communal Bath and Latrine.

And also of -

A Bill to facilitate the division of properties into parts that are to be owned individually and parts that to be owned in common and to provide for the use and management of such properties.

REPLIES TO PARLIAMENTARY QUESTIONS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Replies to Parliamentary Question

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid I am not in a position to issue an injunction.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: That is what I was trying to find out. With respect to the other Resolution, it was carried in its entirety in the newspaper even before the Ruling which Your Honour gave today, and that has always been the practice. I recall my moving a Resolution calling for an investigation into the Housing Authority. Although the point was taken that the Resolution was out of order, the Resolution was carried in the Press, but today we are seeing something new. It is an attempt by the Government, through Your Honour, to stifle newspaper publication of the proceedings in this House.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, what I put to you was quite simple and sensible. If an hon. member gives notice of a Resolution, and another hon. member asks Your Honour to Rule as to whether that Resolution can properly be put before the House and, therefore, be part of the Business of the House, then until Your Honour Rules that it can so be the Business of the House it cannot be published in the House's documents and, not having been published in the House's documents, it cannot be published outside. I should have thought that it would be commonsense apart from being strict Parliamentary etiquette.

QUESTION TIME

BATHSHEBA SOCIAL CENTRE

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time. Question No. 151 was under supplementary questioning at the last sitting of this House. The question reads as follows:

"To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

(a) Will the Minister renovate the Bathsheba Social Centre at Bathsheba, St. Joseph, and have it returned to the residents of the area for use as a Community and Cultural Centre?

(b) Will the Minister insist that the said building be used for no purpose other than as a Community and Cultural Centre with the residents of the area having full and free access thereto?"

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I should like to enquire of the Minister whether he has any additional information on this question since the last sitting of this House. The Minister had informed this House that he would get additional information for us. I am wondering whether this information is available.
3.05 p.m.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Additional information has come to hand that the caretaker has been a tailor for very many years before this present Government was in power and that he lives in the district and finds it convenient to be on the premises for longer hours than it would have been possible if he had not been living in the district. This arrangement continued. The Ministry no longer regards this as a satisfactory arrangement that this tailor should continue to ply his trade and carry on the same kind of duties as caretaker on these premises. However, this centre is going out of existence. On the last occasion I spared no pains to inform the House that it is going to be demolished, and that a new one is to be erected on a site near by in the area. It is a fact that this man was carrying on his trade there, but as a matter of fact, the place is quite unsuitable and has been condemned as a social centre.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Would the Minister agree that in view of the answer given today, his answer on the last occasion was not a full and frank one?

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: It was answered to the best of my knowledge.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Would the Minister agree that the information on that occasion was not correct or was not full and frank?

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: It was frank and full to date.

Mr. CRAIG: Would the Minister say if it was an honest answer?

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: That is not worth a reply by a Minister.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Would the Minister say whether or not the centre was being used as a tailoring establishment long before the last occasion when he answered the question?

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: It was used long before the present Government was in power.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I understand the Minister at our last sitting said emphatically that no one plied any trades there. I remember very well that the Hon. Minister.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member put the question.

Mr. CRAIG: I am going to put the question. I am accusing the Minister of not giving an honest report, and I am leading up to the question which I desire to ask.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a supplementary question.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, with great respect to Your Ruling, I remember hearing the hon. senior member for St. Andrew tell you that you could not tell him how to ask a supplementary. I am trying to lead up to the question.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member is of the opinion that that hon. member was wrong on that occasion, he is not justified in being wrong now. If the

hon. member has a supplementary question, let him ask it.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, I was not being wrong at any time. I spoke with full knowledge at that time. I now have additional information; so I speak with full knowledge on this occasion.

Mr. CRAIG: Did the Minister carry out an investigation at the time to make the statement that he knew of no caretaker there?

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: The words I used on that occasion were "I am not aware". I was not aware then.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, in the light of the information given by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, and in view of the fact that there is no social centre at Bathsheba, and there is no community and cultural centre, what is the caretaker taking care of apart from his own trade?

QUESTION *re* EXTRA-MURAL CENTRE

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 163 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows:

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Is Government aware that the Extra-Mural Centre at Pine, St. Michael is no longer entrusted with receiving fees from students or others who are desirous of participating in Extra-Mural Classes?

2. Will Government cause an investigation to be made in view of the inconvenience caused to students and others seeking to avail themselves of Extra-Mural facilities?

3. If the change is because of administrative convenience or to perfect efficiency, will Government seek to discover why it has taken U.W.I. authorities over ten years to discover this?

Hon. J. C .TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows:-

"The Government is aware that the university administration at the Cave Hill Campus of the U.W.I. decided that, with effect from January 1971, fees due to the university from students or participants in courses organized by the Extra-Mural Department in Barbados should be payable at the Cave Hill Campus instead of at the Extra-Mural Department Centre, the Pine. The Government is not aware that this change has resulted in any undue inconvenience to prospective students. No Government investigation into any aspect of this matter is therefore contemplated."

3.15 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Question Time be extended for half an hour.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister tell us what caused the U.W.I. authorities to take the decision in January, 1971 that all fees formerly paid at the Pine should in future be paid at Cave Hill?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot. The U.W.I. is a self-governing institution and is not answerable to Governments for any decision it takes as to how it administers the University.

Mr. HINDS: Is the Government aware that overseas auditors discovered that the funds paid and received at the Pine Extra-Mural Centre had been misappropriated?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No, Sir.

Mr. HINDS: Did the Minister cause any investigation to be carried out which might bring to light any such matter, in view of the fact that for more than 10 years there had been no such difficulties encountered at the Pine?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No, Sir. The U.W.I. is a self-governing institution operating under its own charter. It has a Senate, Council and several Committees, all of whom divide the functions and responsibilities of governing the University between them. None of the Governments of the region which contribute to the University have any authority to interfere in the internal administration of the University.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that Barbados makes a contribution to the finances of the University of the West Indies, does it not concern Barbados how those funds or any of the funds are spent? Does it still remain an internal matter?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, every year the finances of the University of the West Indies are examined and considered by the University Grants Committee which is composed of representatives of Governments, and every year the University authorities have to satisfy the Grants Committee as to the proper expenditure of the funds at its disposal. This is a routine operation which they carry out every year; the Barbados Government is of course a member of the University Grants Committee.

Mr. HINDS: Will the Minister deny that the reason for having the funds now paid at Cave Hill is an attempt to hide the monies from the Extra-Mural Tutor? The only money that should go into his hands is his own salary.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid I hardly regard that as a supplementary, but rather the subject of an issue.

Mr. HINDS: I did not call Dr. Shorey's name, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a question at all.

Mr. HINDS: I did not call Dr. Shorey's name.

Mr. SPEAKER: No speeches now, please. No. 171 standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, we are going to make these things public; I have the facts all here.

Mr. SPEAKER: No. 171.

Mr. HINDS: We are going to deal with No. 171 now.

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

In view of the statement made in this honourable House by the Prime Minister on 27th July, 1970 to the effect that "The People of Barbados do not trade with South Africa" would the Ministry of Trade take immediate steps to discover if commodities of South African origin are still imported into this country - from South Africa?

2. Who are the importers? And with whom do they trade to get these goods into this country?

3. Is Government aware that South African fruit is imported into this country in tins without labels, but that each such container bears a serial number?

4. Would Government investigate this illicit trading and the process of direct sale and delivery to West Coast and other hotels?

3.25 p.m.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, the reply is as follows:

The Government reaffirms that the people of Barbados do not trade with South Africa, and Government has been advised that no commodities, canned fruit or otherwise of South African origin, have been imported into this island for several years nor are any now being imported.

Government is not aware of any illicit trading nor of any process of direct sale and delivery to West Coast and other Hotels.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the questions made specific reference to West Coast Hotels, did the Government direct any of its enquiries or carried out any investigations amongst the West Coast Hotels?

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, paragraph 2 of the reply expressly states that the Government is not aware of any illicit trading nor of any process of direct sale and delivery to West Coast and other Hotels. I am now being asked if the Government has made any investigations to find out if that is so. Now, if I have been given that answer, obviously some investigation must have been made in connection with West Coast Hotels. Do you think that any responsible officer in the Ministry of Trade who would be responsible, in any form or fashion for the second half of my reply, would have given me this information if no direct investigation had been made? Do you think that everybody must be a doubting Thomas just for the sheer fun of it?

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister tell us if his investigations stretched as far as the Sandy Lane Hotel on the St. James Coast, and if a firm known as James H. Inniss & Company Limited in Bridgetown, Barbados, was the supplier? Let us get down to business.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, will you ask the hon. member to repeat that question?

Mr. HINDS: I want to know if the Minister's investigations reached as far as the Sandy Lane Hotel, and if a firm known as James H. Inniss & Company Limited in Bridgetown, Barbados, was the supplier.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, that detail of the investigation I am not aware of. I do not think, and I do not believe, that any officer in my Ministry would supply me with a reply like this without having made direct contacts with West Coast Hotels. I am not the sort of person to doubt people for the fun of it. I have not been trained to do that.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister make that statement in view of the earlier admission he had to make about the Social Centre? Two weeks ago the Ministry gave him incorrect information to bring in here. In view of the fact that the Minister has had to admit today that, obviously, he had wrong information two weeks ago.....

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. That is incorrect and not true. I never said that. What I said on that occasion was this: "I am not aware". Today I said that, after an investigation, additional information has revealed so and so. *(Asides)* If hon. members can get up in this Chamber and just make misstatements and then frivolously asked that they be withdrawn, then Parliament might as well close shop.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, in the light of the information which has now been given to the Minister of Trade, will the Minister cause investigations to be made and make a further reply to these questions?

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: I will not. Let a substantive question be asked.

Mr. HINDS: Because you are dishonest.

Mr. SPEAKER rose.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister cannot say that he will not do it. It is bad manners to begin with.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. If the hon. member will table specific questions along the line in which he has spoken, I will investigate the matter. Let him call the names; let me have the names on paper whether it be James H. Inniss & Company Limited or Sandy Lane Hotel, and let me call his bluff.

Mr. HINDS: If you have them in your mouth and you can stand on the floor of the House and read them out, do you want me to put them on paper too?

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, that commonplace hon. member who can say such things in Parliament and behave himself as only he can here and everywhere else, when he so cares to table specific questions to that effect, I will answer them and not until then.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, as a further supplementary. Perhaps the answering of this new specific question could be entrusted to the Hon. Leader of the House with his previous experience in this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 166 standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter.

INSTALLATION OF PUBLIC PAYING TELEPHONES

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

In view of the increasing importance of the telephone as a means of communication would Government consider as a matter of some urgency, requesting the Barbados Telephone Company to institute a programme of establishing rural public paying telephones on an Island wide basis?

2. Would Government direct the company's attention to such densely populated areas as may have made application to the Company in the past for subscribers supply service, as in the case of a number of persons residing at Boscobelle, Baltic, Risk, St. Peter - and any such like area with a view to having such areas first served in the programme to be initiated provided it is convenient to the Company?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, the reply is as follows:

"Yes, Sir. The Barbados Telephone Co. Ltd. was requested in January, 1970 to provide public pay telephones throughout the island for the convenience of the public. The Company has installed twenty-three public pay stations to date throughout the island.

2. Consideration is being given to the installation of public pay telephones at thirty additional sites throughout the island. Boscobelle, St. Peter & Baltic, St. Peter, are included in this number. In selecting further sites the Company has undertaken to pay attion to population densities as far as possible."

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 147 standing in the name of the hon. and learned member for St. Thomas. It is to be found on page 8, right hand column.

3.35 p.m.

QUESTION *re* JOES RIVER

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows:-

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Will the Government consider acquiring either in co-operation with the National Trust or otherwise, the valley of Joes River in the parish of St. Joseph from the barrier adjacent to Gaggs Hill Road to the streams outlet on the sea with a view to constructing a walk and other facilities to permit the area's use as a beauty spot?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows:-

"Government has from time to time provided facilities for the leisure and enjoyment of the citizens and is at the moment conducting a study based on The Carlozzi Report of areas for preservation and for recreational purposes and does not propose at this stage to commit itself to any single area in isolation."

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary, can I ask if the Minister will give instructions that the same valley of Joes River be examined to see if there is not some danger of erosion of the present facilities by contamination, pollution, and other matters? I believe that refuse is being thrown into the river.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I will certainly draw this to attention. I will tell the hon. member that the National Trust has been collaborating with the Government on these matters and has in consequence appointed a Special Committee to inspect the valley at Joes River and to report in detail; but I will certainly pass on the suggestion he has made.

QUESTION *re* DRAINS AND GUTTERS IN ST. GEORGE

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 170 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. George.

Mr. HOPPIN: Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows:-

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Is Government aware of the unsatisfactory condition of the drains and gutters leading from St. Augustine's Church on to St. Helen's in the parish of St. George?

Will these gutters and drains be weeded out and waste matter removed so as to prevent the breeding of mosquitoes and flooding when it rains?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, the reply is as follows:

1. "Yes, Sir.

2. Cleaning of the drains and gutters has been carried out. Weeding of the drains and gutters is done on a regular basis."

QUESTION re ROAD AT ROCK HALL NEAR ST. HELENS, ST. GEORGE

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 173 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. James.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows:-

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Is the Minister aware that the residents of Rock Hall, near St. Helen's in the Parish of St. George, suffer great inconvenience because of the lack of a road leading into their district and consequently the said residents must of necessity use a dirt track which becomes almost impassable after heavy rains?

2. Is the Minister aware that residents in the above-mentioned area are willing to make available portions of land to facilitate the building of a road-way leading to the above-mentioned district?

3. Will the Minister take appropriate steps to have this situation remedied at the earliest possible opportunity?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, the reply is as follows:

The information given by the hon. member has proved insufficient to identify the specific area.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, this is a question which concerns St. George, and the Minister says there is not enough information to give him a lead way into a road anywhere known as Rock Hall near St. Helen's in St. George. Are there any places in St. George known as St. Helen's near St. George?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, we cannot find the specific area that the hon. member has mentioned, and I would like the hon. senior member for St. James to say more specifically where the area can be found so that the people from my Ministry can look at it.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, it says "near St. Helen's". How much more specific can I be? If the Minister cares, I will take him there and let him see where it is.

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the supplementary?

Mr. HOPPIN: Is the hon. senior member for St. James capable of describing Rock Hall near St. Helen's now?

Mr. CRAIG: Is there a Rock Hall in St. George and is it near to St. Helen's?

Mr. HOPPIN: There are Rock Halls in St. George.

Mr. CRAIG: Is there a Rock Hall near St. Helen's in St. George.?

Mr. HOPPIN: I would like you to describe it.

Mr. CRAIG: I am asking the hon. member who represents St. George whether there is a Rock Hall near St. Helen's, because the question is very clear cut. If the hon. member does not know his parish, it is not my fault, but I am prepared to go with the Minister and his parliamentary secretary and show them where it is.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not quite follow the question.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I would be prepared to go with the hon. member as long as he is going to have an extra supply of stores and fuel so that we would be able to search and find it.

Mr. CRAIG: As long as the Minister is prepared to go, let him not get worried about extra storage.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I did not say "storage", I said "stores", because we may be looking about for a long time to find Rock Hall near St. Helen's. People from my Department have been searching for it for a long time, and even the people at St. Helen's do not know it.

Mr. CRAIG: I sympathise with the Minister. It is his parliamentary members in the parish of St. George who do not know their parish.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the question whether the parliamentary members know their parish?

Mr. CRAIG: Yes, Sir.

Mr. HOPPIN: Mr. Speaker, for the hon. member's enlightenment there are two Rock Halls: Rock Hall near St. Judes and Rock Hall near Workmans.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, there is also a Rock Hall near St. Helen's. *(Asides)* The hon. junior member for St. Lucy is in no better way to interpret this than I am.

3.45 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member wants to enquire whether there is a Rock Hall near St. Helen's,....

Mr. CRAIG: No, Sir, I know. There is a Rock Hall near St. Helen's in the parish of St. George, and it is regrettable that neither of the Parliamentary members can find this place; therefore I say they have misled the Minister.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, what was the name of the small plantation next to St. Helen's

where the land is rented out now? I believe the senior member for St. George should know it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that Question Time has expired and we now proceed to Private Members' Business.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Hon. Deputy Leader of the Opposition intimate that which he seeks to deal with first under Private Members' Business?

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 17 be taken.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

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

RESOLUTION *re* SOCIAL CENTRE IN THE NEW ORLEANS IN THE CITY OF BRIDGETOWN

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution was brought to this House as a result of certain representations made to me by the residents of the area in Bridgetown known as New Orleans. It is a very densely populated area and at the moment, although the residents of the area enjoy the use of a playing field belonging to the Westbury School,.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that the Reporter is finding it as difficult as I am to hear the only person whom I should now hear.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I was saying that although the residents at the moment enjoy the use of the playing field belonging to the Westbury School, there is however no form of recreational facility at all, and as a result of this there is no social centre at which the residents can gather after playing games on the grounds, or even without playing there is no place for the residents to meet at night to have any sort of social discourse.

I do not intend to make any long speech on this because I believe I need not hammer at the Government the necessity for providing such recreational facilities. I myself have visited the land and have had discussions with the young people in the area and they are badly in need of this pavilion. It is a case where it would be necessary for the Government to purchase land adjoining the playing field, and this can be done either by negotiation or by compulsory acquisition. I think the Government should be aware of the population of the area and the need for having recreational facilities, therefore I move that the following Resolution do now pass:

WHEREAS there is no facility at present existing in the New Orleans area in the City of Bridgetown;

AND WHEREAS it is very essential to have some form of recreational facilities for all the citizens of Barbados;

AND WHEREAS it is universally considered that there should be some form of recreation to foster a healthy mind in a healthy body;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the Government take immediate steps to erect a social centre and pavilion so that the residents of New Orleans may have all the accepted and available recreational facilities for their use.

I will say one thing in conclusion, I think that the time has come when the Government, if they decide to act upon this - I do not think that it is too much for the members of the Opposition when they bring a Resolution like this before this Chamber that the Government when they visit the area for the purpose of finding out whether there is suitable land for purchase, or even as a matter of courtesy, when the members of the Opposition or the particular representative of the area who has been instrumental in putting this before the Chamber, to be notified so that he can visit the area with them. I say this because recently I have had the experience where I led a delegation on behalf of the residents of Chapman Lane to interview the Minister of Community Development and I was given the assurance by the Minister that when the Sports Officer would visit the playing field in Chapman Lane I would have been notified.
3.55 p.m.

To my surprise I read in the issue of the *Advocate* of, I think, the 2nd June that the Sports Officer, the Government Football Coach, and the Chairman of the Parks and Beaches Commission had visited the area and I had not been notified about it. I think, purely as a matter of courtesy, that the representatives for the particular area should be notified of these things. I am not trying to play politics with this. As far as I am concerned, it makes no difference who initiates the debate on the Resolution, but what is important to me is the end result of providing recreational facilities for the young people in the area.

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

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, it is a well-recognised fact that this Government has contributed to schools and to most of the areas, wherever possible, playing fields, parks and recreational centres for the youth of this country. I think I am quite familiar with the entire Orleans area. It is a very heavily populated area to such an extent that the last playing field the people in the Orleans used was the old pond bottom which was filled in. That is one of the few places where cricket and football used to be played.

As I have stated, in all the housing areas and in all of the new areas this Government is developing the Government made sure that, including schools, there were sufficient playing facilities for the peo-

ple. This is one of the areas populated practically to the last square foot of land and the same thing can be said of the adjoining areas. All of the land is used up completely for housing.

Now, the hon. junior member for the City has mentioned Chapman Lane and Murphy pasture. This is an area that is practically a dry weather area. As soon as the rain starts to fall the complete area is completely under water, and the area is unsuitable for any type of playing field to be established to any high standard. At present there is a small area with a small house which can be used only during the dry weather. I am perfectly sure that, if there was any land close to the adjoining area, the Ministry of Community Development would take action to acquire it either by compulsory acquisition or in some other manner. However, if we were able to acquire land in the area for that purpose, it would also create hardships for some of the people living in the very area. I do not think there is any hon. member in this House who knows the Orleans better than the hon. senior member for the City. I think he is as familiar with the Orleans as I am. As I have stated there is hardly one square foot of spare land in that area that could be found, not to mention land for a cricket pitch or a football field.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: I do not quite agree with the hon. member who has just sat down, Sir. Before I say anything further on this matter, I should like to refer to something. Now, the hon. junior member for the City asked the Minister about these playing fields, and he was told that he would be informed when they were visiting the area. I have never been in the habit of abusing Civil Servants on the floor of this House, but seeing what happened in the Senate a few weeks ago with the learned Attorney-General and the manner in which he abused the Government information Officer, I think I would be taking a leaf from his book if I allowed Foffie Williams to know that he is only a civil servant. It is stupid to take sides, because you will know who is the Minister today, but you will not know who will be the Minister in two or three years.

A convulsed idiot like Foffie Williams refuses to ask the junior member for the City to accompany them to the site, but he gets a photographer from the *Advocate* and carries along Carmichael. That is as far as Carmichael can go as far as running at the elections is concerned. As far as he can get will be to get Foffie Williams to take him to Chapman Lane and have a picture taken of him. I want Foffie Williams to know that this is not the sort of behaviour that I believe a Minister would encourage. Be that as it may, Foffie Williams will do for his time. He is one of those fellows who believe that, because he went to Combermere School and brought out his birth certificate, he has a right to have one of the jobs in this country which pays the most money. He could not do that with me. He can go and cut the Prime Minister's lawn and so on.

Mr. SPEAKER: Just stick to the Resolution.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: I am sticking to that, Sir, but I have to tell you about Foffie Williams. As I have said, I do not agree with the Minister. There is Emmerton itself. He is quite correct in saying that you cannot get a cricket field in this area - I refer to the Orleans or Chapman Lane. Nevertheless, you can think of acquiring land by compulsory acquisition. Emmerton itself could be acquired. With regard to the Orleans, there is some land below the school, and I used to lend them the lawn mower, the motor mower and the motor roller from the Park to level off that land. There is also some open land near Hawkins Gap. This land could be acquired to provide a playing field for the people in the Orleans. That is the only place you would be able to put a playing field.

Now, Foffie Williams walked down there like some goat; he stood up with Carmichael, had a picture taken and made a report to the Ministry. He does not know where to go to get the land. If the Minister or whoever was responsible had any decency and had asked the junior member for the City to accompany him, I would have instructed him where he could go to get the land. I am sure the hon. member, who has just spoken, knows about the land behind St. Mary's which was owned by Dr. Hawkins who used to be at the Mental Hospital. Some of the land was bought for the Westbury School. There is another man who died and left some land down there and that could be bought for the purpose of making a recreational centre. You might not be able to have a cricket pitch, but you can have a recreational centre.

I want this recorded. The area owned by the Housing Authority which has a little shed on it that Morgan runs, I want to say that people are charged there even to have a bath. To who does it belong?
4.05 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, this place belongs to the Housing Authority and therefore to the Government as such and to the people. How can people be turned away from having a bath? Only certain people are allowed to go in there, and people are told that if they do not have their passport for the D.L.P., they cannot go in. To be encouraged by a Minister to do this is disgraceful, I do not care who the Minister is. Now that the Minister has returned, I will repeat that there is a small place in Chapman Lane which is owned by the Housing Authority. This is where Mr. Foffie Williams took upon himself not to invite the hon. junior member for Bridgetown who had asked the Minister to receive a delegation to go there. (Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Your son can correct you on that.) I do not think you realise what is happening. You have been my friend for many years and I would hate to clash with you on the floor of this House. I am only telling you that people have to pay for a bath at the place which is there now. (Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: What is the purport of the speech?) Will you see to it that this place is used by everybody?

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. member completed his speech?

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: I have given way to the Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. member risen to a point of order?

Mr. CRAIG: If the Minister has nothing to say, I am willing to address the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: That does not arise.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, this Order is to move the passing of a Resolution requesting the Government to take immediate steps to erect a social centre and pavilion so that the residents of New Orleans may have all the accepted and available recreational facilities for their use. I am certainly in agreement with that Resolution. I understand that the hon. senior member for Bridgetown was finding complaint with some of the apparent attitudes and activities of the Sports Officer. Some time ago at the request of the hon. junior member for Bridgetown, my Ministry was invited to visit the playing field and small social centre at New Orleans. We did not think it was advisable to invite the hon. junior member for Bridgetown on our first inspection of the site. The hon. junior member for Bridgetown made a request of me and asked that a delegation visit me. Before that delegation could visit me, I thought it advisable that my Sports Officer and other officials of the Ministry of Youth Affairs should inspect the grounds and have a look at the Social Centre. I went on the grounds and into the little social centre and saw youngsters playing table tennis and I spoke with them. I walked around the grounds and saw boys playing cricket on the western end which is a refilled area. Within a week the hon. junior member for Bridgetown brought a delegation to the Ministry and we went down and discussed our business, and I promised him to make everything good as far as the residents of that area were concerned, because I believe that wherever you have a city, there must be open lawns for recreational activities. I am a firm believer in that, and the hon. junior member for Bridgetown can testify that within a matter of days we had a piece of equipment on that ground.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member gave way on a point of order, but I must confess that the point of order is very long.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: As the responsible Minister, I must have my say otherwise things would go badly for Government. I do not want Government to lose by default. The hon. junior member for Bridgetown has sent a letter congratulating me for my efforts and for my co-operation in this particular venture.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let it not be forgotten that the hon. senior member for St. Peter has not yet exercised his right to speak.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: I will bow out, but I wanted the records straight that my Ministry is in full co-operation with the members for the City of Bridgetown in seeing that the residents of this particular area get their full recreational opportunities and we have begun to do so. We are trying to level the land. We have put so heavy a piece of equipment on it that it sunk the land, and we are now getting expert opinion as to how best we can serve the residents of this area.

4.15 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid there is no point of order for me to determine. The hon. senior member for Bridgetown gave way and he may now resume.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: I understand the situation and I see what is happening. I give way to the hon. senior member for St. James.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, a Resolution of this nature would attract me very much, and I must confess that I have to add my quota to a Resolution of this nature. For the past 10 years this Government has shown greater contempt for the youth of this country, I believe, than any conceivable Government in the entire world, and to crown it all, if you look across the floor and see the hon. gentleman who just sat down, as the Minister of Youth it is a classic example of the contempt for the young people of this country.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, "the Minister of Youth is a classic example of the contempt to the youth of this country". That is not good English and he is not understood in Parliament. There is an old rule which says that an hon. member must address himself in English, but that is Dutch. That is not my fault, I used to be a schoolmaster.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, maybe if I had in liquor at this time of the evening, gin, or had I been bought by one Party from another Party I would be a real Dutchman, but my pride cannot afford me such things. I still maintain, Mr. Speaker, that a classic example is to only look across the floor and observe the Minister, his physical appearance and even his mental energies. You will observe, Mr. Speaker, this is the type of people that the Government have imposed upon the youth of this country; what kind of young man or woman seeing the Minister - and this is the reason why I believe Mr. Foffie Williams and Mr. Carmichael visited the spot, because you could not take a picture for the young people of this country to see who is supposed to be the Minister of Youth and Community Development.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: On a point of order.

Mr. CRAIG: I am not going to give way.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, if the hon. member is saying that I was omitted from any picture, the hon. member is practising a bit of self-deception. On the occasion I visited the scene, the Sports Officer, my Permanent Secretary, another officer and myself were present on this particular ground, so I do not know what the hon. member is trying to tell this House.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, I remember seeing Mr. Foffie Williams, Mr. Culpepper, Reggie Haynes, but I do not remember seeing the Minister; however, that is only by the way. Mr. Speaker, the Minister said not so long ago that there is hardly an inch of land anywhere in the City of Bridgetown.....

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, which Minister said that, this Minister? I never said that.

Mr. CRAIG: The one that was not drinking outside at the time.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: These people who put up stool pigeons must demean themselves in that manner but I do not have to behave myself like them, I never have, so if he wants to repeat things that he hears people with, let him do so.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid there is no point of order for me to determine.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: I apologise for that, Sir.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, it is not always necessary to have grass lands to put at the disposal of youth for recreational facilities; very often have we seen hard courts where people play lawn tennis, basketball, netball and other athletic games, and I believe this Resolution is calling for something of this nature and not necessarily having these large areas of land for the purpose of playing cricket. I think that is where we all get mixed up, the Resolution is calling for recreational facilities for all the citizens of Barbados, and I can go through St. James, and you will see, Mr. Speaker, that at some of the schools the playing fields are in very poor conditions. You only have to go down at Good Shepherd School; I do not understand what sort of Sports Department we have, but I saw there with my own eyes the poles just thrown on the ground, not even put up. The playing field is all under grass about two or three feet tall, and I think the classic example is to go into St. John where you will see what I consider proper recreational facilities.

What the hon. member is asking for are facilities of that nature, but here the Minister was getting up all afternoon talking about who went to visit a piece of land, and they cannot find enough land. I think that is not necessary, you only have to go along a road any morning around 11 o'clock and you will see boys playing road tennis on the highway because there is no place for them to play. I looked at the Estimates just now and saw something like $36,500 voted in the Estimates for recreational facilities, and I have repeatedly called on the Government asking them not to allow the young people of this country to be taken for a ride as they have been taken ever so often by the Government. There was supposed to be an Independence Hall as was stated in the Government's Manifesto five years ago, and which was to be built just where the Post Office is now but we have not seen this. Nothing at all has been done to improve the social activities of the young people, and this is why I say the young people have been treated with contempt, just because of Government's attitude towards the young people as a whole.
4.25 p.m.

I will have to support a Resolution of this nature, because I am one of those who believe that a healthy body breeds a healthy mind. You cannot continue with this half-baked attitude towards the young people all the time. The Minister himself has nothing to say. He admitted in here today that he did not even know there was a caretaker at a Social Centre in St. Joseph. Even in his own Ministry he admitted today that he did not know there was a Social Centre or of the condition of the Social Centre and that there was a caretaker in charge of it.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. That is not true. What I said on the occasion when I spoke - not today - is that I was not aware that the caretaker was plying his trade as a tailor at the particular centre. Some hon. members could try at times to be honest, if it is not above them.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member made a point before his last sentence.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I do not pay the Minister any mind. I am concerned with this Resolution, because I am interested in seeing proper recreational facilities provided for the young people in this country. You merely have to look at several of these youth groups and you will see them struggling with no incentive. They start off on a very large scale, and in two or three months' time their numbers are reduced to about six or eight. I have seen several of these youth groups; I know that they are happy to get together, and they have to use a school. There is not a single parish that can safely boast of any Social Centre or Community Hall with the facilities in it to encourage young people to come there at night. You have dances in a Social Centre; the caretaker sometimes like the Hon. Minister as he is this evening.....

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member is misleading the House when he says that not one of these Centres has the facilities that will attract young people to visit them at night. There is one that comes most readily to my mind, and it is at Speightstown. For every night of the week, Saturday night is no exception, Sunday night possibly may be an exception, you have young people there playing games under the control of a Committee. It is not correct for him to say so. Let him visit Speightstown and see.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid, again, no point of order!

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: But it explains what would be a misleading statement, if I had not risen on my feet, though.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order!

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I still maintain that there are no facilities provided by the Government in the Community Halls to encourage the young people to go there at night or in the evening for the purpose of carrying out their social and cultural activities in a proper manner. There are definitely no organised facilities for the people.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that the time has expired for Private Members' Business.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended for 14 minutes.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.

On resumption:

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Hon. Leader of the House indicate which Order he wishes to take first.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 4 be the first Order of the Day under Government Business.

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

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

ESTATE AND SUCCESSION DUTIES (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1971

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 4 stands in the name of the Rt. Hon. and learned Prime Minister, and it is to move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Estate and Succession Duties Act, 1941. This Bill was read a first time.

On the 11th May, 1971, the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister spoke and moved, seconded by Hon. G. G. Fergusson, that further consideration of the Bill be now postponed.

The motion was put and carried nem. con.

Discussion on this matter may now be resumed.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple amendment to the Estate and Succession Duties Act, and it seeks to exempt from the payment of duty any particular issue of Government debentures. On the last occasion when I introduced the second reading of this Bill, before I formally moved the second reading, Mr. Speaker, I noticed that the draftsman had omitted from the amendment any mention of succession duty although it was clearly the intention of the Government that the exemption should be from estate and succession duties. They are collectively known, of course, as death duties, and I do not think that there can be any difference of opinion amongst the members of the legal profession, except those working in the Attorney-General's Office, that estate duty and succession duty are two separate and distinct imposts. The only reason why the postponement of further consideration of the Bill was moved was due to the omission in the original Bill, which was circulated, of any mention of succession duty.

Mr. Speaker, we have just passed around the consequential amendment. Whereas the first amendment was to Section 10 of the Bill making it a new Section 10A, this additional amendment will include succession duty, and that is an amendment to Section 40 which will now become Section 40A. It is proposed in future issues of Government debentures that the prospectus should state under any particular issue that the debentures will be free from estate and succession duties and will be accepted at par in payment of estate and succession duties by the Commissioner of Inland Revenue where they form part of the assets of an estate liable to such duties. Not only will the duties be exempted from Government debentures and stock issues, but the debentures themselves will be acceptable in part payment or payment in full for the duties on that part of the estate or estates which will be liable to such payment.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill, of course, does not seek to do both of these things. This amending Bill merely seeks to amend Section 10 and Section 40 of the Estate and Succession Duties Act to specify that Government debentures purchased will be exempted from the payment of such duties. I just mention, parenthetically, for the interest of those members who may have surplus money to invest in Government bonds, that the debentures themselves will be acceptable for payment of death duties, that is, estate duty and succession duty on that part of the estate or estates which will be so liable, but not on the debentures themselves. I do not think there is anything more for me to explain. I have discussed it already with hon. members.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

4.55 p.m.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House find no quarrel with the principle of this Bill, and we welcome the fact that the Prime Minister took it away to have the initial mistakes corrected. I have had an opportunity of speaking to the Prime Minister about it on an earlier occasion, and we will support this particular Bill as a sensible approach towards the question of raising Government finance, because that is what it really is, by means of Barbados Government Debentures.

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

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

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, in Clause 2, immediately after the figure "1941" appearing in the first line, we have to insert the words "hereinafter referred to as the principal Act".

I beg to move that the words proposed to be inserted stand part.

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

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

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

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

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

Clause 3 was called.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, in the original Draft Bill which was circulated, there were three Clauses. The amendment which I am proposing now and which has been circulated will be that immediately after Clause 23 we insert the following as Clause 3:-

Insertion of new section 40A in Act 1941-16

3. The principal Act is hereby amended by inserting immediately after section 40 the following as section 40A -

"Exemption 40A. Succession duty shall not be payable in respect of any issue of debentures or stock of the Government declared by an order made under section 10A to be exempt from estate duty.".

I beg to move that the Clause proposed to be inserted stand part.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the original Clause 3 be renumbered Clause 4.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 4 stand part.

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

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Hon. members must bear in mind that this sitting has not yet been suspended. I can hardly hear the hon. member for the noises below me.

On the motion of Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, seconded by Hon. J. C. TUDOR, MR. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee with amendments, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, the Bill as amended was read a third time and passed and its title read and agreed to.

5.05 p.m.

A BILL TO REPEAL THE OVERSEAS SERVICE AGREEMENT ACT, 1963

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Rt. Hon. and learned Prime Minister, and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to repeal the Overseas Service Agreement Act, 1963 and to provide for the implementation by the Government of the Overseas Service (Barbados) Act, 1970 and for purposes connected therewith.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, in 1963 this Legislature gave approval of an Agreement made between the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of Barbados which was entitled the Overseas Service (Barbados) Agreement, and the essence of this Agreement was to provide for the payment of additional emoluments by Her Majesty's Government to officers who were recruited through the Ministry of Overseas Development for service in the island.

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members will please be inaudible other than the hon. member who is addressing the Chair, for the sake of the Reporters at least.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that the Act of 1963 provided for the payment of additional emoluments to officers serving in the Service of this island, either on contract or permanently, for whom it had been difficult to make provision within the structure of the Public Service of this island, invariably because of the scarcity of such personnel and difficulty of recruitment, and Her Majesty's Government in that year made a proposal to all the overseas Governments to the effect that Her Majesty's Government should be responsible for topping up the salaries out of the funds of the United Kingdom and not out of the public funds of Barbados or any other territory.

I wish to state quite clearly that I personally, despite the difficulties of recruitment, do not think that it leads to good relations within the Service if two people doing the same job are paid on a different basis, but this was sent to the Civil Service Association long before 1963 and the hierarchy, in contradistinction to the rank and file of the Civil Service Association, willingly agreed to this scheme which would have the effect later of topping up their salaries. When the particular officers were designated we then got some protest from the higher eschelons of the Public Service of Barbados, and without being invidious in any way, I respectfully submit not because they were against the scheme in principle like I was but because some officers who thought that they should have been designated were not designated and they thought that all the Secretary of State appointments which had been made in the Public Service before the implementation of this scheme would automatically become designated also. Maybe I am unduly suspicious, but I have to say this because you will hear some discussion at various levels that Barbados should not enter into this scheme at all.

When this Agreement came to an end I had the task of negotiating a new Agreement with Her Majesty's Government whereby the allowances have been increased substantially, and I think those designated officers are now getting 50% over and above the salaries which are paid in Barbados and various other fringe benefits which are not freely available or available at all to the members of the Public Service of this Sovereign independent nation, and then naturally I had to carry out a survey of the effect our not entering into a new Agreement with Her Majesty's Government, would have on the Public Service of this island. I do not mean on the individual susceptibilities or prejudices of certain officers, I mean on the efficient functioning of various departments of Government, and it was only after I was assured by the Ministry of Health that the Public Health services in Barbados would grind to a standstill with all the disastrous consequences that I decided to bring this new Agreement to the House, which, in the circumstances, I commend to the House for its passage, but I should like to say that I had consultation with the Governor of the Bank of Jamaica who is Head of the Jamaican Civil Service and a former close colleague of mine, and he was of the same opinion that there is no more ardent or more chauvinistic Jamaican or West Indian working in the Public Services than my friend the Governor of Jamaica, but he assured me that they were having a hard look at the new Agreement and they were satisfied that there would be a large scale exodus of highly qualified personnel from the Jamaican Public Service if these inducement allowances were removed, so there is not a question, Mr. Speaker, of depriving anyone of something which they should have, we have passed that stage in 1963 where the quarrel was between the British authorities and certain Public Officers as to whether they should have been designated or not.

The point and principle that we are dealing with here today is whether we can afford not to have an Overseas Service Agreement with the United Kingdom Government in order to retain all the medical and paramedical personnel chiefly, certainly engineers and certain other qualified persons in the service of Her Majesty in her right of Governor of this island. It is a very simple issue; as far as I am concerned it is no skin off my nose - to use a popular expression - but as a Barbadian my first reaction was that it was some kind of salary discrimination between overseas personnel and personnel recruited here in Barbados, but there are many of our Barbadian nationals and other West Indian nationals who are designated officers under this scheme, so that in any respect we can have no quarrel with the scheme as being in favour of ex-patriates because some of our officers do qualify for these extra emoluments even although the additional emoluments which they get under the Overseas Agreement scheme would place their salaries above those emoluments enjoyed by the Heads of their Departments, but we have to face the facts of life, and I am satisfied that the scheme is beneficial to this island.

5.15 p.m.

What happens, however, is that although the agreement provides that the Government of Barbados should pay these additional emoluments, we are reimbursed by the British Treasury for any sums so expended. But there is a technical reason why the Government of Barbados should pay the emoluments in the first instance, because in every respect and in every agreement or contract signed between Her Majesty's Government and an officer recruited for service in Barbados Her Majesty's Government is deemed to be the agent of the Government of Barbados. I should like to explain that. If it were not so, we could exercise no disciplinary action or control over the officers who are recruited. Although their additional emoluments are being paid by Her Majesty's Government, they are still being employed by Her Majesty in the right of Her Government of Barbados and not by Her Majesty in the right of Her Government in the United Kingdom, Great Britain and Northern Ireland. I think we have to make this distinction. We have actually had a case of an officer coming down here and wanting to argue that he did not want this and that type of accommodation and writing back, instead of consulting with the appropriate authorities in Barbados, to the United Kingdom saying that since they employed him they would have to find accommodation. Needless to say the gentleman is no longer with us. He was not asked to

leave by Her Majesty's Government; he was asked to leave by the Barbados Government for making himself an undue nuisance and not wanting to come under the control of the Government of Barbados.

I should like to make it clear that the employing authority is the Barbados Government. We pay the salaries,. so there can be no question of under whose direction and control the recruited officers will be. We are then reimbursed by Her Majesty's Government in respect of all the expenditure which we have incurred for these Overseas Service Aid Officers. With that simple explanation, and since this is, with certain amendments, a mere reiteration of the Act which was passed in 1963, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair that the House may go into Committee on this Bill.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 7 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

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

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER who resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

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

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill do now pass and be cited as the Overseas Service Agreement Act, 1971.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: 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 Item No. 3 be the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Accordingly Item No. 3 is the instant Order of the Day. It stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House, and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Registration (Births, Baptisms and Burials) Act, 1891. This Bill was read a first time.

On the 9th March, 1971, it was read a second time.

On the motion of the Hon. Leader of the House, seconded by the hon. junior member for Christ Church, the House went into Committee on the Bill.

Clause 1 was passed in Committee.

The Hon. Leader of the House moved, seconded by the hon. junior member for Christ Church, that Clause 2 stand part.

When this matter was last discussed the House was in Committee, and to that it now reverts.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

5.25 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I believe the Committee will recall that when we were last discussing this Bill, we had passed the second reading and had gone into Committee and passed Clause 1. During the discussion of Clause 2, two hon. members on the other side, the hon. senior member for St. Thomas and the hon. junior member for Bridgetown both made speeches and asked whether we might consider amending the Bill to do two things as I understood, to allow the adjudication of paternity by a Magistrate's Court to be entered on a birth certificate, and to remit any declaration as to paternity made by a Court of competent jurisdiction to be entered on a birth certificate, and they requested that I refer these two points to the legal advisers of Government for any clarification which could be sought on them.

We have looked at this thing, Mr. Chairman, and it has been very difficult for us to discover how the law could be improved in this respect. If the hon. members would wish to contribute further to the discussion, perhaps we might be able to clarify these matters.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Before anyone on the other side speaks, since I had something to do with this Bill, I should like to explain that there is no difficulty. In order to achieve what the hon. members on the other side would like to do. This Bill is a Bill which makes it possible for a person to have

his name voluntarily inserted with the consent of the mothers of children who are not born in holy wedlock, what are called legitimate children, on the certificate of the registration of birth.

The position is that when the hon. members asked for a Magistrate's Order to be inserted on the certificate of birth, what we are contending is that you are not adding anything to the effectiveness of the certificate of birth. A certificate of birth is one which shows that a child was born on such and such a day. It does not even say necessarily what the child's name may be. Frequently it is inserted that a child is a male child or it is a female child. We have not got to the stage where we can put down unisex yet on the certificate; we are not so progressive in this country as yet if there is such a sex, but we put male or female. The requirements of the Christian Church are such that before a child can be admitted to be of the Christian religion he must go through some function at some time of his life of baptism, but as far as the requirements of the law for statistical and other purposes are concerned, the most important certificate is your birth certificate. There are several good and sufficient reasons for this; the first is that once a person has complied with the law and registered the birth of a child born alive and that child subsequently disappears, no one can contend that there was not such a child in being and under the Queen's peace, which is the definition of homicide in the criminal courts of this Island - the unlawful killing of a person who is in being under the Queen's peace. That is one of the reasons. The other reason is a statistical reason, that is, we want to know all the numbers of live births, and it is compulsory for a person to register a birth. Whereas you need not be baptised at all, you need not be immunised against small pox or chicken pox, because any mother can go before a Magistrate and swear off a child from immunisation. As far as registration of births is concerned, this is compulsory; it is a compulsory act imposed by the State on the mother or closest relative if the mother is not able to do it of a person who is born alive in this country. As a mater of fact, it even extends to the children of officers serving overseas in the different Embassies, Missions and Legations of the Government of Barbados. I want to make this abundantly clear because unless you understand or appreciate fully what a birth certificate is about, you will get into the confusion where you will want a Magistrate's Court Order inserted on such birth certificate.

Now I have been told, I was not here on the last occasion and I do not think that this point necessarily arose then, but in discussions with my colleagues I have been told that there are many cases in which a person goes to the United States of America. The name of the father has not been inserted on the certificate of birth or on the baptismal certificate for that matter, and subsequently the father decides that he would like the child to join him in the United States of America. The normal procedure is for affidavits to be sworn by the mother of the child. I think this extends to children under the age of twenty-one only who are regarded in the eyes of the law of Barbados as infants although they can vote at eighteen. In the eyes of the law they are infants up to twenty-one and are only capable of entering into contracts for their own benefit but not for other people's benefit. I think that is the law as far as I can remember it.

The point is that if a father wants a child to get a permanent visa to join him in the United States of America, he can do it as far as I know, and this is not our law, this is the United States law, by affidavits sworn by competent persons that this child was a dependent of his and that he is the father. There are many children who have migrated to the United States on this basis. What we are being asked to do now is to insert a Court Order on a registration of birth certificate. Now the law gives you so many days within which to register the birth of a child and invariably this is done. If it is not done within the statutory period, it is done as soon as possible thereafter and no penalties are imposed for late registration although there is provision in the law for the imposition of such penalties, because frequently the mother may be unable rather than unwilling to go to the appropriate place. If the child was born in a maternity hospital, it is done there by the doctor or the nurse without even asking the mother. They may ask the mother whether she wants the name of the child inserted on the certificate, and she may say she cannot bother with that now, she has to consult the other people and the godmothers and so on; but the point is that registration is done at birth or within a matter of weeks of such, and that then becomes part of the permanent record in the principal Registry in this Island.

When a father does not support a child and the Court of competent jurisdiction which is invariably a Magistrate's Court of Barbados adjudges him to be the putative father of the child, that becomes an Order of the court and that is irrebuttable evidence, once the time of appeal has expired, that he is the father of that child. It is even more evidence than the father's insertion of the name voluntarily on the birth certificate.

5.35 p.m.

If the purpose of the proposed amendment is to make it easier for the father to establish paternity or the child to establish the father's identity if that child wants to migrate or to succeed to some property to which he would be entitled under the amended legislation relating to succession and inheritance, if the object is to make this easier, there is no better evidence than the Court Order itself. The insertion *ex post facto* on the registration certificate that there is a Court Order does not have the same validity as the Court order itself, and either the father who wants to establish this or the mother of the child or anyone else can get a copy of the Court Order and present it as irrebuttable evidence having been so adjudged by a Court of competent jurisdiction in this Island, so what we are saying is that nothing really is gained by inserting a Court Order on a birth certificate. The Court Order may have been within six months of the birth, it may be as much as 15 1/2 years after the birth; I understand

it is now to the age of 16 that support is given but when I was practising it stopped at the age of 12 so you can see how many years ago I used to deal with these things. You can actually bring a case against a putative father when the child is 15 years old when there will not be much time to run, but it frequently happens that a father may have been supporting a child for a long time and there was no need to get a Court Order, and then he takes off, goes to the United Kingdom or takes off with somebody else and decides he is not supporting the child any more and the mother has to take him to court, but as long as the children are not working and she has to establish satisfactory evidence to the Court, then the Order is made.

What administratively is being requested now is that somebody will have the duty of going back to the Registry and dragging out the register of births and inserting on the register, because it is not on the certificate, you have to put it on the register of births before you can get it on the certificate, and we are now mimeographing all registrations. When people come for copies, we are now in the process of mimeographing these things, so that it comes out on a film the size of a photostat; that film will be put in the permanent archives for recopying whenever necessary. The principle register is already there so what you are asking us to do is to go back and insert in the principle register which means going back and searching all the archives to find the film cancelling or destroying that one so that a new film can be taken showing that this entry has been made. With all due respect, and I admire the spirit in which the amendment was offered, I contend that this does not really add to the validity of the Court Order, neither does it assist the persons seeking that statement for various reasons, migration or otherwise, and I also respectfully submit that this Act which makes provision for the voluntary insertion of the father's name, not the compulsory insertion of the father's name, and this would be against the whole spirit and tenure of the Bill itself.

The main consideration is that nothing is gained because the Court Order itself is more valid than the secondary evidence of the Court Order which we are asking now to be inserted on the register of births. It would create an unnecessary amount of work and would not advance the interest of the person wishing this evidence to any degree whatsoever.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, in many ways I regret that the Prime Minister was not present when speeches were made in the second reading of this Bill, because I think a somewhat narrower view than which is put forward today might have been broadened a little if he had had the personal opportunity of hearing the arguments adduced on that occasion. One of the arguments adduced then undoubtedly was that succession to property will be easier if the certificate shows the name of the father, but that was only a relatively small part of the appeal to humanity involved in this question of birth certificates. A speech was made in perhaps somewhat conventional terms, but valuable nonetheless, by the hon. junior member for St. Thomas who pointed out that there were, in his words, no illegitimate children but only illegitimate parents. The burden of having to carry a certificate through life that has only your mother's name on it is one which is borne by 55% or 56% of all Barbadians. None of us can pretend, Mr. Chairman, that it is not an occasional embarrassment; do not let us fool ourselves, in countries where what is called illegitimacy is less of a problem, if it is a problem, than in Barbados, such as the Scandinavian countries, certificates of birth and baptism do not reveal at all whether the parents of the child were married, they have on them the father's name and the mother's maiden name, and only in a small percentage of cases where the father does not acknowledge the child, or cannot be brought to book by action through the Courts, only in a tiny number of cases does the birth certificate of any Scandinavian, certainly in Sweden, bear on it only the name of a mother.

There is no reason that I can see, Mr. Chairman, why this insistence on legitimacy or illegitimacy should continue to affect the child; it is only the child who wants a certificate, registration exists for two purposes, it exists as the Prime Minister pointed out for statistical purposes and also to prove the existence of a life and being in cases of infanticide and so on because you cannot really apply the law of infanticide or concealment of birth or of child destruction unless you have registration of birth. That is one thing, but a separate thing is that in this life all of us need documents of identification and a fundamental document of identification for every child born on the whole of this planet earth in civilised and uncivilised countries so-called is a birth certificate. I believe that there is now nowhere on earth where there is not a compulsion for births to be registered. Where christian marriage exists some people still have children without the benefit of christian marriage or indeed Mohammedan marriage as a case may be, but this is no reason in my argument for insisting that the children who result from these unions should in any way be subjected to embarrassment or possible embarrassment because their certificates show them legally to be a different sort of person from the children of married people.

In Barbados we are moving towards the destruction of all disabilities caused by not being legitimate; we did not have it quite in Barbados to the extent that other West Indian Islands had it. For example in Jamaica I believe that comparatively recently an illegitimate child is not allowed to enter for the Jamaican scholarship; it has been as bad as that in some West Indian Islands. We have never gone to these lengths, but they are still inside Barbados aspects of this, and certainly outside Barbados, particularly in the United Kingdom and the United States, it is a stigma to have a birth or baptismal certificate that does not bear a father's name.

5.45 p.m.

Those who are familiar with marriage certificates will know that when people get married they tell the priest their father's name whether or not the father

is married to the mother. When you look at a marriage certificate, you will see that in most cases both parties insert their fathers' names in the appropriate place irrespective of the fact that they may be illegitimate. I do not see why this type of provision cannot be extended, so that we can have a birth certificate which will have on it the mother's maiden name; the father's name if he appears and signs the register jointly with the mother as this Bill provides, or, as I suggested at another stage, if a man is declared to be the putative father of a child by the court on the mother's application, then the name should be entered as well. That is what I suggested on the second reading of this Bill when it came before the House.

I do not think that we would want to put on the Registry the job of going through the thirty or forty affiliation orders which are made every week. *(Asides)* I am informed by the junior member for Bridgetown, who, I believe, still has more experience in the conduct of affiliation cases than any other Counsel including those we have seen for many years at the Bar, that the number has in fact fallen off. I remember when I first practised at the Bar that the number was about thirty or forty a week, but perhaps fathers in these days are supporting their children without the necessity of going to the Courts. Even if the number was still 30, nobody would put upon the Registry the job of going to search the Order Book of the Magistrates' Courts and make the appropriate corrections in them. This should be done only on the application of the mother, or if the child so wishes on the application of the child. A child should have an opportunity, if he or she has been recognised either by his or her father or by judicial pronouncement as being the son or daughter of a particular man, of having that fact entered upon the documentation which he or she has to carry through life. I believe that the rejection of this is a sop to expediency at the moment. It would be inconvenient because there is, perhaps, no precedent available to the draftsmen in the English-speaking world, at any rate. It would be inconvenient to try to draft this; also the Registry is very busy at the moment.

People are going into the Registry every day with affidavits to make corrections in old birth certificates and in old baptism certificates. Every day there is a collection of people there. The Chief Clerk holds a Court in there. It is a Court that, fortunately, gets through its business more expeditiously than the more contentious Courts, but every day that is appointed for the alteration of registers of births and baptisms there is a long queue of persons with affidavits with or without their Solicitors or Counsel. We know that the Registry is busy, but this is not meant to be a permanent condition. There would only be a few more applications, as I conceive it, Mr. Chairman, if mothers had the right to insert the names of putative fathers on the certificates. That is the compromise that should have been pursued when the arguments were being put to the Prime Minister. The arguments of expediency have convinced the Prime Minister, but the arguments of humanity have not prevailed at all.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I should like to explain to the hon. member that a little before he came back to Barbados I, too, was practising in the Law Courts. I have had no discussion with the Registrar on this matter whatsoever; I discussed it with my colleagues in the Cabinet and we debated it both sides. We are not against the proposed amendment. It is not a question of inconvenience, but there are certain legal and technical difficulties which should be further investigated.

I agree with all the moral considerations urged by the hon. member, but I do not see within the four corners of the Act how, without drastic revision, we can accommodate him at this stage. I have indicated to the hon. member already that we can set up a joint committee from both sides of the House to make recommendations on this particular aspect, but to take them outside the immediate amendments upon which we are engaged.

Mr. ADAMS: Of course, the Prime Minister is not saying what he said initially in his speech. I am glad to hear that the principle is accepted. What I understand from the Prime Minister's argument is that what I said about it being difficult to draft is not accepted. Now, he has the Act before him, and I do not have it before me. I believe I am right in saying that Section 14 - perhaps he can correct me if I have got the Section wrong - of the 1891 Act allows the Chief Clerk to make alterations in any register. He can amend an error.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: In the case of Section 14 it is a question of *casus omissus,* a term which the hon. member would understand. You cannot say that if subsequently 15 years later a Court says that somebody is the father of a child that would be an error in the register. The main point I was making is that this is not only the registration of birth, but but it is the registration at birth and these are the compulsory requirements of the Act. How can we go *ex post facto* 15 years later, because you have right up to the age of 16 to bring an affiliation application. There is something that has been bothering me. It is not so much that I would not like to see all of these distinctions done away with. As a matter of fact, it is this Government that has changed the law of inheritance and is making these changes which we are considering today to remove these iniquitous anomalies.

I agree with the junior member for St. Thomas, although it is not often that both the senior member and the junior member for St. Thomas and I or any two of us at any one time, far less all three of us, see eye to eye on any matter. Despite the fact that the hon. junior member for St. Thomas is a member of my Cabinet we usually take different sides of the argument, he being the devil's advocate and I being on the other side or *vice versa;* and so does the hon. senior member for St. Thomas. There is no real difference between us and what we would like to see. I was merely pointing out that there are certain functional difficulties in introducing such an amendment at this time. We have been considering it since we last moved further consideration of the matter some

time in March, and I still do not see the way out. That is why I am suggesting that if we appointed a Joint Committee at some subsequent time, since there is no controversy, we could iron out these difficulties, but we could not do it under Section 14 because it is a case of *casus omissus*.

Mr. ADAMS: Section 14 - I am glad I got the Section right - is a case of *casus omissus*, but the Act of 1949-28 which is to be read together with the Act of 1891-26 provides for registration of birth not only at birth, but at any time. Now, 1949-28 which is the Registration (Births, Baptisms, Marriages, and Burials) (Amendment) Act, 1949 - I believe that I have some responsibility for this Act although indirectly. It was the fact that my birth was not registered that gave rise to its passage. It was only three years ago that my father and I went to the Registrar and registered my own birth. It is not by any means impossible..... *(Asides)* According to the Prime Minister's argument, I am now three years old, since registration takes place at birth. The 1949 Act allows the Registrar to register a birth after the expiration of 12 months from its date. 5.55 p.m.

This Act, although it does not in fact amend the 1891 Act, is to be read as one; the two Acts are one Act for the purpose of registration of births, and anybody can go and register a child's birth if he has the proper documentation. *(Asides)* This is not re-registration; the 1930 Act is re-registration, that is the birth of persons whose parents were not married when the child was born.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: If the hon. member would give way, the point I am making is that whereas there may be provision under the 1949 Act to allow us to take official recognition of the birth of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas for the first time, it does not make any provision for amending. Section 14 makes provision for amending an error that has been made upon the registration. It only means that where you have omitted to register - I do not have the amendment here before me - it is my recollection that you can go at any time and register. What we are dealing with here is really an amendment to the register which does not come under section 14. That is the small distinction that I was making, and I think that if the hon. member would check, I doubt his immediate fore parents' births were ever registered in 1891; so that there is still some dispute as to the precise date in April that he was born. This is just by the way and you need not have that on the record.

Mr. ADAMS: I never pursued that, but one other point that could have been pursued is the fact that the 1891 Act, again I do not have it before me, provides for the name of the child to be added after the registration has been completed. That section can easily be amended to have the name of the father added as well. All these are matters which in my respectful submission could have been pursued if the Attorney General had seriously intended to assist this matter. Section 11 reads:

"If any child born in this Island whose birth shall been been duly registered shall, within six months after such registration, have any name given to it in baptism, the parent or other person procuring such name to be given may, within seven days after such baptism, procure and deliver to the registrar a certificate according to the form contained in this section....." and so on, and then it goes on to say that the Registrar shall forthwith register the name by which the child was baptised. Well in the same way you have a section which says that you can enter a child's name on a birth certificate, you can have a section which says you can enter the name of the father and set out the conditions. That is one of the conditions. The draftsmen have chosen to amend section 6; they could just as easily have amended section 11, and if there is this difficulty as the Prime Minister refers to which is a difficulty because section 6 is a six months' clause, you can only carry out its provisions within six months, you can put it into section 11 because you can at any time if a child is baptised go and enter the baptismal name on the birth certificate.

I do not like drawing examples from my family, but I do have a fairly close relative who was baptised as an adult woman. I believe perhaps she may already have been married when she was baptised, or perhaps had been baptised for the purpose of being married, and her name could have been entered on her birth certificate. That would have been something like 24 or 25 years after she was born. So there is no difficulty in entering names a long time after the register has started. I believe that members of the Cabinet who discussed this did not have at their disposal adequate legal advice based on proper thought, because they obviously did not have anybody who had read the Act carefully with a view to considering how the admitted wishes of at least two Cabinet Ministers including the Prime Minister who agreed with the point of view that we were putting forward about abolishing the inequities between the different entries could be met. You had a whole Cabinet, I am sure the Prime Minister is not consciously breaking the Official Secrets Act, who agreed that everything should be done to facilitate uniform certificates, but obviously the Cabinet did not have before it the class of legal advice that would allow it to carry these things out. There are four lawyers in the Cabinet, but they may be of different qualities: There is only one that I remember who made a living at the Bar and he is right here in this House; I mean the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister should not in his position in the political world at this stage of development have to be telling the Attorney General and the Minister of Home Affairs how to go about their legal business.

Sir, I can only regard this measure as a stop gap measure. It is a good idea and I could not advise the Opposition to vote against it, and I will vote for it; but it is only a stop gap measure. Our aim should be uniform certificates, so that my certificate would look the same as the certificate of anybody else in Barbados, everybody's certificate would look the same: mother's maiden name, father's name, and that

would be the end of the matter. The father goes and signs and has his name put on. If he is a wicked fellow and you have to drag him to court, the mother goes and has his name put on subsequently. *(Asides)* Well if she loses the case the child has no father, and that would be an unfortunate situation. What if she puts two men in court because she cannot decide which and the magistrate finds that there was joint negligence on the part of two fathers as I understand once happened in Jamaica?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member can do like the gentleman in India applying for the Civil Service who put down failed B.A. Cambridge. So the mother can put down lost case against such and such a man.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, we will vote for this Bill, but it is unfortunate that this is election year and considerations of campaigning may intervene between the Prime Minister's very sensible suggestion of a joint Committee of people who are interested in this to go into it. I would hope that both parties would be able to say as a part of their policy that when they come back to Parliament next session that we will all then perhaps try to get this matter straightened out once and for all.

The question that Clause 2 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On motion of Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr, SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, the Bill was read a third time and passed and its title read and agreed to.

6.05 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, this concludes Government Business for today's sitting. Hon. members will know that we have on this date laid the Condominium Bill which has not yet been printed. In the light of its importance, I believe hon. members might wish some time to study it, and I am proposing that they have that time. I beg to move therefore that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 22nd of this month at 2.30 p.m.

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

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

6.08 p.m.